



Botswana

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2015)

Name of focal point: Mr Nkosiyabo Moyo
Organization: National Disaster Management Office
Title/Position: Chief Programs Officer
E-mail address: nkosiyabo@hotmail.com
Telephone: 002673971945

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 2 March 2015
Print date: 23 April 2015
Reporting language: English

A National HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

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 Risk Management policies are being integrated into development plans at the national, district and local levels (through existing public policies from different governmental and non-governmental sectors)

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 institutions with adequate capacities at both national and district level for coordinated and coherent action in reducing risk and building sectoral resilience.

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

Mechanisms and tools are being adopted for the implementation of environmental management and post-disaster recovery programmes and institutionalized at the various levels.

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? No

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

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

The lack of a legislative instrument to address DRR explicitly is something the country is looking into addressing. Already there are steps to review the Disaster Management policy document.

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 issue of participation from stakeholders is still a major concern. The other issue is lack of adequate capacity by the NDMO as coordinating office due to limited resources both personnel and others

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? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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 Botswana Government in partnership with United Nations Development Programme has been implementing a structured capacity building program for DRR through resource (funds) allocation. The funds are directed towards training at national and district level especially towards community levels also.

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 has not been a clear budget specific to DRR from government to date. Though there are a number of initiatives and programmes being conducted in the country ranging from poverty and food security.

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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 lot more still needs to be done to strengthen the participation of various key stakeholders.

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 a lack of monitoring and evaluation tools to ensure active participation by actors at the local level. Furthermore the lack of legislation mechanism that emphasize on funding at the local government level further poses as a challenge in undertaking DRR initiatives.

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? No

civil society members (specify absolute number)	1
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	1
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	15

private sector (specify absolute number)

science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)

1

women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)

1

other (please specify)

1

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

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office

Yes

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)

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 national platform still needs to include substantial members particularly from the private sector organizations.

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 resources at the National Disaster Management Office which acts as a secretariat for the National Platform.

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? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? Yes

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	No
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No

Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.

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 Hazard Vulnerability and Risk Identification study was commissioned by the Government of Botswana in 2008. The study highlights actual and potential disaster threats in the country with a detailed analysis by using GIS. There is also the National Disaster Risk Management Plan of 2009 which details steps of how to conduct rapid risk assessments.

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 study was mainly conducted at the district and urban levels therefore it did not incorporate the risk data from village and community levels.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

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 national coordinating office NDMO does receive reports of hazards that have impacted in districts including information on the damage caused during such a disaster. Such information is captured and achieved for future usage and trends analysis during regular sectoral gatherings such as workshops and lessons learnt exercises.

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 could be more that can still be done to ensure the reporting, monitoring and analysis of DRR events can also be comprehensively be disseminated to the relevant key stakeholders in a timely manner. As this will further improve the potential responses to future hazards.

Core indicator 3

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

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

Early warnings acted on effectively

No

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 use of short messaging system to warn communities about impending hazards has been welcomed by communities who receive such alerts. These sms notifications are transmitted across all the local mobile networks making it accessible to anyone in the country. Furthermore the use of national broadcast (BTV and Radio Botswana) and print media enhances the timely dissemination of the warnings.

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 harmonizing of various systems by different line ministries/ departments and made into one generic early warning mechanism.

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? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? No

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	No
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	Yes
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	No
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	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.

The country through the country coordinating office has been able to establish effective communication channels with counterparts in neighboring countries such as Namibia. This to share early warning information on cross boundary hazards like floods and wild land fires.

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 need for more emphasis on the building of partnerships and cooperation with the various sectors within DRR. To ensure adequate planning for cross boundary hazards and risk are addressed.

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? No

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

There are no formal established agreements between stakeholders on information sharing and dissemination. This is something that needs to be undertaken to ensure that disaster information can be extensively conveyed to various users such as practitioners, community members and the academia.

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 a greater need to harmonize the communication interventions by the different stakeholders at national and the different developmental partner organizations. Furthermore the need to ensure there is enough resources and capacity to deal with the task.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? No

primary school curriculum	No
secondary school curriculum	No
university curriculum	Yes
professional DRR education programmes	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.

The Department of Sociology at University of Botswana conducts a course on disaster management, and other private tertiary institutions including BAISAGO University College offers a Diploma in Development and Disaster Management. While Boitekanelo College is in the process of developing a course in the DRR field.

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 need to develop a curriculum specifically for the primary school level students, as this is where young people will start learning from an early age about DRR. Also the lack of sufficient capacity and resources at NDMO.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 1

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

The NDMO is currently at the start of its implementation phase of the national strategy on DRR, therefore it's likely to start bearing positive results.

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 lack of capacity and resources is potential a challenge in the success of the implementation of the strategy.

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? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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.

The NDMO has over the years and continues to conduct nationwide campaigns on multiple hazards and vulnerability among the community members. It has also trained District level official in Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Planning, as well as training for community members. Especially on risk assessments and contingency planning.

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 a need for tools and mechanisms to determine precisely the effectiveness and reach of such awareness campaigns.

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? 1

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

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.

The Government of Botswana has provided a special policy for ecological sensible areas of the country such as Okavango. Additionally Government through the Ministry of Environment Wildlife and Tourism has a number of initiatives including the following;

Environment Protection initiatives:

Legislation:

Wildlife and National Parks Conservation Act

Environment Impact Assessment Act 2005
Waste Management Act 2006
Herbage Preservation Act, Forestry Act, Agric Resources Board Act
Meteorological Services Act
National Monuments and Relics Act

Policies and Strategies

National Conservation Policy and Strategy, Wildlife; Forestry; Waste Management;
Land Use and Tourism Policies.
Ecotourism Strategy

Planning

Area/Ecosystem/ Species Management Plans – Elephant Conservation Plan and
Strategy, Okavango Delta Management Plan, Makgadikgadi Framework, Chobe
National Park Management Plan.

Institutions

Anti-Poaching Unit
The Green Scorpions

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 continued stance on climate change, with national committee on climate change adaptation and DRR being managed by two separate government institutions. Hence there is a need for a closer linkage and coordination between these two entities.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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

There is a National Policy on Destitute which caters for the most poor people in the country.

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 are steps being developed by the government to develop some crop insurance schemes to ensure the safety against the effects of drought.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 1

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National and sectoral public investment	No
--	----

systems incorporating DRR.

Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets

Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals

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.

As the national DRR strategy has just started being implemented the effects and impacts of the implementation of this document are still to be noted. As the strategy covers specific components to promote investments in structural risk reduction measures.

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 DRR is relatively new concept in the local domain here in the country getting different actors on board is still a challenge. This calls for more efforts to involve and engage the different actors to get them to buy into the approach.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

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

The Land-board is the authority which allocates the land to the people for housing and livelihood. The Land board has the policy to not allocate the land to people in flood prone 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.

Due to the absence of any specific law that deter the public to build their houses in the flood plains, quite often people ignore the recommendations of the Land-board and build their structures in the flood prone areas. More sensitization of communities especially in flood prone areas need to be continued to ensure adherence of not constructing near or within flood plains.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

The National Disaster Risk Management Plan of Botswana provides a clear stated point to all the relevant stakeholders to incorporate DRR in the post disaster recovery.

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.

For the envisaged national DRR legislation, its anticipated that it will ensure that DRR is included in the recovery programmers.

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

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	No
By international development actors	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.

From recent flooding experiences the authorities have also started taking into account infrastructure that's being built on hazards prone areas. This helps in the planning and ensuring future developments are also not affected.

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 need to reinforce and strengthen the assessment tools and techniques.

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

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies

Yes

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

Yes

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

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

No

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Yes

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

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

Yes

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios

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 Disaster Management Policy indicates how various sectors have to combine resources and work in conjunction with NDMO to deal with disaster situations. This is also further elaborated in the National Disaster Risk Management Plan which highlights the roles and responsibilities of the various actors.

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 a need to increase the frequency of mock simulation excises to build capacity and sharing of skills and knowledge amongst the relevant actors within the DRR sector.

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? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	No
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	Yes
Operations and communications centre	No

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

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 NDMO has facilitated the development of the country's district level contingency plans. Additionally sector specific plans such as wild lad fires and health have been also done with the assistance of the NDMO.

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.

Plans have to be sensitive to the needs and requirements of particular members of the community based on their gender, disability or the elderly.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

The government has established the National Relief Fund Order, which is managed by the NDMO to provide funding to DRR interventions for those affected by disasters.

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 a need to consider the insurance factor in future planning for funding of Disaster induced damage to property. This can be an issue taken up after extensive consultations with the relevant key actors. Such as the insurance sector/business, civil society and other institutions.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

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	No
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	No
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.

The procedure for sharing and exchanging information amongst sector needs to be strengthened to ensure sectors don't view themselves only as the primary source and custodian of such critical information. But through sharing it becomes a common problem attained by cooperation between different actors.

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 development of clear guidelines of how to share information between different stakeholders needs to be addressed as it will allow for steps to be know of who to contact and for what information.

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)

There needs to be a robust view in dealing with the multi-hazard approach in DRR. This must also take note of a significant drive for research in multi-hazards and the integration of DRR into developmental practices.

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

Levels of Reliance

No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

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

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

The inclusion of gender issues and also other vulnerable groups must be

strengthened in DRR for the different phases such as the preparedness stages, disaster impact stages, relief, recovery, and reconstruction and rehabilitation phases.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

A substantial effort is still needed to ensure the various agencies, communities and institutions are properly capacitated. The need is both financial and human capital who can conduct the capacity building programmes.

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)

The government has over the years provided for measures aimed at assisting those from the vulnerable groups. These included programmes such as destitute allowance, public works programs and feeding schemes.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

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

Develop strategies of engaging in more partnerships with the various stakeholders such as civil society, private sector and non-governmental organizations.

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)

The need to strengthen the institutional frameworks that are already in place is strongly needed to achieve a greater degree of inclusion in various aspects of society.

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

Lack of capacity and resources has been the main challenges encountered throughout most parts of this reporting period. As availability of such would have allowed for the achievement of a certain level of progress in DRR programs and initiatives.

Future Outlook Statement

Enhanced cooperation amongst stakeholders on planning across all levels especially with particular reference to the different phases of DRR. Also with an inclusion in the planning of the communities within the country more so those from disaster prone districts and towns.

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges

The lack of continuity in engaging community level participation in DRR, there is need to sustain such community involvement to ensure their uptake of the programs and interventions long after the activities and trainings have been undertaken.

Future Outlook Statement

Community centric strategies need to be developed and implemented to help build their resilience to potential and actual prevalent hazards. Additionally institutions must also be capacitated and adequately equipped to enable them to deliver on their DRR obligations.

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

Though, the country through the NDMO has done an extensive amount of work in the implementation of DRR taking into account the preparedness, response and recovery programmes. There is still more interventions and work that can still be undertaken to protect affected communities from future hazards.

Future Outlook Statement

Based on possible future trends, the incorporation of drr approaches will include envisaged possible or plausible hazards likely to affect communities.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
National Disaster Management Office	Governments	Nkosiyabo Moyo
National Disaster Management Office	Governments	Tebogo Modiakgotla