

Indonesia

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

Name of focal point : Mr Sugeng TRIUTOMO

Organization : Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB)

Designation : Deputy Chief for Prevention and Preparedness

E-mail address : striutomo@bnpb.go.id

Telephone : +62 21 344 2734

Fax : +62 21 350 5036

Additional Focal points/ other comments :

Reporting period : 2007-2009

Last updated on : 30 May 2009

Print date : 09 Jun 2009

Reporting language : English

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/asia/idn/>

Strategic goals 1

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:

The Disaster Management Law and its ancillary regulations enacted and ensure powerful tools to promote the systematic integration of disaster risk reduction into the national, provincial and local development plans, including through the formulation of National and Regional Action Plans for Disaster Risk Reduction. These efforts are undertaken to make DRR a priority in development program. At the national level, the existence of National Action Plan 2006 – 2009 has led to DRR became one of the national development priorities as shown at the Government Work Plan (RKP) 2007 – 2008. Meanwhile, at the local level, especially in areas that have experienced disasters with massive impacts, such as Aceh and West Sumatra, DRR has also been incorporated into the Local Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMD).

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:

The establishment and strengthening of disaster management institutions at all levels, followed by the establishment of DRR platforms that also involve various non-government stakeholders, is actually intended to enhance capacity in identifying, monitoring, and responding to existing hazards, through the provision of training and the conduct of awareness building programs that could build resilience in facing disaster.

The establishment of National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB), and Local Agency for Disaster Management (BPBD), as well as National Platform for DRR (Planas PRB) indicates that coordination among pertinent DRR stakeholders has been enhanced, not only between government institutions, but also non-government organizations. Coordination at the community level is often facilitated by relevant government and non-government organizations, as well.

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:

DRR mainstreamed into national and local policy framework and implementation of guidelines and standard procedures for the strengthening of institutions, and mechanisms as well as relevant instruments on preparedness and emergency response programs in hazard-prone areas, and recovery programs in disaster-affected areas.

Efforts to strengthen the integration and synergy between the three disaster management system, namely disaster risk reduction, emergency response and recovery, has become one of the strategic steps that the Government is currently undertaking, with the involvement of government and

non-government institutions/organization, as well as the civil society, with the aim to consolidate and strengthen the national system for disaster management. In addition to the refinement of national and local action plan for DRR, efforts have also been put to link it with the Disaster Management Plan, in which disaster risk reduction is one of sub-system within the Disaster Management system.

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:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

Description:

Indonesia has enacted Law No. 24 Year 2007 on Disaster Management. The law was formulated through the initiative right of the National Legislature (DPR) and supported by the civil society through the Coalition for the Draft Disaster Management Law initiated by the MPBI (Indonesian Society for Disaster Management). The law was passed in Jakarta on 26 April 2007 and registered in the State Bulletin of the Republic Indonesia Year 2007 Number 66.

Law No. 24/2007 brings about a shift of paradigm in disaster management in Indonesia. The first is the change of view from disaster management with a focus on emergency response to risk management. Second, disaster management is realization of the people's basic right to protection. Third, disaster management is the responsibility of all parties, not only the government. Thus, disaster management that used to be solely in the government's domain is presently moved into the domain of the multi-stakeholders. All spectrums of disaster management from the policy, institution, coordination and mechanism have to involve the roles of the civil society and the private sector.

Law No. 24/2007 has been followed by several regulations:

1. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 21 Year 2008 on the Conduct of Disaster Management
2. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 22 Year 2008 on the Funding and Administration of Disaster Aid
3. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 23 Year 2008 on the Participation of International Agencies and Non-government International Agencies in Disaster Management
4. Presidential Regulation No. 8 Year 2008 on the establishment of the National Agency for Disaster Management (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana/BNPB) and Local Disaster Management Agencies
5. Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 46/2008
6. Head of BNPB Regulation No. 3/2008
7. Minister of Home Affairs Circular Letter on the Acceleration of the establishment of Government Work Unit (SKPD)
8. At local levels, many provinces and districts have passed Local Regulations on DM, detailing the clear responsibilities of each different government level.

National Action Plan for DRR 2006 – 2009 has also been developed and has become reference for national and local government, as well as other stakeholders, in undertaking the implementation of DRR. National Action Plan has also become as the compliments for National Medium Term Development Planning (RPJMN) 2004 – 2009.

Context & Constraints:

There are four key challenges faced by the Government of Indonesia. The first is to ensure the synchronization among the existing regulations and institutions, so that coordination mechanism and effort to integrate the implementation of disaster risk reduction activities could be realized. The second challenge is to ensure coordination of the interaction and communication among the relevant multi-stakeholders in promoting common understanding, togetherness, consensus and commitment in the planning and implementation of DRR activities. The third is to ensure the availability of sufficient capacity in terms of institutional capacity, human resources and funding sources, that could be utilized in the implementation of disaster risk reduction initiatives. The fourth challenge is related to the effort to ensure a consultative process, the involvement or participation of the community in DRR activities. It is also expected that consultation process will be built between the central and local governments. Many kinds of communication and information media need to be developed to raise awareness and understanding of the communities on the importance of disaster risk reduction, through many different forums to gain aspirations and views on pre-, during and post disaster situations.

To solve the above-mentioned challenges, several efforts can be done, among others, by optimizing the functions of the National Agency for Disaster Management in line with its mandate as stipulated by Law No. 24/2007 on Disaster Management, and by enacting regulations and relevant guidelines that are formulated jointly with the relevant stakeholders in a participatory and consultative manner. To ensure synchronization, coordination and proper consultative processes, efforts will need to be done to socialize Law No. 24/2007 on Disaster Management, its ancillary regulations and relevant guidelines. In addition to that, commitment and seriousness will need to be increased among implementing agencies members of the forum or platform committed to implement disaster risk reduction by mainstreaming disaster risk reduction aspects into development planning. For that purpose, training will need to be devised to build capacity in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction, both for institutions at the central level and local level.

In addition, since DM and DRR concept within the context of national and local development and the establishment of DM national and local agencies are relatively new, division of authority and function of relevant stakeholders still require to be further clarified.

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

Description:

There has been some progress in the implementation of disaster risk reduction programs, but the availability of financial resources to carry out DRR plans and activities at the different government levels will still need to be increased. Disaster risk reduction needs further advocacy in order that it can become development priority and enter the national and local budgets with clear budget item.

Budgets for disaster management in most departments and local governments generally are allocated for response/emergency activities. Many disaster risk reduction activities implemented by the different stakeholders have not been built on the same framework, so that the implementation is more or less

sectoral in nature, not structured and not integrated. This has made it difficult to allocate special resources, i.e. human resources, financial resources or physical resources that are sufficient at all levels of government, in line with the situations and conditions of every region.

Resources for disaster management in the civil society usually come from international assistance, donor agencies, the government or the people's own resources that are collected through the help of media campaign or humanitarian agencies. Actually there are still many untapped resources due to the minimal socialization to the community on how to mobilize resources for disaster risk reduction programs and activities. Moreover, many parties from the private sector have started to be involved in disaster management, particularly through their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programs, but the majority still too much preoccupied with emergency response and they are meant more not to alleviate the people's sufferings but to promote their visibility. If these CSR programs also hold "risk management" paradigm, they can contribute significantly in increasing the availability of special resources needed for disaster risk reduction activities.

BNPB is on the way of developing a disaster data and information system (called the DIBI) that can be used in planning DRR activities. In order that the regions can benefit from the system, sufficient financial and human resources will be needed.

Context & Constraints:

Indonesia still faces some challenges in earmarking disaster risk reduction budgets in the national and regional budget (APBN/APBD) allocations. There are many disaster risk reduction plans and activities that are not integrated, systematic and coordinated, and confusing for parties interested in contributing resources. Besides, the absence of mechanism or technical implementation guidelines for resource mobilization and the use and distribution of assistance from donor agencies has also obstructed efforts to ensure the availability of resources for disaster risk reduction activities.

To ensure the coordinated, systematic and integrated conduct of disaster risk reduction plans and programs, efforts will need to be done to increase the capacity to formulate Disaster Management Plans. Awareness of the importance of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development plans has to be raised in all levels and sectors. It is expected that by way of this systematic mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction, special resources required for the planning and implementation of disaster risk reduction activities could be made available and allocated sufficiently.

Furthermore, since the coordination among DRR stakeholders at national and local level still needs to be strengthened, the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation system for the implementation of DM and DRR policy must be enhanced so that the implementation of DRR can bring more positive impacts. One of the required systems is one that has the accountability principle to ensure the utilization of non-government funding can be accountable.

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

Regulation wise, decentralization that promises to transfer "duties and functions" from the central government to local governments has been regulated through Law No. 32 Year 2004. However, this has not been balanced with decentralization or delegation of authorities and resources, which actually is very

much needed by the local authorities in order that they can perform their functions well.

Decentralization of resources to the local level has not been done in a proper way. Much of the existing resources is still pooled at the national government, so that at the local level there is only very limited capacity for risk reduction, particularly the capacity to assess the root causes of the local people's vulnerability.

The civil society in Indonesia has participated substantially in discussions related to various different aspects of disaster risk reduction, through many community-based forums. Also, many preparedness training programs have also been conducted, involving all relevant stakeholders from the grassroots level all throughout Indonesia. However, these activities tend to be not coordinated, not integrated and unsystematic.

In Indonesia areas that often implement disaster risk reduction efforts are mostly those that have experienced major disasters or areas that are prone to disasters that may bring huge impacts. Awareness of the importance of disaster risk reduction usually grows in such areas and among the stakeholders living in those areas. At the local level several DRR stakeholders, together with national-level actors, launch campaigns for awareness raising on Disaster Risk Reduction day. At the national level, many different stakeholders also engaged in a collaborative venture to commemorate this Disaster Risk Reduction day through a series of relevant activities.

Context & Constraints:

One of the challenges is the difficulty in obtaining data and information required by the stakeholders from the civil society and the private sector to plan and develop disaster risk reduction activities. There is no comprehensive data and information available; they are not up-to-date and there are often several versions of data coming from different sources.

The absence or lack of delegation of authority at the local level also confuses many disaster risk reduction actors in integrating their activities into local government's disaster risk reduction plans and programs. The civil society and the private sector have not understood clearly what they could contribute in the field of DRR. Meanwhile, to date the involvement of the media in disseminating information about DRR initiatives is still negligible.

To address the above challenges, effort will need to be done to coordinate the collection and processing of disaster-related data and information, so that the final result will not be confusing for the users and can be updated regularly of relevant parties. In addition to that, since data and information constitute one of the fundamental components in the planning and implementation of disaster risk reduction activities, data standardization, availability and accessibility should always be maintained. It needs to be ensured that the data and information available is user-friendly and can be used easily by the community.

As part of the effort to disseminate information on disaster risk reduction, collaboration will need to be established with the media to promote better understanding of DRR issues and encourage them to come out with creative ideas to socialize DRR issues.

Furthermore, there is a need to balance the administrative and financial decentralization (money follow function) that is supported by clear disbursement mechanism as part of the accountability measures by the Local Government. On this note, it is necessary to have a national strategy that will strengthen the participation and awareness of the public in enhancing its development in other areas, in alignment with the efforts to increase the capacity of Local Government for the provision of disaster related data and information that can be used as consideration for policy making.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

Indonesia has wished to establish National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction since it started to formulate the National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction 2006-2009 in 2005. Since this issue could not become priority issue at that time, it was abandoned. In 2007 the issue was brought to the forth again in line with the socialization of HFA, that also touched the HFA progress review and the set-up of the National Platform for DRR (Planas PRB). The socialization process reaches out to many different stakeholder groups, including the government, the civil society, the university/academics, the international community, the media and the private sector.

In November 2008, with participation from the multi-stakeholders, the consensus to set-up the National Platform for DRR was declared officially. The concept and form of the national platform were built in a participatory manner and involving all interest groups. Planas PRB, which becomes a forum for stakeholders in disaster risk reduction field at the national level, can support the government and the other partners in advocacy, coordination, consultation and analysis in DRR, and other relevant policy issues at the national and international levels, in line with the Law No. 24 Year 2007 on Disaster Management.

Many disaster risk reduction forums or platforms have also been established all throughout Indonesia, for instance the Disaster Mitigation Forum (Forum Mitigasi Bencana), University Forum (Forum Perguruan Tinggi) for Disaster Management/Disaster Risk Reduction, Merapi Forum, Bengawan Solo Forum, and Consortium for Disaster Education and many other DRR forums/platforms at the provincial and district/city levels.

Context & Constraints:

The most crucial challenge for Planas PRB is to ensure that it can perform its functions as expected and maintain an active and participatory membership in promoting disaster risk reduction issues in Indonesia. Also, since Planas PRB is new, efforts are still needed to build a coordination mechanism with existing forums, both vertically and horizontally. In view of the many issues still to be addressed in the field of disaster risk reduction, Planas PRB needs to prioritize its work programs, including effort to mainstream disaster risk reduction into the national development plan. Funds need to be allocated to support the activities of Planas PRB.

As an initial recommendation, Planas PRB needs to immediately activate its secretariat. Also, the membership base need to be expanded and made more inclusive and participatory. Planas PRB needs to quickly establish itself as a forum for disaster-related stakeholders. Coordination mechanism that is systematic and functional needs to be built soon and source of funding considered.

To enhance the function of Planas PRB, it is necessary to have clarity on the role and responsibility of each stakeholder groups involved by using multisectoral approach. By doing so, each stakeholder groups will be aware of their role and responsibility in mainstreaming DRR into development, and also in integrating DRR into other relevant policies/regulations, such as community empowerment, climate change and spatial planning.

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:

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

Description:

In formulating disaster risk reduction programs, data and information related to the existing hazards and vulnerabilities are needed. At the national level hazard data have been produced by the different sectoral ministries. DIBI (by National Agency for Disaster Management/BNPB), PIRBA (by Ministry of Research and Technology/Menristek), and SIMBA (by National Agency for Space and Aeronautic/LAPAN), are among the instances. The Ministry of Home Affairs, through the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation (Permendagri) No. 46 Year 2008, has ordered or recommended that district/city governments collect and report hazard related data in their areas. Several regions have met these requirements, although it has not been optimal.

Presidential Regulation No. 8 Year 2008 stipulates the set-up of disaster management bodies (Badan Disaster Management Daerah/BPBD) in the regions and one of the functions of BPBD is to prepare hazard maps of their regions. Several regions have already had meta data that could be used as a basis for risk assessment.. Capacity building is needed for local governments and local universities or disaster research centers will need to be engaged to support local BPBDs in conducting hazard and risk mapping.

Several risk assessment initiatives have been developed, particularly in areas that have experienced major disasters. The method used in this risk assessment, however, is different from one area to the other. Without standardization in the risk assessment method used, the risk assessment will yield different results that will be confusing for the end users. Data and information related to vulnerability are also still very limited. To address this issue, the government through the BNPB is in the process of preparing a standard guideline in risk assessment that could easily be implemented at the local level.

Context & Constraints:

Hazard maps and hazard information are basically sectoral, so that the same information is often produced by different agencies, although with different methodologies and non-standardized techniques. As a result, the information produced is confusing, does not meet established criteria and difficult to be overlaid with the other maps to make a more comprehensive risk assessment. Thus, there is a need for a risk assessment product that meets scientific requirements as well as can serve as a reference for the national and local levels.

In general, regions affected by disasters have more initiatives in conducting risk assessment. The bigger the disaster suffered by a region, the more initiatives related to risk assessment conducted in the region by the local government or other interested stakeholders. Still, local governments need support from external parties in developing risk assessment and vulnerability analysis. Data and information related to vulnerability and risk assessment has mostly not been integrated optimally into local spatial plans.

To address the above challenges, cooperation needs to be built among agencies developing risk maps to synergize the existing maps into integrated and comprehensive maps. The National Agency for Disaster Management needs to have standardized maps developed by sectoral agencies or ministries. Thus, parties in need of data and information related to hazards, vulnerability and risk assessment can access standardized maps that have been endorsed by BNPB. Besides, the maps produced should also be integrated to the existing database system, so that the accessibility and utilization of the maps could

be optimized.

In order that agencies/organizations that develop data and information related to hazards, vulnerability and risk assessment can produce reliable products, there is a need for a policy guideline on the formulation of standardized maps, which currently is still being prepared under the coordination by BNPB.

It is also necessary to have standardized maps and consistent information that is accountable to the public as means to increase the institutional capacity of NADM and LADM through transfer of knowledge process from donor/international agencies as well as from other areas,

Core indicator 2

Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

At the national level, disaster monitoring system has already in place and being used by the sectoral agencies/ministries. The standard data format has also been agreed by 12 relevant ministries and agencies.

The archive system and dissemination of hazard data for flood, volcano, landslide, earthquake and other hazards are done by the individual responsible sectoral agencies/ministries. However, although the hazard data have been available, its use and utilization at the local level has not been optimal, because the information dissemination system has not been sufficiently developed. For example, the Badan Meteorologi, Klimatologi dan Geofisika (BMKG or Agency for Meteorology, Climatology and Geophysics) issues a warning of possible rainfall with high intensity and long duration for a certain area that is indicated as prone to landslide. If the warning reaches the intended government, which does not have functional warning system dissemination yet, there is no way to disseminate the information to the communities at risk. Moreover, since the collection, archive and dissemination of hazard data has often been done also by each individual sectoral office, when the coordination between these sectoral offices is weak, it is most likely that the hazard data cannot be utilized optimally by parties in need of these data.

Vulnerability data such as social, economic, environmental and physical vulnerabilities are still insubstantial, in terms of the collection, archive and dissemination.

Context & Constraints:

The geographical condition of Indonesia which consists of islands that are scattered in a vast area, poses quite a challenge for an accurate system to monitor disaster. Moreover, the limited number of instruments available to conduct the monitoring will further hinder this effort.

When hazard data is available and it needs to be disseminated to the communities at risk, often there will be other problems such as the wide distribution of the population, the limited infrastructure and the limited communication/telecommunication networks available. To address these challenges, coordination is needed to strengthen the instrument systems, standardize the data format and develop networks for sharing data and information to increase the usefulness of the data. Also, to prevent overlapping of information, the monitoring management needs to be enhanced and hazard data and information need to be centralized and managed by BNPB.

Considering the many data and information held at the different agencies/organizations, the BNPB has developed a national disaster database called the DIBI (Data dan Informasi Bencana Indonesia or Indonesian Disaster Data and Information). It is expected that a standardized and user-friendly database could be established and accessed by the public.

When disaster risk reduction has already been mainstreamed into development plans, regions facing limitations in terms of telecommunication network could give priority to the development of infrastructure to optimize hazard monitoring and disseminate the information to communities at risk. Involvement of the media, including TV/Radio, needs to be enhanced to help in information dissemination.

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

Description:

Early warning systems in national level for several types of hazard, such as earthquakes, tsunami, volcanic eruption, and floods are available and functioning, which have been disseminated to the community level of the communities at risk. Evaluation on the early warning system for several types of disasters in the community level has been done professionally. This is supported by experts from research institutions/universities/disaster studies, adapting the early warning system to the development of the local situation and condition, by taking the existing indigenous knowledge and culture into account. The example is the early warning system developed by the community of Forum Merapi. However, in many other regions, due to the limited capacity of human resources, the response to the early warning system being advocated is not optimal.

The commitment of the relevant institutions on each disaster to provide and disseminate the early warning systems has been realized. However, the outcome is still unsatisfactory due to limited capacity, in terms of financial, human resources and physical capacity.

Context & Constraints:

The geographical landscape of Indonesian archipelago is very extensive. The development of infrastructure does not reach the remote areas, leading to information gap in the level of society. In addition, the limited capacity in the local level, both in the local government and relevant communities, in understanding the information of early warning systems and emergency preparedness to respond to the early warnings has become the major obstacle.

To overcome such challenges, an appropriate development system to promote the information dissemination of the early warning system must be developed. Education and training on the various types of hazards and vulnerabilities must be increased among the relevant community groups so that they can understand and respond to the information on the early warning. Sometimes the incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge is more acceptable than that of the scientific knowledge-based in early warning system. The capacity of the local government and the community must be improved through advocacy, training and drill conducted periodically so that the early warning system developed can reduce the vulnerabilities faced by the communities at risk.

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:

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

Description:

Agreement and commitment have been established between regions which have or face similar risks, for example the four regencies vulnerable to Merapi eruption in Yogyakarta and Central Java provinces. The four regencies located in two different provinces have signed a cooperation agreement in disseminating early warning information, evacuation process and the management of trans-boundary refugees (across administrative boundary in regency and provincial levels). In terms of regional or international risks; agreement, cooperation and commitment in the Tsunami early warning system have been established. For example, under the coordination of Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission UNESCO (IOC-UNESCO), mandated by the international community, has established the Intergovernmental Coordination Group for the Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System (ICG/IOTWS).

In addition, Memorandum of Understanding to consider trans-boundary risks has been developed among the ASEAN country members to build resilient nations to deal with disasters and to realize the safer community by the establishment of ASEAN Regional Programme on Disaster Management (ARPDM) which focuses on the ASEAN regional strategies for disaster management, including the field and priority activities for disaster risk reduction.

Context & Constraints:

The unavailability of regulations and policies on data and information exchange pertaining to disaster risks has become one of the reasons why the existing data and information exchange has not been satisfactory.

Agreement and commitment to cooperate in the risks assessment in intergovernmental levels has been established, but the technical implementation does not function properly due to political considerations, different capacities of each country or region, and the geographical conditions and situations affecting the accessibility.

To overcome such challenges, policies and regulations must be endorsed to facilitate the disaster risk data and information exchange. Besides, agreement and commitment efforts on interregional risk reduction must be focused on human issues to minimize the political consideration issues and problems on interregional level without ignoring the sovereignty and security of respective countries.

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:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

Description:

Various government and non-government organizations/institutions have developed disaster information system, such as the National Disaster Management Agency, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Social Affairs,

Indonesian Armed Forces (TNI), Indonesian National Police (Polri), Indonesian Red Cross (PMI), Agency for Meteorology, Climatology and Geophysics (BMKG), Coordinating Body for Survey and National Mapping (Bakorsurtanal), Ministry of the Environment (environmental and climactic change), UNESCO (Jakarta Tsunami Information Center), DSM websites, The Curriculum Center of Ministry of National Education (learning model and school-based curricula in the hazard-prone areas), LIPI (National Institute of Science), Geology Division of the Department of Mineral Energy Resources, Consortium for Disaster Education. Since the disaster data and information is collected, analyzed and developed by the different sectors, they are not integrated and the information availability is limited because they are very sectoral and the benefits are still limited to the planning of the disaster risk reduction programs.

Although the system developed is relatively better than that of the previous year, the existing information management systems are not yet all user-friendly and hence are difficult to access and download. Sometimes the data does not contain updated information. The types of available data and information are limited; for example, they only refer to the types of data and structure and the limited number of data specifically related with disasters and vulnerabilities.

The accuracy of disaster data still needs to be assessed critically due to different perception or understanding on disaster. For example, in the event of flood in a certain region, it is not clear whether the difference is made between the areas flooded as high as the knee and those flooded as high as the hip of adults. Sometimes this information is not distinguished and considered as one piece of information on flood hazard of a certain area, without considering the different impact the flood has caused the two regions. Thus, it is necessary to call for agreed-upon standardization, limitation and terminologies to mainstream different perceptions.

Context & Constraints:

One of the outstanding obstacles or challenges in this field is the conflict of interest (sectoral sentiment) by each institution or organization which creates or develops the disaster database and information system. Since they have their own interest and they adjust their database and information system to match with the main tasks and functions of each institution and organization, the efforts to mainstream the information system are therefore hindered. In addition, the lack of incentive or low commitment to put the policies into effect, and the lack of awareness on the importance of information and data sharing with other organizations, lead to the wasting of the data and information because the data and information are merely kept and not utilized. Other obstacles and challenges are the limited availability of resources, in terms of both human resources (manpower and information technology experts in the local level), and financial and physical resources badly needed to develop the information system itself.

To overcome such challenges, a network of information system for disaster risk reduction must be developed and run by BNPB by strengthening coordination among the information providing centres (including universities) and Planas PRB (National Platform for Disaster risk reduction) must play its important role. The National Disaster Management Agency can also identify the needs for data on disasters, vulnerabilities and risks to support the initiatives of disaster risk reduction and to encourage the relevant sectors to provide the data.

To raise the awareness of the importance of integrated and accurate information, a strong commitment between relevant disaster risk reduction stakeholders must be established to share information, data collection and data analysis, budgeting and other resources. In order to develop an incentive system for the institution or organization which owns and analyzes databases and information on disasters, effort must be made to integrate information sharing to become a part of the system and to increase the ownership of the information by the relevant organizations or institutions. If the organizations are aware of their integral part of the existing information management system, it is expected that they will be more motivated to share their information in an integrated and coordinated means.

The existence of substantive policies on the domain of public databases of disaster (considered as confidential and open data) is needed to clarify the types of available, accessible and usable data.

There is also a need to accelerate the development of national guidelines for the establishment of Emergency Operation Center that can function as center of information, maximize communication forum of DIBI, as well as to enhance the institutional capacity in translating data and information from relevant institutions into the process of policy making that will bring positive consequences in strengthening DRR at local level.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

In Indonesia, the Presidential Decree was issued to the Ministry of National Education and Ministry of Home Affairs to integrate disaster risk reduction into the school curricula, both intra and extracurricular programs. However, this decree has not been implemented because the policy implementation instrument has not been devised in the national level. Currently, a step to formulate a national policy in the form of strategies to mainstream the disaster risk reduction into the national education system is prepared. As the initial process, a governmental working group and civil society working group, in this case Consortium for Disaster Education has been set up.

In the local level, many regions, in particular those affected by catastrophic disasters or high risk communities, have owned Regional Government Regulation or the Mayor's Decree to integrate disaster risk reduction in the school curricula. However, it is difficult to be implemented by the schools in the regions since the existing curriculum is considered burdensome enough for the students in each level (elementary, junior and senior high schools). In certain regencies, a guideline to integrate emergency awareness into the school-based curriculum (KTSP) is initiated. Despite the fact that the integration of Disaster risk reduction in the school curricula is not yet implemented, some government institutions and local NGOs, national and international organizations have implemented disaster education program in schools and outside schools and in formal and informal institutions. These institutions are included in the Consortium for Disaster Education.

Some government institutions have also prepared some guidelines related to educational materials and disaster-related trainings, but most of the trainings are focused on emergency preparedness, emergency response or emergency management. The disaster risk reduction-related material and training are still limited. Post-graduate programs and elective courses on disasters are set up in institutions of higher education.

Context & Constraints:

Unavailability of policies and guidelines on how to mainstream Disaster risk reduction in the school curricula, the learning materials as well as the relevant trainings (extracurricular or local content) makes it difficult for the schools to implement the strategy of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction. In addition, the curriculum is too burdensome for the students, thus making it difficult for the schools and teachers to mainstream the disaster risk reduction into the students' education materials.

Based on the challenges mentioned, efforts to realize the national policy in mainstreaming disaster risk

reduction into education system and efforts to encourage the regions and schools to support the initiative to mainstream disaster risk reduction in their education materials must be made.

To initiate the try-out and the real implementation of disaster risk reduction mainstreaming into school curricula and education material, the academia or schools must have human resources with adequate capacity. Currently, the human resources available are still limited. Efforts to develop and improve the human resource capacity (educators, educating staff, public and professional officers) must be carried out to implement the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into school curricula, education material, and relevant trainings. The availability of sufficient human resources is expected to encourage the regions and schools to be more creative and innovative in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction.

In addition, national-level guidelines to mainstream disaster risk reduction into school education must be formulated. For example, it must be clear whether it is going to be mainstreamed in the extracurricular and intra-curricular activities, local content, or as a part of the existing school subjects, or into the school programs such as UKS (school health unit), disaster prepared school, Scouts, Youth Red Cross, etc. If the national guidelines are available, the local government and schools will be able to use the guidelines as the reference to mainstream disaster risk reduction according to the situation and condition of each region. To support the implementation of disaster risk reduction mainstreaming, materials and reading texts on disaster risk reduction are needed (both for students and teachers in all school levels).

Core indicator 3

Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

In the past two years, the disaster research centres have developed rapidly in the institutions of Higher Education. The disaster studies outside the university settings, such as NGOs, Donor organization, government and business institutions have increased in number. Some institutions have gone as far as integrating the disaster research as one of the priorities of the research topics, for example Directorate General of Higher Education Indonesia (Dikti), Disaster Response Network (DRN), Indonesian Science Institute (LIPI) and the State Ministry of Research and Technology (Ristek). However, the program and government funding allocated to develop the methodology and tools to analyze the risks are limited.

In relevance with the methods and tools for multi-risk assessments, many stakeholders, in particular academicians/institutions of higher education have developed them. Nevertheless, the tools are still limited and focused simply on the disaster assessment aspects.

Currently, a team consisting of experts in the relevant fields from various institutions commissioned by Disaster Management National Agency and Research and Technology Ministry is preparing to formulate the guidelines for disaster multi-risk assessment.

A research tool to assess risks has been developed and used by private sectors. However, the tool and the analysis result are not for public because it is considered as the knowledge asset by the relevant private company. Cost benefit analysis for disaster risk reduction has not been developed yet so far.

Context & Constraints:

The first challenge is on how to develop a multi-risks analysis assessment which also integrates the environmental impact analysis (AMDAL).

Secondly, sometimes the research tools and methods developed by some research institutions and universities are not utilized by the local government to plan the development which considers the disaster risk reduction elements. Therefore, the efforts to encourage the local government to utilize the research methods and tools must be promoted.

The third challenge is on how to motivate the stakeholders including the research institutions, universities, business institutions and other actors to conduct risk assessment and to share information on the result of the risk analysis previously done.

The fourth challenge is on how to build and use the capacity properly to develop the methods and tools for multi-risk assessments.

To meet the challenges, one of the most important things is to increase the human resource capacity to establish and strengthen the research methods and tools for multi-risk assessment. The role of research institutions or institutions of higher education is significant in this field, therefore the establishment of disaster study centres in particular in the hazard-prone areas must be encouraged. The Government can play its most vital role namely by allocating sufficient research grant to be used by the research institutions and disaster study centres in universities. To optimize the use or application of the research results of the multi-risk assessment, programs to arouse interests in conducting applied research in disaster risk reduction must be set up. One of the ways is by raising awareness among the relevant stakeholders on the importance of disaster risk analysis. In addition, publication and accessibility of the information related to disaster research results must be promoted.

To increase the use of disaster research results including multi-risks assessment, a working mechanism must be established among the researchers and practitioners (government, NGO, private sectors, media) so that the research results can be used in practical terms. In view of the cultural diversity in Indonesia, the research related to indigenous research must be encouraged as one of the initiatives of Disaster risk reduction mainstreaming.

To increase the motivation of relevant stakeholders and to optimize the utilization of research, it is necessary to adopt incentive approach or mechanism for local government as well as for research institutes. Furthermore, there must be means to ensure that research on disasters also accommodates indigenous knowledge so that it can be understood and supported by relevant communities.

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

Description:

Stakeholders, including the government and non-government organizations, institutions of higher education and media have strengthened efforts to increase countrywide public awareness on the disaster risk reduction and on the importance of a strategy to stimulate a disaster resilience culture in the face of disasters. On the other hand, business institutions have not been involved in the disaster risk reduction program that outreaches the community at all levels, even though some companies in particular those related to natural resources; have started developing an awareness program to strengthen the disaster-preparedness in a limited scope.

Up to this point, the previously-mentioned activities are sporadic in nature, having no continuity and strategies related to these issues in the national level. The materials prepared or produced to increase countrywide public awareness and the dissemination of the products, such as leaflets and booklets, are still limited in number, content, coverage, as well as distribution.

The data and good practices as well as access to obtain information/materials are available but still very limited. In the local level, data sharing and good practices are done in several community forums, in particular in the disaster-affected areas or high-risk areas. Media has played its part in increasing public awareness, with the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between Indonesian Red Cross and Media Indonesia to allocate an information column on disaster risk reduction/disasters. However, the media knowledge on disasters, including disaster risk reduction, techniques and ethics of media coverage on disasters needs to be improved.

The disaster risk reduction day is observed nationally every year but the participation of the multi-sectoral partners is very low. The observance coordinated by Disaster Management National Agency is always supported by the civil society organizations/institutions, international communities, institutions of higher education and the media. In the local level, the disaster risk reduction day is only observed by the people in the areas with thorough understanding and awareness of disaster risk reduction. The government involvement in the regional and international forums is very high but the effectiveness of the activities is in question because there are no meaningful follow-up measures.

Furthermore, it is necessary to synchronize the enhancement of public awareness and institutional capacity development programme so that these two programmes can be aligned and become sustainable.

Context & Constraints:

One of the existing challenges is the unavailability of national strategies for this purpose. As a consequence, the activities carried out by the stakeholders are sporadic and unsystematic in nature, so that there is no continuity to ensure the optimal results or impacts. In addition, the level of success in the implementation of community awareness-raising initiatives cannot be measured objectively because there are no indicators developed for such purpose.

In terms of content, most of the community awareness-raising initiatives are focused more on preparedness for emergency response, which actually is only one of the many components in disaster risk reduction. This is caused by, among others, the lack of or limited understanding of disaster risk reduction among the people who designed and developed the community awareness-raising initiatives.

The adequate human resource capacity is very important in the contexts where culturally Indonesian people still believe that disasters happen because they are destined by God and it is an inevitable fate. Therefore, the strategies in the implementation of community awareness-raising initiatives must be approached in a certain way.

To overcome such challenges, a national strategy to increase community awareness of the disaster risk reduction and the institutionalization of the community awareness-raising initiatives are called for. In addition, evaluation method and substantive indicators to measure the success of the community awareness-raising initiatives of disaster risk reduction must be formulated so that the success of the initiatives can be optimized among the urban and rural communities. The capacity of human resource to design and implement the initiatives or disaster risk reduction programs must be enhanced.

In view of Indonesian distinctive culture and diverse local cultures, special efforts must be carried out to increase the communication with the local community so that the local community will accept and understand the education and knowledge of the importance of disaster risk reduction.

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:

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

Description:

Efforts to mainstream disaster risk reduction into policies and plans related to the environment have been commenced. Spatial planning as stipulated in Law No. 26/2008 on Spatial Planning, for instance, has accommodated the importance of disaster risk assessments in planning the land use.

In addition, the government has also initiated the integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, as the outcome of the Bali Conference in 2007. This is followed up with the drafting of the National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation.

Awareness to protect the wetlands has been promoted but has not achieved significant implementation. Forest land use monitoring is carried out as one of the efforts done by the National Forest Inventory.

Context & Constraints:

The constraint or challenge faced in the integration of Disaster risk reduction into environmental-related policies and plans is, among others, the drafting of the policies without involving the relevant stakeholders. Regulations and policies are considered too broad to be implemented. Besides, the policy drafting has not been assessed based on risk indicators. Different interest between the central and local governments also creates different perceptions in interpreting the existing policies/regulations. Weak law enforcement and the unavailability of the monitoring and evaluation system using substantive indicators constitute the challenges at hand.

Efforts to overcome the challenges are recommended by revising or improving the existing regulations/policies to be more well-defined and comprehensive involving relevant stakeholders. A system to ensure the proper implementation of the regulations/policies needs to be set up followed by enforcement measures. To encourage the better implementation of the regulations/policies, a reward and punishment mechanism can be built. Whereas, to ensure the progress of the disaster risk reduction integration into the policies and plans, a mechanism using substantive indicators to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the programs must be developed.

There is also a need to strengthen the consultative process with relevant sectors to develop synergy in implementing policies/regulations, and this process must be supported by clear implementation mechanism and adequate resources.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

The relevant policies to identify and categorize the hazard-prone communities to create a social security system are available, for example food security policy and the establishment of Food Security Council to ensure the implementation of the policy. In addition, the social security system is carried out through social security net, BLT (Direct Cash Assistance), community health security (health insurance for the poor). Access to the micro-insurance for the population at risk has been initiated, for example by coastal population resilience micro-credit (program launched by the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery), and micro-insurance for farmers.

Disaster loss insurance program to protect the communities at risk from multi-hazards (earthquakes, volcanic eruption, tsunami, flood and fire) is available. The stakeholders related to insurance and micro-insurance have given attention and commitment but meet technical constraints. Among them are the questions on who will pay for the premium, who will assess the vulnerabilities, and so on.

Context & Constraints:

The constraints related to the policies and plans for social development aimed at reducing the vulnerabilities of the populations at risk are identified. Among them is the low public awareness to insure their possessions. The promotion in the field of disaster insurance is still considered inadequate. The technical clarity (on the system and mechanism) for micro-insurance is not available. The availability of fund to ensure the sustainability of the program implementation such as JPS (Social Safety Net), BLT (Direct Cash Assistance), Jamkesmas (Community Health Insurance) is limited. The administration system, the demographic data and information have not secured the population at risk. A well-defined mechanism to ensure the proper implementation, monitoring and evaluation using substantive indicators is required. The control system towards the safety net program has not been implemented properly.

To overcome such constraints, efforts to encourage stakeholders to increase public awareness and education to insure their lives and possessions must be promoted. In addition, a comprehensible technical system and mechanism for micro-insurance involving the active participation from the relevant stakeholders must be set up. A substantive monitoring and evaluation system and mechanism must be constructed. Then a system and mechanism should be developed to ensure the availability of fund to guarantee the sustainability of the implementation of JPS (Social Safety Net), BLT (Direct Cash Assistance), Jamkesmas (Community Health Insurance) programs. The improvement of system targeting of the beneficiaries will ensure that all the communities at risk are not overlooked. An improvement of the administration, demographic data and information system will ensure the protection of the vulnerable population. A strong mechanism will guarantee the proper implementation, monitoring and evaluation using clear indicators. The availability of the control system of the safety net program will ensure the proper implementation of monitoring and evaluation. The availability of feasibility study, system and mechanism to set up an insurance program to cover the vulnerable societies must be promoted.

Core indicator 3

Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

The stakeholders have made efforts related to economic sector planning to reduce vulnerabilities. For example, the formulation of fiscal policy by Ministry of Finance to consider disaster risk reduction and climate change; the awareness of food diversification promoted by Ministry of Agriculture; the

commitment of Ministry of Finance to give incentive to business institutions that consider and integrate disaster risk reduction efforts in their business activities; the fishery planning by the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery that takes the disaster vulnerabilities into account; and the initiatives taken by state-owned enterprises (BUMN) to integrate disaster risk reduction in their business activities.

Context & Constraints:

Currently, many efforts to increase people's welfare through assistance program have been made such as BLT (Direct Cash Assistance), KUR (People's Business Credit), and so on. However, the programs have not addressed the reduction of vulnerabilities. Therefore, in the future the content of disaster risk reduction must be included in the multi sector government programs.

In addition, the effort to strengthen coordination between in economic and productive sectoral policies and plans must be made. The mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of the program implementation must be built and strengthened. The comprehensive food security assessment must be carried out. With regard to food security, capacity of food security needs to be strengthened by the officers and vulnerable societies.

There is also a need to enhance the development of holistic policy on economic sector, especially in relevant to Small Medium Enterprises that still requires protection from the government. Furthermore, there is also a need to develop policy that can enhance real sector with incentive programmes, especially for SME.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Description:

Pertaining to the planning and management of human settlement incorporating disaster risk reduction elements, including the enforcement of regulations for human settlements, the relevant institutions have enforced the policies on building codes, zoning and building construction permit. Besides, there is a growing public awareness of the earthquake-proof buildings and an effort to certify the quality of building, public buildings in particular. Law enforcement related to building supervision that considers public safety must be promoted.

Context & Constraints:

There are several of constraints, such as lack of coordination among the organizations concerned with the planning and management of people's settlements in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction elements, including the enforcement of building codes. Also there needs to be a comprehensive strategy for building codes and spatial planning, as well as clear distribution of roles among relevant government agencies.

To address these challenges, it is recommended that a coordination mechanism is established among the relevant institutions to make the work more effective; the use of micro-zoning for the formulation of spatial plans in hazard-prone areas; improved supervision for the enforcement of building codes; public awareness raising for building codes; and enhanced monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the building codes.

Furthermore, there is also a need to develop incentive/disincentive system to encourage the

operationalization or implementation of existing policy and regulations.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

Description:

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes. For example, the housing reconstruction in Aceh and Yogyakarta considered the land-use planning and environment using the earthquake-proof construction methods. Besides, the disaster victim relocation has considered the land-use, risk analysis and disaster risk reduction elements. The Ministry of Health has stipulated a policy related with the reconstruction of ruined earthquake-hit hospitals by adhering to the disaster risk reduction principles. As an effort to educate the society on disaster risk reduction, the disaster affected society is involved in the post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes. In addition, the micro-finance scheme has been integrated into the recovery and rehabilitation activities aimed at assisting women.

Context & Constraints:

The constraints or challenges faced in the effort to integrate the disaster risk reduction into the post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes are: the lack of local leadership empowerment and lack of community awareness and capacity in applying the disaster risk reduction principles to implement the rehabilitation and reconstruction activities. Unfortunately, the value shifting in the originality of indigenous knowledge in rehabilitation and reconstruction has not been documented well.

To overcome the challenges, efforts to reconstruct the purity of values, to document the local wisdom, and to increase the local leadership capacity in implementing the disaster risk reduction and the public awareness in applying the disaster risk reduction values into the rehabilitation and reconstruction programs.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

Description:

There have been land use management policies for controlling disaster risk impacts, even though the implementation was still not optimal. The Department of Public Works and Department of Transportation have been regulating airports and their construction projects based on disaster risk reduction. Some schools have been constructed based on disaster risk impacts, although the number is still small. The government is also strictly controlling the infrastructure construction projects, in order to prevent the construction of public facilities in hazard-prone areas. In addition, despite the weak implementation, such as that in the case of emission test, no-smoking areas, and many others, regional regulations related to air pollution control have also been issued.

At this moment, BNPB is preparing a guideline that would require constructions with high risk of disaster

to be equipped with a disaster risk analysis.

Context & Constraints:

In assessing the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, two main challenges were identified. The first challenge was the weak enforcement of land use which is appropriate with the spatial plan. The second challenge was the low accountability of infrastructure construction projects that obey DRR norms. For instance, not all hospitals have an adequate waste disposal system. In addition, the procedure for evaluating disaster risk impacts in infrastructure building was still limited. These challenges were probably caused by constructors' lack of awareness and commitment in implementing the DRR. Central and local government's different interests and priorities was another cause for the existing challenges.

To address such challenges, it is important to have better monitoring and law enforcement for the violators of city master plan, building codes, and other regulations related to DRR. It is also necessary to have accountability demand enforcement of all infrastructure development projects in accordance with DRR norms. Various efforts are still needed to increase the constructors' awareness and commitment in implementing DRR; in order that the procedure development in evaluating disaster risk impacts in infrastructure construction project can be facilitated. To accommodate the different interests and priorities between the central and local government, an effective communication and coordination needs to be built.

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:

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

Description:

Most regions in Indonesia have already had disaster preparedness mechanisms, although the mechanisms were not integrated and well structured yet. Furthermore, most of them have poor coordination mechanism due to sectoral fragmentation, governance administration, and geographical location. In the same time, institutional and technical capacities of disaster management were still concentrated in major cities.

A number of sectoral institutions had different rules and policies due to the differences in function and interests. However, the absence of integration and harmonization of inter-institutional rules resulted in sectoral confusions, particularly in budget uses related to disaster management.

From the national level until the village level, personnel and volunteers for disaster management, such as Indonesian Red Cross (PMI), Rapid Response Team (TRC), Taruna Siaga Bencana, Pemuda Siaga Bencana, etc, are available. Nevertheless, it is necessary for these field personnel to be brought into line and to possess certain standard competencies. The distribution of tasks, standards, and mandate for the personnel and volunteers coming from various elements of organization still needs further clarification, in order to avoid overlapping and discrepancy. These volunteers also need to be knowledgeable about the fixed procedures and need to be certified.

Mass media play a significant role in collecting both financial support and other (non-journalist) volunteers in disaster risk management. Unfortunately, their effectiveness and efficiency is still not optimal. In fact, sometimes they are counter-productive. Meanwhile, events related to disaster risk reduction, particularly those not included in preparedness for emergency response, have not got much attention from the media.

Context & Constraints:

The increasing frequency of disasters recently has encouraged more organizations and individuals to get involved in aiding disaster-affected victims. Many parties were trying to get involved in humanitarian emergency response, despite the fact that some of them did not possess adequate capacity in such field yet. The absence of both competence standardization and volunteer certification resulted in capacity discrepancy in humanitarian response.

In regions with sufficient institutional and technical capacities of disaster management, poor coordination was often the reason why such capacities failed to function effectively and efficiently. Disaster management mechanisms which are sectoral, geographically, and administratively fragmented also often resulted in poor institutional function and poor technical capacities.

During the pre-disaster stage, horizontal and vertical coordination among emergency response workers should be enhanced. In the same time, their technical capacity should also be standardized. To have a better coordination in disaster management, mechanisms for monitoring and controlling humanitarian and non-humanitarian organizations - including the humanitarian workers - need to be devised, in order to be synchronous with Pusdalops operation plans. To build up emergency response preparedness, Pusdalops in disaster-affected regions should cooperate and collaborate to implement their contingency plan into a joint operation plan.

Mass media can be used to inform the procedures of disaster emergency response to the public. This will help bring about a more efficient, effective, and accurate humanitarian response to aid disaster-affected society. In addition, presidential regulation regarding disaster status needs to be issued immediately and through a participatory process.

Capacity development can also be enhanced through the provision of trainings on contingency planning

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

Description:

Disaster preparedness and contingency plans for emergency response situations were implemented in no more than 10 percent of the whole regions in Indonesia, including the provincial level, regency level, and sectoral level. Program continuity in regions having contingency plans also needs to be investigated further, for instance, to find out whether they regularly test and upgrade their contingency plans. The purpose of this activity is to ensure that the operational plan can run effectively when a disaster strikes.

Integrated action plans from numerous sectors with several types of disaster, such as forest fire, flood, landslide, and drought have been developed. Simulations and drills were not comprehensively done, either only performed in sectoral level or in certain regions. National-scale contingency plans, simulation,

and drills have never been organized.

Emergency network response has been created and proven to run well in local, regional, and national level, despite the fact that they were done by individuals, not institutions.

Context & Constraints:

There were two main challenges regarding the disaster preparedness plan and contingency plan. The first challenge was the low awareness in the regional, societal, and sectoral level on the importance of disaster preparedness plan and contingency plan. The second challenge was the absence of procedure and plan which were agreed by all parties involved in emergency management.

To overcome such challenges, it is necessary to ensure that all parties are in the same perspective on contingency plan and on public announcement of the guidelines published by BNPB. Moreover, the involved sectors must be further advocated to arrange sectoral contingency plan.

Meanwhile, arranging an integrated contingency plan should become one of the priorities delegated to the Steering Committee of BNPB.

There is also a need to build a system for comprehensive institutional capacity development that is supported by the commitment of Local Authority to ensure its implementation and acquire sufficient allocation of resources.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

Description:

Emergency/buffer stocks prepared by the government for disaster emergency response have been provided in the national, provincial, and regional levels. Buffer stocks consist of basic needs such as tents, rice, soup-kitchen, foodstuffs, clothes, and basic medical supplies. The available contingency budget is around 40-50 billion rupiahs, and can be increased when needed. At this moment, BNPB is in the process of constructing Technical Implementation Unit (UPT) in several regions, which will serve as a training center and an emergency response warehouse. In addition, 10 regions in Indonesia have indicated their support in helping the Department of Health to provide medical health service for disaster-affected victims.

The other stakeholders are also well prepared. Indonesian Red Cross (PMI), for instance, owns two main warehouses and six regional warehouses situated in several regions in Indonesia. The warehouses are capable of storing the minimum stocks for approximately 10.000 family units. Once a year, Indonesian Red Cross's raises their financial reserves with the support of national association of the allied countries. International organizations working in Indonesia that have the mandate to perform emergency response, such as UNOCHA, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA, and many others, also possess emergency stock, which is ready to be mobilized when needed. Donor organizations, such as USAID, AusAID, CIDA, DANIDA, etc, also provide contingency fund which is ready to be distributed in time of need. As one of the rules derived from Law No. 24/2007 on Disaster Management, Indonesian government has also issued Government Regulation No. 23/2008 about the Roles of International Organizations in Disaster Management.

Context & Constraints:

Although emergency stocks have been made available by various stakeholders possessing mandate to perform emergency response, oftentimes the emergency stock distribution or mobilization was hampered by numerous factors. Among them was the unavailability or lack of operational funds, geographical conditions hindering the mobilization of emergency stocks, poor transportation system, and poor infrastructure in disaster-affected areas. Problems regarding the emergency response fund or 'on call fund' also occurred, in which fund distribution was slowed down by perplexing bureaucratic mechanisms from the national level to the provincial and regional level. As a result, it took a few months after the emergency response was over until 'on-call fund' arrived at the disaster-affected regency.

To improve the mobilization and emergency stocks provision for disaster-affected areas, acceleration on operational regulations on infrastructure mobilization related to emergency stocks is required. This includes public announcement regarding implementation mechanisms of Government Regulation No. 21/2008 on easy access for emergency assistance. In addition, the availability of the operational fund used for distributing or mobilizing aids to the disaster-affected areas needs to be ensured.

There is also a need to devise special mechanisms to ensure the effectiveness of fund distribution in emergency response phase. Guidelines on 'on call fund' provision have been developed. However, further public announcement, monitoring, and evaluation need to be conducted.

The integration of disaster risk reduction into development planning can encourage good infrastructure development, which is obviously necessary for disaster preparedness (in order to facilitate a better humanity response). The process of arranging presidential regulation on the declaration of disaster status also needs speeding up.

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:

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

Description:

One of the procedures for exchanging information is having coordination meetings during emergency response situations. However, meeting mechanisms tended to focus only on information sharing and ignore needs analysis. Furthermore, the meetings were commonly very intensive only at the beginning of the emergency response stage. Routine reports prepared by numerous sectors also tended to be very descriptive, while the situation analysis and the follow-up actions were still weak.

A number of regions affected by high-impact disasters such as Aceh, Nias, and Yogyakarta has submitted and documented various lessons on emergency preparedness and response, as well as on the planning and implementation of recovery and rehabilitation actions. However, such lessons were rarely used as references to better follow-up actions. Such lessons were also not widely announced in some hazard-prone areas.

Based on the experience of the emergency response, rehabilitation plans, and reconstruction plans in Yogyakarta, the use of Humanitarian Cluster Approach has led program implementation to be more focused, open, and well coordinated.

Efforts have also been undertaken to develop Damage and Lost Assessment. However further process and clear mechanism is still required to follow up the results of the assessment.

Context & Constraints:

Several challenges related to information exchange procedure were identified. Among them is the lack of standard information management system for decision making and up-to-date publication at emergency response situations. Besides that, the initial data when the disaster occurs, which are truly essential for humanitarian response planning, were very limited and sometimes inaccessible. Lack of data analysis capacity which is necessary for providing recommendations for decision makers also hampered the humanitarian responses. Non-governmental organizations felt that the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the stakeholders was not optimal. The government seemed not to have full confidence in involving nongovernmental organizations.

Humanitarian Cluster Approach employed by international organizations to perform humanitarian response has not been evaluated, particularly regarding its appropriateness with the government's emergency response mechanisms.

Such problems remind us the importance of information management system standardization for decision making and up-to-date public information at emergency response situation. Every Pusdalops should have a strong information management system unit which is equipped with adequate resources. Therefore, data analysis can be done and used for providing recommendations for the decision makers. Since the government is not the only stakeholder involved in emergency response, the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the stakeholders requires further clarification. Furthermore, there is a need to evaluate the cluster system and other adoptable systems as long as they are in accordance with government's emergency response mechanisms.

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?:

Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?:

Yes

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

1. Optimizing the role of national and local DM bodies, national and local platforms for DRR and other sectoral or thematic platforms for DRR by mapping roles and responsibilities of stakeholders involved.
2. Increasing awareness of disaster risk reduction among relevant sectors and encouraging the integration and synchronization of disaster risk reduction with other sectoral plans (e.g., spatial plans, environment, forestry, marine and fishery, agriculture, education, etc.)
3. Enhancing understanding of the sectors and the civil society on disaster management/disaster risk reduction by providing technical guidelines for implementation.
4. Formulating strategy and employing a multi-hazard approach in the National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction for 2010-2014.

5. Promoting the development of tools for multi-hazards assessment
6. Building the capacity of relevant stakeholders in understanding and implementing a multi-hazard approach as well as mainstreaming it into information system, formal education system and effort to educate the communities.
7. Integrating disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into the middle-term development plans at national and local level so that DRR programs are synchronized, consistent and sustained.
8. Formulating policy that regulates multi-hazard analysis in a comprehensive manner.
9. Strengthening relevant existing institutions and enhancing capacity in conducting multi-hazard analysis.
10. Improving coordination, consultation process and exchanged of information among relevant institutions.
11. Preparing a comprehensive procedure and mechanism for multi-hazard risk analysis.

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

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):

1. Engaging wholly the relevant sectors, including the Ministry for Women's Empowerment.
2. Formulating a clear policy in mainstreaming gender perspective into DM/DRR and climate change.
3. Preparing a strategy and integrating disaster risk reduction approach that is gender sensitive in programs in the NAP DRR 2010-2014, National and Local Middle-Term Development Plans, Government Annual Plan, and Annual Work Plan of Government Work Unit
4. Formulating indicators to ensure the presence of gender components in disaster risk reduction programs.
5. Conducting awareness raising program on gender involving the community, DRR actors and relevant other stakeholders.
6. Promoting research on gender issue in disaster risk reduction and developing tools to prepare gender-sensitive
7. Conducting risk analysis that takes into account gender aspect.

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):

1. Ensuring the availability of funding for DM/DRR from other sources, such as CSR, community's participation, etc.
2. Building the capacity of human resources based on interest and not only because of institutional duty or responsibility.
3. Promoting disaster risk reduction capacity building programs as priority program of all stakeholders.
4. Allocating resources to universities to develop field of study or department related to disaster risk reduction
5. Increasing communication between training providers and the users
6. Developing strategy for capacity building, including for local governments and the community, with clear priority stages.
7. Strengthening the active role of the media.
8. Enhancing the information system with a relevant network in DRR

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):

1. Accelerating the formal launch and publication of the guideline for risk analysis.
2. Promoting the revitalization and re-actualization of indigenous knowledge in DM/DRR programs
3. Treating communities in disaster-affected areas as subject rather than object.
4. Promoting law enforcement through incentive-disincentive and reward-punishment programs.
5. Building awareness of the people of the importance of “human security” approach in DRR
6. Formulating clear policies with a view of realizing social justice in DRR programs.
7. Developing indicators to integrate “human security” and “social equity” aspects into DRR programs.
8. Implementing humanitarian principles and standards in the implementation of DRR programs.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance:

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

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

1. Ensuring that the National Platform for DRR can perform their functions and roles in an optimal manner.
2. Promoting the participation of the private sector in DRR through CSR in order that the proportion of CSR's activities for DRR will become significant.
3. Promoting people's participation in DRR.
4. Increasing awareness of the importance of cooperation with all the stakeholders.
5. Building trust (for instance between the government and non-government actors) through improved communication process and quality and regular consultations.
6. Building a transparent, accountable and mutually benefiting partnership mechanism between government and non-government stakeholders.
7. Introducing good governance in the government and non-government
8. Building the capacity of government and non-government stakeholders in developing partnership.
9. Promoting equity in partnership based on sound partnership principles.
10. Empowering local partners in engaging in sustainable partnerships.
11. Expanding coverage and networking.
12. Clarifying the clear distribution of roles and responsibilities to reduce duplication.

f) Contextual Drivers of Progress

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):

1. Providing incentive for community members and/or organizations who actively contribute to DRR activities.
2. Providing reward to communities that serve as DRR champion.
3. Revitalizing and re-actualizing indigenous knowledge in DRR.

4. Integrating DRR into the sectoral development programs (e.g. poverty reduction, women's empowerment, etc.) through national and local development planning.
5. Developing the capacity of multi-stakeholders and promoting networking among relevant stakeholders
6. Pushing for shift of emphasis from emergency response to DRR.
7. Ensuring that the central government and local governments have sufficient understanding of DRR so that efforts on DRR can be incorporated into policy and development planning and its implementation will be consistent.

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:

With the enactment of Law No. 24/2007 on Disaster Management and its ancillary regulations and policies, Indonesia has made a significant step in its effort to systematically integrate DRR into sustainable development program (2006 – 2009). The effort to mainstream DRR has been done not only at the national level, but also at the provincial and district/city levels.

BAPPENAS coordinated the evaluation of the NAP DRR in 2008, using four aspects, i.e. consistency, coordination, capacity and consultation. The result of the evaluation reflects the challenges in the effort to mainstream DRR into development. From the consistency aspect, although in general there has been consistency between what is planned and the implementation, actually the number of ministries/agencies incorporating DRR programs in their annual work plans is still insignificant. Consistency of DRR actors varies; with some stakeholders play an active role although they are not included in the NAP DRR. Several DRR players do not use the NAP DRR as reference, but they implement DRR activities with a solid basis.

In relation to coordination, coordination mechanism still requires to be further improved and enhanced, particularly because there are several DRR stakeholders that have strong commitment, but in a way have been hindered in implementing their DRR activities. On the contrary, several non-committed partners have implemented DRR activities. Strengthening of coordination mechanism is required to ensure integration and synchronization of DRR implementation so that gap or overlapping among DRR programs could be minimized or eliminated when possible.

Integration and synchronization of DRR policy and implementation must be supported by sufficient allocation of required resources.

One of the major challenges in mainstreaming DRR into development is the limited capacity of the existing institutions, both in terms of human and financial resources. From the institutional aspect, there are many different regulations and mechanisms from the planning up to the implementation. Meanwhile, the human resources face many limitations, quantitatively and qualitatively. The financial capacity is also still very limited so that only few DRR activities can be implemented by the relevant stakeholders. From the budget aspect, the local government budgets (APBD) do not have a special budget item for DRR but substantially DRR programs/activities could be accommodated through other related program budget items.

In terms of consultation, many activities implemented by DRR stakeholders have involved the participation of the communities, through meetings, training, campaign, etc. Availability of access to information and accessibility of public information in supporting public participation has been improved. Efforts are still needed to develop more strategic activities that could be implemented in a systematic manner and could hopefully bring bigger impact.

Future Outlook Statement:

The national disaster management system that is currently being implemented needs to be enhanced by accelerating the formulation of the operational policies and regulations ancillary to the DM Law. Further commitment is needed from relevant ministries/agencies in integrating DRR programs/activities into their priority programs. The implementation of DRR in Indonesia is mostly based on partnership, so there needs to be strengthening of the commitment of all pertinent stakeholders.

To address the challenge of capacity, priority needs to be given to strategic efforts to increase capacity, including for government apparatuses, particularly in formulating DRR program/activities in the different sectoral institutions through various activities. In view of the importance of the community's role in DRR work, priority should also be given to community-based DRR activities that are continuous and sustainable.

In addition to that, there is a need to synchronize all policies and regulations related to disaster management, so that they will not become contra-productive and hinder the implementation of DRR initiatives. With this synchronization in mind, it is expected that the implementation of the National Action Plan for DRR and the Local Action Plans will become more consistent.

In overall, to ensure a sustainable mainstreaming of DRR into development program, DRR principles need to be integrated into development policies both at the national and local levels (in the national and local middle-term development plans, annual development plans and spatial plans at the provincial and district/city levels).

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:

Many institutions/agencies have been involved in disaster risk reduction activities in Indonesia, but each of them has their own framework that is different between one and another, so that the implementation tends to be not systematic and the impact not so optimal. The absence of this systematic mechanism has often hindered the progress of disaster risk reduction efforts and may even create confusion at the local level and in the community. With the arrival of DRR forums and platforms, both that are thematic in nature or regional (district/city or provincial levels and also national level), it is expected that a systematic mechanism to build the community's resilience could be developed. Yet, since such forums or platforms are mostly new, including the national platform for DRR (Planas PRB), so that these entities themselves are struggling to survive and ensuring their existence, including maintaining the active participation of their members and strengthening their disaster risk reduction initiatives. In addition to that, the limited capacity available at all levels has also slowed down the implementation of disaster risk reduction plans, which in turn has resulted in the less than optimal impact achieved in relation to the resilience of the community in facing the multi-hazards.

Continuous efforts should be undertaken to strengthen institutionalization through the establishment of disaster management agencies and DRR forums at local level.

Future Outlook Statement:

The National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction 2006-2009 has been around for some time, but in the future there is a need to refine it so that it can become a strategic national document for disaster risk reduction. For that purpose, monitoring and evaluation of DRR plans need to be developed, including evaluation indicators that could be used up to the local level to examine the success of the regions. With this it is also expected that every region will be able to identify their capacity building needs to develop and strengthen their institutions, and the mechanisms and ways to build the community's resilience. The human resources will also need to be enhanced through education, training, drill and simulations for all stakeholders, and also through increased participation of the civil society and the private sector. For that purpose, efforts to strengthen or set-up DRR forums and platforms need to be among the priority programs/activities. With the support and active participation of the DRR stakeholders, DRR forums and platforms can move in a more dynamic manner and fulfill the expectations of all relevant stakeholders.

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:

Indonesia is a disaster prone country but no more than 10% of all the regions in Indonesia have made or developed its disaster management plan and contingency plans to face a crisis situation, either at the provincial or district/city level or sectoral. Even regions already possessed contingency plans still need to make follow-up actions to ensure that these plans could really be turned into operational plans in an emergency situation. Some districts and cities have even developed disaster mitigation plan, but all these efforts are still fractional in nature and have not been coordinated well.

The involvement of the civil society in the preparation and updating of disaster management and contingency plans is still very limited, so that often these plans cannot function operationally because very few information is received by the community.

In terms of capacity development, there is a need for the adequate provision or allocation of human and financial resources, as well as infrastructure, and also commitment of local authorities to ensure that the required follow up action takes place.

Future Outlook Statement:

Efforts will be needed to develop a Disaster Management Plan and its National Action Plan for DRR, Contingency and Operation Plans, Recovery Plan and the many required guidelines that could be applied from the national level to the local level. These guidelines need to be immediately socialized among the disaster management stakeholders and updated regularly to ensure relevance with the current situation and condition in the regions. A preparedness strategy needs to be developed for mobilizing resources through the provision of emergency stock, and distribution facilities and infrastructures including the human resources. Besides, there needs to be effort to build a special mechanism to channel funds in emergency response stage to prevent or minimize delays and procedural blunder.

In relation to the participation of the civil society, the provincial/district or city governments need to be encouraged so that they involve the participation of the communities and community groups in local development planning at their respective levels. Efforts will be needed to accommodate community-based disaster risk reduction scheme within local development policies. The participation of the civil society can be built and enhanced through initiatives such as public awareness raising through disaster preparedness training, drills, exercises, simulation, contingency planning exercises, etc.;

enhancement of the capacity of the local leadership; awareness raising for disaster survivors about DRR principles in rehabilitation and reconstruction; improved coordination and standardization of technical capacity of emergency response actors partnership networks with the Emergency Response Center of regions that are hazard prone.