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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 2013-2015

Disaster management sensitive development plans that promote a culture of disaster risk avoidance.

This is achieved through the implementation of the South African legislative framework on disaster management that provides for engagement in disaster risk reduction across the three spheres of government through interdisciplinary structures that actively participate in development planning structures. At a local level, it is incumbent upon each municipality to incorporate disaster management plans and projects in respective Integrated Development Plans and accordingly budget for them. The responsibilities of provincial and national structures are to support and provide policy guidance in the implementation process.

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 2013-2015

Strengthened disaster management structures across the three spheres of government; as well as empowered communities through the implementation of KPA 1 and Enabler 2 of the National Disaster Management Framework.

The South African National Disaster Management Policy Framework and the Disaster Management Act call for establishment of disaster management structures across the three spheres of government. Respective structures are designed in a manner that responds to different aspects and disciplines of disaster management and thus comprise various stakeholders from specific areas of expertise. These structures include amongst others, Disaster Management Centre, Intergovernmental Committee on Disaster Management, Disaster Management Advisory Forums, as well as Volunteer Units.

Section 15 (1)(h) of the Act read with Enabler 2 of the National Disaster Management
Policy Framework seeks to strengthen the capacity of institutions involved in disaster management and promote a culture of risk avoidance among stakeholders by capacitating role-players through integrated education, training and public awareness programmes informed by scientific research. It addresses the requirements for the development and implementation of a national education, training and research needs and resource analysis; a national disaster risk management education and training framework; the development of an integrated public awareness strategy, including effective use of the media; the development of education and training for disaster risk management and associated professions; the inclusion of disaster risk management in school curricula and mechanisms for the development of a disaster risk research agenda.

**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 2013-2015**

Measures (hazard specific contingency plans) are in place to build multi-stakeholder capacity for the management of response, recovery and rehabilitation programmes and projects. This is effected through project teams that are established specifically to manage recovery and rehabilitation projects. Joint Operation Centres (JOCs) are also established for impending and current incidents as well as immediately after incidents to ensure collective management thereof.

The design of reconstruction and rehabilitation projects is approved by the affected municipalities and sectors to ensure that they meet technical and other related standards.

All reconstruction and rehabilitation projects are monitored regularly to ensure their successful implementation. Project monitoring visits & evaluation meetings are held to take stock of progress with projects.

Seasonal planning for possible incidents are also undertaken regularly to ensure enhanced preparedness in the face of disaster threatening incidents.
Priority for Action 1

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National development plan</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector strategies and plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change policy and strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction strategy papers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.
Disaster Risk Reduction in South Africa is mainly regulated through the Disaster Management Act of 2002 and the National Disaster Management Framework of 2005. Other legislative frameworks such as the NDP do make provision for DRR amongst other priority areas. The challenge though, is aligning these parallel guiding processes; mindful of the fact that they are hardly gazetted or endorsed at the same time. It becomes necessary then to engage in robust discussions to ensure that all stakeholders are on par in addressing DRR. At this stage, some sectors are still lagging behind and plans are in place to assist them; e.g. the drafting of Disaster and Risk Management Guidelines by the NDMC for use by sector departments.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Skills base. Disaster Management has never been prioritized as a field of study in South Africa. Through Enabler 2 of the National Disaster Management Framework of 2005, strategies to encourage, initiate and support studies in Disaster Management are underway.

Budgetary constraints to address disaster reduction and recovery function. A coordinated approach through strengthened relations with other stakeholders can alleviate the situation.

**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? 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**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Risk reduction / prevention (%)</th>
<th>Relief and reconstruction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National budget</strong></td>
<td>R 800 million</td>
<td>R 534 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decentralised / sub-national budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 63.2 million</td>
<td>R118 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g. transport, agriculture, infrastructure)</td>
<td>R 84.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

As a matter of principle and procedure; the national, provincial and municipal disaster management centers respectively budget for risk reduction measures through education, training, public awareness and research programmes. Through the National Disaster Management Centre, the provincial and municipal centers administer disaster relief funds following disaster incidents.

Sector departments and some state owned entities also have various funding packages for disaster reduction, reconstruction and rehabilitation programmes. These include; Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, Water Affairs, South African Police Services, South African National Defence Force, Eskom, Airports Company of South Africa and Nuclear Energy. Additional funds are occasionally sourced from the National coffers when the sector departments do not have enough to cover their costs of recovery programmes.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Disaster management is not necessarily a basic service delivery concern; the concept of which unfortunately defines what a municipality primarily does. To that end, priority areas across the spheres of government and between sector departments may not necessarily be the same; even though guided by the same precepts such as the State Of the Nation Address (SONA), delivered annually ahead of the opening of parliament by the president of the country. Efforts to align processes must be strengthened and progress must be monitored with some quality assurance measures put in place.
Core indicator 3
*Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels*

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**

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? Yes

| Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?) | Yes |
| Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government | No |
| Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR | |

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Disaster Management Act of 2002 is a cascading piece of legislation which mandates both provincial and municipal spheres of government to implement disaster reduction and recovery programmes. This is done through the provincial and district disaster management centres; respectively. Because the centres are housed in the department of local government in any given province, they are subjected to budget allocations administered through the Division of Revenue Act (DORA). The designated schedule for these allocations permits virements and as already stated, DRR is not a basic service deliverable and is usually overlooked.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.
The main challenge would have to be priorities in any given locality; which indirectly, is determined by the type and prevalence of disasters. Disaster prone municipalities tend to be more committed than their less prone counterparts. Even though the governing legislation is the same, monitoring DRR must be strengthened from a national level to ensure that municipalities do as they are mandated to do with DRR budget allocations. It is also necessary to provide technical support and strengthen capacity building at a local level to ensure that everybody is on par with respect to disaster risk reduction.

**Core indicator 4**
*A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.*

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 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) |  |
| national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number) |  |
| sectoral organisations (specify absolute number) |  |
| private sector (specify absolute number) |  |
| science and academic institutions (specify absolute number) |  |
| women’s organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number) |  |
| other (please specify) |  |

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 Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The institutions above cannot be ranked because the DRR coordinating structure is not located in any one of them. However, the ranking for the NDMC can be 3 on the basis that institutional arrangements are in place and achievements are yet to be quantified.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

The coordinating function is delivered through the National Disaster Management Advisory Forum (NDMAF) by creating a platform through which practitioners and technocrats in DRR can engage in discussions and share knowledge. Participation in this forum is satisfactory.
## Priority for Action 2

*Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning*

### Core indicator 1

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

**Level of Progress achieved? 3**

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### 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? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-hazard risk assessment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of schools and hospitals assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common format for risk assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment format customised by user</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is future/probable risk assessed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.</td>
<td>National Sector departments have sectoral disaster management plans. These include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Disaster management fraternity is arranged with a national office providing coordination and policy support while the nine provinces have operational disaster management centres. Each province, in turn, manages several local entities within its borders. Assessing disaster risk within all local entities within a province is the challenge. There is a significant lack of technical and scientific resources within local entities to provide a comprehensive risk profile. The National Management Centre has recognized this lack and provides an indicative risk profile for various hazards according to the Disaster management Act. These then form the basis from which provinces and local municipalities understand their respective geographical areas in terms of hazards. South Africa does not have a homogenous climatic profile and the country manages its disaster prone seasons according to two distinct climatic profiles. The western part of the country receives its rainfall in winter whilst the rest of the country receives summer rainfall. In addition to this, the country is classified as a semi-arid region. Uniformed disaster risk profiles cannot be applied due to this reason. The Disaster Management Act specifies distinct hazards that must be quantified and these include: fires, floods, seismic activity and drought. The NDMC has endeavored to quantify these priority hazards for the entire country and partners with scientific institutions and universities to undertake the accurate quantification of each of these hazards. South Africa uses the national authority designated for the collection of official census and statistics; Statistics South Africa (STATSSA), to compile official statistics that are used to quantify communities that are vulnerable and the related capacities within each area to undertake disaster mitigation and response capabilities. In light of the above, there are several contextual areas that prevent a higher score for the risk profiling and these include: lack of technical and scientific expertise at local level to assist local communities prepare risk profiles, official statistics are calculated every five years and these are used to inform vulnerability and capacity indices, variable climatic systems that lead to areas being more susceptible to disasters than others, a distinct rural urban divide, high degree of
migration between urban and rural areas, lack of financial resources in the local entities to conduct accurate risk profiles and a fragmented disaster management function that is focused on response and recovery initiatives.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

1. The lack of technical and scientific expertise at local level to assist local communities prepare risk profiles. The NDMC has strategically positioned itself to partner with key research and scientific bodies in the country to fast track disaster risk profiling and accurate hazard quantification. The NDMC has also signed multiple Memorandums of Understanding (MOU’s) with various scientific bodies to enable a more integrated working relationship with set deliverables.
2. Overcoming the lack of close working relationships with key entities: The NDMC works closely with national offices such as STATSSA to determine profiles related to the country’s vulnerable communities. Calculation of national profiles that can be used to project and reclassify local risk, vulnerability and capacity is the recommended route that the NDMC has decided to follow.
3. Collection of accurate Data: Accurate data collection and the creation of different repositories of disaster incidents and recovery initiatives will aid the NDMC understand the overall disaster management function.
4. Coordination of all three spheres of the disaster management function: The NDMC coordinates the National Advisory forum that brings together, key stakeholders to discuss disaster related matters on a quarterly basis.
5. New legislation and Amendments to the Disaster Management Act: The introduction of the amendments to the current Disaster Management Act and the promulgation of new legislation such as the Fire Services Act will provide more proactive functions related to disaster management.

**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?
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) | Yes
Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries | Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

In 2014, the NDMC initiated a successful procurement of a service provider to compile a database infrastructure that resides on a Geographical Information System (GIS) platform to capture historical disaster incidents together with associated ancillary data such as financial, sector plans, engineering assessments and post disaster verification indices. The database will provide a longitudinal assessment of disaster incidents and the associated contextual conditions to allow for more accurate decision making.

The NDMC together with its provincial and local structures participate in national forum meetings that seek to discuss important disaster coordination matters. Part of this initiative has led to the formation of clusters of provincial working groups for disaster management issues. One such cluster is the formation of the coastal towns working group that meets to discuss disaster related matters for specific coastal areas in SA, such as Tsunami Standard Operating Procedures for coastal areas. In this manner, hazard quantification is managed over provincial boundaries in different geographical areas. The NDMC together with national sector departments have agreements as per the different MOU’s to facilitate coordination of the disaster management function across different geographical areas.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

1. The formulation of a database structure to house the information concerning past
disaster incidents and the relevant ancillary information is currently in progress. This will lead to a more coordinated disaster function and the ability to generate the necessary intelligence for the different areas of disaster management.

2. The formulation of different working group clusters and technical task teams will ensure a smooth coordination of functions across provinces and local municipalities.

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 |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The NDMC in partnership with national departments and the SA Weather Services have developed standard early warnings protocols that are disseminated via SMS, fax, email and web interface.

Together with the NDMC, the SA weather services manages a notifications database that sends early warnings to all provincial and local disaster management personnel.
The NDMC is currently developing the standards and procuring the infrastructure for a multi hazard early warning system in consultation with the SA Weather Services.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Local and provincial structures need to be equipped with the necessary resources, technical equipment and training to ensure that the reception of early warnings is met with the necessary action and preparedness.

The development of an Early warnings platform needs to be completed with the necessary financial resources across all functions of disaster management.

Training and awareness is a crucial component of Early warnings in the different entities once the system has been established.

**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- | Yes |
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

South Africa is part of the SADC Disaster Reduction Technical Committee. Through the SARCOF, the country gets information on regional seasonal risk dynamics. The country is also involved in the Indian Ocean Tsunami Early Warning System (IOTWS). Work is being done to foster working relations aimed at collaboration on trans-boundary information sharing and collaboration on risk reduction and recovery measures. The SADC regional DRR policy and its strategic implementation plan exist and South Africa is a key partner to its design and implementation.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

The finalization of bilateral and multilateral agreements on collaboration within the region is critical to facilitate collaboration on DRR matters. South Africa will strengthen its participation in SADC forums in order to be in the loop on the latest developments in DRR. Sector departments with DRR responsibilities, e.g. Water, Forestry, and Agriculture will be roped in to support the collaborative efforts within sector programmes and for DRR coordination.
Priority for Action 3

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

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 | Yes |
| Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV, ) | Yes |
| Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The early warning system for hydro-meteorological hazards provides a useful platform and mechanism for disseminating information. Through working with the South African Weather Service, messages on disasters are disseminated to the public on time. Dissemination of geological warnings is also taking shape with the improvements around the IOTWS.

A national communication strategy is under development to cater for a national communication system and protocols on issues of disaster risk reduction. Relations with the media have been strengthened.
Communities are empowered through early warning systems workshops and seminars that are held at various provinces to enhance safety from hazards. The workshops also provide an opportunity for local people to learn from local communities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

A national public awareness strategy has not been adopted. Implementation of national public awareness programmes takes place through annual action plans adopted to define strategic approaches of respective provinces for a given year.

Where capacity for DRR has not been improved, the practice of dealing with disaster risk reduction from a response perspective has become common. This practice results with the capacity building function being compromised.

It is important to synergize what sector departments and other disciplines can do or are doing to enhance disaster risk reduction.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>primary school curriculum</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>secondary school curriculum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university curriculum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional DRR education programmes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

South Africa has developed a National Disaster Risk Management Framework aimed at professionalizing the sector. Support will be provided for the development of education and training programmes and for the integration of DRR issues in the school curriculum and other education and training programmes.

Existing programmes are supported through either bursaries, implementation oversight or quality assurance. The framework has been adopted and plans are underway to formalize and implement commitments to that effect.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The inadequate understanding of the function of the framework, thereby reducing it to what is perceived as a response concern. Insufficient budget to implement support, and the implementation of education, training and research programmes.

The challenge of undefined collaboration with institutions involved in capacity programmes. The role of UN agencies in support of national authorities have also not been defined and synergized. NGOs’ roles are also not clearly defined although some work has been done by agencies to promote DRR.

Core indicator 3
Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.

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 scientific applied-research agenda/budget? Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research programmes and projects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The NDMC has conducted research on various DRR topics. Reports are available on: www.ndmc.gov.za

The National Education, Training, Research Needs and Resources Analysis (NETaRNRA) has recommended key elements of a strategic research policy for DRR for the country.

Research outputs are used to inform the improvements of DRR nationally and to assist sectors to improve on their policies and practices.

Some tailored research projects such as: Risk and Development Review Report (2010) were done to provide a picture of the effect of disaster risk and disasters on development for the period 2003-2008. A national study on the status of DRR capacity in the country was also carried out by the South African Local Government Association (SALGA).

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

The absence of a research agenda impedes coordination of research work on DRR. An improvement in the dissemination of research results will be critical to support the function.

**Core indicator 4**

_Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster_
resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

**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) | Yes |
| Guidance for risk reduction | Yes |
| Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level | Yes |

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A national capacity building action plan contains a list of national public awareness and education and training priorities and programmes. All the 9 provinces are supported annually on the implementation of the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk reduction (UNISDR) world disaster reduction campaigns, including the commemoration of the International Day for Disaster Reduction (IDDR). The provinces implement the UNISDR campaign strategies, cognizant of respective disaster risk dynamics and risk reduction priorities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities.
and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

capacity must be strengthened at a national level in order to facilitate the implementation of public awareness programmes. the required strength should address the human capital need and quality of awareness programmes conceptualized. collaboration with other relevant stakeholders such as infrastructure departments and agencies, hydrological services, meteorological services, NGO’s CBOs, Traditional Leadership structures and communities, UN agencies is critical to realize this objective.
Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

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) Yes

| Protected areas legislation | Yes |
| Payment for ecosystem services (PES) | Yes |
| Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management) | Yes |
| Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs) | Yes |
| Climate change adaptation projects and programmes | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

South Africa, through the Department of Environmental Affairs has sound legislation in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services. The department of Environmental affairs oversees, amongst other legislation the implementation of the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003 and also ensures compliance. This Act provides for the protection and conservation of
ecologically viable areas representative of South Africa’s biological diversity and its natural landscapes and seascapes. It also provides for the establishment of a national register of all national, provincial and local protected areas; and the management of those areas in accordance with national norms and standards. It also provides for inter-governmental co-operation and public consultation in matters concerning protected areas; for the continued existence, governance and functions of South African National Parks (SANParks), and for matters in connection with. SANParks is an entity of the department mandated with custodianship of regulations of this Act. The department works with provincial and local governments through various relevant structures. Respective environmental and infrastructure plans are incorporated in the IDPs with inputs from the department. Specialists in various environmental fields are seconded to provinces and work closely with environmental officers from municipalities and other sector departments.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

As much as the environmental legislation in the country is in place and administered well, there is a need to do away with operating in silos and align DRR initiatives with environmental regulations. Relevant private entities and state owned entities needs to be brought on board to ensure integrated planning.

There is also a need to strengthen public awareness initiatives on DRR and Payment for ecosystems (PES) services. It has been found that communities often do not see the need for PES and it is crucial to educate them otherwise.

**Core indicator 2**

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? Yes
Crop and property insurance | Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes | Yes
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers | Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.) | Yes
Micro insurance | No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Some land owners insure their assets against any unforeseen events. However, this is not common or is rare with emerging landowners who do not always have the financial means to secure risk transfer mechanisms. However, agricultural finance institutions such as Land Bank may require that a farmer acquires cover on fires in veld fire prone areas; if they are to finance the purchase of the farm.

Departments such as Agriculture, Health, Roads and Transport, Social Development, Water Affairs, etc are continually doing work aimed at risk reduction in their respective constitutional responsibilities. The risk assurance industry has also introduced measures to support disaster risk reduction measures by introducing programmes such as Business Adopt a Municipality (BAAM) with the objective of supporting the inculcation of risk reduction culture through various measures. A number of projects also exist for climate change adaptation facilitated by various sectors (e.g. agriculture, environmental affairs and municipalities in line with the Local Government Programme for Climate Change (LGPC).)

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

Capacity to support and document best practices out of these important programmes needs to be improved

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? Yes

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

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A number of public investment programmes support DRR objectives. Those programmes include construction and maintenance of roads, hospitals' revitalization programme, upgrading of water reticulation systems, including; sanitation and storm water facilities. The Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG) is also one of the key infrastructure development and maintenance grants contributing to infrastructure hazard resistance. The newly formed Municipal Infrastructure Support Agency (MISA) supports delivery of infrastructure programmes in the provinces and municipalities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

Despite spatial planning initiatives and interventions stated above, migration patterns
in search of economic opportunities results in over population in urban areas and encourages mushrooming of informal settlements. This places a burden on the infrastructure of which translates to service delivery challenges.

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 | Yes |
| Training of masons on safe construction technology | Yes |
| Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities | Yes |
| Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development | Yes |
| Regulated provision of land titling | Yes |

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Various sector policies and programmes exist to support the implementation of the above-mentioned measures. These programmes rest within the responsibilities of other sector departments and agencies. The National Disaster Management Advisory Forum (NDMAF) provides a platform for these stakeholders to engage and share
their priorities and outcomes regarding the above mentioned areas. For instance, to control and regulate development of townships, the township board engages with all its members on issues relating to urban planning. This also includes issues relating to land zoning. Any infrastructural changes in a built up area are effected only after approval by the board and city council. Land degradation and vulnerability such as slopes in landslide prone areas are taken care of through the Land Care Programme that resides in the department of agriculture, forestry and fisheries. It is mandatory that every contractor be registered with the regulatory body; the NHBRC which ensures compliance to building codes and generally regulates the discipline of the built environment. Low-income housing is done in one of two main ways; either the subsidy programme or the Reconstruction and Development Programme, both of which are administered by the department of Human Settlements (DHS). The department partners with and subscribes to the codes of the NHBRC. For land ownership acquired through estate agents, the DHS has established the Estate Agency Affairs Board (EAAB), the mandate of which is informed by the Estate Agency Affairs Act 112 of 1976.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

To closely align & synergize the work of the relevant sectors with those of the disaster reduction and recovery programmes is a challenge.

Core indicator 5

_Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes_

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

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? Yes

| % of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR | 40 |
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened  Yes

Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning  Yes

Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery  Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The post disaster programmes does to a certain extent incorporate DRR for resilience in that the sectors and municipalities must ensure retrofitting and building back better concepts. The response and recovery capacities in the local authorities is still need to be strengthened.

Some municipalities take into consideration Gender issues during response and recovery. There also gender based training provided by municipalities and provinces in areas that are exposed and vulnerable to certain prevalent specific hazards

Risk assessments are conducted in post disaster recovery and reconstruction planning to ensure sustainability of the infrastructure.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Insufficient capacity and capability within the institutions e.g. lack of engineers in municipalities with required skills.

Core indicator 6

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

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 the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By national and sub-national authorities and institutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By international development actors</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Development is mainly regulated by national norms and standards whereas international standards are only for comparison and research. As alluded to in the section on ecosystems, environmental legislation of the country is of a high standard. For instance, it is mandatory to conduct an EIA prior to approval of the implementation of a development project.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

There is no integration of planning and alignment between disaster management and development of projects. The silo operation still dominates the government and private sector.
Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness plans are regularly updated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There are various activities for preparedness taking place within sectors e.g. drills, simulations. The country through its JOINT Operation Centres across the three spheres of government have developed standard operating procedures and also scenario planning to assess the country’s readiness and preparedness in responding to the different scenarios.

Contingency plans are always in place to respond to any anticipated threat.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country’s ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Integration and alignment among sectors is a challenge in that there will be a need for continuous training.

**Core indicator 2**

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations and communications centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and rescue teams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles of relief supplies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure medical facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The country has a well-coordinated system in ensuring preparedness and immediate response to unforeseen events. The NDMC make use of the NATJOINTS AND PROVJOINTS in coordinating and mobilizing resources to respond to unforeseen events.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

lack of commitment from some sectors. It is recommended that nodal or dedicated personnel be appointed by sectors to ensure full participation during this events

**Core indicator 3**

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

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 financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National contingency and calamity funds</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance and reinsurance facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The country has 4 types of funding mechanisms for response and recovery. The funds are sufficient and address damages for sectors and municipalities. Some of the funding mechanisms cater for emergency or immediate relief and the other caters for rehabilitation and reconstruction. The private sector covers some infrastructure such as houses, cars, etc.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.

The challenges experienced is with regard to the timeframes on releasing funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction. It is recommended that as and when rehabilitation and reconstruction funds are required, they should be released and not wait for the normal budgetary processes.
**Core indicator 4**
*Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

**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 | Yes |
| Post-disaster need assessment methodologies | Yes |
| Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects | Yes |
| Identified and trained human resources | Yes |

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Disaster assessment are done by highly qualified personnel comprising of specific engineers from specific fields. The NDMC has developed assessment methodologies which incorporates sector issues to ensure that all infrastructure is well assessed and verified and also costs are attached to the damaged infrastructure

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/will be overcome in the future.
The skills to conduct the assessment is very expensive and it is important for sectors and municipalities to have available skills to conduct assessment and cost verification for damaged infrastructure.
Drivers of Progress

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

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

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

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

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

A national indicative risk and vulnerability profile and vulnerability Atlas for the country has been developed. Development programmes take risk dynamics into account. A National Indicative Risk Profile is being developed to guide planning and assist in integrating risk reduction, service delivery and development discourses. The Vulnerability Atlas is also a source that is been used for planning by different stakeholders

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?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: Yes
Not necessarily. Gender concerns are usually addressed under "vulnerable groups" even though there are entities specifically established to address gender issues such as the Commission for Gender Equality. This commission is a Chapter 9 entity according to the prescripts of the Constitution of South Africa; which amongst other things, renders it directly accountable to the National Assembly and not any ministry. It is responsible for amongst other things; ensuring that gender discrimination of any kind, does not happen at any level and monitors compliance. At this point in time, DRR strategies specifically targeting gender have not been developed and with the recent establishment of the department of women within the presidency, a platform has been created to engage and develop appropriate strategies. The NDMC will engage with both the department of women and the Commission for Gender Equality to gain insight and respond accordingly.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance
Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?: Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

Municipal by-laws provide a basis for law enforcement on municipal issues that include DRR compliance, even though the capacity to enforce the by laws is at a minimal level. Capacity building for traditional communities helps to ensure that a culture of risk reduction is inculcated within communities with the local leadership championing and enforcing the rules.

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities
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 programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

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

Reasonably taken into account; mindful of capacity and budgetary constraints

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

Levels of Reliance
Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged 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?: Yes

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

The Inter-governmental Relations Act 13 of 2005 was passed to make sure that the principles in Chapter Three of the Constitution on cooperative government are implemented. The Act seeks to set up mechanisms to coordinate the work of all spheres of government in providing services, alleviating poverty and promoting development. The Act also establishes a line of communication that goes from municipalities to the provinces and directly to the Presidency. Inter-governmental forums may also be established at district level, where they would consist of the
District Mayor and Local Council Mayors. In many development projects, more than one sphere of government may be involved in implementation. Where necessary, the different organs of state may enter into an implementation protocol that describes the role and responsibility of each organ of state; outlines priorities and desired outcomes; and provides for monitoring, evaluation, resource allocation and dispute settlement procedures. Disaster Management Centres across all spheres of government participate in these structures and it is incumbent upon them to ensure integration of DRR initiatives.

Through these structures, community based disaster risk reduction programmes and advocacy measures enable local communities to share their knowledge and views about DRR issues. Through the implementation of the UNISDR campaign themes, communities are afforded the opportunity to share their expertise and views about certain issues relating to DRR. What still needs to happen however, is to integrate both indigenous knowledge with science. There is also a need to develop a database for all the indigenous case studies and inherent outcomes.

**Contextual Drivers of Progress**

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

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

Political will and championship for DRR is evident at national, provincial and municipal levels. These have positive spin-offs as government policies are gradually taking DRR issues into account, through the lobbying work of the political leadership at all levels. At the local level, Councillor workshops are conducted to assist Councillors have a better understanding of the inextricable relationships between their work and DRR matters.

- More DRR mainstreaming and institutionalization of DRR in all spheres of government.
- Budgeting on Prevention and Mitigation efforts by all sector departments.
- Private sector investment to be leveraged and to ensure public private partnerships.
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

Integrating disaster management plans into municipal IDPs.
Optimizing inter-governmental relations beyond the NDMAF; specifically at provincial and local levels
Strengthening the capacity building function of DRR, especially with respect to public awareness campaigns

Future Outlook Statement

The Disaster Management Act 2002 calls for the establishment of National, Provincial and Municipal Disaster Management Centres. It is additionally necessary to have dedicated focal units within sectors dealing with DRR related issues. The effective functioning of the focal units can be strengthened with further institutionalization of the function within the sectors concerned. Also, provincial and municipal disaster management centres can be capacitated differently to manage disaster risk in their respective areas.

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

Support to the establishment of Disaster Management Centres and focal units within the relevant sectors, e.g. transport, roads, water, social development, etc.
Future Outlook Statement

Awareness campaigns need not only focus on the general public but all sectors involved in some or other form of community development. It is expected that with renewed understanding, stakeholders will pay more attention to DRR in the planning of projects.

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

Poor response coordination by some stakeholders.
Insufficient capacity to implement recovery and reconstruction projects

Future Outlook Statement

Ensure that prevention and mitigation strategies and plans are in place to promote emergency preparedness
Incorporate disaster risk reduction in all development initiatives and reconstruction project to ensure resilience and sustainability
Build capacity amongst the stakeholders to strengthen response and recovery
Promote and conduct public advocacy and awareness campaigns to enhance DRR and resilience
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