

WAY FORWARD

- ACAP has been well introduced, however tools will need to be reviewed with project staffs and people of the communities to make it more contextualized to the remote, mountain context.

of support persons, organization of safe and acceptable toilets, hence increasing the possibility to meaningful participation.

- Focus group discussions and individual



- There is a realization that ALL people should be included in inclusive CBDRM, however identified actions should be followed up. Example: knowing that people living remote and thus not being able to participate is not sufficient; action could be to organize at times the meetings in this remote setting.
- Well structured information sharing, consultation and joint planning with marginalized groups, with clear guidelines on ACAP will result in more appropriate implementation of activities e.g., accessibility of the venue, timing of the activity, availability

interviews are excellent ways to collect the information on specific groups; strong representation of marginalized groups LDMCs has proven to be successful to incorporate the issues of the marginalized groups in the local Disaster Risk Management Plans.

- More flexibility must be ensured for the ACAP indicators as less ambitious targets set for inclusion can be "good enough" for the project in this stage of inclusive development.



Supported by



Contact us

Mission East, P.O.Box 8975, EPC 2328, Jawalakhel, Lalitpur, Nepal, Phone: +977 1 5538416, 5538668, Fax: + 977 1 5545649, Email: admin.nepal@missioneast.org

Disclaimer

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO). The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.

Credit

All photographs and content are property of Mission East unless otherwise noted all drawings are from INCRISD project.

Inclusion in Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction

ACAP Framework outlining the Four Cornerstones of Inclusion

DIPECHO 7th Action Plan
2013-2014



Capacitated women ready to rescue

INTRODUCTION TO ACAP

ACAP stands for Accessibility, Communication, Attitude and Participation and is considered as a framework, embracing the four cornerstones/principles for Inclusion of people with disabilities. It has been adapted during DIPECHO 7th Action plan to ensure inclusion of ALL marginalized groups into Community-based Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives.

The Nepal Government has defined 6 domains of exclusion: ability, gender, age, ethnicity, economic and geography and the guiding principles of ACAP are utilized as a framework, as well as a monitoring tool, to ensure that nobody will be forgotten or left behind before, during and after a disaster.

Looking through the 'ACAP' lens while implementing the DIPECHO 7th Action plan are we able to answer the following questions?

The most vulnerable when the disaster strikes...

*Do we see them,
do we hear their voices,
are their issues raised?
Are they involved
in LDMC meetings,
in orientation sessions,
in DP planning activities,
in emergency committees?
...or are they less prepared?*

WHY ACAP?

The main idea behind this framework was to achieve “inclusion for all” within CBDP activities. It also addresses an important challenge raised by DIPECHO partners during Lesson Learned Workshops (DIPECHO 6th Action Plan) of the complexity and number of various tools that exist to address inclusion for diverse vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities, children, women, minorities, people living with HIV/Aids, etc...

ACAP was conceived to address this complexity proposing a simple, non-technical, easy to measure, frame work, to encourage all organizations to adopt inclusive approach in DRR.

ACAP was conceived to address this complexity proposing a simple, non-technical, easy to measure, model, to encourage all organizations to adopt inclusive approach in DRR.

ACAP as a monitoring tool to ensure inclusion

The ACAP framework has been discussed during a consultative workshop organized by DIPECHO partners in April 2013. DRR actors and inclusion experts identified a set of indicators for inclusive CBDRR to support the operationalization of a standardised and inclusive CBDP model.

It was further adapted by Mission East Nepal into a monitoring tool that guides project design across the input, process and output levels and incorporating 4 key outcome indicators.

Main indicators:

Indicator 1: The number of marginalized people that have access to DRR services has increased through the baseline/end line survey.

Indicator 2: 100 % of DRR, emergency and early warning communication messages are developed and disseminated through appropriate media, and are accessible by different marginalized groups.

Indicator 3: 50% of the marginalized people acknowledges a change of attitude from the community people towards them.

Indicator 4: A proportional representation of ALL groups (including the marginalized) is ensured across all processes of DRR activities including decision-making (meaningful participation).

“Woman, Dalit and people with disabilities are participating in the training and other program activities, which was not the practice before.”

Around mid-phase of the project, a survey was conducted in order to assess the condition of inclusion or exclusion of target groups into community-based DRR activities. 247 individuals representing the most marginalised groups were interviewed.

At the end of the project, effectiveness of ACAP was assessed among target groups, and possible adjustments was identified. 154 individuals were interviewed.

Situation before ACAP deployment:

- 70% of households discuss DRR within families but information is collected and shared firstly by male (81%) (women:19% and children 3% only) showing a strong male domination concerning access to information related to DRR.
- 83% of respondents did not access

any training on DRR mainly because they did not receive invitation (78%), few had no time (9%) and only 2% were not allowed by their families.

- 77% of respondents are not informed about planning process and 87% did not participate in any DRR planning. Communicating the DRR plans and inviting marginalized people to participate in DRR discussion was very weak.

- For the 23% who participated in DRR planning process, 87% felt listened and their input considered.

Conclusion: the main constraints and obstacles felt by respondents to take active part into CBDP process is first their absence from discussion (not invited) followed by the lack of communication and sharing of information toward them on DRR plans and decision.

ACAP PERFORMANCE ASSESMENT

Situation after ACAP deployment:

- An increase in access to information and sharing of DRR related topics by women by 13% (from 19% to 32%).
- 100 % of the respondents attended at least 1 training on DRR.
- Slight improvement on being informed on DRR related planning and participation in the planning process, where the main reason for exclusion is gender disparity and to a much lesser extent ethnicity or disability.

Conclusion: all marginalized people accessed at least 1 training on DRR related topics, hence the access to information increased tremendously. Main obstacle to meaningful participation is less in relation to ethnicity and disability, but more related to gender disparity.

LESSONS LEARNED

- The ACAP framework was for the first time to be introduced in the DIPECHO as model promoting inclusion for all, and at the end of the project, project staffs were excited about the possibilities this framework offers.
- ACAP framework is in its infancy and more coaching is needed to better utilize the developed tools, such as the checklist on accessible meetings/trainings.
- The indicator on accessibility seemed to be over ambitious, as the remote mountainous region has in general already huge environmental barriers, the additional barriers people with disabilities can face are challenging.

Accessibility:

People highlighted that access to information was well organized e.g., invitation letters for activities reached ALL people with clear messages, training halls were spacious with enough room for people using crutches to move around freely and there was sufficient lighting for people who had difficulty reading.



Communication:

Many respondents were happy about the way they were addressed, in simple, local and respectful language. A lot of information was given through pictures so people who are illiterate, who have difficulty in understanding the spoken language or children, could easily follow the meaning of the message. By using respectful language, facilitators had positive feedback and people were more eager to participate in their activities!



Attitude:

Respondents enjoyed the appropriate way the facilitators approached them; they were able to create an enabling environment, where ethnicity, age and (dis)ability seemed to be forgotten: we felt as one!! This was more difficult in mixed male-female groups as men do not always feel at ease when women want to speak up, stopping the women from expressing themselves.



Participation:

People who have a reasonable level of education could express themselves and were listened to, and even able to take joint decisions, irrespective from their ethnicity or (dis)ability. Gender disparity is more a challenge to overcome and in mixed activities women could not always play the role they would want to.



*All drawings are from INCRISD project.