

This version was submitted for the preparation of the Global Assessment Report 2011
Visit PreventionWeb for the latest version: <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/>

Lesotho

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009-2011) - interim

Name of focal point : Ms. Matseliso Mojaki

Organization : Disaster Management Authority, Lesotho

Title/Position : Acting Chief Executive

E-mail address : memojaki@yahoo.com

Telephone : +266 22 312183

Fax : +266 22 327944

Reporting period : 2009-2011

Last updated on : 17 October 2010

Print date : 17 Oct 2010

Reporting language : English

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/africa/lso/>

Strategic goals

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:

- 1 Disaster Risk Reduction issues are being integrated into the development of the National Medium Term development Plan that is at the initial stages of development.
2. Intergration of Disaster Risk Reduction issues into the school curriculum at basic education is ongoing. Sensitization of Higher Education Institutions to integrate DRR into curricula is ongoing.
3. Development of Disaster Risk Reduction Policy is bearing completion.
4. Revision of legal framework for Disaster Risk Management is ongoing (the review of the Disaster Management Act) that will facilitate implementation of the policy.
5. Formation and resuscitation of Disaster Risk Management structures at the village level is ongoing (Village Disaster Management Teams).

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:

3. Development of Disaster Risk Reduction Policy is nearing completion.
4. Revision of legal framework for Disaster Risk Management is ongoing (the review of the Disaster Management Act) that will facilitate implementation of the policy.
5. Formation and resuscitation of Disaster Risk Management structures at the village level is ongoing (Village Disaster Management Teams).

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:

1. Disaster risk reduction approaches into the contingency plans for snow, drought and strong winds have been incorporated.

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:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Is DRR included in development plans and strategies?

No

Means of verification:

* No: National development plan

* No: Sector strategies and plans

* No: Climate change policy and strategy

* No: Poverty reduction strategy papers

* No: Common Country Assessments (CCA)/ UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

Description:

Development and review of legal framework (DRR policy and Review of Disaster Management Act) is still in progress

Context & Constraints:

The process has taken too long a time because of lack of both financial and human resources.

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:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Is there a specific allocation of budget for DRR in the national budget?

Yes

Means of verification:

* 0.005 % allocated from national budget

* 280,000 USD allocated from overseas development assistance fund

* 0 USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)

* 0 USD allocated to stand alone DRR investments (e.g. DRR institutions, risk assessments, early warning systems)

* 400,000 USD allocated to disaster proofing post disaster reconstruction

Description:

Indequate financial and human resources.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of financial resources.

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

Do local governments have legal responsibility and budget allocations for DRR?

Yes

Means of verification:

* Yes: Legislation

* Yes: Budget allocations for DRR to local government

Description:

Even though local governments have legal responsibilities according to the disaster Management Act, budget allocation from the central government still remains at the central level. It is from the central level that local governments still get resources. This poses a problem of timely access during emergencies.

Context & Constraints:

One major constraint is that disaster risk management is institutionalized in the Prime Minister's Office while local Government is located in the Ministry of Local Government and chieftainship affairs. However at the local level, the Disaster Risk Management is the responsibility of the Ministry of Local Government. In addition, the Local government Act does not provide for Disaster Risk Management functions and therefore there is no direct provision of a budget for DRR to the local government and there are no functions of Disaster Risk Management stipulated for Local Government employees.

Core indicator 4

A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Are civil society organisations , national planning institutions, key economic and development sector organisations represented in the national platform?

-- not complete --

Means of verification:

- * 0 civil society members (specify absolute number)
- * 74 sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)
- * 0 women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)

Description:

At this time, only sectoral institutions, academic institutions, UN Agencies and non Governmental and the private sector have been incorporated into the national platform, while the women's groups and other Community Based Organizations still need to be incorporated.

The platform as it is seems to be too large because the Disaster Management Authority which coordinates it has a serious lack of human resources.

Context & Constraints:

The group itself seems to be too large to manage effectively.

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:

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

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

No

Means of verification:

- * No: Multi-hazard risk assessment
- * 0 % of schools and hospitals assessed
- * 0 schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)
- * No: Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments
- * No: Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments

Description:

The only assessments that are undertaken are the National Vulnerability Assessments, the Risk Assessments at the village level and the Community Owned Vulnerability Assessment and Capacity Analysis at the village level. Lack of expertise and financial resources coupled with inadequate human

resources pose as constraints for the core indicator.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of expertise, financial and Human resources.

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

Are disaster losses systematically reported, monitored and analysed?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Disaster loss database

* No: Reports generated and used in planning

Description:

The Disaster Management Authority has no database because there is no equipment that can facilitate a database.

Lack of expertise is another constraint.

Lack of understanding and ownership by responsible ministries such as education, health pose a constraint.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of expertise, financial resource and equipment are some of the constraints.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

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

Yes

Means of verification:

* Yes: Early warnings acted on effectively

* No: Local level preparedness

* No: Communication systems and protocols

* Yes: Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination

Description:

Information of impending some hazards such as strong winds is not available even from the Meteorological services as they are predominantly localised, develop and dissipate quickly.

Context & Constraints:

No information for some hazards such as strong winds.

No means of communication for some communities at risk.

Inadequate resources to finance and disseminate early warning information.

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:

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

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional DRR programmes or projects?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Programmes and projects addressing trans-boundary issues

* Yes: Regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks

* No: Regional or sub-regional monitoring and reporting mechanisms

* No: Action plans addressing trans-boundary issues

Description:

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) has a very weak disaster risk Management Structure that is still at its infant stage.

It has never therefore facilitated cooperation in DRR within the regions.

The regional strategy was developed a long time ago but it was never implemented. It is now under review and the SADC is in the process of recruiting people into the DRR Department at the regional level.

Context & Constraints:

Because of the ineffective office at the regional level, there has been very little trans boundary and regional DRR activities.

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:

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

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Web page of national disaster information system

* No: Established mechanisms for accessing DRR information

Description:

No DRR Information System therefore no data storage, not enough data available.

No adequate information dissemination channels available

Context & Constraints:

Lack of human and financial resources and expertise.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Primary school curriculum

* No: Secondary school curriculum

* No: University curriculum

* No: Professional DRR education programmes

Description:

Intergration of DRR into school curriculum for Basic Education is in progress.

Sensitization of Tertiary institutions to include DRR in the school curriculum is in progress.

Context & Constraints:

Progress is slow because of lack of expertise and financial resources.

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

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget?

No

* No: Research outputs, products or studies

* No: Research programmes and projects

* No: Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR

Description:

Lack of expertise and financial resources.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of financial resources.

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:

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

Do public education campaigns on DRR reach risk-prone communities?

Yes

Means of verification:

* Yes: Public education campaigns.

* Yes: Training of local government

* No: Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level

Description:

Serious lack of human resources inhibit progress .

Context & Constraints:

Lack of human and financial resources inhibit progress.

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

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc)

Yes

Means of verification:

* Yes: Protected areas legislation

* No: Payment for ecosystem services (PES)

* No: Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)

* No: Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)

* Yes: Climate change adaptation projects and programmes

Description:

Lack of human resources poses a constraint in coordinating all the sectors responsible for areas contained in this section.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of human resources for coordination.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Crop and property insurance

* No: Employment guarantee schemes

* No: Conditional cash transfers

* No: DRR aligned poverty reduction, welfare policy and programmes

* No: Microfinance

* No: Micro insurance

Description:

The only safety nets that exist are at the national level, therefore they do not target specifically the risk prone areas even though the improved resilience that they produce assist even those in the risk prone areas.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of financial resources.

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

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment?

No

Means of verification:

* No: National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.

* No: Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals

Description:

Very few sectorial Plans and policies to reduce vulnerability have been implemented.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of financial resources and expertise.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements?

No

Means of verification:

* No: 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 for low income households and communities

Description:

Not enough sensitization to relevant ministries and departments to incorporate DRR in their plans and policies.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of financial resources to enforce the prescribed building standards and to correct the existing ones by maybe relocation.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Do post-disaster recovery programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR?

No

Means of verification:

* 0 % of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR

* No: Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery

Description:

sensitization to include DRR in recovery and reconstruction has been going on.

Context & Constraints:

Inadequate human and financial resources and expertise.

Core indicator 6

Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Are the impacts of major development projects on disaster risk assessed?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Assessments of impact of projects such as dams, irrigation schemes, highways, mining, tourist developments etc on disaster risk

* No: Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

Description:

Lack of expertise.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of expertise.

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:

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

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies?

No

Means of verification:

* No: Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

* No: Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Description:

Lack of awareness in responsible ministries and lack of expertise.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of awareness and expertise.

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

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

Yes

Means of verification:

* Yes: Contingency plans with gender sensitivities

* Yes: Operations and communications centre

* Yes: Search and rescue teams

* No: Stockpiles of relief supplies

* No: Shelters

* Yes: Secure medical facilities

* No: Dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities

Description:

No stockpile of relief supplies, no specific shelters erected except for schools and churches that already exist,

Context & Constraints:

Lack of sensitization of relevant ministries and departments.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster?

Yes

Means of verification:

* Yes: National contingency funds

* No: Catastrophe insurance facilities

* No: Catastrophe bonds

Description:

Inadequate funding and human resources.

Context & Constraints:

Lack of funding and human resources.

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

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur?

No

Means of verification:

- * No: Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available
- * No: Post disaster need assessment methodologies
- * No: Post disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects
- * No: Identified and trained human resources

Description:

Inadequate expertise and human resources.

Context & Constraints:

Inadequate expertise and human resources.

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?:

No

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

No expertise, human and financial resources

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

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):

Lack of sensitization to relevant departments and sectors

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.

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

Lack of awareness by stakeholders

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction

and recovery activities

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

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

Lack of expertise and awareness of relevant stakeholders.

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.

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

Lack of awareness of stakeholders especially the private sector and civil society

f) Contextual Drivers of Progress

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

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

None

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 awareness and commitment by a majority of stakeholders.

Future Outlook Statement:

The education sector is in the process of integrating DRR into the school curricula and the ministry of Finance and Development Planning is in the process of mainstreaming DRR in the Medium Term development Plan. This progress is seen as a basis on which sectoral plans will base their respective plans. It is expected that progress will be much higher going forward from now.

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:

Inadequate financial resources, human resources, expertise and lack of awareness of relevant stakeholders.

Future Outlook Statement:

Even though progress is slow, there is some progress considering that Disaster Risk Reduction is a relatively new concept in this country. Commitment to DRR by key stakeholders still need to be strengthened. Legislation and policy are in the different stages of development and once they are complete and regulations are put in place, progress in DRR will be faster and awareness by stakeholders will increase substantially. It is expected that the Disaster Risk Management structures will be strengthened by engaging more people to man the offices.

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:

Lack of expertise and financial resources has been major constraints

Future Outlook Statement:

Since the country has started to develop and update drought and snow preparedness plans, it is expected that effort will now be directed at reviewing the plans to incorporate DRR approaches in future.