

Notes from the Urban CBDRM Informal Discussion

Date: 13 May 2014

Aim of meeting:

Flagship 4 asked donors and implementing partners who are currently supporting the implementation of CBDRM in urban context in Nepal to come together and discuss the applicability of the 9 minimum characteristics of disaster resilience in the urban context; including issues organisations faced and areas of where more information is needed.

Points of action from the meeting:

Action Point 1:

An informal meeting to be held in 3rd quarter to focus on tools for multi-hazard risk and capacity assessments. This meeting will specifically look at:

- 1) What kind of information we want to collect and what level
 - Government and non government stakeholder mapping
- 2) Which tools we are currently using
 - Are they appropriate for purpose?
- 3) Who is responsible for ownership and management of information?
 - Sensitivity of information
- 4) What technical capacity is needed?

In terms of facilitation of this meeting, (DFID and ECHO to look internally at whether they know of expert(s) in this field)

Action Point 2:

An informal meeting to be in August on understanding vulnerability in the urban context. This meeting will specifically look at:

- 1) What criteria is being used to identify vulnerable groups
- 2) What are we currently doing in Nepal? (situational analysis)
- 3) How can we possibly include vulnerable groups into the design of CBDRM programs
- 4) Sensitivities around vulnerability

Meeting Notes

Topic of Discussion	Discussion points and questions
Characteristic 1: Organisational based at Village Development Committee / ward and	Points: Useful to link with existing structures as many organizational bases are active in areas such as TLOs, sanitation, etc and have relationships with municipalities Key to bring in particularly vulnerable groups, who are often excluded from these structures. In one case, the CDMC was founded in slum dwelling in order to engage and sensitise these groups

Topic of Discussion	Discussion points and questions
community level	<p>and incorporate them into municipal structure</p> <p>More so in the urban context, limited time of individuals and access was pointed out as a challenge in the establishment and effectiveness of organisational base.</p> <p>Issues / Questions: Sustainability of project completion remains an issue. It is unclear how active or effective these groups (CDMCs) are after project support has ended. The issue of sustainability is influenced by community mobility and power structures.</p> <p>When looking at sustainability or effectiveness, must not focus on the structure itself, but on whether the structure fulfils its intended purpose</p>
Characteristic 2: Access to disaster risk reduction information	<p>Points: Reaching vulnerable groups is a particular challenge being faced by organizations in urban context. This requires greater understanding of vulnerable groups (status, location, communication tools)</p> <p>NRRC Communications Group provides agreed upon common messages for Government and organizations. With many organizations communication disaster risk reduction, there is a risk of conflicting messages or too many messages reaching the public. Government and organizations should focus on communicated 5-10 key messages via the common messages. In addition, with many materials already development, organizations should be encouraged to utilize existing stock of materials and focus resources on distribution and target group understanding</p> <p>Organizations must be more strategic in the development and implementation of communications activities – communications must be part of project design. This includes utilizing market analysis and testing communications work to identify most effective approaches.</p> <p>British Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross are collecting/measuring awareness information in targeted areas on a monthly basis. They are finding that awareness is rising but behaviour change is not. This information can be shared with partners.</p> <p>Issues / Questions: IEC production is focussed on 1 way communications. How can organizations better utilize 2-way communications?</p> <p>Advocacy and communications are interrelated. How can organizations strengthen advocacy to ensure stakeholders are targeted, engaged and receive effective messages? How can common advocacy strategies be development to reinforce collective advocacy?</p>
Characteristic 3: Multi-hazard risk and capacity assessments	<p>Points: This was identified as one of the most challenging tasks for organizations in the urban context. It was stated that rural tools for these assessments are almost completely non-applicable in the urban context. A key challenge is how to ensure active or representative participation in a VCA exercise, especially when dealing with large population groups.</p> <p>Issues / Questions: Is there a legal body within the municipality that can be responsible for carrying out a VCA? Or does this responsibility lie with the LDMC?</p>

Topic of Discussion	Discussion points and questions
	<p>How to define a 'community' within the urban context to conduct VCA needs clarification. Also, how does this tool link with other urban planning / assessment processes, such as land use planning?</p> <p>It was agreed that an informal meeting specifically on this issue is required to discuss the tools being used in Nepal or elsewhere to address this characteristic (approaches, technologies, etc.)</p>
<p>Characteristic 5: Disaster Risk Reduction / management plan at Village Development Committee / Municipal level</p>	<p>Points: While there are clear guidelines from MoFALD to municipalities to develop LDRMP, there are still barriers in ensuring this is completed. These barriers include: willingness, priorities, sensitization on issue, capacity. The national government needs to be more forceful in ensuring municipalities are obligating to these requirements. However, these also requires strengthening horizontal and vertical coordination (i.e., with DUDBC).</p> <p>DRR planning needs to be more embedded into other processes and with overall urban planning of the government. In addition, this planning must connect with the DDP.</p> <p>Issue / Questions Are municipalities able to develop the LDRMP without external support? At the moment, it does not look like this is possible – again, this raises issues of sustainability</p> <p>In order to ensure DRR is embedded into planning processes and LDRMP completed and implemented, there must be strong advocacy with relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p>Characteristic 6: Disaster Risk Reduction Funds</p>	<p>Points: Organizations identified that it was easier to establish emergency management funds in the Terai municipalities vs. other areas. This is due to a limited number of competing actors working in these respective municipalities.</p> <p>Unlike rural context, it is not possible to establish DRR funds via community level. Establishing funds at community level requires strong social cohesion which does not exist in urban setting. In addition, larger number of households in urban areas makes this difficult.</p> <p>Issues / Questions: When it comes to the annual development fund, this process does not reach ward level but rather, is allocated by the municipality. This highlights the need for the LDMC to strengthen is advocacy to manage fund allocation from regular development funds.</p> <p>Sustainability remains an issue. Are DRR fund being allocated and planned for after project completion?</p>
<p>Characteristic 9: Community based early warning system</p>	<p>Points: Practical Action advised, based on Pokhara experience, that establishment of EWS utilized same framework from previous rural projects. However, there were differences in terms of technology use, government ownership/leadership, and up-stream / downstream connectivity.</p> <p>Issues / Questions:</p>

Topic of Discussion	Discussion points and questions
	<p>With less social cohesion, it was more difficult to connect upstream and downstream communities in establishment of EWS.</p> <p>Government ownership and leadership was more difficult to obtain</p>

Issues for Future Discussions

- Tools for multi-hazard risk and capacity assessments
- Understanding vulnerability in the urban context
- Livelihoods and disaster risk reduction
- Urban / peri-urban linkages
- Time / effort required for implementation of urban interventions

Attendants:

SN	Name	Designation/Organisation
1	Sam Rose	DFID
2	Piush Kayashta,	ECHO
3	Maira Reddick	NRRC
4	Becky- Jay Harrington	Flagship 4
5	Sara	Handicap International
6	Giovanni Congi	NRRC
7	Kiriti Ray	Handicap International
8	Dinanath Bhandari	Practical Action
9	Edwin Ceniza	WHO
10	Toya Nath Subedi	WHO
11	Shree Basnet	Oxfam
12	Himalay Ojha	Oxfam
13	Frank Kennedy	British Red Cross
14	Prajwal Acharya	NRCS
15	Alisha Ghimire	Flagship 4