



Inclusive and Sustainable Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM)

SIAP SIAGA disaster management consultant, Fredy Chandra, discusses opportunities for a more inclusive and sustainable CBDRM that integrates economic and livelihoods components

Located on the ring of fire, Indonesia has some 53,000 villages located in disaster-prone areas, which means approximately 33% of the total population is directly threatened by disasters. In 2020 alone, 4,650 disaster events were recorded, negatively impacting 6.7 million people, their livelihoods and assets.

In addition to geographic exposure, social vulnerability increases potential risks, such as weak development governance that is not sensitive to the needs of vulnerable groups, such as children, people living with disabilities, women, or marginalized groups such as ethnic and linguistic minorities. It can also lead to development programming that does not focus on reducing disaster risk, improving the quality of ecosystems and the environment, and addressing economic fragility and poverty. Moreover, there is limited access to knowledge resources to manage risk and deal with emergency situations, as well as limited access to social protection.

Under these conditions, it is necessary that disaster risk is managed by a variety of stakeholders, with meaningful involvement of community groups. With community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM), communities who are directly exposed to disaster risks should be the one of the main actors in understanding the nature of the threat, working with other stakeholders (government, civil society groups) to identify the root causes of vulnerability in their area, and assessing and building their capacity so that they can carry out risk reduction efforts through adaptation and mitigation action, preparedness activities

and increased their capacity to protect their livelihood assets to build resilience.¹

CBDRM: A Crowded Space

There are many approaches to, and programs for, CBDRM in Indonesia.² These include programs led by various government ministries and institutions, such as the National Disaster Resilient Village (Destana) program implemented by the National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB), the Climate Village Program (Proklam) at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, the Disaster Prepared Village (KSB) by the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Safe Coastal Village (KKP) program by the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, as well as initiatives led by the Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration, all of which aim to empower communities by integrating disaster resilience and climate change adaptation into village level planning.

Non-governmental organizations are also active in implementing CBDRM and climate change adaptation assistance. Equally important, local communities independently, either through innovation or as part of preserving local cultural wisdom, also make efforts to reduce disaster risk, adapt to climate change and preserve the environment. However, to date, only around 5,000, or 10% of disaster-prone villages have implemented or received support for CBDRM programs or similar.³

With so many villages prone to disasters, and so few receiving direct support to build community resilience, it is

¹ Lassa, J. et.al., MPBI, PSMB UPN, LINGKAR, Planas PB, UNSCDRR, 2010, Guideline for Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia

² BNPB., 2013. *Indonesia's Experience in Developing Disaster-Resilient Community*

³ Coordinating Ministry for Human Development and Culture, 2019, Coordination Meeting on Developing Disaster-Resilient Village and similar programs in Indonesia

necessary to coordinate, synergize and harmonize programs and approaches, across stakeholder groups, in regard to policy, program planning, implementation, and monitoring. The first step is to do a stock take of information on the distribution of CBDRM programs in Indonesia, quality monitoring, the potential of community facilitators, and knowledge products that can be used practically by the community. For this reason, the development of a digital catalog that contains aspects of this information and is easily accessible by various decision makers has been identified as the most appropriate solution to bring synergy across CBDRM programs in Indonesia. In addition to information, program approaches that are relevant to current issues and which can be adopted by various development actors also need to be developed.

The Complexity of CBDRM: Disaster, Climate, Economy and Social Protection

The above notwithstanding there are challenges, particularly on ensuring that programs building community resilience at village level respond to the daily needs and address problems faced by the community. The challenges faced in Indonesia are increasingly complex, such as the growing incidence of disaster threats and uncertainty of risk from the climate crisis, the economic resilience of vulnerable communities. This set of factors are increasingly important because activities and economic assets are exposed to disaster threats and are sensitive to environmental changes. This difficult situation is compounded by social protection schemes that are not yet inclusive, especially for the poor or marginalized who live in disaster-prone areas.⁴ Responding to these challenges requires stakeholders (government, civil society, communities) to take an approach or strategy to build community resilience that combines aspects of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, sustainable economic resilience schemes, and inclusive social protection, thus aligned with the spirit and priorities of the Sendai Framework for Action (2015).

However, active participation in the implementation of a program to build community resilience is often unsustainable and is often no more than a box-ticking exercise. This happens because economic factors and

community welfare,⁵ which are often root causes of the vulnerability of disaster-prone communities, are left untouched or have not been included in the design of existing resilience programs. Program activities often only focus on the formulation of disaster management planning documents and preparedness activities such as simulations, making evacuation maps, evacuation points, or early warning systems. Although all these components are important, if the implementation is not integrated with aspects that strengthen the economy and welfare of the people who are at risk, then the chances of a program adequately addressing the root causes of community vulnerability or building capacity among community members to manage disaster risk will be constrained.⁶

By integrating economic and welfare components, efforts to reduce vulnerability and to build community resilience have much higher potential to be sustainable.⁷ When at-risk communities can develop strategies so that their economic activities can survive the uncertainty that accompanies disasters (and climate change), they have a greater chance of recovering quickly and avoiding falling (deeper) into poverty.

Moreover, integrating social protection mechanisms with CBDRM approaches ensures that vulnerable groups living in disaster-prone areas have access to support during disaster response and recovery. Many individuals from vulnerable and marginalized groups do not currently qualify for social protection schemes from the government, making them even more vulnerable in times of crisis. For example, many livelihoods are sensitive to environmental changes due to disasters or climate crises. Take for example small groups of fishermen who cannot go to sea during extreme waves or farmers who are faced with increasing instances of drought and flooding. In these types of circumstances, as part of the larger work around CBDRM (including adaptation and mitigation efforts through awareness, adapting livelihoods and climate-proofing infrastructure), it is important to encourage the regulation of social protection schemes that are sufficiently flexible to respond to disaster risk and climate-related events and crises alongside programs that are designed to protect the community in the short and long

⁴ Reflection notes on Community-Based DRM – CBDRM National Conference XIV 2021 as written in the position paper and recommendations

⁵ SIAP SIAGA., 2020. Study on the effectivity of CBDRM approach in Indonesia

⁶ John Twigg., 2015. *Good Practice Review 9: Disaster Risk Reduction, Chapter 9: Livelihood and DRR* & John Twigg., 2009 *Character of Disaster Resilience Community*

⁷ Pasteur.K.,2011. *From Vulnerability to Resilience: A framework for analysis and action to build community resilience.*

term,⁸ particularly for those groups that are directly exposed and whose livelihood assets are sensitive to disaster threats and climate risks.

A Holistic and Coherent Approach to CBDRM: Welfare-based Disaster Resilient Villages

By looking at the complexity of the challenges of disasters and climate change and the development of programs to build resilience at the site level, SIAP SIAGA is working with BNPB to facilitate the initiation of a welfare-based Disaster Resilient Village approach. This approach aims to bring together aspects of disaster risk reduction, economic resilience, environmental sustainability, and inclusive social protection and is expected to become a general guideline or model for formulating community-based resilience building programs across sectors. Through this model it is also expected that the synergy of village-based programs will improve to avoid overlapping and duplication of program activities. On the other hand, this approach can be used to see how village-based programs can complement each other to build community resilience.

Looking forward

To achieve these priorities requires a significant level of effort, coordination and stakeholder management. At the village level, where just under half of Indonesia's citizens reside and earn their living, strides have been made by a range of actors in developing various community-based disaster risk management approaches. The paper argues that, on the basis of lessons learned, the inclusion of a welfare-based element, better coherence with economic resilience, a focus on the environment, and other factors, and integration of these approaches into a harmonised village-based programs approach makes sense.

It is also proposes that a consultative coordination mechanism be established between representatives of the Government of Indonesia and their program partners at national and sub-national levels, with the aim that these forums will support consolidation, coordination and harmonisation of approaches, policies, programs and budgeting in the development of inclusive and holistic community resilience programs.

Indonesia has been bold in its efforts to improve disaster risk management at the community level. Evidence from

foregoing programs is rich and can and must be used to support the next step in the development of a holistic and coherent approach community-based disaster risk management programming.

⁸ Arnall et al., 2013 Kerangka Perlindungan Sosial Adaptif (Adaptive Social Protection)