

Localizing Disaster Risk Management Planning (LDRMP) guideline in Mountain context



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Mission East
- values in action



The document has been prepared to understand necessity of localizing disaster Risk management planning guideline in mountain context.

This document is especially designed to understand the contextualization practice of the LDRMP model in Mountain region and the experiences of KIRDARC Nepal and Mission East for the simplification of Local Disaster Risk management Plan (LDRMP). It has been assumed to be assistive document for funding/technical partner, KIRDARC itself and government to use the mountain friendly LDRMP model to prepare effective plan suitable for mountain region.

The document is especially designed to share the learnings and experiences obtained during the implementation of LDRMP and necessity of simplification process of the LDRMP for mountain region. It has been assumed to be supportive document for funding/technical partner, KIRDARC itself and other implementing partners to understand the necessity of simplified model in mountain region.

In 2011, the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MoFALD) published the LDRMP guideline to orient communities and VDC secretariat on how to collect hazard, vulnerability and risk information for the production of Disaster Risk Management Plans of Action. This guideline became a standard for community-based DRR action and all DRR stakeholders active at community level are using it.

While using this guideline, Mission East and its partner KIRDARC were rapidly confronted to challenges during its implementation, due to relatively lack of people's understanding of the process, high illiteracy rates of participants having difficulties to formulate actions, contradictory information collection and diverse perception from diverse group on hazard context, leading to inconsistent results. With the aim to adjust the LDRMP to a simplified version, Mission East engaged a Risk Analyst, Mr Pablo Villanueva Holm-Nielsen, to conduct a test of the LDRMP in 3 villages of Bargaun VDC, Humla district.

The survey was conducted with 3 different groups: community leaders, women, Dalit, with the aim to verify their understanding of the LDRMP and the consistency of findings across the 3 groups.

The main obstacles observed during LDRMP implementation were as followed:

- People did not understand many of the tables from LDRMP guidelines
- Different groups (Dalits, women, leaders) have different understanding of hazards (see box 2)
- People cannot recall past events beyond 4-5 years
- Ward level assessment is not doable because settlements overlap 2 or 3 wards
- Hazard mapping has limited usefulness while hazards (landslides,

- rock fall) can hit everywhere
- People live in 2 settlements (winter and summer) and migrate seasonally, making mapping at community level challenging
- VDC secretary or key people of community (health workers, teachers...) are often not present in VDC but stay in district HQ, hence cannot pilot the process
Asset destruction are rarely reported at district central level, making cross-verification impossible
- People are extremely poor and not very motivated by the process (see box 3)

After testing each of the 18 steps indicated in the LDRMP guidelines, the survey found out that we could bring it down to 8 steps, and operate a shift from hazard-based planning to resource-based planning.



Annex	topics	Difficulties	Keep or drop?
4	cause of disaster and loss	Part of life, people do not remember	Drop
5.1	Hazard mapping and ranking	Impossible to rank, mapping have limited interest	Drop
5.2	Hazard calendar	Important and well understood	Keep
5.3	Historical timeline	people do not remember	Drop
5.4	Hazard analysis	Too complex for people to know causes	Drop
5.5	Social mapping	Work well, very visual, people understand	Keep

Women of the Bargaun settlement participating in the workshop.

Finally it was found that to increase interest of people participating in the process, it was better not to plan after surrounding hazards (as per LDRMP approach) but after priority sector for development (transport, education,

health, water, land, etc...) which can be located far from community but are essential to local development. Based on such outcome, a simplification of the LDRMP was devised to be further tested in 6 VDCs of Kalikot districts, using

3 VDCs to test the simplified version, and 3 VDCs to test the government LDRMP. A consultant was hired to assess the impact of the exercise, comparing the 2 test groups.

S. N.	Indicators	Full LDRMP as per the guideline of MoFALD	Simplified LDRMP by Mission East
A.	Training duration for VCA and LDRMP production	Six days	Three days
B.	LDMC committee	No health post in-charge in the committee	Health post in-charge as the member secretary of the committee
C.	Training contents	Contents follows the 18 steps of the guidelines	Contents are simplified with 8 steps and examples are focused on the mountain area.
D.	Area coverage Under VCA	All wards/communities of the VDC	Two most vulnerable communities of the VDC.
E.	LDRMP Plan Strategy	More focused on disaster management cycle including planning, mitigation activities etc.	More concentrated to interlink between disaster management and VDC sectoral development
F.	LDRMP preparation cost	NRs. 55,000 to 60,000 in full LDRMP	NRs. 30,000 to 35,000 in light LDRMP

Key features of the Full and Simplified LDMRMP Model

Comparative knowledge impact of both LDRMP model

In order to assess the knowledge of different categories of people in the study area, 15 questions were asked with 95 options about the understanding on the various issues of hazards and disasters. 2 VDCs were chosen where the simplified LDRMP was used (Ramnakot VDC) and the full government model

employed (Thirpu VDC). The table below illustrates the average score obtained by various groups of people including the LDMC members.

This table reflects that the knowledge impact of the community people as well as LDMC members was more or less similar in full as well as light LDRMP implemented VDCs. Therefore, it can be concluded that there has not been significant differences on knowledge impact whether there is full or light LDRMP model is implemented.

Comparative implementation impact of both LDRMP model

Similar to the knowledge impact, the implementation impact was also more or less similar for full and simplified LDRMP implemented in the 6 VDCs. No significant differences on the implementation impact were observed whatever LDRMP model was implemented.

VDC	Score obtained by community people			Score obtained by LDMC members
	Dalit	Women	People w/ disabilities	
Ramnakot (simplified)	32	36	41	47
Thirpu (full)	34	35	42	48

Knowledge score on DRR in the study area

Stakeholders' view on the full and simplified model

All of the district level stakeholders notified that they did not have much information about the implementation

of the simplified LDRMP model. Views of other stakeholders such as project staffs, LDMC member and community people were in the favour of simplified LDRMP as it shorten the training duration, and focus on the mitigation of hazards

identified around the VDC level planned programmes (roads, bridges, schools, etc...) enabling a better allocation of scarce resources.

Recommendations

Strengths were observed in both full as well as simplified LDRMP model. Therefore, it is suggested to combine the strengths of both models and to adopt mid-path as proposed below:

Training package: four or five days training package is recommended with less intensive days of training, to enable better participation of people, especially those coming from far away or with households obligations (women). Content can be similar to the simplified model.

Inclusion of health post in-charge in LDMC Committee. Despite not planned in the full model, the health post in-charge is recommended (as per simplified model) to act as alternative member secretary of the LDMC Committee in Karnali region.

Area coverage under VCA: All wards/communities of the VDC are covered for VCA under the full LDRMP model whereas only two most vulnerable communities of the VDC are targeted for VCA under the simplified LDRMP model. It is recommended to follow the full LDRMP model because the vulnerability scores of various wards were found diverse in the project area.

LDRMP planning approach: the full LDRMP approach is focused on hazard identification leading to risk management as per a cycle including planning, mitigation activities etc. The simplified LDRMP model is concentrated on identifying the sole hazards that can pose a threat to the VDC sectoral development plan. Owing scarcity of resources, it is recommended to follow the simplified LDRMP model because it encourage mainstreaming process.



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection

The European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO), the largest single donor in the world, aims to save and preserve life, prevent and alleviate human suffering and safeguard the integrity and dignity of populations affected by natural disasters and man-made crises. A significant part of the European Commission's humanitarian assistance to Nepal goes towards helping communities resist, withstand and cope against natural disasters such as floods and landslides through the creation of community based rescue mechanisms, disaster-resilient infrastructure, early warning systems and flood management.

www.ec.europa.eu/echo



Mission East (ME) is a Danish non-profit international relief and development organization that works with the most vulnerable communities in Eastern Europe and Asia, making no political, racial, or religious distinction among those in need. ME's mission is to help the vulnerable people through humanitarian relief aid, development assistance, the linking of relief, rehabilitation and development, and supporting communities' capacities to organize and assist themselves. ME's 'Values in Action' are honesty, integrity, compassion, respect for all people and valuing the individual. In Nepal, Mission East started working since 2007.

www.miseast.org



Karnali Integrated Rural Development and Research Centre (KIRDARC) Nepal, which is an NGO established in 1999, is an initiation of youths from Karnali zone with a vision of just and prosperous Karnali region with people having access to and ownership over resources. KIRDARC Nepal's mission is to enable Karnali people to claim and exercise their human rights, including the right against poverty and neglect by way of educating, organizing and mobilizing people themselves in actions that promote human rights; research and evidence-based policy advocacy; and just and judicious resource mobilization in the region.

www.kirdarc.org

Contact: KIRDARC, Nepal

Kupondole, Lalitpur, Nepal

Tel: 977 1 5548321/5548040, Fax: 977 1 5549093

Email: kirdarc@kirdarc.org, Website: <http://www.kirdarc.org>