

DELIVERABLE #1
20 JANUARY 2014

Groups to circulate analysis by 12 January 2014
Monday 20 January 2014 – ½ day meeting

GOAL 3 INTO 1

Consolidated DPRP, DDMP & LDRMP

Simplification of the process, to make it:

- Cohesive between the current 3 processes
- Easily understand
- Implementable (fundable)
- Able to be completed with limited external support
- Basic level of assessment and information collection
- Connects to existing planning processes

GROUP ANALYSIS

DPRP

- Alex
- Keshab Sharma

DDMP

- Asim
- Dinanath
- Kiriti

LDRMP

- Rajan
- Christophe Belperron

NDRF

- Becky-jay

Early Recovery

- Unable to obtain copy of draft national guidelines

Objective

Using the template agreed group were asked to conduct a gap analysis of the plan into 3 sections:

1. Structure
2. Planning
3. Information

DRM HARMONISATION PROCESS

3 into 1 DM planning structure separated into phases / chapters:

1. Introduction
2. Preparedness
3. Response
4. Recovery
5. Monitoring & impact assessment
6. Summary



Gap analysis
of existing
plans

3into1
DM planning
structure

Field trip

Final Harmonised
Disaster
Management
Guideline

CROSS ANALYSIS

LDRMP, DPRP & DDMP

COMMONALITIES

All 3 plans establish a PSC (planning subcommittee) to undertake detailed work of respective plans

All detail planning process, ToR for committee structures, legal/policy basis, hard copy of templates for data collection and plan

Difficulties in funding / implementing for identified activities in plans

2 district level disaster related committees

- Similar ToRs (DDRC: Calamity Act & DDMC: NSDRM).
 - NSDRM is more comprehensive and targets whole DM cycle

EXISTING LINKAGES

DPRP is included in the DDMP

LDRMPs (if available) included in DDMP

- no link with DPRP (written before LDRMP created) – identified as a gap

EFFORT ANALYSIS

Rough estimate analysing

- Training of trainers / participants
- Meetings
- Data collection
- Data analysis and writing the plan



DPRP: 4 days per district

DDMP: 28 days per district
(across 9 months)

LDMRP: 48.5 days per VDC
(covering 9 wards)

ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

Number of tools to undertake risk assessment

LDMRP

18

DDMP

53

DPRP

7

STRENGTHS IDENTIFIED

| LDRMP | DDMP | DPRP |
|--|---|---|
| Provides community / VDC level perspective (participatory process) | Increases district level stakeholders of understanding, importance of risk management: through assessment, planning and implementation. | Plans have been developed across the country (replicability is high) |
| Develops capacity at VDC / community level for DRM: including planning & task forces | Provides in depth capacity building of the District line agencies DRR Focal persons (MT team) designed to filter down to VDC level | There is a considerable level of awareness at district level with regards to this plans |
| Important data collection process of sub district risks, hazards & vulnerabilities | In-depth technical analysis of risks across the district including detailed VDC level assessments | The Plan is simple and can be completed with limited technical knowledge |
| Results in community empowerment and ownership of DRM | Longer process and consistent participation increases level of buy in from District officials | |

BLOCKAGES IDENTIFIED

| LDRMP | DDMP | DPRP |
|--|--|---|
| Historical data difficult to access | Planning process is lengthy (takes approximately 9 months) | The fund /resource allocation not generally happening, resulting in plans not being implemented |
| VCA is lengthy and for most communities is too complex | Lack of capacity of the district stakeholders to conduct the DDMP independently. | The Line Agencies don't have space to incorporate the required funding in their sectoral plans. |
| LDMRP are not linked with VDC or district level planning | Implementation process – Lack of DRR budget allocation from Government sources results in limited capacity to implement. | There is a lack of buy in from Line Agencies |
| Limited capacity (knowledge & time) of VDC secretary | High level of technical knowledge required to complete some assessments | LDRMP not linked to the DPRP |
| No recovery element is included | Higher level of support from external agencies required to complete relative complex plan | |
| | Clear Mainstreaming connections and guidance is missing. | |

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE PROCESS

As the DDMP includes the DPRP it makes sense to consolidated these plans into 1 at the district level with VDC level linkages

- Using the DPRP planning process as a base structure

Assessment tools

- Overall simplification of assessment tools at both district & VDC level
 - With an option to include additional tools able to be added for those areas who have the technical resources and capacity to conduct them
 - LDRMPs assessment tools can be greatly simplified in order to make them replicable in areas with limited resources. Reduction from 18 tools to 4.
- Use agreed assessments for all planning phases: response, risk reduction & recovery

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE PROCESS

Continue with scenario based planning existing in DPRP for district level planning

Include links and processes on how to fund plans to increase implementation

Need to develop overall capacity building process that addresses all phases of Disaster management.

Information linkages between VDC, district and central level need to be strengthened. Potentially provide soft copies of tools for ease of sharing and analysis.

DDMC and DDRC ToR amalgamated and merge responsibilities.

Amend the DSLA (district lead support agency) ToR to include technical support for district / VDC level DM planning

HOW TO SIMPLIFY DPRP

| Variable | Costs | Benefits | Decision |
|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| Risk assessment ONLY at district level | 1- Participation is compromised. 2- Capacity is not well reflected 3- community and village level vulnerability information is not well reflected | Short time, less resources | Include both district & VDC level risk assessment |
| Response Preparedness plans ONLY at district level | 1- No capacity to development community response capacity (who are the first responders): A- Time to trigger response is decreased B- number human resources to be deployed is limited C- Access problems by non community members Limits its capacity to be included in Development plans, thus to be funded | Less resources needed | Include both district & VDC level risk assessment |
| Risk reduction measures are not included (ie. remains Prep & response focused) | According to Mercy Corp study in Kailali 3.11 times more cost effective to invest in risk reduction than response | None | Plan needs to address all phases of DM |

SIMPLIFICATION: DDMP

| Variable | Costs | Benefits |
|--|--|---|
| Withdrawal Technical study and risk analysis & social vulnerability risk & capacity assessment | Lack of technical data Less detailed picture of the district provided | Base level of information will result in district officials being able to carry this out with minimal support |
| Shorter planning process | Potentially less buy in / ownership by district level officials | Increased likelihood of being completed |
| Amalgamation of DDMC / DDRC ToR | Increased time allocation of members as part of all DM phase decisions | Cohesive planning of all DM phases and increased awareness of broader DM risks and actions needed |

SIMPLIFICATION: LDRMP

| Variable | Costs | Benefits |
|--|---|--|
| Simplified risk assessment | Picture not as in-depth as 18 tools used currently in LDMRP | Achievable and able to be replicated in remote areas. Flexibility: where desired other assessments can be added. |
| No formal integration with district level plan | Lack of knowledge of local level risks & capacities for response & recovery Lack of access to district level funding / resources | Less work at district level |

PROPOSED ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE

| Assessment | District level | VDC level (conducted in 9 wards) |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Type of assessment | Basic level (3) | In-depth (4) |
| Type of information | Frequency of hazard Equivalent economic losses Human losses | Hazard risk matrix (frequency v impact) Loss ranking & tracking Stakeholder & capacity mapping Problem tree & planning |
| Sources of information | Historical data NRCS data RCs office | Ward citizen forum Affected population |
| Output | Geographical mapping (capacities, locations at risk) Vulnerability ranking (VDC wards) Priorities local DRM plans & divided by sector / clusters | Identify capacity, losses incurred (impact), prioritise hazards & identify possible solutions |
| Decision making | Identify & prioritise VDCs | Identify risk reduction & preparedness measures |