



# Nepal

---

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

**Name of focal point:** Mr Rameshwor Dangal  
**Organization:** Ministry of Home Affairs  
**Title/Position:** Joint Secretary  
**E-mail address:** dangalrr@hotmail.com  
**Telephone:** +977-9851140005

---

**Reporting period:** 2013-2015  
**Report Status:** Final  
**Last updated on:** 7 January 2015  
**Print date:** 23 April 2015  
**Reporting language:** English

---

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

# 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

#### DRM Integration Into Development Plans

By 2015, Nepal will further enhance the mechanisms and tools to support the mainstreaming of disaster risk management in development plans with an emphasis on implementation. Currently, the Government of Nepal has directed local authorities to allocate 5% of local budgets for DRR related activities. Over the past 4 years, Government and stakeholders have tested different approaches and tools to support mainstreaming efforts from local to national level. It is expected that a consolidated guideline and plan for mainstreaming DRR into development will be agreed in 2015. For CRM, Nepal will utilize the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) and the Local Adaptation Plan of Action (LAPA) to ensure CRM issues are incorporated into broader planning processes at the national, regional and local level.

#### Strengthened Policy & Institutional Framework:

The drafted Disaster Management Act will include mechanisms at the national, regional and local level to ensure risk reduction efforts are integrated within development processes. In lieu of this act, the MoHA has established a disaster management division that priorities and integrates risk reduction, preparedness and policy issues including mainstreaming DRR. In addition the NRRC Flagship Programmes works to ensure risk reduction efforts are aligned with national strategy and mainstreamed into development.

The process of approval of the Early Warning Strategic Action Plan has been initiated. This strategic action plan will be instrumental in developing the framework for installation, operation and maintenance of early warning system for major hazards throughout the country. Initiation of Early Warning System Network will be placed at the national level, under the leadership of Department of Hydrology and Meteorology. Basic Level Early Warning System has been established in the seven major river basins, two GLOFs, and two for landslide among additional efforts in other areas

## 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 Institutions at National Level

After the endorsement of the Disaster Management Bill, a National Council for Disaster Management chaired by the Prime Minister will be functional as an apex body. There is a high level Climate Change Council under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister already in place. In addition, the GoN will establish a dedicated institution at national level and a Disaster Management Committee at regional, district and local levels for enhanced coordination and for sustained effort on DRM. The establishment and institutionalization of an authentic and open DRM System, GIS based Disaster Information Management System will be initiated at the central level through SAHANA Software. Collected information through this system will inform decision making for risk reduction and preparedness. Additionally, information collected and available through DisInventar is made publicly available through multiple channels.

### Strengthened Capacity at Community Level

Through MoFALD and the NRRC, agreed minimum characteristics for community resilience have been developed and used to support standardized approaches at building community capacity for DRR. Through this, over 635 VDCs and municipalities (a quarter of the population) have been reached. At the municipal level, 58 municipalities are equipped with fire brigade with the support of the MoFALD while a crops and livestock insurance system has been established by MoAD. National and district level Land Use mapping has been completed. Likewise land use mapping of 254 Village Development Committees (VDC) has also been completed. As a pilot project, three VDCs each from three districts of Terai, are executing land use planning. Risk Sensitive Land Use Planning (RSLUP) will be expanded to cover the Kathmandu valley and other growing regional centers of the country. Capacity at local level for multi-hazard risk assessment and to implement risk reduction measures will be enhanced.

## 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 Capacity to Monitor and Respond

MoHA has established NEOC in Kathmandu and expansion of EOCs in all 5 regions, 42 districts and 5 EOCs in municipalities have been created. A resilient communication system has been placed through these EOCs. A tailor made Disaster Management Information System named SAHANA has already been developed, and it will be institutionalized both at centre and district levels. SOP for National and district EOCs have been finalized and simulation exercises have been conducted in

16 districts to test the SOP and coordination mechanisms.

In order to enhance emergency response, it is planned that a network of warehouses for assuring food security and sovereignty and will store food and non-food items. Nepal Red Cross Society has established 12 warehouses in strategic locations in Nepal with a capacity to support 36000 families. The existing warehouses of Nepal Food Corporation, Nepal Red Cross Society and Private Sector will be strengthened and further networks will be developed so as to have at least one seismically resilient warehouse for food and non-food items each in all of the 75 districts within next four years.

The Government of Nepal has identified and secured 83 safe open spaces for emergency response in Kathmandu Valley. These spaces will act as hubs for response efforts in a large scale emergency situation. Currently, efforts to prepare these sites along with the capacity of surrounding communities is ongoing.

#### Strengthened Mechanisms for Post-Disaster Recovery:

The primary response mechanism for the Government of Nepal is a nationally coordinated cluster approach, with 10 established clusters. Through this approach, Government and humanitarian partners coordinate response efforts. A key component within each cluster is early recovery planning where post disaster recovery issues are integrated into contingency planning. Strengthened information collection for recovery planning is required and ongoing.

# 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? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### 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	No
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	Yes
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	Yes

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

### 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.

## National Development Plan

At the national level, the Government of Nepal began incorporating risk reduction issues into development planning in the 10th five year plan and the subsequent 3 year planning frameworks. At the ministerial level, MoHA, MoFALD, MoAD, MoEST, Mol, DWIDP, MoHP and MoE have begun the process of integrating disaster risk reduction into ministry planning. While strengthening of these processes is required, these sector-specific planning processes are a positive step towards broader mainstreaming efforts.

In order to strengthen DRR monitoring and evaluation, the National Monitoring and Evaluations Guidelines 2013 began to incorporate disaster risk reduction with local infrastructure initiatives with 12 indicators. While review and strengthening of these indicators is required, this is a positive step in ensuring local infrastructure projects incorporate risk reduction.

## Climate Change Policy and Strategy

For CRM, the Government of Nepal has established a prime-ministerial level climate change council which advocates for the integration of climate change adaptation into development planning processes. This mechanism is supported by the National Climate Change policy and the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA). Based on NAPA, the Local Adaptation Plan of Action (LAPA) supports communities in integrating climate change adaptation into development processes. In addition, Environmental Friendly Local Governance Framework was developed in 2013 to support risk reduction initiatives at the household level.

## Poverty Reduction

Nepal's Local Self-Governance Act and Poverty Reduction Strategy incorporate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. This includes providing local government the authority to plan risk reduction initiatives within the respective communities. To support this, MoFALD has developed local disaster risk management planning guidelines. Capacity building to ensure LDRMPs are completed with resources allocated for implementation is needed. In addition to this, the Crops and Livestock Insurance Guidelines 2013 provide guidance on insurance schemes to strengthen crop and livestock resilience.

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.

While Nepal has made significant progress in prioritizing disaster risk reduction through the development on policy, strategies and plans, much work is still required. A major challenge faced is a lack of trained personnel and the allocation of resources (budget) for risk reduction efforts. In addition, the variety of planning processes in place for risk reduction, climate change adaptation and development present a challenge in ensuring integration. While recent efforts to harmonize existing DRM-

related planning processes at local levels are a positive step forward, on the whole, efforts at supporting mainstreaming have been disconnected from one organization, level or sector to the next.

A key issue in the integration of DRR/CCA into development planning is the lack of evidence to support the value added of integration; data collection and analysis from local to national level requires strengthening to support the case for mainstreaming. In lieu of this, DRR/CCA continue to act in isolation with some sector specific achievements made. It will be critical to strengthen capacity from local to national level and across sectors to promote the mainstreaming of these issues. This capacity building must look at the wide range of mainstreaming issues, from planning process, budget allocation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

#### Recommendations

- Appropriate policy and legal framework should be established for DRM/CRM in order to strengthen institutional and national commitment
- National nodal organization should be established for efficacious coordination among DRM/CRM stakeholders
- The National Platform for DRR network should be strengthened to ensure effective coordination and information sharing among stakeholders
- Capacity building and dedicated human resources, particularly at local levels, focused on DRR/CRM is required
- There is a need to strengthen the integration of disaster risk management into school curricula at all levels

## 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? 2

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

### Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

	<b>Risk reduction / prevention</b>	<b>Relief and reconstruction</b>
--	--	--------------------------------------

	(%)	(%)
<b>National budget</b>	NA	NA
<b>Decentralised / sub-national budget</b>	NA	NA
<b>USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)</b>	NA	

**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 allocation of resources for risk reduction in Nepal has been limited, though progress is being made. Primarily, the Government of Nepal has allocated resources for response and relief, as per the Natural Calamities Act 1982. Nepal has been directly/indirectly allocating, through its different departments, around 5% of the total capital expenditure of total annual budget in DRR sectors.

At the municipal level, funds have been made available for warehousing and fire brigades. In other sectors, resources have been allocated for the use of river trainings, embankment programs, conversation committees, flood forecasting and early warning, local DRM initiatives, soil conservation and erosion programs, poverty alleviation, health preparedness, human resources for response and relief.

Sector plans continue to incorporate disaster risk reduction; this has been recognized current and previous 3 year national development plan. In addition, the National Planning Commission has been developing disaster risk management and climate change adaptation inclusive development plans.

Additional budget allocations is difficult to track due to a lack of DRR coding that allows the Government or implementing partners to fully determine investments made in risk reduction.

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.

Budget allocation for DRR/CRM remains scattered among different programs and



projects without long term strategy in place. While endorsement of policy and plans has been strong, translation of this into budget allocation and implementation is lagging. For example, at the local level, while planning tools such as the LDRMP support communities in planning for DRM, budget allocation and implementation is limited. The Government of Nepal is beginning to address this issue by directing local authorities to allocate 2-5% of total revenue for DRR activities. However, there is a need to ensure local government is aware of this directive and has the capacity to act upon it. While the 10th three year plan prioritized DRR at the policy level, implementation and budget allocation did not begin until the 13th three year plan. This highlights the lag between policy and planning and resource allocation for implementation.

### Recommendations

Program performance and financial tracking mechanism should be developed and implemented to monitor DRM/CRM activities at all levels. This will require careful study to define effective performance and appropriate indicators for measurement.

Initiatives in target VDCs with regard to budget allocation have to be scaled up to the national level in accordance to guidelines issues by MoFALD. DRM/CRM and environment management criteria should be incorporated in order to allocate adequate resources and financial support to local organizations.

Disaster risk should be incorporated with the use of econometric models in order to facilitate better economic planning and decision making.

There is a need to ensure infrastructure development incorporate risk sensitive issues in order to protect investments from disaster.

There is a need for separate budget heading to ensure the funding allocation and expenditure pattern for DRR/CCA both at national and local level.

## Core indicator 3

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

### Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? No

<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 government</b>	No
<b>Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR</b>	NA

**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.

**Legislation and Local Government**

The Local Self Governance Act, 1998 has delegated the authority of resource mobilization to local government to address issues such as local infrastructure, development initiatives and risk reduction. In addition, resources mobilized at the local level are utilized for post-disaster response and relief efforts. Based on this authority, two key guidelines have been established to strengthen risk reduction and climate change adaptation planning – the LDRMP and LAPA. Through these plans, local disaster management committees have been formed to strengthen participation at the local level. These committees provide a forum for a wide range of stakeholders to participate and influence planning and resource allocation for risk reduction. Strengthening of these committees has been a continual process with agencies support capacity building, simulation and orientations for participants.

At the district level, DPRPs have been completed in 75 districts and get revision yearly before the monsoon. These plans outline key actions and responsibilities for district authorities in order to prepare for and respond to disaster.

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.

At the local level, the absence of locally elected representatives for over 15 years has hindered local planning processes, particularly the participation of local populations. In addition, the 12 year insurgency created a vain in infrastructure development and social participatory development frameworks. As a result, issues such as risk reduction and climate change adaptation have been overlooked, unplanned or have limited resource dedication.

Local level development initiatives continue to be scattered and sparse with a lack of overall alignment to national strategy or standard. Key requirements for strengthening local level ownership of risk reduction and climate change adaptation include capacity building, skill enhancement, awareness and supportive tools/mechanisms for planning and implementation.

While planning tools have supported authorities in identifying key actions for risk reduction, the allocation of resources for implementation is limited. In addition, overlap between planning process can hinder implementation and resource allocation.

## Recommendations

Development of policy instruments for an inclusive and sustainable development framework that incorporate risk reduction, climate change adaptation and gender inclusive.

Strengthened coherence between different planning processes from local to national level to maximize the allocation of resources. This includes ensuring risk reduction planning incorporates multi-hazard approach.

Increased training and orientation of local authorities on risk reduction, preparedness and response.

There is a need to strengthen the 'culture of safety' from community, village, district, region and national levels.

CBDRM should be emphasized and local resilience, response mechanisms should be tested, promoted, developed and replicated.

Development of decision making and assessment tools that is agreed by all stakeholders to assess hazards and risks for financial planning.

Establishment of local disaster management funds for DDCs, VDCs and communities to ensure adequate allocation of resources for risk reduction.

## Core indicator 4

*A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.*

### 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 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>	Around 100
<b>national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)</b>	NA
<b>sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)</b>	NA
<b>private sector (specify absolute number)</b>	NA
<b>science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)</b>	5
<b>women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)</b>	NA
<b>other (please specify)</b>	NA

**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>	Ministry of Home Affairs

**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 Platform**

The National DRR Platform in Nepal was established in 2009 and reactivated in 2012 as a loose network. The MoHA is the focal ministry for disaster risk management and chairs the DRR Platform with DPNet serving as a secretariat. In addition to the National Platform, MoHA has initiated a process to regularly organize DRR/CRM government focal point meetings. However, these initiatives remain within the central level with limited engagement from district or local stakeholders.

In addition, with the leadership of MoHA, Government of Nepal has formed Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium (NRRC) including international financial institutions, development partners and civil society together to work toward the priority DRR areas in the country according to the National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management in a coordinated manner.

Decisions under NRRC are made through high-level Steering Committee under the chairmanship of the Home Secretary and UN Resident Coordinator on a quarterly basis. 15 Ministries and agencies like, ADB, AusAID, ECHO, IFRC, Japanese Embassy, UNDP, UNOCHA, UKAid, USAid, World Bank, and DPNet (civil society representative) constitute the NRRC Steering Committee.

#### Coordination and Information Sharing Mechanisms

Additionally, various mechanisms (e.g. Cluster meeting, workshops, exercises, and lessons learnt workshop) are functioning and coordination mechanisms have been developed to share information among national and international actors. The NPC led mainstreaming mechanism of concerned ministries is functioning for effective coordination of DRR/M activities.

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.

While the national platform has been endorsed by all stakeholders, implementation efforts and engagement with local stakeholders remains limited. Translating decisions at the National Platform into key actions for target stakeholders has not been fully reached. In addition, many formal and informal institutions are disseminating information at the local level. Ensuring coherence in information sharing remains a challenge from central to grassroots levels.

#### Recommendations

- The National Platform's ToR should be continually reviewed and revised in order to meet the needs of DRM stakeholders and institutions in Nepal.
- The National Platform should meet at least twice a year to review progress, adopt national strategies and determine future outlook and targets.
- Regional, district and local level platforms should be developed to complement and support the National Platform.
- Strengthen the NPC led mainstreaming mechanism of concerned ministries.

# 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? 2

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

### 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? No

<b>Multi-hazard risk assessment</b>	No
<b>% of schools and hospitals assessed</b>	Insignificant
<b>schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)</b>	NA
<b>Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments</b>	No
<b>Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments</b>	No
<b>Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)</b>	No
<b>Common format for risk assessment</b>	No
<b>Risk assessment format customised by user</b>	No
<b>Is future/probable risk assessed?</b>	No

**Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.**

**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.

While multiple risk assessment processes have taken place these have been yet to conduct in a coordinated way. The NRRC Steering Committee has now approved a three-phase process for a nation-wide multi-hazard risk assessment in 2015. The first phase, stock-taking and preparation phase has already begun. The objective is to set baselines and to provide data for the Government to lead a debate on priorities, sequencing, policy and programme development.

A comprehensive earthquake risk assessment of Kathmandu valley was carried out in 2002 and process has been initiated to re-assess the earthquake risk in the changed built environment.

Other initiatives are

- School assessments for retrofitting; thus far, 265 schools in Kathmandu Valley have received assessments
- National Early Warning Strategic Action Plan which addresses the need and for risk assessments to inform early warning installation and operationalization
- Multi-hazard maps for Kathmandu Valley have been prepared with 5 municipalities completing an earthquake risk assessment.
- Participatory Vulnerability Risk Assessment (PVA) has been conducted with support from various agencies.
- The Nepal Hazard Risk Assessment has been completed with support from the World Bank
- Detailed hospital assessment process has assessed 60 hospitals in Nepal, with 10 hospitals receiving detailed structural plans in 2015.
- WASH cluster members conduct structural vulnerability assessments for deep boring and water resources sites.
- TU-Central Department of Environmental Science has provided over 100 research papers, including risk assessments.

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.

Adequate knowledge management and book keeping of research is lagging, resulting in limited information sharing on available assessments or assessment tools. In addition, the scattered nature of risk reduction work, particularly at the local level, has resulted in a lack of coordination on assessment methods. While Flagship 4 of the NRRC has strengthened standardized approaches to local level assessments, these need a close coordination across ministries and connection from local level assessment processes to national level. In addition, translating assessments into action has been challenge, particularly at the local level where risk assessments are

not internalized with local government to support decision making.

Ensuring a national risk assessment is both comprehensive and accepted by key stakeholders in also a challenge.

Recommendation

- Carry on with agreed 3 phase approach towards a nationwide multi-hazard risk assessment process.
- Multi-hazard risk sensitive land use maps for all 5 regional centres, district HQ and other disaster prone communities should be prepared to support planning
- Strengthen technical capacity of local authorities to conduct risk assessment and analysis
- Strengthen national disaster information management system and make database available to all stakeholders from local to national level.
- Strengthen national capacity to lead on knowledge management for disaster risk and impact related data (knowledge management including gap identification, gathering, processing, and disseminating for use).

## Core indicator 2

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

### Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### 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</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.

**Earthquake Monitoring**

Nepal has established 21 seismological stations, 3 broad band stations, 7 accelerometers and 29 permanent GPS stations. With these systems in place, earthquake of magnitude 4 and above are monitored with information displayed on the NEOCs public website and the National Seismological Centre webpage. In addition, the NSC webpage has a 'did you feel it' feature which allows the public to report possible earthquake events and engage with the NSC. While these monitoring stations are in place, communicating this information to the general public is limited.

**Flood Monitoring**

Real time information on temperature, sedimentation, rainfall, and water levels in rivers are displayed for 24 hours via hydrology.gov.np from more than 50 stations. The downstream communities are informed through mobile, radio, and television and government, non-government and community based organizations. Flood forecasting, GLOF information and disseminating information is also effectively employed in some river basins across the country.

**Reporting and Analysis**

Information Management System (IMS) has been established through SAHANA programme in NEOC at MoHA and the system will be networking with REOC in 5 Development Regions and DEOC in all the 75 districts. Most of the information and data regarding disaster and climate risk will be archived in the system. Ensuring this information reaches stakeholders and can inform decision making for risk reduction efforts is still required.

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.

While systems have been established for flood and earthquake monitoring, there is a need to strengthen capacity to operate these systems. It is also necessary to review and determine whether the special distribution of these stations is adequate to monitor potential disasters and transmit that information through appropriate channels for action. In addition, it is important to expand these systems to address other hazards such as fire and landslide hazards.

A key challenge currently faced is ensuring the information monitored and collected is transmitted to vulnerable communities for action. It is also important that communities have the tools and capacity to monitor and report disasters; for this, a rational and reliable data system at the community level is required.

The media, particularly local radio and print, can be an effective tool for collecting risk information and disseminating information to communities at risk. However, media involvement to disseminate real time information has been limited.

**Recommendations**

- Data collection and information dissemination systems should be standardized for stakeholders. This should incorporate local authorities, school teachers and media personnel for data collection and information dissemination. Strengthening the National Disaster Information Management system must be part of this.
- It is important to have a clear policy and strategy in place to strengthen collaboration with media partners in information collection, sharing and dissemination for vulnerable communities.
- Media engagement should be prioritized with technical and capacity building trainings provided to media personnel to cover and disseminate disaster related information.
- Indigenous knowledge systems related to DRM/CRM should be explored and reflected in data collection and sharing systems.

**Core indicator 3**

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

**Level of Progress achieved? 2**

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

**Key Questions and Means of Verification**

Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events? No

<b>Early warnings acted on effectively</b>	No
<b>Local level preparedness</b>	No
<b>Communication systems and protocols used and applied</b>	No

**Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination** 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.

While there has been important progress in the area of early warning in Nepal, institutionalization and nationwide strategy is still ongoing. Currently, the Government of Nepal has initiated an Early Warning Strategic Action Plan, under approval process. The Strategy and NSDRM are effective guiding documents for development and sustainability of effective early warning systems in Nepal.

The Government of Nepal has worked with various agencies in the development and implementation of various early warning systems for flood, landslide and GLOF. This process has required testing of systems to measure effectiveness and modernization and expansion of services for flood forecasting and early warning.

Community based early warning is a core characteristic for resilient communities, While limited in number, Nepal has successfully installed and tested community based early warning. This process has seen some successful outcomes whereby early warning systems are integrated with upstream and downstream communities. By utilized local technology and capacity, communities are better able to manage and utilize early warning systems.

Real time information on rainfall is available from over 25 hydrological stations for 24 hours. Likewise, there are 75 real time meteorological stations to provide weather information throughout the country. The real time information are available for 24 hours at hydrology.gov.np. The information are also disseminated to respective EOC, government line agencies (DDCs, CDOs, etc), concerned communities, and media through telephone and other means of communication when the levels (mainly the flood) reaches a dangerous level.

Similarly, earthquake alert system has been developed for the staffs of Department of Mines and Geology in Lainchaur, Kathmandu and Regional Seismological Centre in Surkhet.

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.

Currently, the focus for early warning establishment has been on major river basins with smaller rivers that pose risk are not integrated. In addition, early warning in Nepal has largely focused on flood with limited progress made with landslide, earthquake or GLOF. A key constraint in expanding early warning to consider other hazards is the lack of technical capacity and necessary information (risk mapping) to develop coherent and effective systems. Related to this is the collection, analysis and archiving of information.

Early warning processes also require strengthening, particularly in the coordination and communication protocols amongst government, national and local stakeholders and communities. Without institutionalization of these processes, sustainability of early warning is a challenge particularly in equipment maintenance and focal point commitment.

The absence of a national level mechanism to monitor hazard and risk, forecast and disseminate warning messages to communities at risk is another challenge in Nepal. The media has low awareness and minimal engagement with early warning.

#### Recommendations

- EWS should be institutionalized at all levels, enhancing reliability and integrating with appropriate government mechanisms. Institutionalization must include the integration with key stakeholders such as academia and communities.

- Multi-hazard maps should be prepared in national, regional and local level. Such maps should be revised and reviewed timely as per the disaster specifics. Dissemination of such maps should be performed in easily understandable language, preferably in local language if available.

- Indigenous knowledge has been proved effective in mitigating disaster risk. Therefore, documenting such practices, disseminating it to wider audiences and institutionalization of the knowledge in formal and informal education system and practice should be prioritized.

## 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? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### 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>	No
<b>Regional or sub-regional risk assessment</b>	No
<b>Regional or sub-regional early warning</b>	No
<b>Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing</b>	No
<b>Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks</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.

**Trans boundary Coordination**

Trans boundary coordination of risk reduction and preparedness has been institutionalized in the SAARC through the SDMC regional platform. Information and knowledge management is available on the regional website, however, prioritization of risk reduction and coordination of these issues at the regional level is limited. A total of 9 Road Maps on different themes, such as: Application of Science and Technology for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management; Coastal and Marine Risk Mitigation; Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction; Mainstreaming DRR in development; Community based Disaster Management; Earthquake Risk Management; Landslide Risk Management; Urban Risk Management and Drought Risk Management has been developed by SDMC to translate key issues of disasters into reality. This road map has clearly traced out the way of regional cooperation on DRM.

**Programmes Addressing Trans-boundary Risk**

A limited trans-boundary disaster management mechanism exists in the Koshi River and Gandak River where early warning information is disseminated to the stakeholders in Nepal and India regarding the flood level in the Koshi and Gandak River; thereby the concerned authority disseminates information to the local level.

There have also been initiations of Trans-boundary Flood Early Warning system in the Hind-Kush-Himalayan region. In addition to this, a Trans-boundary Flood Early Warning System in the Karnali River is functioning, where people-to-people network between Nepal and India has been initiated. The network also covers the line-agencies at the local 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 need for regional cooperation, which extends from real time data sharing to immediate response in the case of a major disaster has been recognized and underscored at regional forums. Some initiatives have taken place such as the issue of river training to reduce flood inundation in Nepal-India boundary, regional flood information system and humanitarian action in the aftermath of a disaster. A key constraint is the lack of trans-boundary operation and cooperation framework in case of disasters. As a result, coordination and planning for disaster across borders is limited to a project approach rather than a comprehensive cross-government strategy. A cooperation framework at the regional and bi-lateral level is necessary. This will not only facilitate efficient and effective planning of resources for immediate response, but also will lead to exchange information and experience in preparedness.

#### Recommendations

- Strengthen SAARC Disaster Management Centre (SDMC) to play central role in DRR and Emergency Response at regional level which will ultimately lead to effective use of SAARC DM center and forestry and meteorology centers for early warning, risk mitigation and emergency response.
- Implementation of road maps prepared by SDMC would be a milestone in regional cooperation and coordination for disaster risk reduction.
- Development of procedure and standards for Rapid Damage and Need Assessment survey by SDMC and use of that information to mobilize resources and response at regional level.
- Trans-boundary cooperation and collaboration in community to national level should be prioritized and assurance of easy mobility across the border should be ensured.
- Establish hotline contact with authorities at all levels (National, Regional and District levels) for immediate communication in case of major natural disasters requiring attention of the other side.
- Develop protocol to share flood and earthquake information across the border from early warning point of view.

# 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? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

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

#### Information Proactively Disseminated

In both pre and post disaster phases, the Government of Nepal and key stakeholders have been strengthening efforts disseminate information publicly through the SAHANA and DRR Portal. Working at the community level, a variety of stakeholders are actively involved in communicating with the public on risk reduction issues. In post-disaster situation, cluster members are responsible for information dissemination with the public. In line with this, the Health Emergency Operation Center has been established in the MoHP to provide health related information in an emergency situation.

MoHA, NRCS, DWIDP and other line agencies from government as well as non-government sectors collect information on casualties, property loss, displaced people, and economic loss and such information are disseminated through national media and even via press meet. MoHA publishes biannual disaster report incorporating disaster information and thematic articles on various disaster and policy related issues. Similarly, the DWIDP has been disseminating national level information on water induced disasters annually. NRCS also publishes regular situation report during the disaster to disseminate the information on casualties, property loss, displaced people, and associated economic loss. With the help of UNDP, historical information on disaster occurrences known as “DisInventar” has been established with disaster information of 1971-2007 and is regularly updated as well. This portal has become one of the reliable resources for disaster information.

The N/R/D/MEOCs can play a pivotal role in collecting, collating, analyzing and disseminating information regularly from its network for coordination of emergency response.

#### Established Mechanisms for Access

There have been a number mechanisms have been established to collect and share information with the public and stakeholders. This includes:

- Disaster portal page
- Common Messages Platform ([www.beprepared.nrrc.org.np](http://www.beprepared.nrrc.org.np))
- Regular TV and radio programmes
- IEC materials
- Social Media
- Disaster Risk Knowledge Management Centre in TU Central Library

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.

While information dissemination has been proactive and access to information has been established, there is a need to strengthen both what and how to communicate information to the public and key stakeholders. The disaster risk reduction portal should be strengthened and regularly updated. To date, although “DisInventar” can be used effectively to collect, analyze and disseminate disaster information, the data collection mechanism has not been formalized within government or partner organizations. Similarly, there is no established mechanism to share such available information. Likewise, in many instances, the available information is not utilized for new programs/activities design and implementation. In order to utilize the information for DRR initiatives at local level, institutional mechanisms at district and village level need to be strengthened through disaster plans.

#### Recommendations

- NEOC, DEOCs, and municipal EOCs should be strengthened in terms of



- infrastructures and capacity for analyzing and disseminating disaster information.
- Regular update and disseminate DisInventar database at all levels.
- Integrate disaster information system from NRCS, Nepal Army, Nepal Police, Armed Police Force and other agencies with the NEOC.
- Develop a system of allocating certain fund for regular updating and disseminating disaster and risk information.

## 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? No

<b>primary school curriculum</b>	Yes
<b>secondary school curriculum</b>	Yes
<b>university curriculum</b>	Yes
<b>professional DRR education programmes</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.

Government of Nepal has been gradually incorporating DRM related contents in school, university and other training curricula. Some key achievements in this include:

- DRR curriculum review and content identification up to Secondary Level with DRR reference material prepared and teacher orientation package developed and used for 2526 teachers already.
- Development of Disaster Management courses at the university level as well as

incorporation into university programs such as engineering, geology and glaciology.

- Incorporation of disaster management into the Local Development Training Academy, Staff College, Nepal Army and Nepal Police courses.
- Armed Police Force has been running basic to advance disaster management trainings to the cadres at training center located in Kurintar.
- School disaster preparedness program is being implemented in some schools while school disaster library and school disaster committee have been established as well.
- School level disaster preparedness plans specific to WASH have been prepared and people have been provided with DRR/WASH training.

While these have been positive steps in promoting disaster risk reduction in the school environment, there remains limited progress in ensuring country-wide and school wide (public and private) commitment.

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.

Promoting school safety must be considered as an investment for the future while also acting as a gateway to promoting safety in the household and community. Schools are facing a shortage of resources and a lack of qualified teachers while the school buildings themselves are vulnerable to different hazards.

In order to achieve effective disaster management in school education, teachers need substantial orientation, training and hands-on experience which can be materialized through regular drills.

All the government officers need to go through basic DRM trainings which are designed for fresh officers to senior executives and offered by Nepal Administrative Staff College. The trainings can be effective forum as an entry point for government officials to develop their understanding about DRR. However, the opportunity has not been effectively used so far.

Another challenge in DRR education is inadequate linkages between formal and non-formal education sectors and with private institutions.

#### Recommendations

- Review the Higher Secondary Level curricula to carry out with inclusion of appropriate and local context related DRM/CRM content in a systematic way.
- In close collaboration with the MoE/DoE, train teachers both at school and college

levels in the field DRR.

- Appropriate incentives should be given to those schools that have developed DRR/CCA plans, including its implementation and regular drills.
- Design and organize exposure trips, modular training and internship for concerned government officials in neighboring countries where school and college curricula offers DRR and learn from them.
- Along with DRR education, carry out regular drills and simulation in schools involving teachers, administrators, member of school management committee and students at least once a year in each of the schools.
- Strengthen engagement and commitment with private education institutions for school safety.
- Enhance capacity of LDTA and Staff College.

### Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

#### Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? No

<b>Research programmes and projects</b>	No
<b>Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions</b>	No
<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.

Some research regarding DRR and Climate change has been conducted at the institutional, individual, and agency level but these efforts are often sporadic. In addition the lack of a proper knowledge management system limits the potential impact of research on decision making.

Economic, financial and cost/benefit analyses have not been implemented for decision making and there are no tools developed for decision making activities to promote sustainability. To address this, NASA has completed a scoping mission and has discussed with MoHA on the need for a risk assessment including a cost/benefit analysis. MoHA and UNDP have completed a study on Economic and Financial Decision Making in DRM augmenting the need of strategic approach to mainstream DRM into development in Nepal.

Risk assessment methodologies available across the world have been used for couple of hazards in limited geographical areas. Study on cost/benefit analysis of DRM in Kailali has been done and impact of Cash for Work as a crisis mitigation measure in Kailali, Dadeldhura and Baitadi districts have been evaluated as a pilot case. There is a need to review these approaches and identify opportunities for scale up.

Some GIS based mapping of local water sources in open space in TU and NARC including 7 wards of Kirtipur and 7 wards of Lalitpur Municipality and GIS based mapping of WASH vendors in Kathmandu have been developed.

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.

There is a limited research on DRM in Nepal, which are sporadic and seldom originate from individual interest. In addition to this, data management is limited so the impact of the research is lagging, particularly in engaging and becoming institutionalized within government and implementing organizations. In order to scale up implementation oriented research, multi-stakeholder forums such as the National Platform can be effective forums. The Platform needs to ensure active participation of academic institutions as one of the major stakeholders. The institutional dialogue can also be strengthened by providing graduate level courses in DRR. There is a need for an effective knowledge management system to disseminate academic research to the practitioners and community people.

There has been relatively little macro-economic and financial analysis of the impact of disasters in Nepal, which is one of the hindrances for cost-benefit analysis for investment in DRR. Central government has yet to internalize the importance of local level planning and implementation of DRR.

## Recommendations

- Academic institutions should be considered as the key stakeholders in the National Platform and ensure that there is effective discussion on research and their implementation in DRR policy
- Incorporate DRM as one of the core or elective subjects in related ongoing graduate/undergraduate programs of different universities.
- Promote academic research and allocate required budgets for research work in collaboration with academic institutions at national and global level.
- GoN should develop tools for financial analysis of large projects in order to carry out Disaster Impact Assessment. Such tools should also facilitate decision making by accounting for the contribution made by such projects in building resilience of communities.

## Core indicator 4

*Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.*

### Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

<b>Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.</b>	Yes
<b>Training of local government</b>	Yes
<b>Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)</b>	No
<b>Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)</b>	No
<b>Guidance for risk reduction</b>	No
<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.

Each year, a number of public level events which contribute significantly to raising awareness of the public, politicians and policy makers are organized. Earthquake Safety Day is observed to commemorate the 1934 earthquake and it has now been expanded to many districts. International Natural Disaster Reduction Day is also being observed each year at the national level.

National, local, and community radios and television cover wide areas to circulate general information about disaster risk reduction, early warning and specific emergency incidents. In addition, print media are also engaged to disseminate information, specific incidents and preparedness and awareness on disaster management.

Media, civil society members, professional society, geologists, and engineers are regularly disseminating their knowledge, experience and voices through media contributing in awareness building, capacity building and resilience development.

Beyond these, GoN has been orienting significant number of people across the country with regard to DRR/WASH programs and preparedness initiatives.

Other activities carried out by different organizations include:

- WASH awareness campaign and counseling program at community level
- Campaigns for food security, biodiversity conservation and climate change adaptation from various agencies
- Community radios, different IEC materials and observation of days in collaboration with other stakeholders including Government agencies
- Community participation in programs like people's embankment program, food for work program etc.
- Awareness dissemination through women's group, mother's group, user's community, children's club, senior citizen's club, etc.
- Organizing workshops/meetings to prepare communities to respond to disasters (district and sub-district level)
- Public awareness activities being implemented by several government and non government agencies at different levels
- Collaborative activities on awareness raising at local and national levels
- Development of documentary video for IDDR (2011-2014) day on children, adolescents, disabilities and elderly under the leadership of GoN.

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 awareness campaign has gained momentum recently after a few fateful events in the new millennium: the 2004 tsunami in Indian Ocean, 2001 earthquake in Gujarat India, 2005 earthquake in Pakistan, 2008 earthquake in China and 2010 earthquake in Haiti. In addition, Koshi Flood in 2008 and this year's Jure landslide disaster in Sindhupalchowk along with flood and landslide disasters in western Nepal has significantly drawn the attention of law makers, policy and decision makers and community people. These incidents have significantly raise the concern of general people. The issues of disaster management have been widely discussed and drawn the attention of government to bring the Disaster Management Act without delay. A DRR toolkit has also been developed with focus to sensitize policy makers and parliamentarians.

While awareness efforts have been strong, there is still a need to reach the most vulnerable communities with key DRR messaging. In addition, there is limited efforts in measuring the coverage and impact of communications work.

#### Recommendation

- All schools throughout the country must have at least one disaster drill each year. Schools can play vital role in developing a sustainable mechanism for sustainability of DRR initiatives and it should be a part of formal and non-formal education.
- Strengthen common communications tools for assessing awareness levels and measuring the impact of communications work. This should also look at innovative and traditional forms of communications and how to best reach vulnerable groups.
- Training and capacity building of local authority on the issue of DRR should be an integral part of any disaster preparedness plan.

# 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? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

The frequency and severity of geological, hydro-meteorological and climate change events is densely concentrated in Nepal, beyond this, epidemic outbreak is frequent in every monsoon. Climate change has adversely affected the rural settlements in terms of productivity, food security and livelihood issues; however exact delineation of climate change impacts hasn't been figured out yet. Natural as well as anthropogenic forces which are triggering climate change and disasters are not



demarcated in planning and efforts towards addressing such issues are inadequate. Nepal has committed its efforts towards climate change adaptation in global and regional platforms.

Initiatives such as the construction of electric fences, embankment improvements, machans (small local bridge/tent), culverts, drainage, dikes, embankments, bridges, shelters, public water supply taps, irrigation facilities and toilets in the communities from five districts covering over 47,000 people has created a better living environment along with reduced underlying risks on flood, drought, wildlife intrusion, water induced epidemics and health related hazards including the impacts of climate change.

A similar integrated approach of environmental management, DRM/CRM for improving livelihoods of people will be instrumental in making a significant difference in livelihood of vulnerable people.

The National Planning Commission has addressed DRM/CRM in approach paper and indicators related to DRM/CRM are also incorporated in monitoring and evaluation tools, thus mainstreaming of DRM/CRM has been now more reflected in planning and execution. In addition, 37 government officials/planners from different ministries received orientations, with support from UNICEF, on environmentally friendly local governance, disaster risk management and climate change.

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.

Nowadays, DRM/CRM initiatives have been more felt in line agencies and the concept of formulation of separate authority for CRM, DRM and EM. The MoEST is the focal ministry for climate change and Environmental management, and for DRM, MoHA is the focal agency. Clear distinction and allocation of strategies couldn't be found till date rather stockpiling has generated series of misconception and diversified efforts.

GoN has repeated its commitment in global as well as regional platforms regarding DRM/CRM; however implementation has not been satisfactory till date.

Challenges could be seen particularly in:

- Translating policies into practices properly
- Community-based projects have limitations in terms of technical quality, resource availability, operations and maintenance and even the good practices are not scaled up
- Database is inconsistent and prohibitive.
- Limited resources are incorporating wider areas and issues Unavailability of resources, resource management and maintenance
- Due to financial constraints, the marginalized and needy people are often being outliers

## Recommendation

- A concrete and integrated framework for addressing environmental management, climate change and DRR issues should be developed.
- A platform for cross-fertilizing the views and ideas of experts in environmental management, climate change and disaster risk reduction should be established. Environmental management, climate change and DRR should be reflected in development plans and policies and such plans are to be subjected for implementation in grass roots levels so as to assure livelihoods of the people.
- Research centers in national and institutional levels should be established to develop compliant, reliable and integrated technology to be employed for environmental management, climate change and DRR.
- DRM/CRM and environmental should be mainstreamed into sustainable development planning.

## 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? No

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

Social institutions like Dharma Bhakari, Guthi, etc. are functional in Nepal as the safety nets facilitating livelihoods issues and promoting DRR, climate change and environmental management. Micro-financing is practiced in community level through cooperatives, cultural organizations and Grameen banks. Micro-financing is till date working as indirect DRR measure, though it has not been mainstreamed in national policies and planning.

Government of Nepal with collaboration of I/NGOs is imparting training on agriculture and distributing seeds to flood affected communities.

There is no safety net for loss of lives, loss of products and loss of livelihoods support system. GoN with some UN Agencies has been providing food rations to villagers who participate in work and training programs where they build infrastructure that links them to markets. Women and young children are provided with nutritional support, WASH support through monthly take home rations.

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.

Prevalent system of micro-financing, cultural institutions and cooperatives structures are significant to develop safety nets in local level for reducing vulnerabilities of communities at risk. Incorporation of environmental management, climate change adaptation and DRR issues into existing systems can also enhance the effectiveness and ensure their long-term sustainability.

Around 70% of people reside in rural setups in Nepal; beyond this urban population concentration has been increased substantially in recent decades at the rate of 6% in comparison to national population growth rate of 1.8%. Urban centers are nowadays growing without considering building codes and risk is being accumulated due to haphazard construction, lack of safety nets, and subsistence type of occupational activities in informal sectors.

#### Recommendations

- There is need of a pilot project, micro-financing and micro-insurance system focusing in low income groups in urban centers.
- Innovative financial instruments are necessary for addressing environmental management and DRM/CRM.
- Promote private sector and community based organizations to play their vital role in DRM/CRM and environmental management with regard to financial instruments (micro-financing, micro-credit, micro-insurance, etc.)
- Development of financial risk sharing mechanism and risk transfer mechanism particularly insurance and reinsurance against disaster and climate change risk is necessary.

## 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>	NA
<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.

DRM/CRM mainstreaming have been well accounted in development plans. Sectoral plans and policies like, National Shelter Policy (1996), National Agricultural Policy (2004), National Urban Policy (2006), National Land Use Policy (2012), etc. have incorporated DRM/CRM issues; however implementation of all these policies is not satisfactory.

Budgetary allocation in vulnerability reduction based infrastructure development is not prioritized; as public amenities don't comply seismic safety and most of such buildings are in dire need of strengthening. Newer constructions have accounted seismic safety measures, though due to lack of monitoring, seismic risk is not substantially reduced.

Ministry of Physical Infrastructure and Construction has implemented Earthquake Risk Reduction and Recovery Project (ERRRP) project which has initiated pilot

projects of retrofitting public infrastructure in five regions.

Structural and non-structural assessment of hospital buildings in Nepal have been provided with guidelines as per the building codes and structural retrofitting has been done in Patan Hospital and Bheri Zonal Hospital till now. Under safe school policy, 165 school buildings have been already retrofitted and the process is still continued.

Additional good practices implemented successfully by different agencies are listed below:

- Exploration and promotion of initiatives to generate economic sources such as allocating certain percentage of revenue from community forest goes to DDRC fund in Udaypur district and fistful of rice campaign, and emergency relief fund are established in communities.
- Policies and guidelines projects have been developed and implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities. Micro-insurance schemes are integrated with micro-financing and micro-credits and also in cooperative systems as well in some communities like in case of agricultural production: agricultural disease management work in 7 districts.
- Livelihood capacities of communities have been strengthened in 5 VDCs in 2 districts.

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.

Most of the schools across the nation are in urgent need of retrofitting and efforts are not adequate till date. GoN and UNDP are collaborating in retrofitting of public school buildings though private schools are to be framed under this scheme as well.

In-depth studies of school buildings in terms of multiple hazard occurrences and building vulnerability should be associated in policies. The Nepal Living Standard Survey 1996 and 2003/4 identified economically vulnerable segments of society; however linkages between economic vulnerability and disasters have not been established till now.

Local level safety nets, local revenue allocation would somehow enhance the resilience and capacity of local people. Grass-root level micro-financing and micro-insurance should be assured for all people under disaster and climate change threat.

#### Recommendations

- Develop, strengthen and multiply cooperative organizations which can support investment, insurance and deposit for small scale farmers and business persons in local level so as to promote CBDRM/CBCRM.
- Enhance local resilience in terms of financial and technical capacity against disasters and climate change impacts.

- Use vernacular technologies for appropriation of traditional coping mechanism against disasters and climate change impacts.

### Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

#### 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 technology</b>	Yes
<b>Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities</b>	No
<b>Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development</b>	No
<b>Regulated provision of land titling</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.

As the very first attempt to delineate the seismic risk, Kathmandu valley was studied by MoHA/JICA in 2002, depicting a severe loss of life and property during future earthquakes disseminating a dysfunctional capital if a great earthquake occurs. The Nepal National Building Code was developed in 1994 and adopted after 2004. For the first time, Lalitpur Sub-Metropolitan City endorsed building code in 2007 and till now more than 20 municipalities have declared the implementation of building codes and

other 24 municipalities are underway.

Local municipalities and DUDBC have initiated the process of training masons for safer construction practices, until now 4300 masons have been trained and such trainings are now being conducted within and outside Kathmandu valley.

The National Shelter Policy 1996 and National Urban Policy 2007 have incorporated DRR to some extent beside this land use planning is incorporated in every periodic development plan, though implementation and monitoring is inadequate.

RSLUP for KMC is reviewed, endorsed and under implementation.

E-building permit system to promote building code enforcement piloted in Kathmandu and Lalitpur municipality.

DUDBC currently takes a lead through Technical Support Group on Safer Urban Building Construction in bringing various government and non-government stakeholders together. In Nepal, more than 19 organizations are involved in promoting safer building construction at municipality and VDC level, as well as from the perspective of school and hospital building safety.

Landslide zonation maps have been prepared for 10 areas, urban risk assessment has covered 5 municipalities, multiple hazard maps have been prepared for 4 municipalities and 30 municipalities are underway.

In order to meet the MDG of Education for All by 2015, Nepal needs to construct 10,000 class rooms every year following building standards.

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.

Most of the countryside buildings are non-engineered, unreinforced masonry structures and urban setups are not even incorporating engineered construction. However, only engineered construction would be inadequate, this paradigm should be switched towards earthquake resistant construction complied with building codes.

Sufficient numbers of engineers having knowledge regarding earthquake resistant construction are not trained yet, though there are periodic code compliant design workshops and trainings from UNDP and other agencies. Still the hiatus has been observed between the trained manpower and implementing their knowledge. The first step must be started with awareness regarding earthquake resistant construction and training the construction manpower.

#### Recommendation

- Training to masons, contractors, designers, engineers and owners for awareness and capacity building towards earthquake resistant construction particularly

- concentrated in urban setups and vulnerable areas.
- School Disaster Risk Reduction Initiatives are to be hinged with awareness and capacity building of local communities, technical manpower and masons.
- Newly constructed buildings, hospitals and public infrastructure should be building codes compliant and seismic safety regulations. For rural areas, mandatory rules of thumbs if developed would be significant in ensuring resilience of public buildings.
- Develop retrofiting strategy for public facilities, schools and hospitals with tools for prioritization
- Develop retrofiting guideline at national level and strengthen capacity of local authorities of Kathmandu valley and of 4 other regional centers (out of 5 including Kathmandu) for implementation of Building Code and Retrofitting for existing buildings.
- During past events, many indigenous construction features have contributed best in lowering damage, so such features should be explored and promoted in local level.

### Core indicator 5

*Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes*

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

#### Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? No

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

The 1934 Bihar-Nepal earthquake, 1988 Udaypur earthquake, 1993 Central Nepal flood, 2008 Koshi flood, 2009 Jajarkot cholera outbreak, 2014 Jure landslide in central Nepal and Mid-Western flood, etc are some most talked and severe disaster impacts in Nepal. Previously due to lack of experience in post disaster response, recovery and rehabilitation the disaster impacts were devastating; however recently such concerns and aspects are more introduced and accounted. Realization of the gap between pre-disaster initiatives and post-disaster frameworks, GoN has formulated identifying five different flagship programs for immediate intervention for DRM and flood management in the Koshi river basin under the prioritized flagship programmes.

The NAPA and LAPA have been significantly introduced in Nepal as gender equality perspectives and even implemented during Koshi Flood as well. However, there are some challenges on effective implementation of NAPA and LAPA has not been developed for all the communities considering woman's participation and equality. The Armed insurgency period in Nepal, which lasted for 10 years resulted in loss of lives and damage of infrastructures, GoN allocated about 5% of annual budget in the fiscal year 2009/10 for relief, reconstruction and rehabilitation only.

Disability and Vulnerability Focal Points (DVFP) being set up as a one point-focal point linking the vulnerable groups (persons with injuries, disability, older people, children) with relief, protection and mainstream service providers to assist during post disaster response mechanism.

There was a two year PRER (Protracted Relief and Early Recovery Project) focusing on Education and Nutrition in Koshi affected VDCs. The project has supported nearly 5,420 children, in terms of nutrition. Shelters and improved livelihood capacities have been implemented at the community level, which integrate into post 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.

Being the Chairman of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) Nepal has been raising voices for climate change adaptation though efforts are inadequate till now. Financial and resources constraints are overwhelming the capacity of authorities. After the end of emergency, attention of frontline media will be over and disaster affected people who are left to live on their own. The lack of attention to this issue increased vulnerability of local communities.

The lack of an institutional arrangement at central and local levels for integrated DRR

has led to inefficient use of resources invested in recovery and rehabilitation. The decisions are made on ad-hoc bases and often hampers the smooth recovery.

Recommendation

- Community participation in planning to implementation in response, recovery and rehabilitation is necessary in order to ensure effective investment in disaster resilient recovery efforts.
- Establishment of separate technical section for post disaster response, recovery and rehabilitation.
- Enforcement of earthquake resistant construction standards for new construction incorporating DIA in large projects and following the hazard maps for minor construction might enhance resilience.
- Prepare system and mechanism for incorporating DRM into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation (Build Back Better).
- Provision of system for using opportunities during the recovery phase to develop capacities that enhance disaster risk reduction in long run, incorporating sharing of expertise, knowledge, lessons learned, and good practices.

### Core indicator 6

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

#### Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

#### 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.

EIA and IEE are now-a-days mandatory processes for every project, disaster impact assessments are not yet made mandatory in Nepal. However, recently attention towards DIA is felt more as well.

Seismic risk is severe across Nepal but construction practices and existing structures are enhancing vulnerability in larger extent in Kathmandu valley alone. Public buildings are nowadays accompanied with seismic vulnerability assessment though residential buildings are not that much incorporated. Individual studies, agency based researches have incorporated but such studies are not concrete and disseminated for all. Many other municipalities are incorporated in seismic risk study, and Kulekhani reservoir and other river systems are studied in relation to sedimentation and flooding. Though such studies are not disseminated and incorporated in policies and planning.

In the recent years, majority of the hydropower projects has incorporated anti-seismic design by adopting building code.

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.

Government, non-government sector, civil society members, activists are all pronouncing DRM/CRM in planning, policies and development activities as well so DIA has been felt more while it hasn't been incorporated with EIA/IEE. Substantial amendments and revision in NDRA should be highlighted for assuring DIA to development activities to minor constructions as well. The capacity is confined in some local and central levels as there is lack of tools for impact assessment of contribution of a particular project to the resiliency of communities.

### Recommendations

- Disaster resiliency contribution should be one of the factors for prioritization of projects as it will be instrumental in enhancing resiliency to nations, communities and development.
- 
- A mechanism should be established to assess disaster impact of development projects and other constructions.
- System should be developed to integrate DIA along with EIA/IEE and SIA for every construction projects with prior consideration to climate change issues and

environmental management.

- Development of human resources and comprehensive tools for DIA is needed for effective incorporation of DRM/CRM issues in plans and policies.

# 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? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

### 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.**

No

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? No

**Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections**

No

**Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios**

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.

School and hospital safety has been prioritized highlighting the seismic safety of schools and hospitals in Kathmandu valley to address seismic vulnerability in 980 public school buildings. A wider Master Strategy for School Safety has also been developed to support long term planning for school safety in Nepal.

With the Government's School Earthquake Safety Programme 265 school buildings from Kathmandu valley have been retrofitted since 1990 with risk assessments ongoing in other districts. Additional school safety work is occurring outside of this programme, but tracking of such remains difficult.

For hospital safety, a detailed assessment process of 60 hospitals in Nepal is ongoing with 10 detailed structural plans to be completed by 2015. The National Trauma Centre has been established and is providing health facilities to the victims of disaster events instantly. Hospital emergency preparedness is carried out with lead support from TUTH. Bheri Zonal Hospital and Patan Hospital are already retrofitted. These Agencies are also working to form Disaster management committees and different task forces like; early warning, search & rescue, food & water, shelter & NFI. Mapping of health facilities in Kathmandu valley above 50 beds along with their health professionals and surge capacity to support at times of mega earthquake disaster is completed.

DM division is established in MoFALD and MoHA with capacity to scale up work in DRR and MoEST in CRM and EM. N/R/D/M EOCs are established and to support EOCs in information collection and management, MoHA has led a process of reviewing and updating common assessment tools such as IRA, MIRA and National Detail Assessment. Additionally, 126 personnel from 19 districts have been trained on DRM with support from UNICEF and I/NGOs. To support WASH preparedness, 75 district water and sanitation engineers were trained on DRM.

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 has been estimated that there are about 60-80000 school buildings in 32000 public schools and several thousands of private schools comprising similar number of buildings as that of public schools. With more students moving towards private education, it is important for Nepal to address safety in these institutions and public buildings.

Additionally, Nepal is required to add 10,000 classrooms each year in order meet the MDG of Education for All by 2015. Due to a large number of constructions involved and also because of the urgency with which these schools are being built, the new constructions do not meet required level of seismic safety. Enforcement of building code for new constructions can be instrumental in minimizing the risk.

Good practices are to be promoted across the country in terms of capacity building and creation of working and conducive legal and policy environment in local, regional and central level. Implementation is still lacking in VDC level to national level.

**Recommendation**

- Safe School Policy should be endorsed from across the stakeholders with primary focus on reducing the multi-hazard risk in the area and construction should be provided with a manual Building codes are to be made mandatory with regard to newer constructions or even for existing structures as well.
- Assess multi-hazard risk and vulnerability of school buildings throughout the country, rank the schools for actions to be taken (either to replace, retrofit or safe enough to continue operation) and prioritize the intervention with allocation of resources according to the level of hazard.
- Vulnerability assessment of schools and hospitals throughout the country and recommendation should be provided for either retrofitting or dismantling and reconstruction.
- Develop policy and mandatory regulations for structural and non-structural safety in case of major earthquake for all hospitals throughout the country.

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

<b>Plans and programmes are developed with</b>	Yes
--	-----

<b>gender sensitivities</b>	
<b>Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery</b>	No
<b>Operations and communications centre</b>	Yes
<b>Search and rescue teams</b>	No
<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.

Growing attention towards disaster preparedness and climate change, international commitment and implementation in some level have facilitated Nepal to be regional role model in this sector. Commitments and voices in the UN, LDCs, SAARC and other platforms could be seen from country and policies and frameworks are being formulated rapidly. The Government and The UN Humanitarian Country Team have created a joint coordination structure that has been instrumental in disaster preparedness and response. Most notably, MoHA has led the process of developing “The Guidance Note on Disaster Preparedness and Response Planning, 2011’ with the support of humanitarian partners. This Guidance Note has been officially endorsed by the GoN and forms the basis for country-wide district preparedness and response plans.

In addition, the Government and international and national partners have coordinated efforts in the development of national cluster contingency plans since 2008. Based on these contingency plans, clusters have been coordinating efforts to stockpile essential items for response. In support of the cluster coordination mechanism, the Ministry of Home Affairs has been practicing nationwide disaster preparedness and response planning workshops at national, regional and district levels. As a result of these efforts, all 75 districts have prepared DPRPs while social mobilizers, VDC secretaries and WCFs/CACs and DRR focal points have received DRR orientations.



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.

Due to lack of proper coordination, capacity building and resource development, the planning and policies are not effectively implemented and monitored in Nepal. Adequacy and sufficiency of emergency response and preparedness are still felt hence regular drills and simulations should be prioritized.

Some of the challenges faced by different organizations are listed below:

- Difficulty in mobilization of DDRC members
- Duration of programs is very short for project based activities and this constraint often results in one-time activity. Sustainability is key challenge to these activities.
- No enough time required for simulation
- Insufficient dissemination of information in the prescribed formats.
- Lack of pre-positioning provisions of agencies.

#### Recommendations

- The district level DPRPs should be enhanced with financial and technical resources so as to assure local resilience, and DPRPs should be developed in community level.
- Provision should be made to spend at least 10% of annual budget at local level and separate local budgets should be allocated for DRM/CRM and environmental management initiatives from the collected revenues.
- The district and local level DPRPs should be timely revised incorporating annual drills, simulations, awareness campaigns.
  
- The cluster approach should be continued and strengthened by allocating clear roles and responsibilities and sharing good practices.
- Indigenous knowledge systems should be promoted in local communities for reliability, clear understanding and good endorsement from local institutions.

## 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>	No
<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.

Government of Nepal funds in disaster response and recovery initiatives through Prime Minister's Disaster Relief Fund, Ministry of Home Affairs regular Central Disaster Relief Fund and Department of Water Induced Disaster Prevention directly and incorporated with infrastructure development indirectly. The President Churia, Terai-Madhesh Development Committees has annual budget of NRs. 900 million and DWIDP has annual budget of NRs. 3000 million. In addition to this, government of Nepal yearly allocates NRs. 50 million dedicated fund for emergency response. From this year, GoN has started to allocate NRs10 million annually for DRM activities, beginning in 2014.

During disaster events, public, private, institutional and foreign aid agencies allocate budget so that governmental response is becoming easier recently, which was seen during Jure landslide and Mid-western flood in Nepal.

There is also a provision for District Disaster Relief Fund with sufficient amount as the situation demands in each 75 districts. Additionally, Regional Administration Office, Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) separate relief fund and stocks and the UN also has a central emergency and relief fund.

In addition to government agencies, I/NGOs and community based organizations are putting their efforts together in collecting funds to carry out emergency relief operations with the government.

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.

Budget allocation and implementation is not effective in Nepalese context due to financial and technical capacity of government as well as the stakeholders. Budgetary allocation is not sufficient and institutional commitments are yet to be rendered with emergency support and response.

Geographical asperities, annual torrential precipitation, lack of preparedness and simulations are key challenges to implement rapid response and relief activities. Beside this, trained human resources are still being lagged. Additional challenges include; the management of warehouses and limited stockpiling, communication equipment and infrastructures, implementation of National Building Codes, management of evacuation sites, high risk seismic zone and haphazard construction practices.

**Recommendation**

- Comprehensive earthquake response and recovery plans has to be developed for every urban centers, however Kathmandu Valley and other vulnerable urban areas should be prioritized more due to concentration of population, critical facilities and infrastructures.
- Policy tools are necessary to ensure disaster resilient public facilities such as schools and hospitals, and critical infrastructure such as communications.
- Purposeful open spaces supplied with WASH facilities are to be maintained in regular interval in Kathmandu valley and other urban centers.
- Trained human resources like MFRs, Search and Rescue, First Responders, volunteers are to be developed for immediate intervention in local level.

**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? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

**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



**Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects**

Yes

**Identified and trained human resources**

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.

MoHA is the focal ministry to assess disaster damage and loss from local level through NEOC and disseminates it to the stakeholders in regular basis. In July 2009, GoN and other humanitarian partners agreed to develop and follow common template during disaster assessment. In case of disaster event surpassing local capacity, use of Multi-sectoral Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) template was agreed to be used by all. MIRA now is updated for multi-hazard scenario and the format ensures cluster based assessment and avoids data duplication among agencies.

SOPs for EOCs are in place to disseminate information and simulations are needed to test and strengthen these procedures. Agreements for WASH and child protection supplies are formulated till date.

An integrated response is reflected through Association of INGOs Nepal (AIN), which has published Report on “Nepal’s Emergency Preparedness and Response System-Good Practices, lesson learnt and gaps.” One of the key lessons learned underscored in the report is that “Disaster actors have adopted a culture of producing and distributing situation reports. This is a change from the past, when individual organizations kept record for their own benefit only.” It also launched the “Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early Reconstruction (A Nepali version)” which will be instrumental in ensuring continuation of education facilities in emergencies. Sphere Project 2011 in Nepali language has been prepared by DpNet and is available as per needs.

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.

Comprehensive risk management has been deeply felt among the stakeholders in Nepal overcoming the traditional response and relief frameworks. However, integrated disaster risk management is the ultimate solution of DRM/CRM with sustainable development strategy. Though, due to political transition and focus on

infrastructure development, this concept has been seldom talked among the stakeholders in Nepal. Budgetary allocation has not got proper attention with regard to DRM/CRM hence the policies are dormant and commitments are being skeleton only. This is, in part, due to the limited capacity in collecting of disaster data to adequately inform decision making for risk reduction and emergency preparedness.

Sharing knowledge among the stakeholders in district level and other forums has not been sufficient and hence the resource allocation, mobilization and proper response are not ensured yet. Knowledge management and formulation of decentralized policies focusing on participation and inclusive motto might overturn the present DRM/CRM scenario, though proper attention is still lagging in Nepal.

#### Recommendations

- Develop more and reliable EWS for major hazards and disseminate information from various media in a regular basis. For this, EWS are to be disseminated through Television, Radio, Mobile phones with the approval and verification of concerned government agencies.
- Disaster database should be managed properly and strengthened for instant data access and use.
  
- Develop infrastructure for EOCs in all districts and ensure proper collaboration among the stakeholders and agencies for collection, analysis and dissemination of data to the communities
  
- Integration of advanced technology with indigenous knowledge, community practices and local initiatives should be prioritized for sustainability.
- Strengthen research on disaster affected communities, particularly on vulnerable groups such as children and adolescents.

# Drivers of Progress

---

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

### Levels of Reliance

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

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?: Yes

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

MoHA has finalized the national multi-hazard risk assessment including earthquake, landslides, flood, drought and epidemic as disaster events in 2010. Economic impact has been focused on this study as well. This has significant impact upon the resilience building in Nepal. The study has become a milestone work in DRR initiative in the country. However more studies are to be carried out to develop tools to incorporate findings in development projects and policies. Moreover, multi hazard risk assessments are done at community level during local disaster risk management planning process including at schools safety assessment..

Enhancing local resilience and capacity development, community participation and ownership are also key issues in achieving level of resilience. In case of Nepal, more to do to reflect decentralized DRM/CRM policies and practices. In the days to come, the new policy and development guideline should integrate DRR and CCA promoting community efforts so that the vision of building community resilience may be achieved in the required level. Allocation of resources to community level plan implementation through policy provisions could contribute to understand and prioritize risk reduction interventions.

## **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)

Women in Nepal are still under-privileged compared to their male counterpart. After the April movement in 2006, gender issues have been more pronounced in policies to practices so that reservation and special cares have been assured in Nepal. By overcoming, previous drawbacks, mainstreaming gender inclusive policies for DRM/CRM are to be concerned as women are the prime victims of disasters and climate change due to their peculiarity.

As the available database does not incorporate gender disaggregated data, recently efforts are being initiated in the SAHANA program.

There is full acknowledgement of the issue at the national level; one of the eight guiding principles of the NSDRM is gender mainstreaming and social inclusion.

The commitment of the government at central level is also reflected in National Plans and Policies which is also underscored in the recently published approach paper for the 3-year development plan. The Government of Nepal disaggregates the annual budget in sector-wise gender responsive section. The 2009/10 annual budget has 17.3, 36.43 and 46.27 percentage allocation for directly supportive, indirectly supportive and neutral gender responsive allocations, respectively.

The need and success of gender sensitive DRM are reflected in studies and projects. Efforts are being made to make DRM more GESI friendly. A national level ToT on mainstreaming gender into DRM was organized in 2008. Under the leadership of GoN, several organization has conducted women centered trainings on earthquake resistant construction for female, female homeowners training and basic disaster relief management training for housewives etc. Beside this, nowadays woman's groups, mother's groups etc. are playing crucial roles in WASH to DRM/CRM activities and efforts.

## **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)

Government of Nepal has prioritized DRM/CRM in development plans through its three years development plan though visible efforts have not been reflected yet in the sector of sustainable development framework or financial and technical capacity building nationwide. Plans have incorporated much about DRM/CRM in district level DNDRC but much have to do to attain Nepal's commitment in international platform. Nowadays, clear demarcation of awareness level in local to national platforms could be seen.

There is a mechanism at the district level (CDO, DDRRC, LDO) but this has not yet effectively implemented at village or community level due to lack of technical capacity. Involvement of communities in DRR initiatives requires strengthening of their capacity which requires information exchange at different stages. As many VDCs now merged together and new municipalities are formed, intentional institutional approach for identifying and addressing the vulnerabilities and also not adding further risks to the communities need to be prioritized and well resourced!

The recognized need for a consistent approach which, is now being foreshadowed by a commitment to implement 1000 CBDRR projects against agreed minimum characteristics. It is envisaged that through this, consistent practice will be adopted which will ensure effective information exchange, awareness raising, intensive training, and encourage communities to understand the complexity of the problem.

Agencies constituting government, non-government and community have been organizing capacity building trainings to simulations, drills and even awareness campaigns for earthquake resistant construction or even for WASH and ODFA movements in Nepal. Such efforts have resulted in substantial progress in country, though enhancement and sustainability of such programs are seldom considered, hence upon consideration and inclusion of local voices is to be mainstreamed. Therefore, need assessment of local level government officials and communities is to be carried out based on which sustainable capacity building programs should be introduced.



## **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)

Survival issues are now advocated from across the communities ranging from civil societies to human right agencies. Disasters and climate change impacts are increasing in intensity and scope due to the combined effects of large-scale environmental, social, demographic, and technological changes. Climate change and the potential for increased disasters related to extreme events also raise critical concerns for long-term human security and sustain development gains. There are no provisions laid to take into account of the socio-environmental risk to the most vulnerable and marginalized groups (CCA, DRR and Human Security, GECHS).

Realizing the need to address specific issues of vulnerable, marginalized and poor strata of society, the GoN has put forward special economic program for underprivileged, homeless, and vulnerable groups. One of the eight guiding principles of NSDRM is ensuring human and social security.

Drawing the paradigm as; there are about 20,000 squatter settlers in more than 70 squatter settlements. Currently, 23% of the people are still living below the poverty line earning less than a dollar a day. The Government of Nepal is constructing 3,000 housing units targeted for the poor in eastern Terai and such programs are being widened in other parts of the nation. Even though, being settled in the slum area, all people have right to reside in safe area, so assessment of such areas, evacuation and resettlements are urgently needed as per the national commitment.

Children, elderly, disabled and women are most vulnerable in many contexts of Nepal and their specific needs and priorities have not been well addressed. This is to be well addressed in coming years through strategic, policy and planning perspectives.

## **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)

MoHA has started an active engagement of stakeholders working in DRM/CRM (noticed this acronym many places- let us put at minimum places) at central level through regular multi-stakeholders meeting and become significant effort towards to share activities and experiences in DRM/CRM. The National Platform has been constituted and its institutionalization process is being scaled up. Network of organizations involved in DRM is creating a forum for many stakeholders to share experiences, develop future actions and implement effective initiatives for comprehensive DRM/CRM.

Indigenous knowledge, its significance and efficacy has been nowadays more felt in studies though comprehensive studies are lagging with regard to indigenous knowledge of DRM/CRM.

District level partnership meeting for DRM/CRM are functional in all 75 districts like in the case of pre-monsoon workshops and DPRP in district level. The DNDRC is coordinating the line agencies and stakeholders, is functioning in accountable ways so as to build resilience in local level.

These activities reflect that there is acknowledgement of the multi-stakeholders engagement at all levels. However, the focus primarily has been on emergency response and relief rather than comprehensive and integrated disaster risk management (IDRM) so there's urgent need of paradigm shift. Prevalent acts are to be amended and additional arrangements are to be made soon for assuring resilient communities all over Nepal. A high level arrangement at central level and separate focal agencies to work at central and local levels needs to be established with the involvement of multi-stakeholders as envisaged in the NSDRM, 2009. Partnership between government and I/NGOs have been strengthened through various arrangement and still one of the areas to continue in future. Bringing private sectors in DRM discussion is another priority for Nepal

# 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)

Only with comprehensive DRM Act, it is possible to institutionalize and implement the NSDRM otherwise diversified efforts would continue to ruin livelihood aspects claiming lives, properties and sentiments every year. In order to implement NSDRM immediately, GoN has launched Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium (NRRC) including technical, financial, humanitarian and development partners. NRRC has forwarded flagships programmes in reducing vulnerabilities to natural disasters.

These flagships are:

1. School and Hospital Safety
2. Emergency Preparedness and Response
3. Flood Risk Management in the Koshi River Basin
4. Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction
5. Policy/Institutional Support for DRR

Each flagship is lead by relevant government agency and coordinated by an international partner. The flagship leads are responsible for establishing and maintaining the momentum that has been harnessed for DRR in Nepal.

In addition to the NRRC, the Government of Nepal has continued its progress in ensuring DRM/CRM remains a priority by emphasizing DRM in National and other Development Plans. In 2010, the Government of Nepal initiated pre monsoon disaster preparedness and response plan workshops to ensure districts maintain preparedness and response as a priority and such workshops are continued till date.

While these mechanisms serve as drivers of progress for DRR in Nepal, constraints to the legal framework and operational capacity, human resources and trained manpower along with solidarity and integrity among various stakeholders in national, regional and local level remain a challenge in ensuring DRM is effectively implemented.

# 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

DRM/CRM has been well accounted in development policies and plans till now, though substantial achievements are yet to be observed in terms of periodic and national plans. However, what is reflected and underscored in the plans is not substantiated in the annual programs and budgets. One of the reasons for this is the lack of tools to assess the contribution of an investment in development sectors towards disaster resiliency of a community and/or nation. There is a need to devise a mechanism to assess disaster resiliency of the project itself and also of its contribution toward disaster resiliency of a community plans and policies. Beside these, there is a lack of comprehensive DM Act to replace the existing Natural Calamity Relief Act. The integration of DRM and CRM measures in the development policies could be a key steps to achieve the sustainable development.

DRM/CRM mainstreaming is needed in order to assure livelihoods of people thus ultimate reduction of vulnerability in terms of various types of disasters is possible afterwards. Enforcement of plausible and sufficient building codes, climate change adaptation policies, local resilience and capacity building, and incorporating timely revision and monitoring would worth high for a country like Nepal.

---

### Future Outlook Statement

With addition of limited facilities, semi urban areas are declared as urban area in the form of municipalities that has amplified the urban risks. The multi-hazard and risk assessment of newly declared municipalities are to be incorporated in the risk assessment programmes. The Climate change adversity and disaster vulnerabilities have been in geometric progression in Nepal putting several millions of people under risk and threatening the livelihoods. Significant and visible plans and policies, primarily affordable from the local resources are to be developed for improving livelihoods and reducing vulnerabilities.

An integrated response to sustainable and resilient development model is inevitable if

Nepal looks upon improvement of livelihoods and enhance resilience from local to national level. There is growing trend to compartmentalize disaster risk reduction, climate change, environmental risk and health hazards as separate domain. This approach will not only address the partial problem but also will be detrimental to long term sustainability of development effort. Moreover, the intervention for the integrated approach need to have direct linkage with livelihoods of people to ensure community ownership of any development effort.

## Future Outlook Area 2

***The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.***

### Overall Challenges

The emergency response and relief approach is so entrenched in the current system that it will take time to mobilize the system to more comprehensive disaster risk management approach. The new DM Act which is in pipeline will be instrumental to gear up the effort towards changing this mindset. The new policy and act will also ensure sufficient institutional and budgetary provision and mechanism to spend on mitigation, preparedness and recovery. Beside these, following are the major challenges:

- Promulgation of the proposed DM Bill
- Utilization of existing local resources
- Reduce dependency syndrome to district headquarter
- Capacity building at national and community levels
- Linking the network of community level to district level network
- DRR concept incorporated in cooperative efforts at VDC Level
- Use of resources even to increase risk, need to minimize
- Strengthening of academic institutions for risk reduction integration

---

### Future Outlook Statement

The current legislative and policy focus on emergency response and relief hinders efforts to strengthen integrated disaster risk management. There is urgent need to develop policies and tools which demonstrate the role of integrated disaster risk management and sustainable development in reducing vulnerability and protecting investments made in development. After the enactment of proposed DM Act, existing committee based approach would be replaced by institution based approach from the national level to local level. There is need to build capacity of the local government to ensure risk assessment and mitigation in each development planning in the

community level. The academic institution would be strengthened and DRM/CRM curricula would be incorporated comprehensively from school to university levels.

## 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

Emergency response has been the main focus on disaster risk management in the previous years. This focus was sporadic and did not effectively address the risks that face Nepal as the SOPs have not been developed. The development of institutional mechanisms are weak and relief funds are distributed in an ad-hoc basis. The newly established NEOC and the corresponding R/DEOCs is a positive step in strengthening emergency response. However, there is a need to develop and strengthen a network of EOCs across the country from central to local levels. The challenge is to shift focus from an emergency response approach to a more comprehensive disaster risk management approach, which ultimately replace the existing reactive approach by proactive approach. This requires a change in practice, attitude and commitment from government officials and civil society actors.

---

### Future Outlook Statement

Sectoral capacity development at the central and local levels will be required to ensure strengthened disaster risk reduction at the national and community level. This includes strengthening institutional capacities, such as the development of the NDMA as envisioned in NSDRM and developing orientations at the community level to identify risks and utilize traditional knowledge/technology, innovations and practices of communities to reduce vulnerabilities. The ongoing efforts on development of PDNA tools and strengthened network of NEOC and all R/D/MEOCs would be instrumental in response, relief and recovery.

# Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA)	Governments	Mr. Rameshwor Dangal
Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development	Governments	Mr. Rishi Acharya
Ministry of Defense	Governments	Mr. Bhagusan Thapa
Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology	Governments	Dr. Jay Raj Adhikari
Ministry of Forest and Land Conservation	Governments	Mr. Govinda Bahadur Shrestha
Ministry of Agricultural Development	Governments	Dr. Shree Ram Ghimire
Ministry of Land Reform and Management	Governments	Mr. Akbar Pradhan
Ministry of Women Children and Social Welfare	Governments	Mr. Ram P. Bhattarai
Department of Urban Development and Building Construction	Governments	Mr. Tulashi Kharbuja
Department of Mines and Geology	Governments	Mr. Lila Nath Rimal
Department of Water Induced Disaster Prevention	Governments	Mr. Ramananda Prasad Yadav
Department of Education	Governments	Mr. Jhapper Singh Biswakarma
Department of Hydrology and Metereology	Governments	Mr. Rajendra Prasad Sharma
Nepal Army	Governments	Mr. Sanjaya Thapa
Nepal Army	Governments	Mr. Sanjaya Thapa
Nepal Police	Governments	Mr. Sudeep Acharya
Armed Police Force	Governments	Mr. Jeevan KC
United Nations Development	UN & International	Mr. Krishna Raj Kaphle

Programme	Organizations	
United Nations Population Fund	UN & International Organizations	Mr. Hari Karki
United Nations Population Fund	UN & International Organizations	Mr. Hari Karki
United Nations Children's Fund	UN & International Organizations	Mrs. Sunita Kayastha
United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office	UN & International Organizations	Mr. Suresh Pandit
Nepal Red Cross Society	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Dharma Raj Pandey
USAid	Networks & Others	Mr. Shantosh Gyawali
Central Department of Environment Science-TU	Academic & Research Institutions	Prof. Dr. Kedar Rijal
KIRDARC Nepal	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Min Bahadur Shahi
CARE Nepal	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Bishnu Prasad Kharel
DPNet	Networks & Others	Dr. Bishal Nath Uprety
ECO-Nepal	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Ram Chandra Neupane
Plan Nepal	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Shyam Sundar
OXFAM	Non-Governmental Organizations	Yadav KC
Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium	Networks & Others	Mr. Alex Barcena
MERCY CORPS Nepal	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Sagar Pokharel
MERCY CORPS Nepal	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Sagar Pokharel
World Vision	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Surendra Babu Dhakal
National Society for Earthquake Technology	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Bijay Krishna Upadhyaya



National Society for Earthquake Technology	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Bijay Krishna Upadhyaya
National Centre for Disaster Management	Non-Governmental Organizations	Dr. Meen Bahardur Chhetri
Korea International Cooperation Agency	Networks & Others	Mr. Tika Sharma
Local Development Training Academy	Governments	Mr. Hari Krishna Koirala
Help Age International	Non-Governmental Organizations	Ms. Sangita Niroula
Practical Action	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Gehendra Gurung
Food and Agriculture Organization	UN & International Organizations	Ms. Paridhi Pathak
Ministry of Home Affairs	Governments	Mr. Pradip Kumar Koirala
Tribhuvan University	Academic & Research Institutions	Dr. Deepak Chamlagain