A Strategic Study

In support of the CBDRM Platform's long term planning

Study undertaken for:

Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration/GoN

Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) Platform/IFRC Nepal

Study undertaken by:

Suresh Pandit

Disaster Risk Management Specialist

Email: panditsmr@gmail.com

June 2019

Kathmandu Nepal

CHAPTER I

Background

Nepal is one of the disaster prone countries in the South Asia with more than 80 percent of the total population at risk of various natural hazards such as floods, landslides, windstorms, hailstorms, fires, earthquakes and etc. Nepal's vulnerability to climate change and earthquakes ranks 4th and 11th respectively at global level (Maplecroft 2011, BCPR 2004 cited in MoHA 2015). The country is also among the 20 most disaster-prone countries in the world. An analysis of disaster data of Nepal for last 45 years indicates that incidences of disasters are growing every year with increased human casualties, economic losses, environmental degradation and significant adverse impact to the national GDP annually. The national disaster report (NDR) 2017 reveals a total number of 2,940 disaster events claimed 9,708 lives in 2015 and 2016 including the 2015 Earthquake with its human casualty 8,970.

Nepal has shifted from relief centric to broader and proactive disaster management regime remarkably. The current Constitution of Nepal entrusts disaster management responsibilities to the local governments which is further reinforced by the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act 2017 and Local Government Operation Act 2017. Recently developed National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2018 and its strategic action plan 2018-2030 also reflect a strong alignment with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) 2015-2030. Nepal has shown a strong commitment towards the implementation of the SFDRR, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and other regional and global frameworks for robust disaster risk management. To support the government in successful implementation of these policies and to translate these commitments into actual actions, many development and humanitarian partners have also been contributing to the broader spectrum of disaster risk management in Nepal. The NDR 2017 has also captured some of the investments made by UN agencies, donors, Red Cross movements and INGOs in the disaster risk management sector which itself is an important acknowledgment of those agencies working in this sector.

Among many international agencies contributing in the DRM sector, the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) is one agency working in Nepal from last many years with its strategic aims to save lives and help people prepare for and recover from disasters and crises. Support of the IFRC in different spheres of disaster risk management has contributed to the capacity building of government and humanitarian partners and help alleviate peoples' sufferings. The IFRC is a prominent humanitarian partner within the existing humanitarian architecture and coordination system which works together with Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and the Government of Nepal on the broader disaster risk management issues. It is also providing technical and facilitation support to Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) and reinforced the latter's capacity in the disaster response and management in Nepal.

Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium (NRRC)[1] was another important and successful initiative to raise concern among government and development agencies in undertaking coordinated risk reduction efforts in Nepal. Among its five Flagship areas, a few s particularly Flagship 4, community based disaster risk management (CBDRM), have been able to generate long term impact in the broader disaster risk management and resilience building. The IFRC successfully led the Flagship 4 under the tutelage of the NRRC enlarging its scope and connecting with many actors. After the NRRC's end in 2016, the IFRC has played a proactive role in developing and institutionalizing the Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) Platform, under the leadership of the Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MoFAGA) which has a larger scope to strengthen coordination, collaboration, partnership and advocacy on DRR in the new federal structure. The CBDRM Platform with IFRC's secretariat support has envisaged a specific goal to support the Government of Nepal contributing to enhance community resilience through effective coordination, facilitation of technical cooperation in the field of DRR and information sharing in support of the Government of Nepal.

The Government has enacted (including its first amendment) Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act at Federal level which is largely adapted by many local governments as well. However, its effective implementation relies on the level of localization and concerned stakeholders' capacity at the local level. Recently adopted National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Reduction National Strategic Action Plan (2018-2030), that are largely in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, have also envisaged coordination functions be placed at the local level. IFRC's initiative of facilitating the CBDRM Platform at the national level in support of DFID has been providing coordination support to many government and other actors on the community based disaster risk management issues. In the context of growing vulnerabilities and limited capacity of the concerned stakeholders at Province and Local levels, it will be relevant to review the scope of the CBDRM Platform and develop its long term vision in order to expand its activities to province and local levels in the changed political context.

Objectives of the study

Main objective of the short study is to provide a strategic guidance and recommendations for the CBDRM Platform to engage strategically in a longer-term with multi tiers government agencies. It will also guide and support to better strengthen coordination, collaboration, partnership and establish networking mechanisms at all levels. Findings of the survey will provide adequate insights for the long-term planning of the CBDRM Platform exploring its continued relevance to the changing institutional context of Nepal in line with the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act, related Policy and Strategic Action Plan.

---

[1] Formed in 2009

Methodology

Methodology of the study was simple that applied both primary and secondary information collected through the review of available literature/documents, consultation meetings, survey and key informants interview and etc as required and agreed by the IFRC.

- Literature/Desk review: The consultant reviewed all available secondary information required to conduct the study.
- Survey: A short survey questionnaire was designed and received inputs from 20 diverse respondent agencies;
- Key Informants Interview: The consultant also undertook key informant interview independently and gathered required information, their opinion and perception.
- Consultative meetings: IFRC has also supported in organizing consultation meetings with the IFRC team itself and the MOFAGA in order to drive the assessment effectively.
- Draft presentation and group exercise: After the study, preliminary draft was presented at a program jointly organized by MoFAGA and IFRC,and the report got finalized after incorporating valid comments and suggestions. After the presentation and query session, all participants went through a rigorous exercise to figure out challenges, recommendations and agencies' potential contributions in different elements of the Platform. The exercise outcomes sheet is also incorporated in the annex.

Limitations

- The review process relied heavily on the key informants and literature review in undertaking this assignment, however, few of the targeted KIs were still out of reach.
- Study design had envisaged inputs from a fair number of heterogeneous survey respondents for both quantitative and qualitative information, however, number of respondents providing inputs were quite low despite rigorous follow up efforts made by the consultant and the IFRC as well.
- The review process could not incorporate consultation with Province stakeholders and vulnerable local governments to assess their understanding and perspective. A consultation was made with the Mayor and Chief Administrative Officer of Tokha Municipality Kathmandu which cannot be generalized.

CHAPTER II

Introduction

Nepal has achieved significant progresses in the broader disaster risk management including adoption of the most awaited DRRM Act in 2074. The 2015 Earthquake response and recovery experience and reoccurring floods response experience have also contributed in achieving these progresses. Nepal's DRM history dates back to the early 80s with adoption of relief centric Natural Disaster Calamities Act which served till the new Act was adopted, however, the notion of broader disaster management was embraced with adoption of National Action Plan on Disaster Management in 1996 only. The National Action Plan was the first government's official document to acknowledge broader disaster management guided by the first World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and Yokohama Strategy, Japan (1994). However, the Action Plan could not increase momentum to internalize the notion of the disaster management. In the history of periodic plans, the Tenth plan (2002-2007) commenced internalization of the broader disaster management concerns with specific objectives, strategies, policies and programs which is also not successful to establish the disaster risk management system in Nepal. The subsequent three-Year Interim Plan (2007-2010) recognized disaster as an impediment to development gains and DRR is an integral to the development programs which has been followed by all other subsequent periodic plans till now.

In the legislative and policy context with regards DRRM and resilience in Nepal, the Constitution of Nepal 2015 plays crucial role as it has clearly stipulated the DRM is a shared responsibility of all governments. The Constitution has specified that the responsibility of disaster management falls under the jurisdiction of Federal, Provincial and Local governments. Local Government Operation Act, 2017 is another important law that has made the local government authorities responsible for the disaster management in their areas of responsibilities. It also entrusts the local governments responsibilities of formulating their own laws, regulations, levying taxes and raising funds and etc. The DRRM Act 2017 is the primary instrument to lead disaster response, risk reduction, preparedness and management interventions at all levels. Adoption of this Act has been understood as a paradigm shift from the relief centric approach to a broader disaster risk management and risk reduction in Nepal. Besides, the government also adopted Disaster Risk Reduction National Policy 2018 and Disaster Risk Reduction National Strategic Action Plan (2018-2030) in line with the SFDRR 2016-2030. Even prior to adoption of the DRRM Act, government formulated National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management (NSDRM) 2009 proactively with a vision of a disaster-resilient Nepal as called for in the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA), 2005-2015. However, the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Authority envisaged by the same Act is the executive authority to deal on the wholesome of the disaster management is yet to get established. Government of Nepal has also endorsed the National Disaster Response Framework (NDRF) in 2013 with a view "to guide more effective and coordinated national response in case of a large scale disaster."

Nepal also showed enthusiasm in internalizing and implementing commitments held at global and regional levels with regards to the disaster risk management and the resilience building. Efforts made by international agencies for the Governments' capacity building, technical support and

advocacy have also contributed to improve the legislative and policy context for DRRM and resilience in Nepal. UN humanitarian country team (HCT)'s continued support in coordination and capacity building and NRRC's initiative to enhance coordinated DRR have always been instrumental in the Nepal's DRM affair. In such a conducive policy environment and government's commitments, international partners have accelerated various programs under the broader disaster risk management at different government levels. In the federalism context, localizing the policies developed at various levels has been a challenge mainly due to capacity of the local governments and disaster governance in place at local levels. In the absence of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Authority at central level, multi-stakeholders coordination function with information exchange has been shadowed, however, MOFAGA and MOHA have been putting their efforts to enhance coordination. Other few formal and informal forums such as UNHCT, AIN TGDM, NPDRR, CBDRM Platform and so forth have also been contributing for coordination and information sharing on the DRM and resilience issues at national and sub national levels. Such coordination functions at Provincial and local levels can be instrumental to bring all concerned actors together for building governments capacity and establishing robust DRM system with involvement of broader stakeholders including private sector.

Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium(NRRC) initiative

The NRRC was initiated in May 2009 after the government approved National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management(NSDRM) 2009. Even though the country's political system and institutions were focused on recovery from a decade long conflict, a sudden breach of the Koshi embankment in 2008 brought the attention of government and development partners for disaster management and contributed in bringing the NSDRM as well. Hence the NRRC's priority was to implement certain priority aspects of the Government of Nepal's NSDRM establishing development and humanitarian nexus in coordination with government and development partners. The NRRC intended to help the government achieve the HFA goals by 2015. It was formed with the active participation of the MoHA, other relevant ministries, member agencies of the UN system, the World Bank, the ADB and the IFRC.

The NRRC had three over-arching objectives:

- To support the government to address key DRRM priorities described in the NSDRM.
- To establish a coordination platform to facilitate partnership between international agencies, government and civil society to implement DRR actions.
- To mobilize resources and technical assistance for DRRM in Nepal.

On the basis of Government priorities, patterns of risk and vulnerability in Nepal, NRRC established 5 flagship priorities led by key government Ministries and co-led by various international agencies:

- o Flagship 1: School and Hospital safety
- o Flagship 2: Emergency Preparedness and Response Capacity
- o Flagship 3: Flood Risk Management
- o Flagship 4: Integrated Community Based DRR/DRM

o Flagship 5: Policy and Institutional Support for DRM

The NRRC was governed by a Steering Committee which provided vision, strategic guidance and technical support for the implementation of the NSDRM. The Steering committee was co-chaired by the Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the UN Resident Coordinator. Its membership comprised representatives from the flagship lead ministries and their international coordination partner organizations. A small NRRC Secretariat was also established to provide technical and advisory support to the Steering Committee. It was also responsible for maintaining close coordination with and between coordination partners and flagships to help drive forward NRRC programme activities.

After successful implementation of the first phase, the NRRC was closed in 2016 consequently all flagships' functions were also ceased with an exception of #4 that evolved into the CBDRM Platform and continued function even in the changed context. However, NRRC review commissioned in 2013 had recommended the second phase extension from 2015 to 2020 based on its assessment of the consortium's overall effectiveness. Major political change in the country and priority shift to the earthquake recovery and reconstruction might have also contributed for the non-extension. The first phase of the NRRC implementation has generated many relevant knowledge and lessons which was synthesized by the NRRC evaluation held in 2018. The report has clearly stated that '.. the demise of the NRRC has left a gap in the coordination architecture..'. The report highlights some important aspects and learning such as lack of political will, failure to mobilize resources and coordination gaps with the flaws in the NRRC structure. It is also analyzed that high expectation raised among stakeholders largely remained unfulfilled that ultimately drained political will.

Establishment of CBDRM Platform

As highlighted in the preceding section, IFRC successfully facilitated the flagship 4 'Community Based Disaster Risk Management" under the NRRC tutelage and also initiated some sort of transformation of the flagship to the CBDRM Platform which is a unique and new collaboration after the end of flagships.

A National Steering Committee under the leadership of MoFAGA provides strategic guidance to the platform. IFRC provides secretariat support to the Platform. As the Secretariat, IFRC will provide administrative, logistics and programmatic coordination, collaboration and partnership as well as support to the MoFAGA, platform and its partners. An Advisory Committee with representatives from the IFRC, MoFAGA, MoHA, UN representatives and donors is also established to provide strategic direction.

The Platform conducts consultation meetings, dialogue bringing Government agencies, donors, and other agencies and professional groups engaged in the CBDRM. The meetings primarily focus to share information, review progresses, develop tools, identify common approaches and share success stories. The Platform also establishing a Web-Based Information Management System and also formed different thematic consultation groups.

Localization of DRR related laws/policies and local level capacity building have been the major concern of the CBDRM Platform. Besides, its national level coordination and policy dialogues have also raised concern on effective implementation of DRRM Act, DRRM Policy and DRRM Strategic Action Plan at province and local levels where the roles of local level DMCs are clearly defined. Among many responsibilities of local level listed in the Constitution as single rights and in the Local Government Operation Act, disaster management is an important responsibility.

CHAPTER III

Finding and Analysis

Relevancy of the CBDRM Platform

The CBDRM Platform, after receiving a legitimate endorsement from the MOFAGA and a broader partners, is no longer mere a legacy of the NRRC flagship 4. Rather it is a dynamic forum to coordinate many implementing agencies on the community DRR issues in order to support the MOFAGA in the changed context. Even though MOHA is the nodal Ministry to oversight overall disaster management affairs, Government's work division rules has assigned some tasks under the broader disaster management to many other Ministries and authorities including the MoFAGA. The MOFAGA has been entrusted some roles with regards to localization based on its institutional legacy and comparative advantage of coordinating role with province and local levels.

Coordinating role of the CBDRM platform is perceived important to help the Government localize policies, guidelines and monitoring progress collectively. Initiation of policy dialogue and sharing of learning, information and ideas at the federal level have been able to raise its importance among government and development actors. Disaster risk management sector is evolving itself which needs to tackle issues of climate change and other unpredicted disasters like windstorm in terai. Such forums play instrumental role to provide operation and policy inputs to the government, noted by a DRM specialist. Many respondents agree that amongst many other forums and networks like NPDRR and AIN TGDM, the CBDRM Platform is able to justify its relevancy and demonstrate dynamism in its function.

As the localization and local level coordination roles rest with the MoFAGA, government and other respondents have expressed that leadership role of the MoFAGA for this platform is quite justified. 60% respondents realize that this arrangement is highly appropriate and 40% respondents express as appropriate. Many respondents spoken to expressed that future leadership of the CBDRM platform has to shift to the forthcoming DRRM Authority once it is established for its sustainability. However, Government and other few agencies have expressed different opinion. Given the Platform's role to support the MoFAGA in localizing policies and programs and bringing community concerns to the policy level, the current arrangement will still be relevant even after the DRRM Authority establishes, however, coordination with the Authority will be important. The Platform's importance is considered high at the moment because the Constitution and other Laws have embraced the notion of disaster risk management and resilience which creates conducive policy environment for the actors working in this sector. Local governments' capacity constraints to deal with the disaster management at local level reflects as an area requiring coordinated support of humanitarian and development partners. Respondents have also mixed responses on whether the CBDRM Platform needs engagement in the broader development issues, disaster risk reduction and resilience building will have intrinsic relation with the development itself.

An issue of confusion over two networks[2] under two important ministries was also raised and few of them also suggested to merge these two Platforms for better synergy. The MoHA official clarified the confusion stating that both Platforms have different and specified roles and functions under the broader disaster management, however, the level of activeness may vary due to many factors. The CBDRM Platform's specific functions can complement to the NPDRR, therefore, these platforms coordinating to each other will be important.

Effectiveness and its operation

Many respondents spoken to have expressed that it is successful in coordinating many implementing agencies on issues related to the community based DRR and supporting to the MoFAGA for policy internalization. Its engagement with a wide range of actors including donors, academia, media and discourse on contemporary issues and information sharing were also commended. Expanding outreach activities to municipal level and initiating orientation and knowledge sharing to few municipalities is also good work considered, Municipalities officials acknowledged this positively.

General perception among the survey respondents was that the platform has significant contribution in developing and analyzing the 9 minimum characteristics of CBDRM, developing LDCRP guideline and facilitating MOFAGA for development of its CBDRR plan. It has also said contributed for the formulation of DRRM Policy and strategic Action plan adopted by the MOHA. The Platform has also collecting the information on who is doing what and sharing to the stakeholders which is also appreciated. Harmonizing and contextualizing tools and approaches and sharing and communication among the actors was also perceived as a visible outputs of the Platform.

Survey respondents aggregate opinion on the effectiveness of the platform's functioning in following areas are as follows;

     i. Facilitation: Good
     ii. Thematic dialogue consultation: Good
     iii. Policy engagement: Good
     iv. Harmonization of approaches and tools: Moderate
     v. Knowledge sharing: Good

Parameters: very weak, weak, moderate, good and very good

Their responses on its support to the government in the DRR and policy issue is moderate with 46% and high with 40% followed by nominal and significantly high with 7% each.

Though the Platform is perceived undertaking effective coordination and support in the community based DRR, many respondents raised concern over some tasks that could have been done even better. Knowledge management and sharing of information could be improved with stratification of information recipients establishing feedback mechanism. The Platform is federal centric with no community representation mechanism that needs to improve in its conduct. Engagement with

---

[2] National Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction and Community Based Disaster Risk Management Platform

private sector and coordination and collaboration with Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and other contemporary networks and forum was also perceived not adequate.

Expansion scope

The CBDRM Platform has a larger scope and requirement to expand to Province and Local levels with different mechanisms and governance structure relevant to local context. Vulnerability, capacity and appetite of concerned province and/or local level governments are important determinants. Most respondents spoken to have stated that coordination and information sharing functions of the Platform will be important to the local level for policy localization and harmonization, however, the expansion needs to be in a planned and systematic manner. Having a relatively long term vision and a robust plan with a broader collaboration at the central level would help to strengthen its own capacity to expand.

All respondents have the same opinion on the expansion requirement to the Province level, however, mixed reactions were received to the local level expansion. Few respondents spoken to and one third survey respondents have to say, such forum does not require at the local level as the disaster management committee has to accelerate the coordination function on the DRM affairs, however, their capacity needs to be enhanced in a coordinated way even without creating any structure at the local level.

Many respondents express requirement of such forum at all local levels. Many of them suggested to go down to the local level in a phase wise manner as rolling out to all levels may not be possible at a time and the establishment drive should follow the priority need. In contrary, few of them expressed quite ambitious thoughts to establish the Platform at all 760 units (7 province and 753 local) together just giving a framework bringing concerned government, development partners, private sector, red cross and etc in the forum. While applying this concept, coordination, consultation and technical support can be provided to the forum but leadership role should be taken by concerned Ministry at Province and Municipality/Gaupalika at local levels. The technical support should consist of programs/actors mapping, and developing an online information portal linking to the local governments' website which can provide significant support to the local government and other governments also for planning and policy development process.

Many respondents who have suggested to go down to local level, do not have enough ideas on its potential structure and the leadership at province level, however, all agreed that the leadership should be taken by the Government agencies. Many respondents also expressed that the Secretariat role for the smooth functioning of these forum needs to be arranged within the purview of concerned government responsibility. Few respondents have concerned the Platform needs to be functional bringing community concerns and making the community engaged irrespective of the mechanism it adopts. Many of them expressed that the Platform has to be led by the upcoming DDRM Authority whereas a number of respondents don't see feasible as latter is not the operational body and it will not have presence to local level as well. In the Province government structure, MoFAGA does not have its wing to provide leadership at the Province level Platform like it is overseeing at the national level. The Platform may have to seek leadership of either Chief Minister's Office or Legal and Internal Affairs Ministry which was also a concern of respondents.

The expanded scope was also highlighted to use the strength of NRCS at local level which can play an important role to continue the platform's coordination role. It also has to coordinate and advocate the notion of Grand Bargain to big donors at federal level to provide more means at the local and community level which also motivates community and local organizations for their long term engagement.

CHAPTER IV

Recommendations

The relevancy of the Platform is well acknowledged by most actors and its perceived scope is also gradually growing. In this context, the platform will have following three broad alternatives that provide solid foundation to develop its long term strategic engagement;

Alternative one: Slightly improving its status quo situation, the Platform has to continue its existing activities in a relatively planned, systematic and coordinated manner at the central level.

Alternative two: With the improved set up at the national level, the platform has to expand to a few Province and local levels. It can go in a phase wise way with devising robust action plan including defining roles of actors involved and setting attainable goals for a certain period.

Alternative three: In coordination with government and collaboration with other like-minded agencies, the platform has to go to all Province and local levels at a time with of course developing clear action plans and mechanism.

MoFAGA officials are also in a favor of the second alternative as it will be challenging to go massively to all local levels at a time due to resource constraints as well as assurance on its functionality in the long run. While selecting the province and local level institutions, adequate homework needs to be done to ensure well representation of socio, economic and demographic dimensions in each ecological region and Province. Considering its resources, capacity and comparative advantage, it would be wise decision to go with the scenario two and take maximum benefit of strength of NRCS chapters at local levels.

With regards to the mechanism and the leadership at Province and local levels, an inference drawn from the response is no one size fits all. As long as the leadership of the platform is Government agency at both levels like at the Federal level, the mechanism can also be the same as inclusive as possible to bring all the available actors. Office of the Chief Minister or Ministry of Legal and Internal Affairs can be relevant body to take its leadership, however, existing vulnerability, available capacity, activeness of development and humanitarian partners and civil society and the Province Government's set priority may contribute to determine the modality. A decision taken from the Province level itself after intensive consultations among concerned government and development/humanitarian partner agencies would provide adequate legitimacy and the ownership as well to take the Platform forward. The same approach can be applied at the local level under the leadership of Deputy Mayor or Environment and Disaster Management Committee which also would be wise to have participatory decision at the local level. At both levels, existence of Association of INGOs in Nepal (AIN) network and NRCS network will be instrumental for deciding on the potential facilitating role, however, the Secretariat needs to be within the office of its leadership.

Short-term Plan

- The visible outputs of the Platform even in the limited resource and capacity are largely acknowledge by many actors, however, there are enough rooms for the improvement. Trying

to cover each and every issue even within the gamut of broader disaster risk management and resilience makes the Platform thinly stretched which may results in diluting its vision and decreasing effectiveness. **The platform is recommended to revisit its areas of responsibility defining its primary and secondary engagement, develop action plan with follow up mechanism and expected end results.**

- Information management and knowledge sharing among government and partner agencies have been perceived as an add value of the Platform which, however, needs to get well documented, published and shared stratifying the recipients. Establishing such system will also be instrumental to offer its support to the forthcoming DRRM Authority to establish/operate Disaster Management Information System (DMIS) effectively. **The Platform is recommended to establish knowledge management system, continue information sharing effectively and initiate research and evidence generation on pertinent issues with the help of implementing partner agencies.**

- While going to a few selected Provinces and local levels, the Platform needs to have some basic information of those targeted units and internal strategy for the selection of units. **The Platform is recommended to undertake assessment and analysis of potential Province and local units and develop pilot plan with proper analysis of vulnerability and potential province/local governments' capacity, its own capacity, potential resources, collaboration opportunities and comparative advantage of the Platform.**

- The Steering Committee of the Platform has ensured representation from many key Ministries and authorities such as MOHA, MOUD, PMO, NPC, and MOFE which is important to link concerned Ministries. Meaningful engagement of these agencies would be important for the Platform to achieve coordination and policy engagement at strategic level. Private sector and academic institution also can play important role within the Platform. **The Platform is recommended to enhance meaningful engagement of the steering committee representatives from Government agencies, private sector and academic institutions. The Platform also needs to increase accountability among members defining their roles with resource sharing from government as well.**

Long term:

- Steering Committee has to have a long term plan to embed the Platform in the governance structure for its continuity, rather than operating as a project. A strategic link with the forthcoming DRRM Authority has also be explored where DMIS and resilience can be the entry point;
- Develop target area specific detailed plan with mechanism and strategically roll out the pilot program at selected Province and Local levels ensuring community engagement and establishing its linkage at the federal level.
- Develop website at local level that can help information feeding from community level to national and province level on program/agency mapping, program delivery and policy feedback.

- Considering growing urbanization and associated risks, the platform has to include urban disaster risk reduction (UDRR) in its priority and expand comparative advantage to facilitate thematic consultation on WASH, Education, Child Protection and etc.

Acronyms

AIN	Association of INGOs in Nepal
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
DFID	Department for International Development
DMIS	Disaster Management Information System
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoN	Government of Nepal
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HFA	Hyogo Framework of Action
IFRC	International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
INGOs	International Non-Governmental Organizations
KII	Key Informants Interview
MoFAGA	Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration
MOFE	Ministry of Forest and Environment
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MOUD	Ministry of Urban Development
NDR	National Disaster Report
NDRF	National Disaster Response Framework
NPC	National Planning Commission
NPDRR	National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction
NRCS	Nepal Red Cross Society
NRRC	Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium
NSDRM	National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management
PMO	Prime Minister's Office
SFDRR	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
TGDM	Thematic Group for Disaster Management
UDRR	Urban Disaster Risk Reduction
UN	United Nations
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene

References

- Constitution of Nepal 2015
- Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act 2017 with amendment in 2019
- Local Government Operation Act 2017
- National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2018
- Disaster risk reduction national strategic plan of action 2018-2030
- National Disaster Response Framework 2013
- Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium Review 2013,
- Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium Lessons Learning Review 2018
- CBDRM Platform Strategic Paper
- Nepal Disaster Report 2017
- Sendai Framework for DRR, 2015
- Paris Agreement on Climate Change, 2015
- Agenda for Humanity, 2016
- MoFAGA Plan of Action

List of persons consulted during KII

1. Mr Jaya Narayan Acharya, Joint Secretary, MOFAGA
2. Mr Bamshi Kumar Acharya, Under Secretary, MOHA
3. Mr Rishi Raj Acharya, Under Secretary, MOFAGA
4. Mr Prakash Adhikary, Mayor, Tokha Muicipality
5. Mr Pradip Paudel, Chief Administrative Officer, Tokha Municipality
6. Mr Man Bhadur Thapa, Representative for ADPC
7. Dr Shibesh Chandra Regmi, AIN Chairperson
8. Ms Sunita Kayastha, Emergency Specialist UNICEF
9. Mr. Ram Prasad Luetel, Emergency Coordinator FAO
10. Mr Prem Awasthi, Coordinator for UN RCO
11. Ms Louisa Medhurst, Humanitarian and Resilience Advisor, UN RCO
12. Mr Ram Thapaliya, Director for ICMA
13. Mr Sumit Dugar, Disaster Resilience Policy Officer for DFID
14. Mr Henary Donati, Disaster Resilience Manager for DFID
15. Ms Jessie Huard, Disaster Resilience Program Manager for BRC
16. Mr Tirtha Joshi, Country Manager for ARC
17. Dr Suman Karna, DRM Professional
18. Mr Anil Pokharel, DRM Professional
19. Mr Ram Chandra Neupane, Chairperson of Eco Nepal and Former Chair of DP Net,
20. Mr Jagdish Kharel, Image Chanel Television

GROUP WORK: Sharing of survey study of CBDRM Platform longer-term engagement-CBDRM Platform Partner's Consultative Meeting

June 14, 2019-MoFAGA

Group 1: Relevance/ National (Discussion Point: Alignment and linkages with other institutions and networks)

Key Successes	Key Challenges	Concrete Recommendations	What can you contribute?
- Managed to bring different relevant stakeholders at one platform - Successful in promoting useful dialogue & discussions around DRR & CC	- Follow-up activities - Relevant government partner's presence is weak - DRR & CC not coming together - Explicit roles	- Role of CBDRM in tools/guidelines/SOPs preparation, standardization, endorsement and implementation - One national platform led by MoFAGA can contribute including NPDRR (Prepared/response) - Enhance engagement with provincial and local governments (Interaction) - CBDRM Platform secretariat should also be led by MoFAGA.	- Help in following ways: • Technical inputs • Resource mobilization • Monitoring & Evaluation • Dialogue & Discussions • Expert advise

Group 2: Relevance/ Provincial and local (Discussion Point: Contributions to coordination at provincial and local levels)

Key Successes	Key Challenges	Concrete Recommendations	What can you contribute?
- Federal to local level linkage - Systematic linkage, communication & coordination between local level & civil society's working team - Sensitization of provincial & local level stakeholders - National to local level linkage easy	- Duplication in roles and responsibilities of government unit (MoHA and MoFAGA) - Dilemma in way forward - Capacity building enhancement of provincial level - Sensitization	- Well-designed roles and responsibilities of government institutions at provincial and local level - Province/local stakeholders capacity building, sensitization	- Technical support - Coordination - Communication - Sensitization

- Systematic linkage, coordination & communication among local level & CSOs working there (Systematic mechanism)	- Functional and regular challenge (platform regular sharing, continuity) - Altogether 760 units cannot be empowered - Private sector CSOs capacity enhancement - Defined roles and responsibilities of each government institutions - Functional and sustainable challenge		

Group 3: Effectiveness/day to day management (Discussion Points: Coordination, meetings, steering committees, working groups, etc.)

Key Successes	Key Challenges	Concrete Recommendations	What can you contribute?
- Information sharing among stakeholders through meeting and to know who is doing what/ where - Sharing of policy guidelines and other core documents - Ownership creation among stakeholders and adaptation	- Irregular platform meeting - Resource constraints - Lack of mechanism/unit to coordinate between local province and federal system (Sajha Adhikar Suchi)	- Regularization of meetings in terms of frequency - Logistics support in meetings should be on rotation basis (Annual planning needs to be done for resources) - Bridging role to coordinate among all level (Province/local & federal) - Private sector's participation in the platform - Involvement of local NGO	- Technical support - Coordination (Academia, private sector, CSOs - Sensitization and capacity enhancement - Communication - Linkage between surrounding units

Group 4: Effectiveness/Information management (Discussion Points: Website, mailing list, information bulletin, etc.)

Key Successes	Key Challenges	Concrete Recommendations	What can you contribute?
- Flood portal - Stakeholders mapping - Initiative for the website development of the platform	- Platform to accumulate and share information not visible/ non existing - Independently functioning portal and information management system	- Should be need based & addresses with consultation from concerned agencies at all relevant field - Also be responsible to contribute more and pro-actively to the information hub in one place to bring more diverse voices, learnings and experiences - The database and platform should be provisioned to be replicated in the local websites as well as the architecture at the national level - Learning from experiences in similar coordination platform (NRA-HRRP)	-

Group 5: Effectiveness/policy influence & tools standardization (Discussion Points: engage in policy development, efforts to standardize tools and approaches etc.)

Key Successes	Key Challenges	Concrete Recommendations	What can you contribute?
- Strengthened stakeholder's engagement - Linkage between partners and government institutions	- Status of platform & line agencies - Planning was focused on activities rather than strategic	- Leadership by existing government structures - Ideas generation & learning platform - Researches/gap analysis/knowledge generation - Strategic action for DRM	-

		- Local platform on DRR - Risk reduction/resilience building should be focused - Outcome of CBDRM Platform should be clear - Sharing platform - Support federal and province through platform - Support local level government through existing sectoral committees - Local development should be through community organization (such as TLOs)	

Group 6: Effectiveness/peer to peer learning (Discussion Points: Learning visits, lesson learning meetings, sharing of reviews and evaluations, etc)

Key Successes	Key Challenges	Concrete Recommendations	What can you contribute?
- Ownership - Standardization - Best Model - Improvement in learning - Knowledge based	- Project based - Continuity - Documentation/Achieving - Funding (Resources) - Identity/ Acceptance	- Partnership with Academia for evidence-based learning - Robust learning platform - Detailed and scientific study - Leadership development (Cohesive development) - Sustainability Planning	- Share best practices, research, learning findings