Mamuju, Indonesia

Local progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2014)

Name of focal point:	**Yusniar Nurdin**
Organization:	**BNPB**
Title/Position:	**Technical Support Consultant**
E-mail address:	**yusniar.nurdin@gmail.com**
Telephone:	**+6281360495899**

Reporting period:	**2013-2014**
Last updated on:	**11 December 2014**
Print date:	**11 December 2014**
Reporting language:	**English**

A Local HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/

Priority for Action 1

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

---

Core Indicator 1.1

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

How well are local organizations (including local government) equipped with capacities (knowledge, experience, official mandate) for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Capacity development of existing government and non government organization at the region for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaption is on progressing since the disaster prevention is new and the tendency of disaster is for response. Facilities provision, additional budget allocation, human resources increase in number and capacity and all stakeholders participation is essential to increase organizational capacity on DRR and CCA.

To what extent do partnerships exist between communities, private sector and local authorities to reduce risk?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited partnership of community, private sector and local government on disaster risk reduction caused by lack understanding and no network available for these

stakeholders as well as absence of regulation on it.

Core Indicator 1.2

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

How far does the local government have access to adequate financial resources to carry out risk reduction activities?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited local resources accessible for disaster risk reduction, a support requires from province and national.

To what degree does the local government allocate sufficient financial resources to carry out DRR activities, including effective disaster response and recovery?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The allocation of budget for DRR activities is limited for disaster risk reduction, disaster response and effective early recovery.

Core Indicator 1.3

Community participation and decentralization are ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.

How much does the local government support vulnerable local communities (particularly women, elderly, infirmed, children) to actively participate in risk reduction decision-making, policy making, planning and implementation processes?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Lack of community participation on local DRR development planning at the region caused by no political right understanding from community and government need to increase community awareness to participate on local development planning

To what extent does the local government provide training in risk reduction for local officials and community leaders?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No disaster risk training available at the area for official and community leaders.

How regularly does the local government conduct awareness-building or education programs on DRR and disaster preparedness for local communities?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Programs include cultural diversity issues	No

Programs are sensitive to gender perspectives	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Local Disaster Management Office implementing the regular activities on DRR information socialization to community and school and there is some coordination between Officials and private sector on the program. The coverage area of program is limited and additional budget and enhance of human resources in number and capacity is requires as well as a good coordination among Officials.

Core Indicator 1.4

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

To what extent does the local government participate in the national DRR planning?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited participation of local government on national risk disaster reduction plan and need a synchronization between local and national on DRR plan.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

---

Core Indicator 2.1

National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk.

To what degree does the local government conducted thorough disaster risk assessments for key vulnerable development sectors in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The risk assessment on flood hazard existing at the area is applied and it is need to implement an integration risk assessment by additional budget allocation as well as increase number and capacity of human resources. Active involvement of university/academician is important to support the risk assessment implementation.

To what extent are these risk assessments regularly updated, e.g. annually or on a bi-annual basis?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Existing risk assessment not regular update yet cause lack of data, human resources capacity and budget allocation.

How well are disaster risk assessments incorporated into all relevant local development planning on a consistent basis?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Some sectors development has considered disaster risk on the local development program but no risk assessment available.

To what extent have local schools, hospitals and health facilities received special attention for "all hazard" risk assessments in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Schools	No
Hospitals/ health facilities	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Some schools, hospital and health facilities constructed at safe area, meanwhile many these facilities located at prone area.

How safe are all main schools, hospitals and health facilities from disasters so that they have the ability to remain operational during emergencies?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Schools	No
Hospitals/ health facilities	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited assessment conduct to measure the ability of shcool, hospital and health facilities to operate during emergency response.

Core Indicator 2.2

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

-- No questions related to local context --

Core Indicator 2.3

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

To what extent are early warning centres established, adequately staffed (or on-call personnel) and well resourced (power back ups, equipment redundancy etc) at all times?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Local Disaster Management Office establishing the call center as service provides for community complain. The Meteorology and Climatology Agency conduct daily weather monitoring as public consume.

How much do warning systems allow for adequate community participation?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Lack of community involvement on early warning center.

Core Indicator 2.4

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

How well are local government risk assessments linked to, and supportive of, risk assessments from neighbouring local authorities and state or provincial government risk management plans?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Hazard assessment is available at the region but no risk assessment implementing yet.

Priority for Action 3

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

---

Core Indicator 3.1

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

How regularly does the local government communicate to the community, information on local hazard trends and risk reduction measures (e.g. using a Risk Communications Plan) including early warnings of likely hazard impact?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Regular and irregular activities by Officials on risk information distribution to community formed as socialization of some hazards threat and provision of information material for community. Officials participation lack on risk information distribution caused by lack of limited human resources capacity, budget allocation and lack of coordination among Officials.

Core Indicator 3.2

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

To what degree do local schools and colleges include courses, education or training in disaster risk reduction (including climate related risks) as part of the education curriculum?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No DRR integrated into education sector by formal or informal.

Core Indicator 3.3

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

-- No questions related to local context --

Core Indicator 3.4

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

-- No questions related to local context --

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core Indicator 4.1

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.

How well integrated are local government DRR policies, strategies and implementation plans with existing environmental development and natural resource management plans?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

As the initial step Local Disaster Management Office has distributed letter to Officials on synchronization of local development with disaster risk reduction plan.

How far do land use policies and planning regulations for housing and development infrastructure take current and projected disaster risk (including climate related risks) into account?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Housing	Yes
Communication	Yes
Transportation	Yes
Energy	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Local government issued some regulation to support consideration of risk reduction into local development among others land use and building codes regulations. In fact, many violation of these regulation taken place at local development process of housing and infrastructures. Strict supervision and strong law enforcement is to be conducting by Officials.

How well are risk-sensitive land use regulations and building codes, health and safety codes enforced across all development zones and building types?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Lack law enforcement and supervision increasing number of land use and building codes violation at the area.

How strong are existing regulations (e.g. land use plans, building codes etc) to support disaster risk reduction in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No supervision data treated to conclude effectively land use and building regulation implementation on disaster risk reduction aspect.

To what degree does the local government support the restoration, protection and sustainable management of ecosystems services?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Forests	Yes
Coastal zones	Yes
Wetlands	No
Water resources	Yes
River basins	No
Fisheries	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Local government program for environment protection is implementing with limited coverage area and some illegal environment exploitation activities and lack of community participation on the program constrained the effectively of program.

How much do civil society organizations and citizens participate in the restoration, protection and sustainable management of ecosystems services?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No civil society organization involves on environment and ecosystem management.

How much does the private sector participate in the implementation of environmental and ecosystems management plans in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

A small number of private sectors collaborate with local government as their participation on environment program by mangrove planting at coastal area and support the embankment for river area. Private sector need to assure its activity not disturb the community life aspect. Local government to endorse greater participation of private sector on environment program.

Core Indicator 4.2

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

What is the scope of financial services (e.g. saving and credit schemes, macro and micro-insurance) available to vulnerable and marginalised households for pre- disaster times?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited financial services available for vulnerable households prior disaster, meanwhile a small amount of fund is available at post disaster period.

To what extent are micro finance, cash aid, soft loans, lone guarantees etc available to affected households after disasters to restart livelihoods?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The Local Disaster Management Office provides financial support for affected households to restart livelihood activities with limited amount. Small amount of local budget allocation diminish number of local development prioritize.

Core Indicator 4.3

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

How well established are economic incentives for investing in disaster risk reduction for households and businesses (e.g. reduced insurance premiums for households, tax holidays for businesses)?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited economic incentives available for involvement on disaster risk reduction.

To what extent do local business associations, such as chambers of commerce and similar, support efforts of small enterprises for business continuity during and after disasters?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No progress achieved on the issue.

Core Indicator 4.4

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

How adequately are critical public facilities and infrastructure located in high risk areas assessed for all hazard risks and safety?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No risk assessment commit for public facilities and vital infrastructures.

How adequate are the measures that are being undertaken to protect critical public facilities and infrastructure from damage during disasters?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Development activities to increase capacity of public facilities and infrastructures from disaster damages is limited.

Core Indicator 4.5

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

How well are disaster risk reduction measures integrated into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation activities (i.e. build back better, livelihoods rehabilitation)?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Disaster risk reduction aspect not fully integrated yet into recovery and rehabilitation activities post disaster. Initiation step is takes to relocate survivor from prone area on reconstruction post disaster.

Core Indicator 4.6

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

To what degree do local government or other levels of government have special programs in place to regularly assess schools, hospitals and health facilities for maintenance, compliance with building codes, general safety, weather-related risks etc.?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Schools	No
Hospitals/ health facilities	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No routine program applicable to assess safety of school, hospital and health

facilities.

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

---

Core Indicator 5.1

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

-- No questions related to local context --

Core Indicator 5.2

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.

How regularly are training drills and rehearsal carried out with the participation of relevant government, non-governmental, local leaders and volunteers?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Officials not regularly programming training drills and simulation as part of disaster preparedness program, except Local Disaster Management Office (BPBD). Understanding the disaster management solely responsibility of BPBD, lack of coordination and lack of budget allocation is constrained the routine drills and simulation implementation

How available are key resources for effective response, such as emergency supplies, emergency shelters, identified evacuation routes and contingency plans at all times?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Emergency shelters	No
Safe evacuation routes identified	No
Contingency plan or community disaster preparedness plan for all major hazards	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

A small amount of budget allocated by Officials and on-call budget available and accessible when disaster occurs. Many aspect on preparation of effective response is essential to carry out at the area.

To what extent does the local government have an emergency operations centre (EOC) and/or an emergency communication system?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No emergency operating center establish at the area under Local DM Office, however emergency command post establish in case of emergency. Police and military office has radio communication system for emergency operating.

How aware are citizens of evacuation plans or drills for evacuations when necessary?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Some community at vulnerable area have evacuation plan but lack of socialization to ensure community participation on it. More prone areas need socialization on evacuation plan with active community involvement.

To what degree does the Contingency Plan (or similar plan) include an outline strategy for post disaster recovery and reconstruction, including needs assessments and livelihoods rehabilitation?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The contingency plan has integrated with strategic for recovery and reconstruction but lack of coordination among sector on arrangement and implementation phase.

How far are regular disaster preparedness drills undertaken in schools, hospitals and health facilities?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Schools	Yes
Hospitals/ health facilities	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Limited routine training and drills implement at schools, hospital and health facilities,

only a small number of schools covered.

Core Indicator 5.3

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

To what degree do local institutions have access to financial reserves to support effective disaster response and early recovery?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Officials allocate some fund for emergency response and local government allocate on-call budget that accessible when disaster occurs. A number of stockpiles available includes with collaboration with material distribution during emergency response. Local government experiencing difficult mechanism on liquidation of on-call budget. The cooperation with private sector is essential as sources of support for emergency response and effective early recovery.

How much access does the local government have to resources and expertise to assist victims of psycho-social (psychological, emotional) impacts of disasters?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Lack of capacity to manage the psycho social impact to survivor.

Core Indicator 5.4

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

-- No questions related to local context --