



Vanuatu

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) - Interim

Name of focal point: Shadrack Weleghabit
Organization: National Disaster Management Office
Title/Position:
E-mail address: sweleghabit@vanuatu.gov.vu
Telephone: +67822699 +67823035
Fax:

Reporting period: 2011-2013
Report Status: Interim
Last updated on: 14 September 2012
Print date: 31 October 2012
Reporting language: English

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/oceania/vut/>

Section 1: Outcomes 2011-2013

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcome Statement:

Recognition of DRM as a development issue is well established in Vanuatu. DRM is an integral element of PAA-PLAS, the national development documents; and DRR is an increasingly referenced issues in sector development plans.

Articulation of all-hazards risk management has been somewhat less successful as single hazards tend to be considered in isolation, rather than potential impact on the sector/project/community itself. There also remains a lack of effective disaster risk planning tools that can facilitate resilient decision making.

The awareness of disaster risk is apparent. The means of addressing disaster risk in development decision making are not.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcome Statement:

Significant governance gains have been made in the last one to two years. NDMO has seen substantial investment in its capacity to plan and respond to disasters, and has been co-located with VMGD which enhances its access to hazard risk knowledge and expertise.

The establishment of the National Advisory Board on DRR and CCA is imminent. This is a major development in how Vanuatu addresses disaster risk and will see a consolidation of stakeholder efforts with the objectives of increasing impact and efficiency in DRR and CCA interventions.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcome Statement:

With the advent of the NAB, the government of Vanuatu is now in a strong position from which to systematically engage with both sub-national levels of government, and with communities. Community engagement to date has primarily been facilitated by NGOs, and has attempted to link with sub-national administrative functions in order to ensure connection to national DRR functions. In reality these links have been difficult to maintain.

The project management unit (PMU) of NAB will be explicitly charged with ensuring stakeholders engagements with communities are consistent and coordinated.

A critical link between community capacity building is the community disaster committee interaction with area and provincial representatives of government - most importantly this will

be interaction with provincial disaster committees (PDCs). Development of PDCs is on the NDMO agenda in the short term as sub-national capacity building is re-invigorated, and it will be crucial that these structures are in place to support the growing number of CDCs established in Vanuatu.

The recently established Vanuatu Humanitarian Team (VHT) and the PMU will both play significant roles in ensuring consistent messaging is delivered at community level. VHT (and Red Cross) has commenced a process of standardising communication materials, and VHT members have committed to delivering consistent messaging. These knowledge steps, alongside continued targeted community capacity building will improve community resilience.

Section 2: Strategic goals

Strategic Goal 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:

Substantial progress since the last review has resulted from strengthening the National Disaster Risk Management Office (NDMO) and finalization of new arrangements for integrating governance of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) efforts.

The broad government objective of decentralizing operations where practical has extended to DRR, and although the establishment of disaster management offices in Santo and Malampa provinces was postponed, three provincial offices are planned in “harder to reach” provinces. Although commitment and sentiment for decentralizing DRR is strong, there are many obstacles. Local level DRR initiative is most often facilitated by NGOs. Means of strengthening provincial and area level administrative uptake of DRR have been identified through explicitly linking NGO/community efforts to national DRR accountabilities coordinated by the Vanuatu Humanitarian Team (VHT); and accordingly ensuring local level administration is linked and strengthened as part of ensuring best practice.

Education and health ministries continue to lead sector DRR initiative but there have been significant gains driven by formal establishment of a cluster system in Vanuatu. Clusters, like their global counterparts, are responsible for coordination of response and risk reduction activities. Cluster activities are overseen by the newly created VHT (which shares an office within the NDMO), but led by their respective line ministries. Response contingency planning at sector level is underway – led by clusters and overseen by VHT. First exercises are planned for late 2012.

Strategic Goal 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:

The proposed amendment to the government’s National Disaster Act that was drafted in 2009 has been withdrawn from approved by the Council of Ministers. New arrangements will be drafted once the recently established National Advisory Board (NAB) for DRR and CCA has been formally approved. Formal NAB arrangements are to include provincial responsibilities.

As discussed above, community level strengthening is primarily facilitated by NGO’s with most initiatives including establishment of community disaster committees (CDCs). CDCs are

not necessarily well linked to area and provincial administrative structures, and although ensuring their longevity beyond NGO/project involvement is targeted at setup, it is unclear how durable these arrangements are in reality – especially as comprehensive area and provincial structures are not currently in place.

Cluster activities (above) are increasingly strengthening sub-national level institutions.

The primary national development policy document now firmly incorporates DRR. Although the Priorities for Action Agenda (PAA) – and Planning Long Acting Short (PLAS) both include sector opportunities for DRR, there is little practical guidance to guide implementation. The PAA in particular points to the DRR and DRM National Action Plan (NAP), which in turn strongly reflects the Pacific Regional DRR and DM Action Plan and the HFA.

Strategic Goal 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:

DRR activities and first phase response have been the primary focus of government led DRM initiatives. Community reconstruction activities have typically been the focus of communities themselves, and of NGOs. This general arrangement is reflected by the current Vanuatu DRM institutional focus.

By proxy the NDMO considers recovery and reconstruction when engaging in response activities. The reality of the typical Vanuatu emergency is that they tend to be small in scale and occur some distance away from the capital (where resources are currently centralized). In effect, part of the a VUV25m (approx. USD270,000) response fund that NDMO can access is used for recovery and reconstruction because it is not practical to focus on response alone in these conditions. In practical terms, response activities will often see (for example) rehabilitation of water supplies that have run down over many years but which were “finally destroyed” in a flood.

That these activities address reconstruction is largely coincidence: there is no systematic means of linking preparedness, response, or recovery to reconstruction by way of risk reduction. In finalizing NAB arrangements and structure, discussion on these links has occurred.

Inclusion of risk reduction in traditional DRM activities is steadily improving due substantially to the increased capacity of NDMO and establishment of VHT and country cluster arrangements.

Section 3: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions?
Yes

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	No
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	No

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk? Yes

Description:

- DRR is recognized in national planning strategies PAA-PLAS, and this fact is widely recognized by sector agencies and partners
- Provincial administrations are aware of their increasing role in facilitating decentralization of government capacities generally, with DRR awareness strong in some provincial

administrations

- NDMO strengthening and establishment of the VHT have strengthened direction towards DRR, with VHT in particular being active in coordinating non-government agencies who deliver efforts at sub-national level
- External agencies increasingly involved in provincial planning, which is increasingly bringing DRR awareness to the provincial planning table.

Context & Constraints:

- With notable exceptions in health and education, government line ministries do not typically reflect DRR explicitly in their annual planning. Wider legislative review could help ministries planning processes align better with PAA-PLAS, thereby enabling improved DRR integration
- Decentralising responsibilities is a critical area of work that has already been identified for the short-medium term. Area Councils are seen as an ideal point for strengthening, in support of Provincial administration
- The spread-out nature of provincial centres in Vanuatu contributes to difficulties in applying and supporting effective DRR decentralization without adequate resourcing (in both staffing and budget terms).

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget	x	x
Decentralised / sub-national budget	x	x
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	x	

Description:

- Health and education ministries show evidence of good progress with DRR planning and resources allocated within ministry budgets. Both are also effective at advocating for improved external infrastructure. These ministries are also gaining recognition externally and offer a good working example to colleagues in the wider DRR and government communities
- Health and education ministries now both have human resource dedicated to DRR
- Early stage planning has commenced on developing a DRR finance strategy for key sectors
- The NAB arrangements for DRR and CCA offer excellent prospect for coordination of DRR resource. Development of a project management unit within NAB is scheduled, with this unit responsible for highlighting efficiency opportunities and gaps (amongst other things).

Context & Constraints:

- Many stakeholder hold the view that a reactive approach to DRR resourcing is the norm. It is held that resourcing of DRR is sometimes driven BY donor activity budgets, and is often in reaction to emergency events or high profile issues
- There is little awareness of DRR expenditure. Many stakeholders, including many ministries undertake activities which could be construed as DRR, but are not identified as such. There is opportunity to establish line ministry budgeting tools to extrapolate this data, and to identify explicit DRR opportunities which meet both DRR and other objectives within ministries.

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? No

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)

No

Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government

No

Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR

0

Description:

- NGOs play a pivotal role in mobilizing community participation in DRR, and with the establishment of the VHT, coordination and support of these activities from a government perspective has vastly improved
- Some organizations have also been successful in establishing church based DRR initiatives. Sustained links to with these efforts to “formal” government DRR processes is a little more problematic, especially in the absence of sub-national government support
- A number of community disaster committees have been established. These provide effective link points for DRR
- Central government has articulated their commitment to ensuring Provincial and Area level decentralization, however delegation of DRR functions and budget is yet to be formalized.

Context & Constraints:

- Although Provincial Authorities have formal government “authority” in all government matters, the reality is that the current lack of human and financial resources constrains what they are able to do
- There is only patchy knowledge of DRR (and response) roles and responsibilities at Provincial administrative level
- Establishment and strengthening of new and existing provincial disaster committees tends to be an annual “commitment” but is seldom sustained. Increased resource for NDMO increases the likelihood that this commitment may soon be realized.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? Yes

Civil society members (specify absolute number)	1 representing all
National finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	1
Sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	7

Private sector (specify absolute number)	0
Science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	0
Women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	0
Other (please specify)	0

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	No
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	No
In a civil protection department	No
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	Ministry of Internal Affairs

Description:

- The DRR and Disaster Management NAP Task Force (NTF) has been functioning. It was recently wound up in anticipation of formal establishment of the NAB. Both NAB and the taskforce have/had multi sector involvement with NAB having a slightly wider stakeholder pool
- A number of NGO consortia are operational for relatively large DRR and/or CCA projects. These provide an effective coordination mechanism, and provide for improved engagement with NAB as there is typically a single project lead agency explicitly tasked with coordination engagement
- Improved participation of private sector, mainly communications companies, in coordination structures
- VHT cited as substantial vehicle for improvement seen in functioning of DRR platforms
- NDMO capacity to lead and “use” invigorated platform, and in addition NDMO now has formal agreements with a number of external agencies (mostly NGOs).

Context & Constraints:

- It is early days for the NAB, and much hope is placed in its ability to lead the way in DRR implementation and coordination. Before NAB was proposed, the national platform for DRR had a government focus and was supplemented by a non government DRR group (NGOs, UN, etc) which was not fully effective at informing the government platform

- Private sector and churches roles on the DR platform are not strong – their input is not regular
- Representation from minority groups, and those who don't traditionally enjoy good access to DRR support, could be strengthened.

Section 4: Priority for action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

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: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	Some but not quantified
Schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	Some but not quantified
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	No
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	Education, Health, Infrastructure and Public Utilities

Description:

- A number of risk assessment processes and tools have been used/implemented recently. Examples include VANRIS (Lands Dept), VEMIS (Min.Education), and CLIMSIM (Meteo)
- Weather and El Nino Southern Oscillation (ENSO) monitoring has improved substantially in recent years
- Some sector assessments have been completed – again health and education lead the way. Ministry of Infrastructure and Public Utilities (MIPU) have undertaken some risk assessment work and other ministries have also commenced assessments

Context & Constraints:

- There is solid awareness that assessments for individual hazards have been undertaken, and for some locations and sectors these have been consolidated, but there has been no comprehensive multi-hazard assessment undertaken
- Risk mapping has been undertaken in some areas, but is not typically available as a planning tool. There is substantial demand for such tools
- Traditional knowledge is applied at community level and many national stakeholders felt that this could be harnessed to inform national risk assessment

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed? Yes

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated	Yes
Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/information systems)	No
Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries	No

Description:

- PICRAFI (Pacific Island Catastrophic Risk and Financing Initiative) assessment widely cited by national stakeholders as containing good urban hazard and vulnerability data. This is however not widely available
- There is no “system” used to monitor all risks, but Vanuatu Meteorology and Geo-Hazards Department (VMGD) is particularly active in hydro-meteorological risk monitoring. VMGD is also improving volcanic risk monitoring

Context & Constraints:

- The central repository of disaster losses is not kept consistently – information is stored and accessed by NDMO on an ad-hoc basis and supported by a number of other data hosts
- NDMO is currently gathering national data on risk exposure and intends to make it available
- Risk information management is not routinely used as a planning tool for a number of reasons: the analysis has not been comprehensively completed; analysis completed is not centralized; analysis available to NDMO or line ministries is not uniformly presented so is difficult to consolidate
- There are significant gains to be made by completing hazard and vulnerability analysis, and presenting it as a planning tool

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Early warnings acted on effectively	Yes
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	Yes

Description:

- National stakeholder saw this as an area that has seen substantial recent improvement
- Several high profile initiatives to disseminate warning information have been undertaken: the NDMO has established ToRs with mobile phone network companies and radio stations to carry warning messages on an ongoing basis
- Although warning systems are in place for a number of hazards, there is only limited progress in establishing supporting community awareness campaigns or community action plans
- VMGD website is seen as a good outreach tool, albeit for urban Ni-Vanuatu.

Context & Constraints:

- There is a tendency towards technological means of outreach to communities – which has risks. Traditional early warning methods are actively used in many rural areas and stakeholders felt that better use of these techniques can effectively supplement the tech based solutions promoted by government currently
- Coverage of early warning, local preparedness, and communication systems/protocols is far from uniform or extensive.

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? Yes

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	Yes
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	Yes
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	Yes
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	Yes

Description:

- With the exception of seismic hazards, transboundary risks are the norm for Vanuatu. As an island nation with a scattered population Vanuatu's characteristics are similar to most of its neighbours. Accordingly use of transboundary risk information sources and monitoring is the norm
- RSMC Nadi Regional Tropical Cyclone Centre, Pacific Tsunami Warning Centre, Melanesian Volcanological Network, are all examples of working transboundary risk information sources
- Pacific regional networks such as the Pacific Platform for DRM, and the Pacific Humanitarian Team provide Vanuatu with valuable cooperation opportunities
- Cooperation with neighbours has been maintained since the substantial efforts to establish bird flu response protocols 3-4 years ago. Cooperation is most evident for various health risks and is monitored through the Ministry of Health

Context & Constraints:

- Stakeholder focus tends to be on receipt of technical input from regional actors on risk assessments. Although Vanuatu does contribute substantially to regional efforts, DRR functions in this context focus on "capacity building" generally rather than risk assessment specifically

Section 5: Priority for action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

Information is proactively disseminated	No
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	Yes
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	Yes

Description:

- Community messaging tends to be disaster preparedness focused rather than on wider DRR – this includes messaging delivered through a weekly radio show aired nationwide
- Traditional knowledge is the default information base, which has potential to be supplemented
- Some clusters have good information sharing that reaches to community level – education in particular has been held out as a good example of information sharing in action
- Agencies have commenced a process to consolidate DRR messaging used in at community level. VHT have coordinated one multi-stakeholder workshop on this with a view to establishing and agreeing guidelines for messaging, and sharing resources when practical.

Context & Constraints:

- Messaging to communities promoted by government is of a general nature and tends not to reflect the gendered nature of risk differential within communities, nor the ability of traditionally marginalized groups to receive and act on information
- Consistency of messaging from different sources is particularly difficult when Provincial and

Area administrations have limited capacity to ensure effective linkages outside of the capital. Efforts on consolidation of DRR messaging (above) need to be linked with Provincial and Area administration strengthening.

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

Primary school curriculum	Yes
Secondary school curriculum	No
University curriculum	No
Professional DRR education programmes	No

Description:

- Over the last two years the education in emergencies cluster has taken an active role in establishing DRR in the school curriculum. The Ministry of Education, UNICEF, and Save the Children have put significant resource into ensuring DRR is a critical element of the current primary curriculum review
- Intermediate level curriculum review is earmarked but yet to commence
- DRR is a minor element of courses conducted by the Vanuatu Chamber of Commerce. Strengthening this is seen as a significant opportunity to increase disaster risk awareness within the business community. Similarly strengthening the Vanuatu National Training Council also offers scope for further improvement

Context & Constraints:

- Linking the gains within the school environment with the wider community is seen as a great opportunity to broaden community awareness of DRR
- Recovery concepts are not highlighted in existing materials – the focus is on risk identification, management, and disaster preparedness

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? No

Research programmes and projects	Yes
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	No
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	No

Description:

- National stakeholders readily identify with a number of individual hazard risk assessments rather than for multi-hazard assessments. The reality is that institutionally led multi hazard risk assessments are rare in Vanuatu. Community based assessments tend to be multi hazard, however as highlighted elsewhere, links between communities, through Provincial and Area administrations, through to central government are not particularly strong
- Cost benefit analysis is not a systematically utilized tool – and there is little scope for capturing social cost/benefit of DRR actions. The fact that disaster damage information is not systematically tracked (earlier in this document) reinforces that cost benefit analysis has little foothold currently

Context & Constraints:

- The single hazard nature of much risk assessment work was highlighted throughout engagement with national stakeholders. Through VHT, NGOs offer opportunity to increase the multi-hazard basis for research and analysis
- There is significant demand for basic planning tools that enable line ministries to assess the worth of DRR investment through application of cost benefit analysis and return periods.

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: 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.	Yes
Training of local government	Yes
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes
Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	No
Guidance for risk reduction	No
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	Yes

Description:

- Public awareness has been increased over recent years with National Disaster Awareness day taken as an opportunity to spread the message. Media outlets are particularly supportive of NDMO efforts to disseminate information. Government agencies other than NDMO have little resource to support such days, so government reach is limited
- There is good general awareness of hazards however specific strategies for community response are not well embedded, and communities particularly vulnerable to hazards receive same “national” messaging as those less vulnerable
- Agencies have commenced a process to consolidate DRR messaging used in at community level. VHT have coordinated one multi-stakeholder workshop on this with a view to establishing and agreeing guidelines for messaging, and sharing resources when practical.

Context & Constraints:

- National campaigns seldom reach rural communities, and it is generally felt that outer islands are not “as aware” of disasters as those closer to Port Vila and Luganville
- Remote rural communities where Bislama is seldom spoken are at a disadvantage to receiving effective messaging originating from government/NDMO.

Section 6: Priority for action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

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: 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) No

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	Yes
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	No
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Description:

- Various acts of parliament serve to act in a dual manner as both protection of ecologically and traditionally important places, and to restrict development in vulnerable locations
- Primary “economic development” acts including the Foreshore Development Act and the Physical Planning Act don’t adequately reflect DRR or risk more generally
- Urban planning guidelines are being developed, and urban land use zoning is being developed for Port Vila and Luganville
- There is some use of payment for ecosystem services as a means of incentivizing environmental management, but this is not institutionally driven.

Context & Constraints:

- Environmental impact assessments (EIA) are carried out by the Dept Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC) whenever significant development proposals are put forward. These are however limited to consideration of applications to lease land, and EIAs take only limited consideration of disaster exposure
- Although NDMO and DEPC liaise on an ad-hoc basis, there exists significant opportunity to strengthen DRR elements of EIAs by routinely involving NDMO, or at least DEPC having accessing NDMO risk data and tools
- The limited capacity of Provincial Governments to apply DRR principles was highlighted again under this indicator, as it is typically the responsibility of Provincial Governments to flag issues to central government as they relate to provincial development projects.

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: 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Crop and property insurance	No
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	No
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	No

Description:

- Vanuatu does not have a classical welfare system, rather extended family networks are typically relied on for social protection. In rural areas in particular, these networks are strong, however urbanization is applying pressure as families “stretch” between their villages and the two main urban centres
- The church also provides social support
- There are various microfinance, crop insurance, and urban housing insurance options available to spread the risk of disaster, however awareness of these is not particularly strong. Informal systems of “lending” exist at community level, but these are typically not financial

transactions

- PAA-PLAS includes aspirations to employ rural Ni-Vanuatu on infrastructure projects that serve rural Ni-Vanuatu. This is promoted as a means of increasing cashflow and may positively impact resilience to disaster, however it is not clear how extensively these provisions have been taken up.

Context & Constraints:

- Most of rural Vanuatu rely on subsistence agriculture and fishing. They are relatively “asset rich and income poor” which limits the ability for families to access insurance and credit. Women tend to be excluded from any income generation in rural areas.

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? No

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	Yes
Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets	Health, Education, Infrastructure and Public Utilities
Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals	Yes

Description:

- Although DRR is not directly addressed by most sectors, risk reduction is often apparent under “other names”, and often even addressed by coincidence. For example, most of the large scale road maintenance in rural areas occurs in areas where flooding or landslide is common and means of mitigating future damage are invariably considered. That this work is a priority is a practical reflection of infrastructure on small islands, rather than DRR being a priority for MIP
- The Public Finance and Economic Management Act is an accountability initiative for government to adequately consider risks when making investment decisions

- The agriculture cluster has recently been strengthened and is now among the most active in Vanuatu. The cluster is led by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry and Fisheries (MALFF).
- The two municipalities of Port Vila and Luganville are increasingly including DRR in elements of municipal planning

Context & Constraints:

- As noted earlier, there are few tools (if any) available for the public service to routinely address DRR in during annual or strategic planning processes. This presents a great opportunity to fill the gap through collaborative development of tools and SOPs for that can be adopted and adapted by public agencies.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	No
Training of masons on safe construction technology	No
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	No
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	No
Regulated provision of land titling	Yes

Description:

- As discussed above, land use zoning is being undertaken for Port Vila and Luganville, although this process had been ongoing for some time. Provisions for enforcement of municipal rules are not particularly strong
- MIPU are now regular collaborators with NDMO for consideration of risk to major roading contracts, and there is a proposal to review MIPU strategy to reflect DRR
- As also discussed above, MIPU do not have an explicit DRR policy, but DRR considerations tend to be made as a coincidence when road repairs are considered
- Building and drainage codes are both in draft form, but traditional building methods employed in rural areas are typically robust.

Context & Constraints:

- Squatter (informal) settlements around the major centres of Port Vila and (to a lesser extent) Luganville are of significant concern as they tend to occupy higher risk sites/areas. It is understood that in time, review of the Municipal Act will incorporate provisions for management of squatter settlements. Until then, management of risk for squatter settlements remains ad-hoc
- Over the years there have been some efforts to document and disseminate traditional construction techniques to ensure knowledge is passed on and improved where practical. There is opportunity to re-invigorate this work through DRR work that happens with communities – under coordination of VHT efforts to consolidate consistent DRR messaging.

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? No

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	0
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	No
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	No
Measures taken to address gender based	No

issues in recovery

Description:

- Robust traditional construction techniques are widely employed during reconstruction in rural areas, although there are occasional issues associated with over-harvesting of local timbers which exacerbates flood risk and further forest degradation
- Private sector recovery and rehabilitation efforts seldom reflect DRR in a comprehensive manner – there are few tools available to them to do so
- Several ministries – including Health, Education, and MALFF are adept at incorporating DRR into their recovery portfolios
- Provincial government DRR strengthening is to be commenced in the next 12 months.

Context & Constraints:

- There remains an over-arching impression among national stakeholders (those where DRM is not their core work) that DRR is primarily, if not solely, an effort to anticipate and provide for disaster events. This limitation of conception to preparedness means that many stakeholders defer to the government VUV25m response contingency that can be accessed by NDMO for response activities. This in turn leads to the impression held by many that anything related to “disasters” is the purview of the NDMO. This attitude is slowly changing but opportunity exists to solidify the changed perception by providing tools for “non-disaster” agencies to incorporate DRR into their annual planning, which would include integration of DRR into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? No

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? No

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	Yes

Description:

- MIPU are now regular collaborators with NDMO for consideration of risk to major roading contracts, and there is a proposal to review MIPU strategy to reflect DRR
- As also discussed above, MIPU do not have an explicit DRR policy, but DRR considerations tend to be made as a coincidence when road repairs are considered
- National stakeholders typically felt that on balance, disaster and environmental risk considerations were secondary to economic considerations in major development projects.

Context & Constraints:

- Various acts of parliament were cited by national stakeholders of evidence that development projects include DRR considerations, but the reality is that projects with comprehensive DRR considerations have been developed as such largely by chance. With minor exceptions such disaster risk considerations within Department of Conservation EIE, there is no systematic means for decision makers to include DRR in their day to day work. There is a present opportunity to address this
- Environmental impact assessments (EIA) are carried out by the Dept Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC) whenever significant development proposals are put forward. These are however limited to consideration of applications to lease land, and EIAs take only limited consideration of disaster exposure
- Cost benefit analyses are not routinely employed as a means of quantifying cost of DRR measures identified when determining viability of major projects. This is again due primarily to a lack of comprehensive risk and hazard information, and to lack of cost benefit tools
- There is also limited means of NDMO gathering information from other areas of government when disaster risk issues arise. NDMO involvement relies on either pro-active staff viewing project proposals, or on chance. This issue will be overcome insofar as it relates to development projects when the NAB Project Management Unit is established to coordinate CCA and DRR project activity in Vanuatu
- International development actors are continually improving their adherence to international obligation regarding safe development and disaster risk.

Section 7: Priority for action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

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: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies

No

The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support.

Yes

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? No

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

Yes

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Yes

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

Yes

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios

No

Description:

- There is strong awareness that establishment of NAB is something of a “game changer” for DRM in Vanuatu, but the broader policy situation remains in flux until NAB is embedded.
- The technical and institutional basis for DRM is broadly seen as much improved, with extra resourcing made available to NDMO in the past 12-18 months, and co-location with VMGD ensuring that geological and hydrometeorological hazard expertise is well linked to disaster expertise
- NDMO capacity gaps have been systematically addressed by bringing in external resource, particularly through skilled volunteers, and twinning such support with a Ni-Vanuatu counterpart
- As the pre-eminent clusters, health and education have made significant progress in establishing drills and training. Education has run drills in schools, and health is to consider hospital drills in the near future as they bring on a full time DRR staff member. The NDMO has run national drills in the past, and will engage in a more regular drill program in partnership with VHT.

Context & Constraints:

- The DRM policy environment is not particularly well understood – due primarily to the fact that the National Disaster Act was redrafted in 2009 and is yet to be passed. Once NAB is established, DRR and CCA arrangement will be governed separately from response and recovery arrangements (which will still be managed by NDMO). NDMO is to drive legislative review for preparedness, response, and recovery once NAB is embedded
- Gender and child protection is seen to be poorly integrated in the policy and practice environment. These issues remain the focus of a number of organisations active in DRM. These organisations are relied on informally to ensure response planning and activities retrofit gender and child protection considerations – rather than any mainstreamed effort.

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities

No

Risk management/contingency plans for

No

continued basic service delivery

Operations and communications centre	Yes
Search and rescue teams	No
Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Shelters	Yes
Secure medical facilities	No
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	No
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	No

Description:

- Although commitment to support Provincial government is strong from NDMO, these are early days for this support. Little government capacity exists outside of Port Vila, and there is a general reliance on Port Vila from Provinces – to the extent that a perception exists in some Provinces that Port Vila will provide all resources needed to mount an emergency response
- A number of agencies have emergency response supplies pre-positioned in provincial locations, and NDMO has a fairly good understanding of what is located where
- Community Disaster Committees are becoming more prevalent as agencies put resource into their establishment. They provide an effective potential link to generally otherwise weak formal Provincial response arrangements

Context & Constraints:

- VHT arrangements are less than 12 months old and will take some time to embed. Driving sector response plans is an initial VHT priority, so significant improvement is expected in this area. Health and education clusters have drafted contingency plans already, but there is no established single format (yet) that can ensure effective integration of sector plans
- There is demand for and some motivation towards establishing full SOPs for each sector. This should be encouraged, and where possible, government agencies that sit outside of the narrow band of cluster agencies should have representation on development of SOPs.

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National contingency and calamity funds	No
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	No
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	No
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

Description:

- The VUV25m response standby fund available at the request of the NDMO is a solid backstop in the instance of small and medium sized response operations (to hundreds of affected people rather than thousands)
- Government and institutional donors to Vanuatu are now coordinating on their emergency response provisions and expectations
- The PICRAFI insurance initiative mentioned earlier will eventually provide substantial support for infrastructure and urban disaster damage recovery, but other insurances are inadequate for response or recovery
- Several ministries have MOUs with NGOs that outline project and strategic support, and humanitarian support is often noted.

Context & Constraints:

- Much is made of the VUV25m response standby fund available at the request of the NDMO. This fund is adequate for small scale responses where NDMO (and as of recently VHT partners) would be expected to undertake most of the response work, but there is an almost uniform lack of disaster contingency funds located within government budgets outside of the health and education ministries. This, coupled with something of an expectation that the donor community will typically support with funds leads to possibility that a large scale rapid response would quickly exceed Government ability to mobilise and manage simply due to lack of funds
- Access to the VUV25m response standby fund is relatively simple but possibly relies too much on existing professional relationships rather than a designated process for release. This “system” is susceptible should any key personnel be incapacitated.

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

Description:

- Substantial cross stakeholder work has been done to establish a multi sector rapid needs assessment template for response. The often remote nature of Vanuatu disasters means that an initial assessment is more detailed than might be seen elsewhere, so more information is gathered and greater complexity is created. This is a key reason why data entry and analysis has been something of a sticking point in some recent events. NDMO and VHT have taken steps to improve this situation
- VHT is overseeing a comprehensive process of all five clusters addressing response information management. This will be tested in drills later in 2012
- NDMO is currently addressing information management/planning via a full time staff member.

Context & Constraints:

- Although NDMO and VHT are aware that they are needed, there is not yet an established series of SOPs for response. When developed, these documents should include provincial administration roles, and links to community roles as appropriate. Substantial work must also be done in bringing church groups to the table to ensure SOPs reflect church organizations likely disaster response functions
- There is little, if any, structure for post response review and lessons learned processes. These should be established as soon as practical.

Section 8: Drivers of Progress

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

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

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):

Multi-hazard and integrated approaches are typically exercised solely by NGOs engaged at community level. As larger, higher impact projects are emerging as the preference for donors to such projects, co-opting Area, Provincial and central government involvement in these processes is becoming more the norm. This offers significant opportunity to link with technical risk reduction efforts that focus on one hazard.

Single hazard approaches are the norm for central government at the moment. This is due primarily to the fact that relatively few areas of Vanuatu have been assessed for disaster risk relating to multiple hazards – a national risk mapping process has not been undertaken at adequate levels of detail. Conducting and compiling such mapping would allow prioritization of locations for multi-hazard community based approaches.

Single hazard approaches prevail also as substantial external technical expertise is required for hazard risk reduction. It is typically more cost effective to use technical expertise in one hazard across several locations while they are in country. There is potential to “twin” future technical inputs with concurrent community focused engagement that would take a multi hazard approach (identifying possible future technical inputs as appropriate).

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.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: No

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: No

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

Women and girls are represented on a number of national and local level disaster panels, however in general, gender concerns in DRR are subject to much the same gender characteristics as other Vanuatu sectors. Vanuatu is a patriarchal society with strong custom which traditionally lessens to role of women and children. Much has been done to improve participation – including within NDMO and other national DRR stakeholders, but much remains to be done.

Gender disaggregation is increasingly common as sectors compile their preparedness data. Although it is widely recognized as good practice, there no integrated gender reflective approach or ethos in Vanuatu.

Gender sensitive approaches are the norm for many NGO driven DRR initiatives.

There is widespread perception that greater involvement of women would reduce some of the problems of politicization that have affected disaster preparedness and response initiatives administered by male Parliamentarians.

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.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?: No

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: -- not complete --

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

Substantial strengthening of the NDMO has occurred since the last HFA review, and a substantial portion of strengthening has gone towards training staff. With the pending push to increase DRM capacity at Provincial level, more training can be expected. Indeed, capacity development is a strong element of the NAP.

It is encouraging to see staff positions for DRR established within health and education ministries, and similarly encouraging to see agriculture and environment departments including human resource with substantial CCA skills.

Capturing of traditional DRR techniques remains something of a holy grail. Many efforts have gone into documenting practices over the years, including those by the Vanuatu Cultural Centre, but no comprehensive pool of knowledge exists. There is opportunity to capture and disseminate traditional knowledge as part of the current VHT efforts to consolidate DRR messaging across agencies.

Community level capacity is far from consistent and this will remain an issue for some time as limited resources are applied to a geographically dispersed population. Some villages are particularly well prepared and connected to sub-national and national response structures, some are in the early stages of developing their capacity, and many more have not addressed their capacities at all.

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

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: No

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: No

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

As discussed earlier, social safety nets are provided by extended family units and through wider community reciprocity. The government provides no social welfare services other than core health and education services.

The important role of NGOs, churches, and civil society groups in reaching out to remote and vulnerable communities is acknowledged by national stakeholders. However, there is no strategic national approach which targets the most vulnerable communities. Moreover, there

are as yet no nationally endorsed guidelines for community based disaster risk management.

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.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: -- not complete --

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

With strengthening of the NDMO, and co-location with VMGD, there has emerged a stronger outward engagement of government DRR and CCA efforts. This coincides with a general increase in the role of international NGOs in DRR and CCA work. Larger programmes have been initiated, and collaboration between government and NGOs has strengthened. A substantial contributor to the positive view of collaboration is the fact the VHT has been hosted (physically) by the NDMO.

Private sector engagement in DRR is not comprehensive, but ground has been made through mobilization of telecommunications and radio operators in piloting warning messages. Continued success in this field should be used as a catalyst to highlight benefits for other commercial sectors.

As discussed above, capturing of traditional DRR techniques remains something of a holy grail. Many efforts have gone into documenting practices over the years, including those by the Vanuatu Cultural Centre, but no comprehensive pool of knowledge exists. There is opportunity to capture and disseminate traditional knowledge as part of the current VHT efforts to consolidate DRR messaging across agencies.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

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

-- not complete --

Additional context specific drivers of Progress # 1

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):

Although much hope is pinned on the soon to be ratified NAB arrangement for formally integrating DRR and CCA, it is a truly encouraging development. This development, and the proposed project management unit within the NAB offer substantial gains for DRR.

One of the primary challenges for NAB will be – given the relatively small number of NAB seats – ensuring that participation can be effectively elicited from community, area, and provincial level representatives. This challenge speaks to the substantial DRR capacity gaps that exist at sub-national administrative level, and the fact that NGO facilitated community based DRR work is constantly expanding in scope and scale.

Section 9: Future Outlook

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:

Substantial progress since the last review has resulted from strengthening the National Disaster Risk Management Office (NDMO) and finalization of new arrangements for integrating governance of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) efforts.

The broad government objective of decentralizing operations where practical has extended to DRR, and although the establishment of disaster management offices in Santo and Malampa provinces was postponed, three provincial offices are planned in “harder to reach” provinces. Although commitment and sentiment for decentralizing DRR is strong, there are many obstacles. Local level DRR initiative is most often facilitated by NGOs. Means of strengthening provincial and area level administrative uptake of DRR have been identified through explicitly linking NGO/community efforts to national DRR accountabilities coordinated by the Vanuatu Humanitarian Team (VHT); and accordingly ensuring local level administration is linked and strengthened as part of ensuring best practice.

A tremendous amount of work has been done over a number of year to assess the extent of disaster risk facing Vanuatu. Despite there being a wealth of information available, the basis for analysis, and presentation of results is often not consistent, resulting in a series of assessments rather than a solid basis for making risk resilient planning decisions.

Therefore the most significant task to be undertaken in more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into planning and programming is: the consolidation of risk information; the identification of gaps in information; and the development of tools through which the information can be applied to decision making.

Future Outlook Statement:

The systematic consolidation of risk information and completion of national and sub-national (rather than local) risk assessments can contribute to more robust planning decisions. This can be achieved by using risk information to develop generic DRR decision making tools for adoption and adaptation at all levels. These tools can act as a critical link between risk information and sustainable development.

Future Outlook 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 proposed amendment to the government's National Disaster Act that was drafted in 2009 has been withdrawn from approved by the Council of Ministers. New arrangements will be drafted once the recently established National Advisory Board (NAB) for DRR and CCA has been formally approved. Formal NAB arrangements are to include provincial responsibilities.

As discussed above, community level strengthening is primarily facilitated by NGO's with most initiatives including establishment of community disaster committees (CDCs). CDCs are not necessarily well linked to area and provincial administrative structures, and although ensuring their longevity beyond NGO/project involvement is targeted at setup, it is unclear how durable these arrangements are in reality – especially as comprehensive area and provincial structures are not currently in place.

Cluster activities (above) are increasingly strengthening sub-national level institutions.

The primary national development policy document now firmly incorporates DRR. Although the Priorities for Action Agenda (PAA) – and Planning Long Acting Short (PLAS) both include sector opportunities for DRR, there is little practical guidance to guide implementation. The PAA in particular points to the DRR and DRM National Action Plan (NAP), which in turn strongly reflects the Pacific Regional DRR and DM Action Plan and the HFA.

Future Outlook Statement:

By extending capacity development within central government to sub-national government level, Vanuatu has an opportunity to bridge the gap between institutional strength in Port Vila, and the growing network of community disaster committees. In bridging this gap, Vanuatu can help ensure sustained community resilience to hazards where capacity exists already, and it can also model good practice for wider community capacity building.

Future Outlook 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:

DRR activities and first phase response have been the primary focus of government led DRM initiatives. Community reconstruction activities have typically been the focus of communities themselves, and of NGOs. This general arrangement is reflected by the current Vanuatu DRM institutional focus.

By proxy the NDMO considers recovery and reconstruction when engaging in response

activities. The reality of the typical Vanuatu emergency is that they tend to be small in scale and occur some distance away from the capital (where resources are currently centralized). In effect, part of the a VUV25m (approx. USD270,000) response fund that NDMO can access is used for recovery and reconstruction because it is not practical to focus on response alone in these conditions. In practical terms, response activities will often see (for example) rehabilitation of water supplies that have run down over many years but which were “finally destroyed” in a flood.

That these activities address reconstruction is largely coincidence: there is no systematic means of linking preparedness, response, or recovery to reconstruction by way of risk reduction. In finalizing NAB arrangements and structure, discussion on these links has occurred.

Inclusion of risk reduction in traditional DRM activities is steadily improving due substantially to the increased capacity of NDMO and establishment of VHT and country cluster arrangements.

Future Outlook Statement:

By linking preparedness, response, and recovery planning to either the national development documents (PAA-PLAS), or to community/sub-national/sector development plans (whichever is appropriate), it will be possible to ensure that DRR acts as the pivot between disaster and development.

Future Outlook Area 4

The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 66/199, requested the development of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. A first outline will be developed for the next Global Platform in 2013, and a draft should be finalized towards the end of 2014 to be ready for consideration and adoption at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2015

Please identify what you would consider to be the single most important element of the post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2025).:

Adaptation remains the prime focus of climate change action in Vanuatu. The strong links between the climate change and DRR agendas in Vanuatu is reflected by the establishment of the NAB which jointly addressed DRR and CCA. In addressing the post HFA period it will be critical for CCA and DRR approaches to be reconciled and consolidated, and new systems for resourcing (finance/human/technological) promoted.

In this context the continued focus on the ability of development decision makers to use risk information to guide decisions is critical. This focus places the imperative on governments to establish/consolidate sound risk data, and provide effective guidance on use of that data.

Section 10: Stakeholders

Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report

Organization	Type	Focal Point
AusAID	Gov	Patrick Haines
Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation	Gov	Trinison Tari
Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation	Gov	Reedly Tari
Department of Local Authorities	Gov	Jeffrey Kaitip
Department of Strategic Policy, Planning and Aid Coordination	Gov	Armstrong Masanga
Jotham Napat	Gov	Vanuatu Meteorological and Geohazards Department
Ministry of Agriculture	Gov	Peter Iesul
Ministry of Education	Gov	Jim Knox
Ministry of Education	Gov	Jim Knox Allanson
Ministry of Finance	Gov	Antoneth Arnhambat
Ministry of Health	Gov	Viran Tovu
Ministry of Infrastructure and Public Works	Gov	Erick Yani
Ministry of Lands	Gov	George Kerpy
National Disaster Risk Management Office (NDMO)	Gov	Pete Turnbull
National Disaster Risk Management Office (NDMO)	Gov	Peter Korisa
National Disaster Risk Management	Gov	Simon Donald

Office (NDMO)		
National Disaster Risk Management Office (NDMO)	Gov	Shadrack Welegtabit
National Disaster Risk Management Office (NDMO)	Gov	Gideon Mael
Vanuatu Meteorological and Geohazards Department	Gov	Robson Tigona
Vanuatu Meteorological and Geohazards Department	Gov	Esline Garae
Vanuatu Police	Gov	Mr Alex Joe
SOPAC Division of SPC	Regl Inter-gov	Mosese Sikivou
SOPAC Division of SPC	Regl Inter-gov	Samantha Cook
Telecom Vanuatu Limited	Private	Lawrence Mainguy
Telecom Vanuatu Limited	Private	Sebastien Kappel
Telecom Vanuatu Limited	Private	Gerome Guicherd
Vanuatu Chamber of Commerce	Private	Alick Berry
Care International	NGO	Isaac Savua
Oxfam	NGO	Nelly Willy
Save the Children	NGO	Mishael Garae
UNICEF	UN & Intl	May Pascual
UNICEF	UN & Intl	Hilson Toaliu
UNICEF	UN & Intl	Patrick Shing
UNOCHA	UN & Intl	Greg Grimsich
Vanuatu Red Cross	UN & Intl	Romain Estebe
Vanuatu Red Cross	UN & Intl	Paolo Malatu

PCIDRR

Networks &
Others

Barua lauma

Vanuatu Humanitarian Team

Networks &
Others

Philip Meto

Vanuatu Humanitarian Team

Networks &
Others

Jennifer Worthington