

## Annex 2 - Urban DRR workshop 13 August 2012

### Afternoon group discussions

#### Group 1 Urban DRR approaches

Blockages	Recommendations	Involvement
Lack of private sector engagement in DRR	-Mechanism to engage private sector <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Platform</li> <li>Building relationships and networks</li> </ul>	- NRRC - DP-Net of other existing networks - Municipalities - Associations - Government
Lack of & ill maintained infrastructure	Develop monitoring from local level	- Municipality and local communities - "stream watch" - Public
Building demand and awareness	Activating or building on local organizations / systems	All projects
Lack of uniformity in approaches (duplications, gaps)	Agree on common approach though information sharing	National <--> local
Dealing with social hazards	- Engage existing organizations - Identify social leaders	All projects
Insufficient emergency services & facilities	Investing in capacity and resources	- Government - Communities
Diversity (also an opportunity)	Mapping (social and physical)	- IMS working group - NRRC - Census-government
Land use mapping still on-going	Hazard mapping and land use mapping	
Insufficient understanding of government plans	Implementing partners aligning plans with government direction	- All partners - Government
Lack of preparedness	Community DM plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open areas identified for each ward</li> </ul>	
Need better response plan	Roster list of responders	
Lack of specialized teams	Organized volunteer groups for search & rescue and response	
Private / public buildings and nursing houses not safe	- Retrofitting, ensuring new constructions to be more safe - Flexibility for doctors to serve in other hospitals during emergency	

#### ***Discussion:***

##### Private sector:

Meaning of Private Sector engagement was discussed.

- Responsibilities of private hospitals in emergencies.
- Coordinated channelling of aid provided by private businesses – many are willing to help but don't know how.

##### Mapping and information sharing:

- There is a lot of mapping and information gathering done, can be difficulties in verifying

information.

- Participants were willing to share their mapping information on common platform.
- Central point of information collection was raised, along with the need for a sharing platform

### Group 2 - Governance and DRR

Blockages	Recommendations	Involvement
Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of sensitizing</li> <li>• Lack of political will</li> <li>• Plans up to local levels (representation of the whole community)</li> <li>• Guidelines (more needed)</li> <li>• Sector specific DRR policy national plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advocacy at all levels</li> <li>- Participatory approach</li> <li>- Capacity building at all levels</li> <li>- Timely monitoring and follow-up mechanism</li> <li>- Enforcement of NSDRM with supported by planning budget (multi-sectoral)</li> <li>- Line of accountabilities</li> <li>- DPRPs to be annexed to local level development plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government agencies</li> <li>- INGOs</li> <li>- NGOs</li> <li>- donors</li> <li>- communities</li> <li>- media</li> </ul>
Coordination & Collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity on roles and responsibilities of actors (confusion on local level)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advocacy at all levels</li> <li>- Participatory approach</li> </ul>	
Service delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of ownership in building</li> <li>• Lacking uniformity / duplications</li> </ul> Communication, coordination, partnerships	Institutionalisation of DRR initiatives	Local government bodies, communities, other stakeholders
Issue with informal settlements	Right-based approach	All

#### **Discussion:**

The accountability of implementing plans and policies was discussed. There are many plans and policies developed that have not been implemented for years. Who is accountable?

### Group 3 - Community organisation and participation

Blockages	Recommendations	Involvement
Difficult to identify communities and beneficiaries	Use Tole Lane Organisation (TLO/TIC), ~200-250 households, as reference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ward members</li> <li>- TLO/TIC</li> </ul>
Ensure participation of community	Incorporate DRR in TLO activities/ plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Municipality/VDC</li> <li>- TLO</li> </ul>
Awareness of risk reduction	Ensure engagement through TLO in planning and implementation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TLO / municipality</li> <li>- local CBOs</li> </ul>
Communication before and during disaster (preparedness and response)	Local friendly communication system, social networking, sirens	TLO/ local CBOs
Engagement of new partners	Engage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Private sector (electricians, plumbers, etc that provide services directly)</li> <li>- line agencies (security, police)</li> </ul>	Private sector
Coordination among multiple actors (accountability)	Coordination meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Municipality</li> <li>- TIC</li> </ul>

#### **Discussion:**

Community participation:

Discussion on how to ensure participation of local community was held. Even after careful selection of participants to attend a longer planning process, it is difficult to retain engagement. Suggestion to divide wards into smaller clusters, and to have representation from all clusters in a single event at district level. Flexibility in timing was suggested, instead of 9am to 5pm events e.g. having a few more days from 6am to 9am.

Response mechanism:

When communication mechanisms collapse in disaster, how to tackle with coordinating and communicating?

Protection issues after mega disaster need to be thought through.