



# Indonesia

---

## National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2015)

**Name of focal point:** Dr Raditya Jati  
**Organization:** The Indonesian National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB)  
**Title/Position:** Deputy Director for Disaster Prevention  
**E-mail address:** radityajati@gmail.com  
**Telephone:** +6281229823518

---

**Reporting period:** 2013-2015  
**Report Status:** Final  
**Last updated on:** 20 December 2014  
**Print date:** 23 April 2015  
**Reporting language:** English

---

A National HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb  
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

# Outcomes

---

## Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

### Outcomes Statement

Disaster management planning has been strengthened at the provincial and district/city levels. After equipping all provinces with DM Plans in 2012-2013, BNPB facilitated 61 districts and cities to develop their DM Plans. Currently the agency has been piloting village-level DM Plans in 8 villages in the District of West Pasaman, Pandeglang, Jember and Sukabumi. It is expected that these local DM Plans may facilitate local DRR stakeholders in further mainstreaming DRR into regular development planning.

## Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

### Outcomes Statement

After all provinces have set-up DM agencies between 2010-2013, currently more than 90 percent of the districts and cities in the country have established Local DM Agencies (BPBDs). BNPB has continuously facilitated BPBDs and local DRR platforms to promote DRR at the village level. Capacities for response, for risk assessment and community-based DRR have also been developed through training and simulation exercises at the district/city and village levels. Capacity to respond to climate-related risks, however, has not been so significantly developed at the local level.

## Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

### Outcomes Statement

At present 122 districts and cities in Indonesia have developed their contingency plans for multiple hazards. Efforts to engage communities and DRR stakeholders in contingency planning and disaster emergency response exercises have also been increasing. There is growing number of disaster simulations and exercises conducted in many parts of the country, with the biggest one the Mentawai Megathrust Tsunami Disaster Exercise that was organized in 2013, which was participated by international partners and 18 neighboring countries.

# 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 2013-2015

Strengthened implementation of disaster management plans at the central and local levels and enhanced mainstreaming of DRR-CCA into development.

## 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 2013-2015

Strengthened capacities of District/City DM Agencies (BPBDs) in facilitating villages and communities to build their resilience to disaster.

## 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 2013-2015

Enhanced capacities at BPBDs to incorporate DRR into emergency preparedness, response and recovery programs.

# Priority for Action 1

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

---

## Core indicator 1

*National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

### 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	No

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

### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Indonesia has passed numerous rules and regulations on DRR and DM from the central government to the district/city levels. Capacities both at the central and local levels have been much enhanced. However, much still has to be done to strengthen capacity particularly at the district/city level.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The key challenge in this issue coordination among stakeholders. It is still very difficult to coordinate the stakeholders in commonly shared issues that need to be followed-up together. Efforts to mainstream DRR into local development need to be further enhanced. Clarity in the distribution of roles and responsibilities between BNPB and national actors, and BPBDs and local actors need to be increased.

## 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	0.9	
Decentralised / sub-national budget	0.38	
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)		

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The line ministries have programmed and allocated budget for DRR initiatives, which are integrated into their regular programs. At the provincial level, a number of provinces have tried to integrate their DM plans into local development plans and budget. Districts and cities that have developed DM plans have also been encouraged to incorporate them into district and city development plans.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Awareness and understanding of DRR have not been inclusive, particularly among members of the national and local legislatures. Most decision makers still consider DRR as non-essential and it is more important to allocate budget for emergency and post-disaster recovery programs only. Also, the cost-benefit of DRR investment has not been commonly agreed by majority of decision makers.

**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

<b>Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)</b>	Yes
<b>Regular budget allocations for DRR to local</b>	Yes

## government

**Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR**

0.1-0.38

### **Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Decentralization has been implemented in Indonesia since 1999, so the mandate for DRR at the district and city level lies at the local BPBD. BNPB does not have a direct authority over BPBDs, but it supports BPBDs through provision of facilities and infrastructures as well as technical assistance. In many districts, rooms for participation have been opened in many areas through local DRR platforms and other means of coordination. For the future it would be beneficial if local BPBDs could develop comprehensive strategies to promote local participation.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The key challenge to decentralized disaster risk governance includes lack of resources to be given to the local level and limited human resources in the regions. Community's participation in DRR has mostly been good in areas that have experienced major disasters. In the past four years BNPB has facilitated "Disaster Resilient Village" program that has the purpose of promoting community's participation in DRR at the village level.

## **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

<b>civil society members (specify absolute number)</b>	67
<b>national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)</b>	2
<b>sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)</b>	22
<b>private sector (specify absolute number)</b>	9
<b>science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)</b>	26
<b>women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)</b>	2
<b>other (please specify)</b>	2

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

<b>In the Prime Minister's/President's Office</b>	No
<b>In a central planning and/or coordinating unit</b>	No
<b>In a civil protection department</b>	No
<b>In an environmental planning ministry</b>	No
<b>In the Ministry of Finance</b>	No
<b>Other (Please specify)</b>	Independent ministerial-level authority, the BNPB

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.



In addition to BNPB as the national coordinating authority responsible for the entire aspects of disaster management including DRR, Indonesia also possesses Planas PRB, the National Platform for DRR that was established in 2008. The multi-stakeholder platform includes as its members government institutions, non-government organizations and the private sector. Recently the platform has been revitalized through the appointment of a new chair and new management team.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The National Platform for DRR has yet to be capacitated and made capable to serve as government's partner in promoting and advocating DRR. BNPB will facilitate further Planas PRB to play a more prominent role and function in promoting DRR in the country.

# Priority for Action 2

*Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning*

---

## Core indicator 1

*National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors.*

Level of Progress achieved? 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

<b>Multi-hazard risk assessment</b>	Yes
<b>% of schools and hospitals assessed</b>	
<b>schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)</b>	
<b>Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments</b>	No
<b>Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments</b>	Yes
<b>Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)</b>	Yes
<b>Common format for risk assessment</b>	Yes
<b>Risk assessment format customised by user</b>	No
<b>Is future/probable risk assessed?</b>	No
<b>Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.</b>	Public works, energy, mineral resources, marine and fishery, climate, agriculture

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

All the provinces in Indonesia have possessed multi-hazard risk assessments. Around 20% of the districts and cities have also developed their risk assessments. At the central level, the line ministries have also conducted risk mapping in accordance with their responsibilities. These risk analyses have been enriched with vulnerability and capacity information from the community, as well as index of potential losses.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The key challenge in this regard constitutes the lack of technical capacity in many BPBDs to conduct risk assessment. Also the availability of data has not been adequate, particularly in Eastern Indonesia. Further capacity building is needed for risk analysis and mapping both for the national and local stakeholders. Coordination among sectors needs to be enhanced to agree on and use a common risk analysis methodology.

**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

<b>Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated</b>	Yes
--	-----

<b>Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)</b>	Yes
--	-----

<b>Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries</b>	Yes
--	-----

### **Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Responsibility to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities lies in different line ministries. The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources is mostly responsible for geological hazards, particularly volcanic eruption and landslide. The Ministry of Public Work is responsible for flood hazard. BMKG is responsible for climate-related hazards and tsunami. The Ministry of Forestry is responsible for forest and land fires. BNPB facilitated the line ministries in disseminating important data. It has also developed hazard and vulnerability databases.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The chief constraint includes the absence of commonly agreed 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 systems uniformed. There also needs to be coordinated efforts in risk assessments and database management to avoid duplication across government institutions. At the lower government level, the challenge is more on budget, and lack of human resources and technical know-how.

### **Core indicator 3**

*Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.*

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

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

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Early Warning Systems in Indonesia has relatively been more advanced for hazards such as flood, tsunami, extreme weather, extreme waves, volcanic eruption and forest fires. The problem, however, lies in EWS' outreach to the grassroots communities and capacity strengthening to build communities' capacities to respond to warnings.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Not all community members have access to disaster early warning messages. The EWS developed by sectoral ministries and agencies at the national level mostly reaches district/city offices only. There needs to be established and enhanced systems to deliver warning messages to reach every household in the hazard prone areas.

# 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

<b>Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring</b>	Yes
<b>Regional or sub-regional risk assessment</b>	Yes
<b>Regional or sub-regional early warning</b>	Yes
<b>Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing</b>	Yes
<b>Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks</b>	Yes

## Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

With regard to trans-boundary risks, Indonesia is highly committed to joint management of cross-border risks, particularly related 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). Indonesia plays a leading role in the management of trans-boundary risks through the AHA Center. The country has also been active in Pacific Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System (PTWS) and ASEAN Earthquake Information Center (AEIC).

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular,

highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The key challenge includes lack of awareness and knowledge of regional/trans-boundary 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.

# Priority for Action 3

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

---

## Core indicator 1

*Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)*

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

### Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

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

### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

BNPB has facilitated the set-up and maintenance of the Indonesian disaster data and information. Other ministries and agency such as BMKG manages data related to extreme weather, earthquake and tsunami. The Ministry of Energy and Mineral resources maintain data related to volcanic eruption and land mass movement. Several local governments, together with non-government partners such as university, have developed disaster information systems that are specific to their needs. The media has also been proactive in disseminating disaster-related data and information.



Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The remaining challenge includes the provision of disaster-related information to people living in remote areas. Some have been able to be reached through television and radio networks that have relatively covered all parts of the country. There is also a cultural obstacle that many people are not proactive in seeking information about the risks they are facing. The government still needs to further build the capacity of BPBDs in managing risk information and communication.

## Core indicator 2

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

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 DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	Yes
university curriculum	Yes
professional DRR education programmes	Yes

### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Indonesia sees an increased commitment in this issue, as the Ministry of Education and Culture, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Religious Affairs, Ministry of Home

Affairs, BNPB and non-government stakeholders have jointly worked towards stronger implementation of DRR through the curriculum. More and more training programs have been developed by non-government partners to strengthen capacity for better recovery.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

One of the remaining challenges in this regard include the need to enhance coordination among relevant 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.

### Core indicator 3

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

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

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

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Government ministries/agencies have developed methods and tools for risk assessments, like BMKG or the climate agency, for instance, developed assessment methodologies for tsunami, extreme weather and extreme wave, and earthquake and flood. The Geological Agency developed methodologies and tools for volcanic eruption and land mass movement. The Ministry of Public Work developed flood risk analysis. The National Science Institute (LIPI) developed Preparedness Analysis. BNPB has also developed multi-hazard risk assessments methodologies. However, the country has yet to develop cost-benefit analysis for risk sensitive investments.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

It is still a challenge to establish assessment methods that will be commonly agreed and used by the different ministries and agencies, as most institutions have the interests of developing their own method. There needs to be an integrated and comprehensive research policy in disaster management and risk reduction that also covers the relevant cost-benefit analysis.

## 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? 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 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

<b>Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)</b>	Yes
<b>Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)</b>	No
<b>Guidance for risk reduction</b>	Yes
<b>Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level</b>	Yes

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A comprehensive strategy for awareness building for disaster preparedness has long been put in place by the government. Many awareness building drive, however, have mostly involved communities in rural areas. Guidelines and information about DRR have also been made available for grassroots communities particularly in hazard prone areas.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The remaining challenge constitutes that the national strategy, albeit been drafted for some time, has yet to be implemented with sufficient funding support. The monitoring and evaluation of the process and outcome have also been limited. Lack of coordination; weak knowledge management; and poor communication strategy have also become obstacles in advancing public awareness to nurture a culture of resilience.

# Priority for Action 4

*Reduce the underlying risk factors*

---

## Core indicator 1

*Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.*

Level of Progress achieved? 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 mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) Yes

<b>Protected areas legislation</b>	Yes
<b>Payment for ecosystem services (PES)</b>	Yes
<b>Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)</b>	Yes
<b>Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)</b>	Yes
<b>Climate change adaptation projects and programmes</b>	No

### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

DRR has long been linked to environmental management and mainstreamed into development. The forthcoming Middle-term National Development Plan 2015-2019 combines both these issues, which have also been supported by numerous regulations enacted by the line ministries. There has been a mechanism for Payment for Environmental Services, but the technical guidelines may need to be further

refined.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Among the challenges include ineffective law enforcement, overlapping of regulations and lack of inter-agency coordination. There needs to be more concerted efforts to enforce the prevailing regulations that sanction the two issues.

## 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

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

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Indonesia implements social development programs for population at risks, mostly in the aftermath of a disaster event. A number of social development programs have addressed people’s vulnerability such as the rice for the poor program, the social security program for senior citizens and social assistance program for people with disability. Micro insurance and micro financing programs have also been developed by the government and private sector, but the penetration has been limited to several areas only.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The biggest challenge in this regard is the lack of clarity in the criteria of the poor and vulnerable people and information about the whereabouts of these groups. Sustainable development needs to be focused more on vulnerable people in hazard prone areas.

**Core indicator 3**

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? No

<b>National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.</b>	No
<b>Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets</b>	
<b>Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals</b>	Yes

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There have only been pilot initiatives in formulating economic and productive sectoral policies and plans to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities. Policies at the local level have not been systematic and mechanism to empower vulnerable people's livelihoods has not been adequate. Local economic development implemented has not incorporated risk sensitive considerations.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Awareness of the importance and benefit of DRR has not been internalized in the economic and productive sectors. DRR programs targeted to small-medium enterprises in hazard-prone areas need to be increased. Local government should facilitate small businesses to engage in business continuity planning and management.

**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

<b>Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas</b>	Yes
<b>Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas</b>	Yes
<b>Training of masons on safe construction</b>	Yes



<b>technology</b>	
<b>Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities</b>	Yes
<b>Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development</b>	Yes
<b>Regulated provision of land titling</b>	Yes

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Indonesia has long made it obligatory for housing developers to conduct an environmental assessment, which contains risk reduction elements, prior to start building and to comply with building codes. Many regulations have been enacted to this regard, such as the Law on Spatial Planning and Law 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. Early efforts to certify building quality, particularly for public buildings, have also been implemented.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The key challenge lies in the consistency in implementing policies and regulations related to spatial planning and infrastructure. There are also some overlapping and disagreement of policies between different levels of government, weak monitoring and evaluation and ineffective law enforcement. Safety culture needs to be promoted further in the development of settlements.

## **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

<b>% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR</b>	5
<b>DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened</b>	Yes
<b>Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning</b>	Yes
<b>Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery</b>	Yes

### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Starting from the 2006 Yogyakarta earthquake, Indonesia has endeavored to mainstream DRR into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation. Every post-disaster recovery program in the country has since needed to be started with a Post-Disaster Need Assessment and the formulation of Action Plan for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. BNPB regulation No. 17/2011 on rehabilitation and reconstruction has further internalized DRR mainstreaming in recovery. The government has also implemented “building back better” approach in most post-disaster events since 2006.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The remaining challenge includes the lack of awareness and understanding of the

issue as well as weak coordination among different sectors. BNPB as the institution responsible for DRR will need to enhance collaboration with the Ministry of Public Works and other institutions in promoting the integration of DRR into post-disaster recovery. Local communities, particularly minority and vulnerable groups, need to be engaged in risk sensitive post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction.

## 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? No

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

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

### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Efforts to develop analytical instruments to assess the disaster impacts of major development projects have just been piloted, although the country has made it 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.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Local governments have mostly prioritized investments brought by big development projects over the risks that they may pose. Hence, permits have mostly been issued without due consideration of the potential risks that may be caused by development projects. Also, there has not been an adequate methodology for analyzing the disaster risk impacts of major development infrastructure projects.

# Priority for Action 5

*Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels*

---

## Core indicator 1

*Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.*

Level of Progress achieved? 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**

Yes

**based on future risk scenarios**

## **Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Currently all provinces and more than 90% of the districts and cities in Indonesia have possessed their own local DM agencies. BNPB continues to build the technical capacity of these BPBDs. Many areas have developed rapid response teams and at the national level two specialist rapid response teams have been established. Many regions 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.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

One of the main challenges includes difficulty in enforcing laws and regulations. Also, since the shift of paradigm from response to DRR has not been well socialized, at the local government level, risk management is often considered as the same with emergency preparedness. It is clear that BPBDs have to be strengthened in implementing their duties and responsibilities.

## **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

<b>Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities</b>	No
<b>Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery</b>	Yes
<b>Operations and communications centre</b>	Yes
<b>Search and rescue teams</b>	Yes
<b>Stockpiles of relief supplies</b>	Yes
<b>Shelters</b>	Yes
<b>Secure medical facilities</b>	Yes
<b>Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities</b>	Yes
<b>Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response</b>	No

**Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).**

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

More than 25 percent of all districts and cities have formulated contingency plans for various types of hazard. However, only a limited number has been prepared with sufficient gender sensitivities. Contingency plans have mostly been prepared to respond to emergency situations and not for continued basic service delivery. Only a limited number of BPBDs have been able to implement contingency plans through regular disaster drills and rehearsals.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The challenge lies in the lack of awareness, both in government and community, of the importance of contingency and preparedness plans in enhancing disaster

preparedness. There needs to be continuous socialization of the importance of these plans and budget for their implementation.

### 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

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

#### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

On-call budgets have been allocated at the national level by the line ministries and at the local level by a number of provincial and district/city governments. However, the regulations that stipulate this issue are not clear, so that not all local governments can allocate such budget. Disaster risk insurance, catastrophe bonds and other risk transfer mechanisms have not been developed adequately in the country.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be



overcome in the future.

One main challenge is the absence of clear regulations that govern disaster budget at the national and local levels, which has made it difficult for decision makers 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.

### 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

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

#### Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Information exchange during emergency has long been established in Indonesia. For volcanic eruption, the Geology Agency regularly disseminates warning messages

during hazardous situations. The Ministry of Public Works regularly conveys information on flooding to communities potentially affected. Both systems have reached household level through the BPBDs. The country has also developed Post-Disaster Need Assessment/PDNA and trained people to implement this instrument.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The key challenge faced includes the massive task of covering all the districts/cities (nearly five hundred) in the country and building capacity to implement these procedures. Efforts will be needed to build disaster information systems that are accessible directly by the people. Skilled staff will need to be trained regularly at all levels of government, while facilities and infrastructures also need to be furnished particularly at the local level.

# Drivers of Progress

---

## **a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development**

### Levels of Reliance

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

Multi-hazard analyses have been developed from the national down to the district/city level. In some highly prone disaster areas, risk analysis has even been done at the village level. Efforts to build capacity of stakeholders in DRR have continuously been done, especially for decision makers at the district/city level, in order that they can mainstream DRR into regular development planning. Related to this, however, more efforts need to be done to provide budget allocation for local governments and encouraged them to increase their budget spending on DRR.

## **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?: Yes

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

The Government of Indonesia has developed gender disaggregated data down to the village level. However, this has yet to be used properly in decision-making in all development sectors. Gender concerns has only started to inform development policies and programs, since awareness of policy makers on the importance of promoting gender equality has not been well developed. The government needs to enhance the capacity to manage gender-disaggregated database. The involvement of mass media and NGOs in mainstreaming gender into DRR will be very crucial.

### **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?:  
Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

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

Relevant agencies, institutions and offices at the district/city level have mostly possessed capacities to enforce risk reduction regulations. 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 human resources in disaster management.

### **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?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

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

The country has implemented a number of social protection measures or safety nets such as health insurance, social assistance for the poor and provision of rice at a discounted price, but the coverage of these programs has not known to be sufficient to reduce poverty. There needs to be a stronger political will in integrating human security and social equity approaches into DRR 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

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.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

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

BNPB and DRR stakeholders have initiated activities to collect local experiences and traditional knowledge that have developed in many hazard-prone areas of the country. These knowledge and experiences have helped build community's resilience to disaster. Efforts to integrate them into the local, sub-national and national DRR

plans and activities in a meaningful way, however, have not been done in a systematic manner. The government needs to enhance further such an initiative.

## **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)

Academicians and intellectuals in Indonesia have become more and more engaged in disaster risk reduction efforts. Currently the country has just had its national association of disaster experts. The association is committed on empowering local governments in DRR and building resilience.

## **Additional context specific drivers of Progress # 1**

### **Levels of Reliance**

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

### **Drivers of Progress**

A good post-disaster recovery strategy

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

Indonesia has developed a good post-disaster recovery strategy. In the aftermath of a disaster event, the government will conduct a post-disaster need assessment (PDNA). The results from this exercise will guide the formulation of the Local Action Plan for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. The action plan, in addition to containing rehabilitation and reconstruction programs, also contain programs for the livelihood recovery of the people and the recovery of the entire aspects of the disaster-affected communities. Recovery has also served as an opportunity to build back better and more risk sensitive, as around 5% of the recovery budget is usually allocated for DRR programs and activities.

# 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

In terms of the integration of DRR into development, Indonesia has achieved significant results. The regulatory framework for DRR and institutional arrangements for DM agencies have been enhanced down to the district/city level. Challenges, however, are still abound with the lack of synchronization between DM regulations and rules that regulate other sectors. Rules and policies that regulate investment and economic development often outweigh those regulating DRR. Disharmony in also exists between regulation and policies made at different levels of government. Shared perception of DRR and common understanding of the way to mainstream DRR into development have also not been achieved. 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 comprehensive. The existing government administration system still limits allocation for DRR.

---

### Future Outlook Statement

With the formulation of the new middle-term development plan 2015-2019 the Government of Indonesia will implement DRR programs that are relatively integrated into the sectors. It is expected that the local governments, particularly district/city governments will be also incorporated DRR and environmental concerns into local development plans. Risk assessments will be enhanced and implemented in more and more districts and cities. Better coordination will be established with the line ministries and agencies, and also with NGOs 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***

## Overall Challenges

Since the 4th AMCDRR in Incheon and reaffirmed in the 5th AMCDRR in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, the Government of Indonesia has always focused on building resilience at the village level. These efforts, however, was challenged by the number of villages in Indonesia that are situated in hazard-prone areas. With a total of more than 75,000 villages, out of which around 60% are situated in hazardous areas, while the resources and budget are limited, the country can only implement resilience programs in a limited number of villages. Another challenge is that the line ministries implement DRR-related activities on their own, with minimum coordination among each other. Hence, it will be difficult to assess the effectiveness of resilience building programs implemented by different government institutions all over the country.

---

## Future Outlook Statement

The newly elected government of President Joko Widodo has strongly maintained that they will focus the national development at the village level. Greater budget has been allocated to villages, and it is expected that DRR will become one of the priority programs.

## 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

Indonesia has integrated DRR approach into emergency preparedness, response and recovery programs. The challenge, however, lies in the lack of capacity and technical know-how of responsible agencies. Also, the capacity of the human resources needs to be enhanced particularly in incorporating risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programs.



## Future Outlook Statement

With the new national middle-term development plan 2015-2019, it is expected that systematic integration of DRR into emergency preparedness, response and recovery programs will be further enhanced. This certainly needs to be complemented with efforts to develop the capacity of BPBDs and their staff in planning and managing risk sensitive DRR programs. The presence of strong BPBDs will accelerate the systematic integration of DRR into all development programs. In future BNPB will need to provide strengthened technical and financial support to BPBDs to formulate contingency plans and engage in risk-sensitive post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction.

# Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
National Disaster Management Authority (BNPB)	Governments	Wisnu Widjaja, Lilik Kurniawan, Raditya Jati, Mohammad Amri, Novi Kumalasari, Firza Ghozalba, Pratomo Cahyonugroho, Sesa Wiguna, Arie Wulandari
United Nations Development Programme	UN & International Organizations	Valentinus Irawan, Siti Agustini, Arezka Hanantyo, Ridwan Yunus
Masyarakat Penanggulangan Bencana Indonesia	Networks & Others	Henni Vidiarina, Faisal Djalal, Djuni Pristiyanto
Bingkai Indonesia	Non-Governmental Organizations	Sofyan Eyanks
Disaster Resource Partnership	Networks & Others	Victor Rembeth
Planas PRB/National DRR Platform	Networks & Others	Miranti Husein, Syamsul Ardiansyah, Rini Trinirmalaningrum
Mercy Corps Indonesia	Non-Governmental Organizations	Ina Nisrina
Japan International Cooperation Agency	UN & International Organizations	Noviyanti Erfien, Ryo Sirait
USFS Indonesia project	UN & International Organizations	Regina Rahadi
United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	UN & International Organizations	Riana Nedyawati
Australia Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction	UN & International Organizations	Chasan Ascholani