



Indonesia

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013)

Name of focal point: Sugeng Triutomo
Organization: National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB)
Title/Position: Deputy Chief for Prevention and Preparedness
E-mail address: striutomo@bnpb.go.id
Telephone:
Fax:

Reporting period: 2011-2013
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 7 October 2012
Print date: 17 May 2013
Reporting language: English

Official report produced and published by the Government of 'Indonesia'

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

Section 1: Outcomes 2011-2013

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcome Statement:

Indonesia has further made substantial progresses in mainstreaming DRR into national and local development, at the policy and regulatory levels, as well as planning and programming levels. After passing the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) 2010-2014, Indonesia has made all 33 provinces formulate their Regional DM Plans. Efforts have also been initiated on devising DRR-based spatial planning in several areas. Related to regulatory aspect, more and more regulations have been enacted at the national and local levels.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcome Statement:

Currently all provinces in Indonesia have established their DM agencies. More than eighty percent (399 out of 497) of the districts and cities in the country have also set-up their Local DM Agencies (BPBDs). Mechanisms for DRR have started to be developed through Local DM Agencies (BPBDs) and DRR platforms that involve the multi-stakeholders. Capacities for response, for risk assessment and for community-based DRR have also been developed through training, simulation exercises and pilot projects in several districts and cities.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcome Statement:

Disaster risk reduction has started to be integrated into emergency preparedness through contingency planning processes at the national and local levels. Post-disaster reconstruction policies have applied the principles of “building back better” and integrate DRR through human recovery principles. Several post-disaster areas have developed specific programs and activities to reduce physical and socio-economic vulnerabilities of the local people, particularly those most disadvantaged.

Section 2: Strategic goals

Strategic Goal 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:

Strengthened disaster management planning at the provincial and district/city levels. Greater mainstreaming and synchronization of DRR and CCA programs into national, provincial and district/city development plans.

Strategic Goal 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:

Strengthened capacities of Provincial and District/City DM Agencies (BPBD) to respond better to growing disaster and climate-related risks. Enhanced resilient development and ecosystem management at the community level through the promotion of disaster resilient villages in selected districts.

Strategic Goal 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:

Enhanced capacities at the provincial and district/city levels to engage stakeholders in contingency planning and disaster emergency response exercises. Strengthened knowledge and skills in conducting post-disaster need assessment and risk sensitive post-disaster recovery.

Section 3: Priority for action 1

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

Priority for action 1: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions?
Yes

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	No
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	Yes

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk? Yes

Description:

At the national level Indonesia has passed many rules and regulations on disaster risk reduction and management. Currently the country moves to strengthen regulatory environment at the provincial and district/city levels, to promote decentralized risk governance as stipulated by the laws. Capacities both at the central and local levels have

been much enhanced. However, enhancement of disaster management has mostly occurred at the national and provincial levels and its implementation in the district/city level has yet to be strengthened, both in terms of regulatory and institutional settings.

Risk maps have been available in all 33 provinces, although their use in actual development planning has yet to be strengthened and advocated. Cross-sectoral and trans-boundaries cooperation have also been enhanced, such as through the newly devised Indonesian National Tsunami Master Plan. The shift of paradigm from response to disaster risk reduction, however, still needs to be promoted among the sectors at all government levels. Risk sensitive spatial and development planning have to be further promoted at the lowest level of government and the communities.

Context & Constraints:

The key challenge in the implementation of DRR in hazard-prone districts and cities is the lack of understanding of the essence of risk reduction concept. Dissemination and socialization of key DRR policies from the central government have not been conducted comprehensively and engaging all districts/cities. Many policies are formulated in the context of disaster response and hence conveying the wrong signals to the regions. Mainstreaming of DRR into local development needs to be further disseminated and promoted. Competence in things related to regulation and policy needs to be enhanced in all levels. Distribution of roles and responsibilities between National (BNPB) and Local DM Agencies (BPBD) needs to be clarified and harmonized.

Other key challenges include lack of capacity, commitment and consistency in developing strong DRR regulatory and policy environment in the regions. With many Local DM Agencies (BPBDs) still in their infant years, difficulty in maintaining qualified staff members due to local political dynamics, and lack of local resources allocated for DRR, significant results in risk management have yet to be struggled for. Leadership roles of National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) and Local DM Agencies (BPBDs) need to be enhanced in the development of strong regulatory and policy environment conducive to risk reduction.

Priority for action 1: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
--	--	--------------------------------------

National budget	0.286	0.413
Decentralised / sub-national budget		
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	26,548	

Description:

At the national level most sectoral ministries have programmed and budgeted DRR programs in their portfolio, although these programs are mostly integrated into their regular programming and sometimes not easily seen as DRR. All the provinces in Indonesia have already had their DM plans, yet these plans have not been equipped with sufficient budget, as they mostly constitute indicative and proposed programs and activities prescribed by the national government.

DRR has yet to be a priority issue, as to date it is still difficult for local governments to budget for risk reduction programs. Contingency funds are already available at the national government and several local governments, but other than this, budget for DRR is still very limited, particularly for mainstreaming DRR into local development programs. In implementing DRR activities, ministries/agencies tend to work on their own in an uncoordinated manner, although this situation has gradually been improving.

Context & Constraints:

The biggest challenge is that understanding of DRR among the key government stakeholders has not been equal and comprehensive. Many critical decision makers, including members of the national and local legislatures, still consider disaster programs as consisting of emergency response and post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction activities only. Further, the cost and benefit ratio of disaster risk reduction investment has not been made clear for most decision makers, so it is still difficult for them to budget for DRR.

In terms of human resources, the constraints lay on the fact that the majority of personnel in DM Agencies at all levels are relatively new to DRR issues. Also, staff members in government agencies throughout all levels of government are easily moved from one section to the other, so it is difficult to nurture skilled personnel that are capable of developing DRR programs. Local leaders need to develop strong vision in DRR and prioritize mainstreaming of DRR into their policies, and the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) may facilitate this process. Regulations need to be strengthened to regulate coordination in disaster management by BNPB. Clarity of roles and responsibilities in DM across all levels of government needs to be strengthened.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? Yes

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	Yes
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	No
Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	0

Description:

Indonesia implements decentralized risk governance, with each level of government responsible for managing disaster events appropriate to their levels. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) does not have a hierarchical authority over Local DM Agencies (BPBDs), but it supports BPBDs through provision of facilities and infrastructures as well as technical assistance in many aspects of DM and DRR. In relation to participation, rooms for participation have been opened in many areas through local DRR platforms and other means of coordination, but these have not been explored to the full in areas that have not experienced major disaster events.

Local governments, in this case Local Disaster Management Agencies (BPBD), have not implemented a comprehensive approach to promote local participation, since most of them are still struggling with their internal capacity building. Meanwhile, in many hazard-prone areas NGOs and CBOs have been active in working with local communities in grassroots level DRR initiatives. Lack of access to information concerning DRR may become one of the obstacles to community participation in DRR. It is obvious that LG's community outreach capacity needs to be enhanced.

Context & Constraints:

The challenges to decentralized disaster risk governance particularly lay with the unclear legal and regulatory framework as it has not reached its final format and is still being developed since the early 2000s. This has made it somewhat difficult to establish coordinated and integrated working arrangement in disaster risk reduction between the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) and sectoral ministries in one side and Local Government sectoral offices and Local DM agencies (BPBD) on the other side, although the situation is gradually improving. DRR program planning needs to be synchronized between the central and local level governments and formulated based on scientific risk analysis that involves the participation of the multi-stakeholders.

People's participation in DM and DRR has mostly been good in areas that have experienced major disasters but it is not the case with regions that have never been struck by large scale disaster events. It is difficult to encourage community participation, because in their DRR programming most local governments only engage communities in several limited socialization sessions that is often considered as passive participation. However, with support from Local Disaster Management Agencies (BPBDs), the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) has recently promoted "Disaster Resilience" programs, which attempt to promote community participation in DRR at the village level. Another constraint is that information dissemination has not reached optimally remote places far from urban centers. Community participation needs to be enhanced by building a sense of ownership towards DRR activities among stakeholders.

Priority for action 1: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Civil society members (specify absolute number)	60
National finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	2
Sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	20
Private sector (specify absolute number)	9

Science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	24
Women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	1
Other (please specify)	2

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	No
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	No
In a civil protection department	No
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	Independent ministerial level national agency for disaster management (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana/BNPB)

Description:

Indonesian National Platform for DRR (Planas PRB) has been in existence since 2008. It is a multi-stakeholder platform, whose member organizations come from the government, non-government entities and the private sector. Recently the platform has not been so active, save for several incidental activities here and there and activities implemented by their members individually. It can be said that this forum has not been working systematically, with work plan and allocated budget. Support from its member organizations is expected to be increasing in the near future. To date, they, particularly from member private companies, mostly contributed to specific events where they could demonstrate their visibility. Several provinces have established their own DRR platforms, but the consolidation of DRR platforms across the government levels still need to be encouraged.

Context & Constraints:

The National Platform for DRR still require further effort to be able to serve as an equal partner of the government in advocating for DRR. One key constraint is that members sitting in the platform representing their organizations are mostly prominent people who tend to be very busy. Thus, it is a challenge for both representatives from the government Ministries/Agencies and non-government entities have not conducted regular meetings.

Awareness of the existence of Planas PRB among government and non-government stakeholders at the central and local levels has not been internalized. Information about what have been done by the Platform has seldom been publicized. It is obvious that the roles and responsibilities of Planas PRB need to be strengthened and that it require significant support from relevant stakeholders so that it can play its prominent role and function in DRR advocacy in the country.

Section 4: Priority for action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Priority for action 2: 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: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Multi-hazard risk assessment	Yes
% of schools and hospitals assessed	0
Schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	0
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	Yes
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS), Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Marine and Fisheries, and National

Description:

Multi-hazard risk assessments have been made in all the provinces and similar efforts have been initiated at the district/city level. Sectoral ministries and agencies have also conducted risk mapping and analysis in line with their specific responsibilities, e.g. the Agency for Meteorology, Climate and Geophysics for meteorological, climate and geophysical hazards, the Geological Agency for volcanic and land mass movement hazards, the Ministry of Public Works for flood hazards, etc. These risk analyses have been enriched with vulnerability and capacity information of the community, as well as index of potential losses.

The risk analyses, however, only provide maps at a small scale, at the provincial level. These risk maps need to be detailed into greater scale so that all hazard prone districts and cities will have operational and usable maps that can be used in conducting development planning that is based on disaster risk considerations.

Context & Constraints:

The key challenges on this aspect include the lack of technical capacity in most Local Disaster Management Agencies (BPBD) in conducting risk analysis; lack of financial resources and the limited availability of detailed data at the district/city level, particularly for regions in Eastern Indonesia. It is obvious that capacity development is greatly needed for risk analysis and mapping both for the national and local level stakeholders. Coordination among sectors needs to be enhanced to agree on and use a common risk analysis methodology.

The government needs to actively disseminate risk analysis at the national and provincial level for use at the lowest possible level. Communities' capacity in understanding hazard and risk analysis as well as risk maps needs to be strengthened. The media needs to be empowered to package and convey risk information that is valid and systematic and do not cause confusion among people. Such information needs to be standardized and made easy (not too technical) for easy access of all relevant stakeholders.

Priority for action 2: Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed? Yes

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated	Yes
Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)	Yes
Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries	Yes

Description:

Indonesia, in collaboration with some donor agencies, has developed several systems for risk assessment and risk analysis, such as the Indonesian Disaster Data and Information (DIBI), Simpadu, Geospatial, Parba, Simba, Neonet, INAsafe and others. Hazard and vulnerability databases have also been developed by the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) as well as by the line ministries tasked with managing specific hazards. However, the common format and standards for risk assessment and risk database management that will be acceptable for all parties are still being developed.

Related to the use of these risk data and information, some agencies at the national level and several at the provincial and district/city levels have already used them for planning purposes, but this has not been widespread. Accesses to these data and information have also not been even in the regions.

Context & Constraints:

Among the key constraints include the lack of agreement among the sectoral ministries and academicians on the methodology and format of risk assessment and database that will be acceptable to all. Efforts are being done to standardize this through the Indonesian National Standards (SNI) that will help in making the system and sub-systems uniformed. Another challenge is that there needs to be inclusive and coordinated efforts in risk assessments and database management, so that there will not be any overlapping or duplication of works from the ministries and across the levels of government.

At the local level, the challenge is more on the budget, human resources and lack of technical know-how. The national and provincial governments need to help build the capacity of district/city governments in conducting risk assessments at the community level and use the result in their development planning.

Priority for action 2: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Early warnings acted on effectively	Yes
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	Yes

Description:

Indonesia has established Early Warning Systems (EWS) for all key hazards such as flood, tsunami, extreme weather, extreme waves, volcanic eruption and forest fires. Only a few, however, have reached the community level and followed-up with the development of relevant capacity at the grassroots level to response to these warnings. It could be said that the availability of EWS has been improving, but its utilization continues to be limited.

Context & Constraints:

Not all levels of communities have access to disaster warning messages. The EWS developed by sectoral ministries and agencies at the national level mostly only reaches district/city offices. There are still no established systems to deliver warning messages to the households. The maintenance of EWS instruments has not been done well. There have only been a handful of provinces and districts/cities that have developed and implement SOP for EWS in their regions. It is clear that more resources need to be dedicated for the development of multi-hazard EWS, both the technology and human aspects.

Priority for action 2: 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: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? Yes

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	Yes
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	Yes
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	Yes
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	No

Description:

Indonesia has been committed in managing cross-border risk, particularly with regards to tsunami and smoke hazards. ASEAN, South Asian and several other countries in the Asia Pacific region have been actively involved in Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System (IOTWS) for risk mapping and disaster management. Indonesia also plays a leading role in the management of trans-boundary risks through the AHA Center (ASEAN Coordinating Center for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management). The country has also been active in Pacific Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System (PTWS) and ASEAN Earthquake Information Center (AEIC).

Context & Constraints:

The main obstacle in trans-boundary DRR cooperation is the lack of awareness and knowledge of regional/cross-border disaster risks. The roles of the AHA Center and other forums of cooperation and information sharing need to be enhanced and more joint DRR initiatives need to be promoted.

Section 5: Priority for action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

Priority for action 3: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

Information is proactively disseminated	Yes
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	Yes
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	Yes

Description:

At the national level Indonesia has been successful in developing and maintaining the Indonesian disaster data and information, the DIBI, which is managed by the National Agency for DM. Specialized agencies such as the Meteorology, Climatology and Geophysics Agency manages data related to extreme weather, earthquake and tsunami, while the Geology Agency manages data related to volcanic eruption and land mass movement. Several local governments, together with non-government partners such as the university, have developed disaster information systems that are specific to their local needs, although such effort has not been widely done.

The most significant development on this aspect is the growing involvement of the media in disseminating disaster-related data and information. More and more print and electronic media have developed special sections that discuss disaster-related issues. An MOU has been signed between the government and TV stations that immediately prior to or during a disaster event TV companies have to display running texts about the disaster. There is also growing participation from the civil society, with many community groups taking part in disseminating disaster-related information through community radios, radio streaming, social media like twitter and FB, and so on.

Context & Constraints:

Indonesia still faces the challenge of providing disaster-related information to people living in remote areas, except through television and radio networks that have relatively covered all parts of the country. Information dissemination is also hampered by internet connectivity and communication network that are relatively limited and centered in major islands only. There is also a cultural obstacle that many people are not proactive in seeking information about the risks they are facing.

With regards to government agencies tasked with conveying disaster and risk-related information to community at risk, the challenge is lack of coordination between the relevant institutions from the central level down to the district/city level. It is obvious that the government needs to further build the capacity of Local Disaster Management Agencies (BPBDs) and Local Governments in managing risk-related information and communication, in addition to strengthening the use of popular and social media.

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

Primary school curriculum	Yes
Secondary school curriculum	Yes
University curriculum	Yes
Professional DRR education programmes	Yes

Description:

There is already commitment from the government, as the Ministry of Education and Culture, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Religious Affairs, Ministry of Home Affairs, National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) and non-government stakeholders have developed stronger regulatory framework through several DRR in education regulations. Mainstreaming of DRR into school curriculum has been piloted in 100 schools throughout the country, following the completion of modules for the integration of DRR into education. As part of One Million Safe Schools and Hospitals campaign, several pilot projects have been developed to retrofit school buildings and strengthen capacity for building back better. From

the national special allocation fund for education, 70% has been allocated for retrofitting school buildings.

Context & Constraints:

A critical challenge in this aspect is the lack of coordination among concerned agencies from the national down to the local levels. The government needs to advocate further the integration of DRR and recovery concepts into school education and DM training and exercises, particularly at the district/city governments as the actual service providers.

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Research programmes and projects	Yes
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	Yes
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	No

Description:

Several government ministries/agencies have developed research methods and tools for multi-hazard risk assessments. The Climatology Agency (BMKG), for instance, has developed assessment methodology for tsunami, forest fire, extreme weather, extreme wave, earthquake and flood. The Ministry for Energy through its Geological Agency (PVMBG) has developed assessment methodologies and tools for volcanic eruption and land mass movement assessment. The Ministry of Public Work has developed flood risk analysis, and so forth. The Indonesian National Science Institute (LIPI) develops Preparedness Analysis that has been applied in several regions. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) has also developed multi-hazard risk assessments methodologies. However, all these efforts still need to be harmonized and synergized and applied all over Indonesia in an integrated manner. Cost-benefit analysis of DRR has not been so widespread, and there have only been a handful of C-B analyses done by government and

non-government institutions in an anecdotal manner.

Context & Constraints:

The sectoral approach employed in development in Indonesia, including in the field of disaster management has contributed to the difficulty in establishing risk assessment methods and tools that are commonly agreed and used by the stakeholders. Initiatives to develop such methodologies and tools are usually under-funded and there has not been any organization considered as authoritative enough to lead the process.

Indonesia needs to develop an integrated and comprehensive research policy in disaster management and risk reduction that also covers the relevant cost-benefit analysis. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB), in coordination with the Coordinating Ministry of Research and Technology, needs to advocate for greater budget for disaster research.

Priority for action 3: 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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.	Yes
Training of local government	Yes
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes
Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	Yes
Guidance for risk reduction	Yes
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	Yes

Description:

Indonesia has developed an integrated strategy for awareness building for disaster preparedness, but it is yet to be disseminated to stakeholders. Many campaigns have been conducted to educate the public on disaster preparedness as well as to train local government officials. Guidance and information about risk reduction have also been made available for grassroots communities particularly in hazard prone areas. However, although commitment and practices have existed, they have yet to be comprehensive and covering all hazard prone areas in the country.

Context & Constraints:

The constraint is that the national strategy to raise public awareness, although it has already been drafted, has yet to be agreed and implemented with sufficient funding support. For relevant activities already implemented, the monitoring and evaluation of the process and outcome have been limited, if not non-existent. Lack of coordination; weak knowledge management; and poor communication strategy have also become obstacles in developing public awareness drives to nurture the culture of resilience. The country needs to enhance coordination and collaboration in this aspect.

Section 6: Priority for action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Priority for action 4: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	Yes
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Description:

DRR in the country has been linked to environmental management and mainstreamed into development. The ninth priority program in the Middle-term National Development Plan 2010-2014 combines both these issues. The policy has also been supported by numerous regulations, such as the Environment Bill, the Spatial Planning Bill, the Natural Resource and Ecosystem Conservation Bill, the Forestry Bill, the Geothermal Bill, the Water Resource Bill, the Coastal Management Areas Bill, the Waste Management Bill, and the other relevant laws. There has been a mechanism for Payment for Environmental Services, for instance, although the technical guidelines may need to be further refined. In general the policy and institutional arrangement are available, but the implementation is still limited and not covering all over the country.

Context & Constraints:

Among the constraints include weak law enforcement, overlapping of regulations and lack of inter-agency coordination. Indonesia has already enacted many required laws and regulations, but efforts to enforce these instruments have not been so successful due to lack of understanding and commitment of the sectors in building synergic cooperation. There are also the challenges of decentralization and lack of transparency and accountability. Indonesia needs to further nurture awareness of the importance of DRR that is integrated into environmental conservation and reduce compartmentalization among sectors that manage DRR and environmental programs.

Priority for action 4: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	Yes

Description:

Social development policies and plans have been implemented for population at risks, but mostly in the aftermath of a disaster event. At present Indonesia has just upgraded its position from a low income to a middle income country. This demonstrates progress or improvement in people's live. Several development programs have addressed people's vulnerability reduction such as the Rice for the Poor, Social Security for Neglected Senior Citizens and Social Assistance Program for Heavily Disabled. Micro insurance and micro financing programs have also been developed by the government and private sector, but the penetration is low and has been limited to several areas only.

Context & Constraints:

Among the constraints include lack of clarity in the criteria of the poor and vulnerable groups. Also, the groups considered most at risk have not been identified clearly and firmly. To encourage social development policies and plans that could reduce people's vulnerability, efforts need to be done to increase understanding and capacity in formulating development policies and plans that may reduce the vulnerability of populations risk. The community needs to be empowered to demand their rights and local governments need to be encouraged to understand right-based approach to development.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	Yes
Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets	Quake resistant building code
Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals	Yes

Description:

A number of efforts to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities have been implemented, but mostly in areas that have just been hit by major disasters, as part of post-disaster recovery initiatives that promote alternative livelihood programs. In the field of agriculture, the Ministry of Agriculture has developed programs to diversify food crops to reduce vulnerability to climate change and disaster. The Ministry of Finance has developed an incentive program for business that implements disaster risk reduction through their business activities. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery has also formulated disaster risk sensitive plans that are pro job and pro poor. Most of these initiatives, however, are still in their pilot phases.

Context & Constraints:

The main constraint is lack of understanding and awareness among stakeholders and policy makers of the importance of risk-proofing economic activities. The social economic development paradigm that is pro growth, pro jobs and pro poor has not been implemented consistently, and is sometimes subjugated by the interests of big investments. There needs to be a coordinate effort to mainstream DRR into local economic activities.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	Yes
Training of masons on safe construction technology	Yes
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	No
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	Yes
Regulated provision of land titling	No

Description:

Substantial progress has been made on this aspect. It is now obligatory for developers of human settlements to conduct an environmental assessment, which contains risk reduction elements, prior to start building and to comply with building codes. Several legislations have been passed such as the Spatial Planning Bill and the Law No. 28 year 2002 on High-rise Building, the building code, micro-zoning regulations and others. In areas highly-prone to earthquake, governments and non-government partners have disseminated information to the public on the importance of earthquake-resistant building. Building artisans in those places have also been trained on earthquake safe construction. Initial efforts to certify

building quality, particularly for public buildings, have also been implemented.

Context & Constraints:

The main obstacles in mainstreaming DRR into the planning and management of human settlements include inconsistency in the implementation of policies and regulations on spatial and infrastructure planning; overlapping and disagreement of policies between government levels, weak monitoring and evaluation and ineffective law enforcement. Safety culture needs to be promoted in the development of settlements. Development needs to incorporate people’s vulnerability considerations.

Priority for action 4: 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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	5
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	No
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	No
Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	No

Description:

Since 2011 Indonesia has already possessed policies to mainstream DRR into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation in the form of Chief of the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) regulation No. 17/2011 on rehabilitation and reconstruction. The Disaster Management Plan 2010-2014 and National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction 2010-2012 also contain programs and activities to integrate DRR into recovery. The government, with support from international partners, has implemented “building back better” approach in several post-disaster areas, including in post Yogyakarta and Central

Java earthquake of 2006, West Sumatra earthquake of 2009 and post Merapi Eruption of 2010.

Context & Constraints:

Constraints in integrating DRR into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation include lack of awareness and understanding of the issue as well as weak coordination among different sectors. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) as the institution responsible for disaster management needs to collaborate with the Ministry of Public Works and other institutions in promoting the integration of DRR into post-disaster recovery. Cross-sectoral coordination mechanism must be built and the interests of local communities, particularly minority and vulnerable groups, need to be accommodated in post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? No

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	No
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	No
By international development actors	No

Description:

Efforts to develop analytical instruments to assess the disaster impacts of major development projects have just been initiated. The country has also made it a prerequisite to conduct Environmental Impact Assessment at the individual project level, and Strategic Environmental Analysis for areas that have many development projects that may potentially damage the environment and the people.

Context & Constraints:

Experts and DRR practitioners in the country have not reached agreement on a specific methodology for disaster risk impact assessment for development projects that may be commonly accepted by all. It is obvious that the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) needs to collaborate with the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of Energy and Mineral resources as well as other closely related key institutions to formulate an appropriate risk assessment instrument. As a first step, the government may examine the possibility of including disaster risk analysis for major infrastructure and development projects into Strategic Environmental Analysis.

Section 7: Priority for action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Priority for action 5: 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: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies	Yes
--	-----

The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support.	Yes
--	-----

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

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety	Yes
---	-----

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness	Yes
--	-----

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections	Yes
--	-----

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios	Yes
--	-----

Description:

All provinces and more than 80% of districts and cities in the country have established local disaster management agencies. The technical capacity of these Local DM Agencies (BPBDs) continues to be developed by the National Agency for Disaster Management and the national government. Many areas have formed their rapid response teams and at the national level two specialist rapid response teams have been set-up. Many areas have developed risk-sensitive spatial planning and implemented programs for disaster preparedness, contingency planning, and response. DRM policy that employs a risk reduction perspective has been in place, but it has yet to be implemented well and throughout all over the country.

Context & Constraints:

A key constraint in this aspect is weakness in enforcing the relevant laws and regulations. Also, since the shift of paradigm from response to DRR has not been well socialized, risk management is often not well understood. Lack of capacity in the regions has also become an obstacle, including the fact that many civil servants often undergo frequent official personnel rotation, so that often the personnel's understanding of their key duties and responsibilities is insufficient and the work cannot be done well. There needs to be synchronization and harmonization of disaster-related laws and regulations between different sectoral agencies and different government levels. The Local DM Agencies (BPBD) also need to be strengthened in terms of their understanding of policy and regulatory issues.

Priority for action 5: 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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	No
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	No
Operations and communications centre	Yes
Search and rescue teams	Yes

Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Shelters	No
Secure medical facilities	No
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	No
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	No

Description:

A number of contingency plans have been developed at different government levels, but with only minimum gender sensitivities. Contingency plans have mostly been prepared to respond to emergency situations and not for continued basic service delivery. These contingency plans have now been reinforced to be “living documents” in which relevant stakeholders should jointly update the documents on periodic bases. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) has been encouraging Local Disaster Management Agency (BPBDs) to take lead in conducting training, drills, simulated exercises (Tabletop Exercise, Command Post Exercise, Field Training Exercise) based on the contingency plan that they have developed so that corrective actions can be undertaken based on the lessons learnt of these trainings/exercises. The challenges to enhance these preparedness measures include the lack of resources (human, expertise, budget, equipment, facilities, etc) at the local level. Thus, many BPBDs still rely on national support for undertaking those activities.

Context & Constraints:

The biggest obstacle is the uneven awareness, both in government and community, of the importance of contingency and preparedness plans in enhancing disaster preparedness. This lack of understanding and awareness has further influenced the political will to provide budget to formulate the plans at the central and local levels. There needs to be continuous socialization of the importance of these plans.

Priority for action 5: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	No
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

Description:

Disaster funds in the form of on-call budgets have been allocated at the national level by the sectoral line ministries and at the local level by several provinces and district/city governments. The case is also true with rehabilitation and reconstruction funds. However, not all provinces and districts/cities have allocated disaster-related budgets, because the regulations that stipulate this issue have not been clear. Disaster risk insurance, catastrophe bonds and other risk transfer mechanisms have not been developed well in Indonesia.

Context & Constraints:

One big challenge in this issue is the absence of clear regulations that govern disaster budget at the national and local levels. This has made it difficult for decision makers at the local level to allocate disaster budget. The government needs to formulate clear regulations related to disaster budget and make funds disbursement more responsive and easier, while still maintaining transparency and accountability. Regions need to be encouraged to formulate contingency plans and allocate contingency budgets. Risk transfer mechanisms and instruments need to be further explored and developed in cooperation with international development partners.

Priority for action 5: 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: 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available	Yes
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	Yes
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	Yes
Identified and trained human resources	Yes

Description:

Systems for information exchange during an emergency situation has been established, like in the case of Merapi Volcano Eruption by the end of 2010 and annual flooding in the capital city of Jakarta, to cite some instances. Both the systems have reached household level through the district/city DM Agencies (BPBDs). The country has also developed PDNA (combining DALA and Human Recovery Needs Assessment) and legalized it through the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) regulation. Human resources have also been trained for these purposes.

Context & Constraints:

The constraints faced include the massive task of covering all the districts/cities (497) in the country and building their capacity to implement these procedures. Efforts will also be needed to build disaster information systems that are accessible directly by the people. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) needs to engage more the Ministry of Communication and Information in the dissemination of disaster information. Related to post-disaster reviews, participation of the affected communities has to be enhanced to make these reviews more relevant with the needs of disaster-affected people.

Section 8: 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):

Indonesia has developed multi-hazard analyses at the provincial level and has just started to do so at the district/city level. Efforts to build capacity of DRR stakeholders are continuously done, especially for decision makers, in order that they can mainstream risk reduction considerations into regular development planning.

Efforts need to be done to promote cost-benefit analysis of DRR, so that local governments may be convinced of the need to integrate DRR into development. The country has to formulate a national strategy to mainstream multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development, and later develop the relevant guidelines, instruments and regulations. Dissemination of information related to DRR mainstreaming needs to be done in more and more districts and cities, involving the Local Disaster Management Agencies and other relevant local government units. Advocacy also needs to be done for the provision of sufficient and sustainable resources for disaster risk reduction and disaster management.

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

Levels of Reliance:

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: No

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

Gender disaggregated data have been available up to the village level. However, this has not been used widely in decision-making related to risk reduction and recovery activities. Gender concerns are only starting to inform policy and programme conceptualization and implementation, since awareness of policy makers on the importance of promoting gender balance has not been well developed. The country needs to implement continuous socialization of gender equality issue in disaster risk reduction at all levels, and involves women meaningfully in the formulation of disaster risk reduction policies and implementation of DRR efforts.

The policy of mainstreaming gender into disaster risk reduction will be substantially supported by the presence of accurate data and information related to the situations faced by vulnerable women who live in hazard-prone areas. For that purpose, the government needs to enhance the capacity to manage database. The involvement of mass media and non-governmental organizations in mainstreaming gender into disaster risk reduction will also be very crucial. The government needs to facilitate and provide resources to the non-government entities to reach out to the wider public.

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.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?: -- not complete --

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: -- not complete --

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

In general responsible agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have developed initial capacities to enforce risk reduction regulations. Yet, there have not been any efforts to identify the overall existing capacity both at the national and local levels. Early efforts have been done to build the capacity for response and to reduce risks through training of local institutions, village committees, communities and volunteers. Capacity to reduce risks and conduct better recovery has continuously been done through improvement of facilities and infrastructures, and development of quality of human resources in disaster management.

Since the government has only limited resources, mobilization of potential resources from the non-government sector, like from the private sector, the media, university and even from the communities themselves, need to be strengthened. The empowerment and revitalization of local wisdoms in DRR may also need to be enhanced. Another important thing, empowerment of the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) and Local Disaster Management Agencies (BPBDs) to implement their coordination functions both in a normal situation and in an emergency will also need to be strengthened.

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

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 programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: -- not complete --

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: -- not complete --

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

Indonesia implements several social protection measures or safety nets such as health insurance for the poor (Jamkesmas), social assistance for the poor (Jamkesmas) and provision of rice at a discounted price, but the coverage of these programs has not known to be sufficient to reduce poverty. There are needs to be a political will in integrating human security and social equity approaches into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities. The government needs to promote both issues not only in emergency situation, but also in disaster risk reduction and recovery activities.

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.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: -- not complete --

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

DRR stakeholders in Indonesia have developed strong partnership and collaborative ventures in DRR from the very beginning. The country established its multi-stakeholder National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Planas PRB, in 2008. Members of this platform include representatives from government institutions, universities, NGOs, CBOs, mass media and private sector companies. Partnership at the local and community levels has also been flourishing, with the establishment of DRR platforms and forums at different government levels down to the village level. A number of initiatives to collect local experiences and traditional knowledge in DRR has been initiated, but the results have not been integrated meaningfully within local, sub-national and national DRR plans and activities. The government needs to enhance further such initiatives.

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):

The contextual drivers that may be pursued in the future:

- Enhancement of the coordination among DRR agents
- Synchronization and harmonization of roles and responsibilities between different levels of government and different institutions
- Advocacy for strong regulatory environment on DRR, greater budget and stronger oversight
- Collaboration between local governments for information exchange and joint risk management for risks that are commonly faced
- Enhancement of Corporate Social Responsibility in DRR

Section 9: Future Outlook

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:

The national and local governments in DRR have achieved significant results in Area 1. The regulatory framework for DRR and institutional setting for DM agencies have been enhanced. However, there is still challenge with the lack of synchronization between DM-related and non-DM regulations, such as those related to investment and economic development. Disharmony in regulatory framework for DRR also exists between different levels of government. Integration of DRR into sustainable development policies has been initiated through risk sensitive spatial planning and development plan, but they have not been widespread as people's understanding of these issues is still limited.

Common perception of DRR and a common understanding of the way to mainstream DRR into development have also not been achieved. Many decision makers, including those at the executive and legislative branches of the government, still hold the opinion that disaster management is a matter of responding to disaster events, and therefore disaster policies and budget are more focused on disaster response and post-disaster recovery aspects. Another challenge is that the existing DRR policies have not been implemented well and translated into capacity and institutional development. Many relevant policies have been formulated at the central level, but their implementation at the provinces and districts/cities have not been to the maximum. The existing government administration system still limits resources for disaster risk reduction.

Future Outlook Statement:

The Indonesian government will further encourage the mainstreaming of DRR into development, by promoting district/city level DM plans that will be integrated into development plans. Risk assessments will be enhanced and implemented in more and more districts and cities in hazard prone areas. Better coordination will also be sought with relevant ministries and agencies, including with non-governmental organizations and local government offices.

Future Outlook 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:

The Indonesian government has initiated some programs at the village level that aim at reducing vulnerability and building resilience. The Ministry of Health, for instance, has developed Prepared Villages program since 2006. The health-based program has the objective of improving health services, and promoting health preparedness and healthy behaviors, which is expected to cover 80% of all villages in Indonesia by 2015. The Ministry of Social Affairs has implemented Disaster Prepared Kampongs program since 2010. Disaster Resilient Coastal Villages program was initiated by the Ministry of Marine and Fishery for coastal villages that are prone to tsunami and the impacts of climate change. In 2012 the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) started its Disaster Resilient Villages Program. The program tries to build resilience at the village level through the introduction of risk analysis and mapping, preparation of disaster management plan and DRR action plan by communities, early warning system, volunteer development, and development of economic resilience

These efforts, however, was challenged by the big number of existing villages in Indonesia, which amounts to 75,410 villages, while resources and budget available are limited. In the implementation of DRR and DM related activities different ministries/agencies tend to implement their programs on their own, with minimum coordination among each other. Coordination is also not easy. With many government and non-government institutions/agencies involved in disaster risk reduction activities, coordination and communication among stakeholders become critical in building community's resilience to disaster.

Future Outlook Statement:

The focus of intervention by the Indonesian government and DRR stakeholders will be put on building the capacity of people at the village level. Programs on DRR and CCA will be developed further to promote the sustainable development of communities. To support these efforts, district and city disaster management agencies will be strengthened to provide better service on DRR for communities at the village level. It is expected that programs that are started with and by communities will contribute to the building of resilient people in Indonesia.

Future Outlook 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:

Initial efforts to incorporate risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities have been conducted. This has been challenged, however, by the lack of capacity and technical know-how of the responsible agencies. Disaster preparedness and contingency planning have been developed in some provinces and district/municipality level. However, contingency plans are still often in the form of merely documents and not systematically reviewed or evaluated. To date, there have not been clear concepts and mechanisms to integrate risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of programs for disaster affected communities.

Future Outlook Statement:

To systematically incorporate risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities, efforts need to be done to develop the capacity of newly-formed district/city disaster management agencies in planning and implementing risk sensitive disaster management programs. Besides educating and training BPBDs (Local Disaster Management Agencies) staff members and relevant stakeholders, capacity building also needs to be done through formulation of regulations, mechanisms, guidelines and standard operating procedures that are clear, accessible and firm. Strong BPBDs will accelerate the systematic integration of DRR into all disaster-related programs. The National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) has been providing technical and financial support for BPBDs at the provincial level for the formulation of contingency plans, as well as for the conduct of regular training and exercises based on the contingency plans that each respective area has to ensure that corrective actions to enhance preparedness measures are undertaken. Further supports must be provided to the BPBDs at the local (district/municipality) level as they are the front liners for DRR implementation, as well as the first responders when emergency situation occurs.

Future Outlook Area 4

The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 66/199, requested the development of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. A first outline will be developed for the next Global Platform in 2013, and a draft should be finalized towards the end of 2014 to be ready for consideration and adoption at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2015.

Overall Challenges:

After one decade of HFA implementation, quite significant DRR results have been attained in various countries, especially at the national level. However, large countries such as Indonesia, India, China, etc, require more or longer time to be able to implement HFA at the local level. Therefore, Indonesia views that HFA priorities are still valid to be reinforced further but it certainly needs to be tailored so that focused could be given more into the local context (district and maybe even at the community level).

At the national level, new concepts needs to be developed further to enhance the implementation of HFA priority 4, as well as for DRR issues related to climate change, poverty alleviation, sustainable development etc. The importance to put efforts on these issues have been pointed out based on studies for GAR 2009, 2011 and maybe will remain as issues in GAR 2013.

Section 10: Stakeholders

Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report

Organization	Type	Focal Point
Climate Change National Board (DNPI)	Gov	Ari Muhammad, Ardianto A, Rachmi Yuliantri
Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare	Gov	Togap, Yasrif
Geospatial Information Agency	Gov	Habib Subagyo, Imam Hidayani
Indonesian Institute for Science (LIPI)	Gov	Diffi FH, Dimas AP, Hariadi Permana
Meteorology, Climatology, Geo-Physics Agency	Gov	Untung Merdiyanto, Suhardjono
Ministry of Agriculture	Gov	Desni Endri
Ministry of Communication and Information	Gov	Ardi Timbul
Ministry of Disadvantaged Area Development	Gov	Bambang, Isnadiati, Riezchal Mivtah
Ministry of Education and Culture	Gov	NS. Vijay KN
Ministry of Forestry	Gov	Joko Suwanto
Ministry of Health	Gov	Siti Khadijah
Ministry of Home Affairs	Gov	Vitus
Ministry of Industry	Gov	Putu J, Ardika, Rachmat A
Ministry of Marine and Fisheries	Gov	Eva Kurniawan
Ministry of Public Works	Gov	Indah, Choky R.H, Vikka V, Karni NPR, Dewi ES, Dodi Priyono

Ministry of Religious Affairs	Gov	Kasilah
Ministry of Social Affairs	Gov	Sitta Widayawati, Nerty S.
Ministry of Transportation	Gov	Dwi Utami CH, Rika Deswati
National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB)	Gov	Dr. Syamsul Maarif, Sugeng Triutomo, Teddy Sudinda, Lilik Kurniawan, Gita Yuliant, Cahyo Nugroho, Linawaty, Sutopo, B. Wisnu Widjaja, M. Robi Amri
National Development Planning Agency	Gov	Aryawan, Togu Pardede
Nuclear Energy Monitoring Agency	Gov	Lukman H, Suharyanda
Provincial Disaster Management Agency of Yogyakarta	Gov	Danang Syamsu
Technology, Research and Application Agency	Gov	Isman Justanto, Sunyanta P, Nasrul Baddu
Volcano and Earthquake Mitigation Center	Gov	Supriyanti Andreastuti
DRP	Private	Victor Rembeth
HM Sampoerna	Private	Welly Wiryanto
Unilever	Private	Maya Tamimi
Bandung Institute Technology (ITB)	Acad & Research	Krishna S Pribadi
FBI University of Indonesia	Acad & Research	Ivan A.A., Tika
PSMB UPN	Acad & Research	Eko Teguh Paripurno
Humanitarian Forum Indonesia	NGO	Widowati
Local DRR Forum of Bengkulu Province	NGO	Hemma Malini, Agus Widiyanto

Local DRR Forum of Central Java Province	NGO	Naibul Umam
Local DRR Forum of Papua	NGO	Paminta Widodo
Local DRR Forum of West Sumatra Province	NGO	Badrul Mustafah
LPBI NU	NGO	Syamsul Hadi, M. Bashori
Masyarakat Penanggulangan Bencana Indonesia (MPBI)	NGO	H. Iskandar Leman
National Platform for DRR	NGO	Datti Fatimah, Trinirmala, Akbar Ali, Avianto Muhtadi
Palang Merah Indonesia (Indonesian Red Cross)	NGO	Arifin M. Hadi
PCC Aceh	NGO	Desy Wulage
Perkumpulan Kerlip/Seknas Sekolah	NGO	Yanti Sriyulianti, Zamzam Muzaki
Yakkum Emergency Unit	NGO	Syamsul Ardianansyah, Heppi Rahmawati
Australia Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction	UN & Intl	Chasan Ascholani, Miranti Husein
BGR	UN & Intl	Chandra Soekarno
Hope Worldwide Indonesia	UN & Intl	Willy Gozal
JICA	UN & Intl	Yoshio Tokunaga, Noviyanti Erfien, Ryo Sirait, Laurensia Gunawan
Mercy Corps	UN & Intl	Ina Nisrina
UNDP	UN & Intl	Regina Rahadi, Valentinus Irawan, Ridwan Yunus, Banu Subagyo, Yusniar Nurdin
UNOCHA	UN & Intl	Titi Moektijasih, Riana

Nedyawati

Berita Lingkungan.Com

News & Media

Marwan A.

Skala

News & Media

Galuh, Syafiria