

Summary Report

DIPECHO National Consultative Process on Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia

Background & Overview

- The present report reflects the outputs of a National Consultative Meeting (NCM) organized by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office. The meeting is as part of the programming process of the European Commission Disaster Preparedness Programme (DIPECHO) for South East Asia.
- The report will be used to define priorities for the upcoming DIPECHO South East Asia 7th Action Plan (2010-2011). However, it should not be considered as the Guidelines for applicants themselves. Also, the present document does not reflect the official position of the European Commission.
- It was the 5th NCM organized in the country (March 2004, March 2005, November 2005, and December 2007).
- The rationale behind the NCM is to: carry out a multi-stakeholder dialogue on current Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) issues in the country in parallel with progress of DRR strategy and planning drawn by the government; identify gaps and needs for DRR advocacy; disseminate lessons learned, in particular on community-based DRR (CBDRR); discuss DIPECHO's proposed orientations in Indonesia for the period 2010-2011; use participant's experience to refine priorities, gaps and actions identified while promoting further synergies with ongoing and/or planned DRR and development programmes in the country by relevant stakeholders.
- The next Call for Expression of Interest for the 7th Action Plan for DIPECHO South East Asia will have the following timeframe:
 - Publication of a Call by January 2010 - Deadline end of February 2010
 - 15 month projects to start as of May 2010 at the earliest
- The Meeting was well attended, with 75 participants in the opening, down to around 50 by the end of the day. Stakeholders from the Government, donors, international organizations, UN agencies, consultants, local and international NGOs (and few associated cooperating partners) participated, with a majority however from the latter group.
- In the morning, presentations from BNPB and Bappenas gave insights of what is progressing at government side, it was interesting for participants to get updated on DRR agenda that the government has been trying to advocate for in particular the DRR mainstreaming in the process of national development planning systems. While,

institutionalization of BPBD (mandated agency for disaster management at sub national level) was among other issues of which is on progressive track.

- We would like to give a particular thank to the BNPB and Bappenas for their presentations, all partners for jointly drawing the lessons learnt presentations on project implementation and challenges, as well as to the facilitators of three working groups.

Opening Remarks

- The European Commission representative, Mr. Charles Whiteley, Head of Political, Press and Information Section, highlighted developments made by DRR actors in the country that implies the country's strong commitment towards DRR mainstreaming, among others: the institutionalization of BNPB, the launching of the Indonesia DRR National Platform and other initiatives and intervention at country level or regional level, that were found to be in line with the recently approved European Union DRR Strategy for assistance to third countries. He stressed that proneness of the country to disasters, reflected in many disastrous events that it required an integrated approach from national to community level in saving lives and reducing vulnerabilities. DIPECHO has been active since 1998, providing grants amounting to some EUR 5million (approximately IDR 72 billion) around the initiatives for pilot actions and promotion of good practices in disaster preparedness.
- Mrs. Dewina Nasution, Head of Legal & Cooperation Bureau of the *Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana – BNPB* (the National Committee for Disaster Management) who delivered the keynote speech on behalf of the Chief of BNPB Dr. Syamsul Maarif, MSi, highlighted the relevance of investing in DRR to improve lives of Indonesian population as a highly prone country to natural disasters as well as human induced hazards. Indonesia has made significant progresses shifting from ad-hoc response oriented actions towards disaster risk reduction and in the awake of the tsunami in Aceh in 2005, as the government came to realize the need to have a formalized legal basis for disaster management in the form of the Disaster Management Law and other subsidiary policies and regulations. However, the country needs to strive harder to achieve substantial results in DRR beyond the political commitment.
- BNPB attempts to put emphasis on efforts to empower universities to be an agent for mainstreaming DRR into development, but it is also realizing that Community-Based DRR would require collaboration from various stakeholder aside of the government, which is very much welcome and appreciated by the government.

Session 1: Strategic DRR Framework, Lessons Learned, Key Recommendations and Messages

A. Overview of DRR Strategy and Planning in Indonesia (Government Perspective)

Progress of HFA, the National Platform and Updates on Main Priorities for Actions and Follow-up (BNPB)

- Indonesia is located in disaster prone area, some considered it as "Laboratory of Disasters", due to its geographical, geological and demographic condition. Intensity of disasters is increasing (in frequency, numbers of victims and economic losses) and becoming more complex and therefore is must use multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary approach, in integrated and coordinated manner. In a way, it emphasizes the need for disaster management system, which is then legally accommodated in the Law. 24/2007 on Disaster Management.
- The purpose of Disaster Management is to: (1) protect the public from hazard; (2) synchronize existing regulations; (3) develop planned, coordinated and comprehensive disaster management system by ensuring implementation of planned, coordinated and inclusive disaster management, taking into account respects for local wisdom, building public-private partnership, enhancement of spirit for mutual solidarity and charity, creating peace in community life, nationhood and statehood.
- Indonesia's national system for disaster management is growingly empowered through the establishment of BNPB (the mandated agency for DM) and further to expect is the formulation of BPBD at sub-national level (provincial and districts) that has been established in several areas. In the future operational capacity of BNPB is supported by the establishment of emergency operations center and in addition 12 logistic depots to supports emergency management at local level, in a coordinated mechanism amongst various relevant sectors. So far the agency has 6 emergency operations in provinces.
- The country is considered to be on track in regards to implementation of Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA). Out of the five priorities, apparently priority 3 (Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels) to be a bit behind as three of its indicators (indicator 2-4) were scored 2. In priority 5, similar score was given to indicator 2 (disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place....).
- The establishment of National Platform for DRR was started in 2008 when various stakeholders signed the declaration of commitment for the formation. After series of discussion and meeting, the National Platform was officially launched in 28th April 2009 consists of representatives from government, politicians/parliament, private sectors, academician, NGOs, media and international communities.

DRR in the National Planning System, National Action Plan 2010-2012 (Bappenas)

- The importance of having DRR mainstreamed in the National Development Planning System would mean that the government is highly committed to implement DRR as one of the development priorities and the programmes will be properly designed, executed (in a systematically coordinated manner), supportably by clear budget and thus the outputs and outcomes are measurable in accordance with its objectives through clear monitoring and evaluation system. This is what Bappenas and BNPB have been pursuing to achieve.

- The National Action Plan (NAP) 2006-2009 had elaborated the interest and responsibility of stakeholders through the participation and coordination process concurrent with the HFA. However, it is deemed important to foresee long term commitment towards DRR through integration of DRR into national development planning system judging that DRR as an investment. The draft NAP DRR 2010-2012 proposed by Bappenas (the Development Planning Agency): 2010 will be mainly targeting to regulation and institutional strengthening programme (up to IDR 10.170M); 2011 will focus on disaster management planning as well as research, education and training programme (of IDR 10.281M) and more agendas to be achieved in 2012 i.e. mitigation and preparedness programme, early warning system (EWS) programme, community participation and capacity strengthening programme for DRR and preparedness programme that will amount to total IDR 11.271M.
- However, huge challenges were anticipated as the following:
 - National mid term development planning (2010-2014) as the umbrella for NAP 2010-2012 has not been enacted
 - National DM Plan 2010-2014 as the umbrella for NAP DRR 2010-2012 has not been issued
 - Effort on the issuance of nomenclature programme for DM (restructure fiscal year programme) seems not inline with the NAP DRR programme orientation, as the first orientates the DRR programming (and thus budgeting) separate for emergency and rehabilitation while the later is looking for comprehensive ways to reduce (disaster) risks and build up community resilient at the same time.
 - How to raise commitment (from all stakeholders) for supporting the preparation of NAP DRR as the guidance for the implementation of DRR, similarly to raise understanding that DRR is an 'investment' and should not be seen as 'expenses'.
 - At global level, commitment for DRR implementation (as underlined during the Global Platform in Geneva in June 2009) indicated the ideal minimum allocation for DRR is 10% of disaster recovery budget, or at minimum 1% from development budget.
- Contribution from multilateral and bilateral loans and/or grants on DRR will be useful in supporting:
 - Institutional and regulatory development at national and local levels
 - Revitalization of agriculture, forestry and rural areas
 - Poverty reduction programmes
 - Community development programmes (livelihoods, settlement infrastructure programme)
 - Development and strengthening on EWS (includes strengthening multi sector and multi stakeholder coordination and cooperation within early warning chain)
 - Infrastructure development (includes regulation and building standards)
 - Strengthening BMG on Climate and Weather Services Capacity
 - DRR education and training programme
 - Raising public awareness

Summary of discussions on Overview of DRR Strategy and Planning in Indonesia (Government Perspective)

- Despite efforts initiated jointly by BNPB and Bappenas to promote integration of DRR into development planning, with the change of the government administrative structure, the chance to have DRR as one of the country's main priorities for long term development plans is relatively unclear. Bappenas had drafted the development plans that integrate DRR issues. However, in the latest draft the development plans, DRR issues have been removed and formulized into a normative environmental. However, Bappenas would continue promoting DRR as important element in multi-sectoral approach, of which Bappenas has been supporting through the “SC-DRR” (Safer Community–DRR). The draft of the next Development Plan will be presented to the new head of Bappenas after the cabinet inauguration.
- The government is in the process of finalizing the legal regulation in regards to decision on status and level of disaster (to be signed as presidential regulation) to complete sets of regulation indicated by the DM Law.

B. Overview of DRR of European Commission

- European Commission DRR actions have been largely addressed by its natural disaster preparedness programme managed by DG Humanitarian Aid (ECHO, which is DIPECHO. DIPECHO works through EU-NGOs, IOs/UN, and Red Cross movement in close collaboration with local partner organizations/institutions.
- In the year of 2009, DIPECHO is spending EUR 10 million in South East Asian countries. This would be part of the EUR 34 million 2009 funding worldwide. Focus of funded actions remains on preparedness measures, including demonstrative small scale mitigation particularly through Community based disaster risk reduction (CBDRR). In the meantime, actions developed to promote regional and international DRR agenda and implementation of Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) are as well supported. It is important to highlight that link of the funded actions with other EC instruments and other donors are key, and it should complement humanitarian aid actions as part of DG ECHO's humanitarian mandate to save lives.
- EU DRR strategy was adopted by European Union in May 2009. The paper elaborated policies framework of the European Union towards DRR with highlighting improved coherence between EC instruments including DIPECHO. Action Plan corresponds to the DRR strategy paper is under preparation, but for now the implementation will work through on-going instruments until 2013 with some underlined activities as follows: Mid term review of priorities, Country Programming and regional thematic lines, Increased EC cooperation with ASEAN (including on DRR) and New global instrument, for instance Global climate change alliance.
- Implementation of DRR through DIPECHO funds for Indonesia started back in 1998 with increasing trends in the amount spent on projects in the country, significantly in 2008 call. Currently there are 6 projects financed under the 6th AP, implemented by Oxfam GB, ACF, ASB, Danish Red Cross, German Red Cross and Save the Children.

- Based on the recommendation of DIPECHO evaluation in 2006, since 2007 ECHO puts efforts to help partner maintain their human resources. Orientations of priority issues for 2008-2011 are still valid but would focus on scaling up and promotion. It is anticipated that in terms of total amount spent on projects in the country for next term will approximately similar (in terms of percentage) to the current AP, however, it will depend on quality and complementarities of proposals.
- DIPECHO will contribute to ongoing efforts for CBDRR institutionalization at sub-national level for: (1) continued promotion of CBDRR at various level; (2) Continuation of CBDRR pilots/modeling at local levels but with improved cooperation mechanism; and (3) support transfer of experience (capacity-building, tools development, standardization of approaches, IEC materials, campaigns etc.). Empowering DM agencies at sub national level such as the BPBD, national platform and other coordination fora could be as well included. Pilots in urban areas are welcomed but with priority for support to Safe School and Safe Hospital campaigns. It is also keen to see a continued dissemination and promotion of experience, good practice collection, research and review of indigenous knowledge (include on Climate Change Adaptation) and dissemination of standardized DRR tools, messages, ToT methodologies etc. Nevertheless, it is compulsory to develop and use joint IEC materials that have been adapted to local needs and contexts.
- Proposed priority actions, first of all it should address natural hazards within the framework of multi-hazards approaches, or all separate hazards except drought. The action should address the most hazard prone and vulnerable areas: with the concern that it is consolidation or completion of pilots, but in case of pilot actions that have gone through several phases or with completed models, then it should be dissemination tools and methodologies only. Again on other pilots, wherever it is innovative, should aim to scale up, build systems and capacities and for sub-national modeling (for polling of DRR/development agencies and programmes) with clear perspective of handover.
- It should be highlighted that for the next AP, actions should show more coordinated approaches and continued reinforced joint actions, activities and/or approaches with largely consideration that CBDRR should be included in the annual country strategy paper of the partner organization.

Session 2: Lessons Learnt (from implementation of on-going ECHO funded projects)

A. CBDRR at school – GRC, ASB and SC

- Although the three projects have DRR promotion at school as one of the components of intervention (with the exception for ASB, it is the main component), however the approach used and action taken is different. GRC is focusing on building up DRR perspectives amongst youth volunteers at schools of PMI's chain, ASB is promoting DRR at the schools in particular with the concern towards children with disabilities at inclusive schools and Save the Children is trying to advance with child-led DRR methods promote where children are the focal points of the delivery of DRR messages.

- Challenges were experienced in three different categories, i.e. (1.) the capacity of the government (such as lack of awareness towards DRR, no budget allocation for DRR programming, lack of coordination amongst different agencies/offices etc.); (2.) school base activities (such as lack of awareness in school safety concept includes issues related to children with disability, no mechanism for consistency checking and sharing DRR materials for schools (but the government could consider integration of monitoring responsibility into ToR of school supervisors), lack of teachers capacity to be involved in DRR for children with disability, etc.); and (3.) community-level (lack of funding for sustaining disaster preparedness activities and even to implement DRR plans and programmes, absence of detailed multi-hazard information and vulnerability assessments – social, political, economic and environmentally, etc.).
- In conclusion, the organizations considered that there were challenges as well as opportunities during projects implementation this far, amongst others:
 - Schools can be an effective platform to bring DRR commitment to the communities
 - Government officials can be effective channel to promote DRR in schools and communities, but certainly it requires funding that should be allocated to support this initiative.
 - In order to secure the sustainability of the project, it is crucial to include political advocacy as a part of project activities, especially lobbying for government budget allocation for DRR education in schools in the future.
 - Government commitment is required in order to include DRR into curriculum.
 - Compiled experience of DRR in schools can be used to write a guideline on how to conduct school based DRR.
 - Schools with extensive DRR practice can be a focal point or model for new schools
 - Schools structural safety and physical and non physical accessibility should be mainstreamed into all school based DRR project.
 - Vulnerable population such as elderly and disabled people must be included into the action plan.
 - DRR education in communities can also be a tool to identify generally marginalized children (eg. children who have no access to education) by identifying vulnerable groups in their communities, which contribute to MGDs.

B. Linking community based DRR actions and government work: joint presentation by partners – ACF, DRC and Oxfam

- Under the discourse of community based DRR action and efforts to link it with the government work, the partner organization were elaborating issues significantly touching the DM system and institutionalization of DM mandated agency, includes the operationalization of the national platform. Two major issues were raised: i.e. (1) ensure that DRR is a priority, at national and local level, and (2) build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.

- Under the first issue, it was considered that in spite of the fact that the DM Law has been in place, it is quite undeniable that there is a need to have an effective socialization of the Act at district and sub district level. It needs to be translated into local regulation and then be implemented, which in the end will require harmonization of certain government programmes (include budget) to be in line with DRR frameworks.
- In regards to the newly formed national platform, it is quite of concern that as a forum the agency needs to improve its capacity for implementation, monitoring and evaluation. It should as well integrate DRR perspective into development programmes and policies taking into consideration that number of 'good governance' capacity building programming is increasing and on the other hand CSOs which work on integration of DRR into development policies are emerging.
- On BPBD, transition from Satkorlak to BPBD is on process, however, still not in all districts as local governments continuously facing challenges in formalizing BPBD. This agenda can be among other issues that could be taken forward by the national platform to push for with the underlining point to increase the effectiveness of BPBD. Some problems that could prevent BPBD in performing effectively such as re-deployment of local officials that can negate DRR awareness raising and advocacy that have been carried out.
- On the other hand, in order to become sustainable, the community based disaster risk management programmes should have been put into action plans and thus had budgetary allocated for, especially on preparedness. However, based on experiences, linking community action plans into development planning, policies and budgeting is challenging due to different mode of working and modalities that the government has. It is not always flexible to be accessible by non governmental stakeholders.

Session 3: Thematic Discussions for the 7th DIPECHO Action Plan for South East Asia

Mainstreaming DRR into education system

Background:

- The numerous work already implemented by many DRR actors, both government and non government agencies of (national and international agencies) through school and child activities, child-led/child-focused actions, includes advocacy, curriculum and IEC development etc. Some were proactively carried out by members of the Consortium for Disaster Education and other institutions independently and/or jointly.
- The SC-DRR supported action in mainstreaming DRR into education system had been initiated aiming at (1) developing DRR policy and legal frameworks; (2) developing and strengthening institutional system in supporting DRR actions in a decentralized and integrated local development context; (3) establish and strengthening education program

and public awareness for sound understanding on the development/disaster correlation;
(4) to show DRR initiatives towards resilient community

- Discussions in the cluster groups on evacuation issues (norms, standards) since schools are often used for such purposes.

Discussion and outputs:

- DRR education is a progressive issue that is continuously promoted. The SC-DRR project is among other DRR instrument that strongly promotes this agenda. The center for curriculum (Puskur – Pusat Kurikulum) is developing the guidance of "Integrating DRR into Education System", this is not only for curricula but as well as school activities. In line with this, **what is considered important is for the integration (of DRR) into curriculum to be done through relevant subject in the existing curriculum instead of adding new subjects.** Otherwise, it would overburden school children and teachers with additional subjects, since it is not efficient to have a stand-alone DRR subject. **Ways to approach this for instance by integrating DRR education into teachers' teaching package.**
- **Mainstreaming DRR into education system should not only deal with curriculum but need as well to have action element (out-of-class activities – active practical learning-by-doing approach).** Practically, this could be useful for students' orientation at the beginning of school year, or applicable during Monday (flag-hoisting) ceremony or other government events.
- **It is important to support 'school community resilient' and in line with this, DRR actors should advocate local regulation (Perda) to include schools as the system for DM in the community** because local government has the obligation to formulate Disaster Management Plan (such as risk map, contingency plans etc.) that should accommodate school community.
- **Promotion of DRR education should not be limited to schools but could be expanded to explore religious structure (mosque, churches, temples etc.) comprehensively.**
- **Lack of exploration of media role on DRR is seen as a gap that could be a window for opportunity to take on board.** This could be done part of the CSR agenda of the media company, or other companies devoting for DRR education activities.
- **Monitoring and evaluation could be an opportunity to involve (and thus educate) government to concern for DRR in education** and in a way expectedly will open chances for higher commitment in terms of funding for further monitoring and evaluation (after project finishes).
- In the awake of disasters, it has been **often experiences that schools were vulnerable to destruction due to no enforcement of building codes.** This should be advocated to relevant government institutions such as public works, BPBD, education department and office as well as the parliament. **In this sense, it could be considered to have law enforcement for mainstreaming DRR into education at local level.**

- **School preparedness program should be activated such as school action plan or contingency plan and drill**, which involves teachers and students (this should be further linked with wider contingency plans developed by the government). However, it is realized that **in most cases DRR education is least in the priority of government and parliament, of which should be advocated for**.
- As for implementers of DIPECHO funded projects, **coordination should be strengthened to ensure (better) sustainability of programmes. This can be done through exchange of DRR materials, lessons learnt and expertise etc.**

Community based DRR actions and local planning

Background:

- Within a sustainable long term perspective of DRR, the initiated CBDRR actions should be further taken by the local stakeholders to implement. The best way of approaching such action is the integration of DRR agenda into (regular) development plans and programmes that are financed by local budget (down at village up to the provincial level). The challenge is poor understanding of mainstreaming DRR (into development programming), despite being advocated for.
- Non governmental agencies had played significant role in contributing to the establishment of disaster resilient community. In the absence of very solid DRR perspective amongst decision making officials (at lowest up to highest governance level), continuation of DRR agenda is questionable.

Discussion and outputs:

- **In order to ensure good implementation of CBDRR programming, agencies should put attention to project design and have clear criteria for proposed locations**, then undertaking rapid HVCA in the identified locations.
- **Community based disaster risk reduction implies some sustainable actions.** However, sometimes agencies promote overly sophisticated EWS that are difficult for maintenance.
- **Integration of DRR into government planning implies a long term agenda to be achieved** and as such bears a challenging condition for DIPECHO type of project. **A strong advocacy effort should be done.**
- **Lack of understanding on DRR is an issue for integration of CBDRR into local planning. This could be addressed by engaging government and the community with a combination of methods (bottom up and top down) in order to ensure that there is strong notion to go for this agenda.** Coordination is a key for a successful effort, this should be done at sub district and district level.
- Due to the short term duration of DIPECHO project, **as an indicator of sustainability it is recommended to try to ensure to get a letter from Bupati on including DRR budget into the annual development action plan for the following year.**

- **Urban activities confront high challenges as the program will face much larger complex issues** that can be politically sensitive such as the slum dwellers. As such, **project should be better addressed within a long term programming.**

Institutional capacity building

Background:

- The most concerning issues in relation to the implementation of CBDDP/CBDRR programming is the sustainability of the initiated actions, how further it is going to be developed by the local stakeholders. Ideally, the DRR actions should have been better tapped into DRR mainstreamed programming financed by local budget (down at village up to the provincial level). The challenge is poor understanding of DRR mainstreaming (into development programming) framework, despite being advocated for, and thus no commitment made for further actions.
- Coupled to the poor understanding of DRR mainstreaming (into development programming), the obstacle for a comprehensive integrated disaster management is structural challenges of the governance system in the decentralized context of Indonesia where inter-departmental coordination and collaboration continued to be a working agenda.
- With the formation of the national platform and other DRR agenda at national level such as the integration of DRR as one of the national development priorities 2010-2014, the formulation of a Strategic National Action Plan (SNAP 2010-2012), there should be a better mapping of the capacity building initiatives and plans towards further development of a better synergy among all DRR stakeholders.
- The Law No. 24/2007 on Disaster Management stipulates the ultimate role of DM lies with the government of Indonesia.

Discussion and outputs:

- **Institutional capacity building should not be merely limited to actions promoting DRR in the government institution and mechanism. It should also pay attention for the need to grow capacity of non-state actors so that they can play greater role in supporting and complimentary to the government.** This includes the growing role of media in Indonesia, which can be used as a vector for awareness raising in DRR. Good practices were seen in the Philippines where quite often media broadcasts films or regular short stories on DRR etc.
- **The capacity building should also putting attention in building up understanding of DRR concepts between all actors (civil society, government, donors etc.)** due to the need for having common definitions, concepts and goals of what is DRR or CBDRR although then those actors could develop many different modules on DRR or CBDRR according to their mandate and capacity.

- Institutional capacity building is not an easy topic for short term actions such as the ones funded under DIPECHO. This is in particular the case, since DM actors, not being limited to government system but as well as other national actors, are relatively weak in DRR. Therefore, **capacity building framework would be preferably a long term actions as such will have sufficient timing for putting solid ground for further development.** The issue is so far capacity building initiatives were focusing too much on providing inputs but not so much into impact orientation.
- **Another concern within the issue of institutional capacity initiatives is sustainability of the initiatives.** In many occasion, due to limited means (both human resources and financial resources) putting the risk of further follow up of the DRR actions as mostly local government do not allocate budget to sustain the programme. **There should be ways to break this problem, however, this is a challenge in itself bearing in mind the complexity of government funding mechanism will involve somehow the role of local Parliament.**
- **At some point there is a need to enhance communication between academia, practitioners and communities on DRR issues.** This is considerably substantial because most of the time DRR is brought into discourses at academic/practitioners level that does not properly followed by the same level of understanding at community level. This could lead to misunderstanding (and could lead to panicking eg. for emergency warnings) on the language used (that is not necessarily 'down to earth').
- Aside of poor human resources capacity within the government system, it is widely experienced that a lot of turn-over in the local government institutions will contribute to change of priorities and thus all already implemented action will be less effective. **It is good to promote inclusion of DRR topics into the civil servant curricula as a cross cutting issue.**
- Again on the role of media, it is seen in various emergencies that media are becoming fund-raisers for disasters but without proper understanding on DRR approaches and it is quite frequent that media have money to spend but without clear proper monitoring on the effectiveness of the action financed due to lack of knowledge and lack of experience. **What is needed then is the linkage between media and disaster practitioners for cross learning process.**
- In addition, **the capacity building initiative could be worth for supporting the national DRR platform considering the value added of this forum to raise voices for DRR concerns that DRR practitioners in the country should be paid attention to.**

Annexes

- Compiled materials from the NCM: presentations, agenda, list of participants, speeches, press release
- Outcomes of Working Groups including background and reference documents

Outcomes of Working Groups

Group I : Mainstreaming DRR Into Education System

Note: **Puskur** (Center for curriculum is developing the guidance “Integrating DRR into education system” (not only curricula, but also school activities)

No.	Issue or Gap Identified	Actors and Targets (who should do what; addressing whom)	Recommendation / Action (including timeframe)
1	Integration into relevant subject, using the existing curriculum instead of adding new subjects	BNPB DEPDIKNAS DIKNAS (national and district)	Preparing addendum, additional materials for the existing subjects. Integrating DRR education into teachers’ training
2	Minimum pointers for DRR education materials for each level of education	PUSKUR BADAN STANDARISASI NASIONAL	CDE compile and provide to Puskur, BSN
3	Mainstreaming DRR into education system should not only deal with curriculum but need to have action element (out of class activities)	DIKNAS School community (teachers, staff, pengawas, parents’ association)	Use: - MOSS (students orientation at the beginning of their school year) - Hidden curriculum (Monday ceremony) - Many government events (27 May drill)
4	Building linkage between school, community and government including linkages with bigger contingency plan.	KESBANGPOLINMAS BPBD SEKDA SCHOOL COMMUNITY DRR LOCAL FORUM NGOS FIRE BRIGADE POLICE MILITARY PMI PUSKESMAS DINKES POSYANDU	Schools should involve community into their activities and vice-versa. Exploring “Parents Association” to advocate and be active on DRR NGOs/institutions working on DRR to disseminate the understanding/knowledge not only to their targeted schools but also to the community that they are working

		PKK	
5	No enforcement of building codes, particularly for schools	PU BPBD DEPDIKNAS PARLIAMENT SCHOOL COMMUNITY UNIVERSITY PII (ENGINEERS' ASSOCIATION)	Advocacy to PU, BPBD, DEPDIKNAS, DIKNAS, PARLIAMENT, Train community on basic building code and construction (to enable them to monitor) Retrofitting school buildings
6	Activate school preparedness program (teachers, students, school action plan/contingency plan, drill, etc.)	DINAS PENDIDIKAN SCHOOL COMMUNITY (INCLUDING SURROUNDING COMMUNITY) NGOS	Programs on school safety and preparedness
7	Lack of prioritization for DRR education from government, parliament.	BAPPEDA BPBD NGOS & PRACTITIONERS UNIVERSITIES DPR & DPRD LOCAL COMMUNITY PRESS/MEDIA	Advocacy for allocation for mainstreaming DRR into education to government, Parliament.
8	Law enforcement for mainstreaming DRR into education at local level	BUPATI DPRD DINAS PENDIDIKAN	Advocacy at three levels: National level: Basic and Middle Education, Department of National Education Province: Provincial Office for Education District level: Bupati/Head of district to issue local regulation (PERDA)
10	Monitoring and evaluation (funding for monitoring & evaluation stops when the project finished)	DINAS PENDIDIKAN PENGAWAS SEKOLAH BPBD SCHOOL COMMUNITY BAPPEDA NGOS	Ensure the Government be involved in the project and continue the monitoring.
11	Advocacy to the local government to use school as the system for DM in	NGOS LOCAL DRR FORUM	Advocate Perda include schools as the system for DM in community

	community: local government has the obligation Rencana Penanggulangan Daerah – Local Disaster Management Plan (risk map, etc.)	BUPATI	
12	Exploring religious structure and mechanism for DRR education (mosque, churches, temples, etc.)	DINAS AGAMA NGOS CBO (NU, MDMC) PKK DINAS INFORMASI DAN KOMUNISASI RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS (MUI, KWI, ETC.)	Involving the actors at all stages.
13	Unsustainable DRR training program for school community (particularly teachers)	NGOS DONORS CDE BNPB BPBD UNIVERSITIES	Use the existing training activities of the government to integrate DRR education Use Puskur monthly training activity on KTSP to every kabupaten and kota all over Indonesia. Provision of DRR material in easy language for Puskur. Use of school networks to educate as many as possible teachers/schools on DRR. Use “Pengawas Sekolah” to enforce the school on DRR education
14	Lack of exploration of media role on DRR education	MENKOMINFO BNPB BPBD NGOS DONORS DINAS INFORMASI DAN KOMUNIKASI MEDIA JOURNALISTS’ ASSOCIATION FAMOUS PERSON	Advocate Menkominfo to explore the role of media on DRR. Training for journalist
15	Coordination among DIPECHO fund recipient for sustainability of	DIPECHO NGOS	Exchanging DRR materials DIPECHO fund recipients for sustainability of the programme

	programs		
16	Explore CSR for DRR education activities	LOCAL NGOS DEPDIKNAS DINAS PENDIDIKAN BNBP BPBD	Through local partners

Group II: CBDRR actions and Local Planning

Issue or Gap Identified	Actors and Targets (who should do what; addressing whom)	Recommendation / Action (including timeframe)
Focused project design	DiPECHO NGO/INGO LGU Community	Criteria for identify locations should be clear; use – rapid appraisal for hazard / capacity / vulnerability in target locations
Lack of understanding of DRR	Engage the government and community, private sector, other in awareness raising (DM Bill, public awareness, capacity building, linking, acknowledgement, ownership)	Combining methods - Bottom up and top down (district to community, community to district) Hazard specific higher level / provincial
Strengthen coordination at sub-district level	All stakeholders within a forum; inter-organization, mobilization of resources, accessing good practice and poor practice, access to models – synergy, accountability / governance – Musreimbang, PNPM	Identify existing forum
Strengthen the coordination at district level		Mapping Sharing information Identify and advocate opportunities for financial support to community risk reduction plan
Advocacy at what level		
Enhance community capacity to do advocacy in DRR		
Integration of DRR into government planning		This is too long term to achieve in a DIPECHO Advocacy efforts from government and CSO / NGO in planning for integrating mitigation into development planning
Design of perda (ensure it is well design)		HR input to support effective design of perdes

Overly sophisticated EWS technological solutions – need for sustainability		Don't have overly sophisticated technological designs for EWS, build on indigenous practices, EWS needs to be user-friendly, explore how sustainability aspects will be maintained
Urban activities are challenges – they take longer and get towards sensitive political issues (slum dwellers)		These sorts of projects / activities should be shared with longer-term donors

Group III: Institutional Capacity-building

Institutional = not only government but any type of organization.

Issue or Gap Identified	Actors and Targets (who should do what; addressing whom)	Recommendation / Action (including timeframe)
Lots of focus on elementary / secondary schools and teacher trainings, but there is a need for working upstream in the training of the future teachers for more sustainability	University / teacher training centers Targeted persons: - Head of faculties for awareness, - Students for trainings - Pilot activities in schools by the students	Include DRR concepts in the teacher trainings. This should include field activities for future students. Outcome = future teachers more aware on DRR and importance of safe schools
Enhance communication between academia, practitioners and communities Languages are different, which create at least misunderstanding and at most panicking (example for emergency warnings)	Experts, universities	
Need to think on a systematic manner and set milestones		
How to maintain the sustainability of a capacity?	Local government	Allocate a budget every year to have refreshment activities / reminder. This budget should come from local government. It should be an event involving public and have media coverage

Gap: local government do not allocate budget to sustain the actions	Local government	This should be coordinated first with local Parliament (PERDA) and local officials should be made aware of this
Creating links between Indonesian stakeholders, like PMI and ITB for example	Private sector and practitioners Example: PMI has a good communication network and ITB can provide needed expertise, for mitigation activities for example.	Bridge partners and seek for in-kind support to our actions. Involve private sector as well (CSR)
Bridge the community-based actions and the local governments	Local government	Check whether our actions are included in the government activities Act as part of the government strategy, like disseminating their strategies, etc.
Not the same understanding of concepts between all the actors (civil society, government, donors...) For example, some mitigation actions in communities are sometimes considered as non-DRR by donors, but rather agricultural ones	Communities / CSO / donors	Need to agree on common definitions, concepts and goals, but then develop many different modules depending on each actor's mandate and capacities CBDRR is more a "movement" than a project, so that every single component of the population can be included
The media in Indonesia plays a big role and they are not addressed by DRR projects	Media	Use media as a vector for awareness-raising in DRR Actions: awards, films on DRR, (good practice in Philippines), regular short stories
Monitoring and evaluation of the DRR agenda and the DRR projects We only think in terms of inputs and not yet in terms of impact We need to think of a baseline and indicators now to be able to monitor and evaluate later on	Local implementing partners and communities	Evaluate not only activities but rather impact of these activities Create tools for this evaluation However, it might be too early to evaluate impact now, since DRR is very new in Indonesia
At the community levels, there are also a lot of "institutions" (farmers, women, etc.). Their capacity should be enhanced as well.	Local communities	Mapping these groups, their knowledge, their practices, etc. Awareness and technical assistance to these groups.

		<p>This should be prioritized because of the great numbers of these groups.</p> <p>One good approach could be to train trainers to contribute to a change of behavior as a start</p>
Lot of turn-over in the local government institutions that can cause change of priorities	Local civil servants	<p>Ensure that there is an obligatory function from the civil servants involved</p> <p>Include DRR in civil servant curricula as a cross-cutting issue</p>
<p>Media are becoming fund-raisers now for disasters, but they should be linked with DM practitioners for the implementation</p> <p>Media are creating their own foundations to spend the money, but with no clear monitoring and lack of experience</p>	Media and civil society emergency actors	<p>Promote partnerships between media and emergency actors</p> <p>Indonesian civil society should have the capacity to raise their funds locally (in country) from companies, medias, etc.</p> <p>Our projects could require our implementing partners to provide part of the budget, whether in cash or in-kind (this ensure commitment)</p>
DRR in the working areas (industrial disaster)	Companies / private sector	<p>Increase awareness of private sector about industrial risk both for neighboring communities and internal staffs</p> <p>Conduct in-house trainings for staffs (like first aid for example) and community-based activities for surrounding people</p> <p>This can be funded (at least partially) by the companies themselves</p>
What about the capacity-building of the national DRR platform?	National / local DRR Platform	<p>Difficult to work at national level, but maybe actions could target the local platforms (example Merapi Forum)</p> <p>To promote a wider participation to these platforms though our programs, since these platforms are good voices for the communities</p>