

Indonesia

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009-2011)

Name of focal point : Mr Sugeng TRIUTOMO

Organization : Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB)

Title/Position : Deputy Chief for Prevention and Preparedness

E-mail address : striutomo@bnpb.go.id

Telephone : +62 21 344 2734

Fax : +62 21 350 5036

Reporting period : 2009-2011

Last updated on : 30 Apr 2011

Print date : 03 May 2011

Reporting language : English

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

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

Outcomes for 2007-2009

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.

Outcomes:

Indonesia has made significant progress in systematically mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into the national development process, especially with the enactment of the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) 2010-2014 and the National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (NAP-DRR) 2010-2012. The conduct of disaster management has also become one of the key priorities in the National Middle-term Development Plan 2010-2014. From the regulatory aspect, more and more regulations have been issued by the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB) and relevant government Ministries/Agencies.

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.

Outcomes:

Indonesia has made it obligatory for all the provinces to have their own independent disaster management agencies. All provinces have currently established their Local Agency for Disaster Management (BPBDs), while for the district/city level, more than 60% of the districts/cities have established BPBDs. Several provinces and districts/cities have also had disaster risk reduction forums or platforms that involve government and non-government stakeholders. Progress in the institutionalization of disaster management agencies has improved coordination capacity in disaster management. The capacity to identify, monitor and respond existing hazards has also been enhanced through many different training and activities to raise awareness about disaster.

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.

Outcomes:

Disaster risk reduction has started to be integrated into policy framework at the national as well as local levels for preparedness, emergency response and post-disaster recovery. Reconstruction policies in post-earthquake areas, for instance, have applied the principles of "building back better". Several post-disaster areas have also developed specific programs and activities to reduce physical and socio-economic vulnerabilities.

Strategic goals

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 2011-2013:

At the national level Indonesia has formulated its National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) 2010-2014 and the National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (NAP-DRR) 2010-2012. Disaster management has also become one of the key priorities of the government in the National Middle-term Development Plan 2010-2014. The Government will encourage more the mainstreaming of programs from the NDMP and NAP-DRR into the strategic plans and annual plans of the national government ministries/agencies and the Local Middle-term Development Plans (RPJMD) and the Local Government Annual Development Plans (RKPD) of the governments at the provincial and district/city level. Risk reduction mechanisms have started to be developed at many different levels by the multi-stakeholders, including the development and adoption of technologies that support disaster preparedness and sustainable development. Risk reduction methodologies and strategies have also been developed by government and non-government agencies at the national and local levels.

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 2011-2013:

The establishment of BPBDs and multi-stakeholder DRR platforms in the regions will strengthen preparedness at the regional, local and community levels. The presence of BPBDs and DRR forums will also help enhance coordination and cooperation among relevant DM stakeholders, including with non-government partners, and also at the grassroots level with facilitation from the Government and relevant non-government organizations. Partnership with university, the media and the private sector will also be strengthened in the regions, and it is expected that this may also enhance the conduct of disaster risk reduction.

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 2011-2013:

At the national level the Government with support from non-government organizations and the other stakeholders including international donors, is in the process of developing institutional capacity building programs for disaster risk reduction. Special emphasis will be given for the capacity development of BPBDs at the provincial and district/city levels that have just been established in planning and implementing disaster management programs, including in mainstreaming risk reduction in a systematic manner into preparedness, emergency response and post-disaster recovery programs. The Government also engages the other parties, in particular the NGOs, in implementing disaster risk reduction programs at the community level.

Priority for action 1

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

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Is DRR included in development plans and strategies? Yes
- * Yes: National development plan
- * Yes: Sector strategies and plans
- * Yes: Climate change policy and strategy
- * No: Poverty reduction strategy papers
- * Yes: Common Country Assessments (CCA)/ UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

Description:

In general it can be maintained that Indonesia has already possessed disaster risk reduction policy and regulatory frameworks. Besides the Law No. 24 year 2007 on Disaster Management, several ancillary regulations derived from the Law have also been enacted at the national as well as regional levels. Disaster management capacity at the central and regional levels has also been enhanced. Nearly all ministries have developed policy frameworks that contain mitigation aspects. State Ministries' strategic plans for 2010-2014 have also factored in DRR and CCA that will ensure their commitment towards both issues. However, implementation to the regions has yet to be completed, both in terms of institutional building and disaster management planning.

The capacity and resource development process has been evident but there are still some constraints, both financial and policy constraints. The socialization of the shift of paradigm to disaster risk reduction has yet to be improved among the sectors at the central and local levels. The enforcement and implementation of land use and spatial planning and risk sensitive development planning have to be improved, particularly in regions that have not been familiarized with DRR concepts.

Context & Constraints:

One of the constraints related to this issue is the lack of competence in vertical and horizontal regulations and policies. Knowledge of DRR mainstreaming has yet to be disseminated to the regions and the functional and structural relations between BNPBBNPB and the local BPBDs needs to be strengthened.

The NDMP 2010-2014 and NAP-DRR 2010-2012 have been issued, but these documents have not been disseminated optimally to the different government Ministries/Agencies and the wider public, so

that not all parties have the same ownership of the documents. There needs to be further harmonization and synchronization of cross sectoral DRR policies.

In future policy implementations in the regions needs to be monitored and enhanced. Capacity for DM and DRR needs to be developed, particularly related to policy and regulation. There needs to be socialization of DRR mainstreaming and enhancement of functional and structural coordination between BNPB and BPBDs. The NDMP 2010-2014 and NAP-DRR 2010-2012 need to be disseminated further among the ministries and the wider public, so that all parties will own the documents. Measures need to be developed to strengthen cross sectoral DRR policies.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 2

Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Is there a specific allocation of budget for DRR in the national budget?
- * 0 % allocated from national budget
- * 0 USD allocated from overseas development assistance fund
- * 0 USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)
- * 0 USD allocated to stand alone DRR investments (e.g. DRR institutions, risk assessments, early warning systems)
- * 0 USD allocated to disaster proofing post disaster reconstruction

Description:

The commitment of the central and regional governments has been evident through the Middle-term Development Plans, the NDMP, the NAP DRR and the Strategic Plans of the different State Ministries and Agencies. For the regional level, commitment has been there but capacity has still been limited.

DRR has become a national priority but at the regional level not all districts and cities have included DRR as their priority in their development programs and budget. Coordination among the relevant State Ministries and Agencies have also become better with facilitation from the NADM.

Context & Constraints:

Disharmony still exists in DRR programs between the national and regional governments due to difference perspective in disaster risk potentials. Many regional governments have yet to develop their DRR vision and missions. DRR regulations have yet to be adopted by all multi-stakeholders, particularly by the State Ministries and Agencies. Capacity building efforts have not yet been disseminated optimally at all levels.

In future there needs to be program synchronization between the central and regional governments. The capacity of the human resources needs to be further enhanced. DRR needs to be mainstreamed in a more consistent manner into the Middle-term Development Plans, the Strategic Plans and Annual Plans of different local government offices.

DRR platforms need to be revitalized as a meeting forum among the multi-stakeholders. There needs to be greater consistency between the program planning, program implementation and the budgeting. Related to that, program monitoring and evaluation need to be strengthened at all levels.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

* Do local governments have legal responsibility and budget allocations for DRR? Yes

* Yes: Legislation

* Yes: Budget allocations for DRR to local government

Description:

In terms of participation and decentralization in the conduct of disaster management, there is still a tendency to give priority to government bodies at the national and local levels (up to village level). Participation and decentralization have been applied but not completely. The Government has started to implement a comprehensive approach to develop local DM bodies. Meanwhile, the capacity of the local governments has yet to be developed to accommodate grassroots level DRR initiatives.

Context & Constraints:

In relation to participation and decentralization of disaster management activities, there are still some obstacles in obtaining valid data and information. The consultation process undertaken in the effort to formulate disaster management and disaster risk reduction programs at the national and local levels is usually limited to socialization that in several occasions involves the community, but more in a passive participation. Participatory processes employed serve more as an instrument that has not accommodated the actual interests of the community. In other words, the existing mechanism has not been able to guarantee a participatory process, while the socialization and dissemination of information at the community level has not been optimal.

The planning, implementation and monitoring system has not been well developed. Delegation of authority to the regions is limited since the socialization and advocacy of disaster management responsibilities at the local level has not been done optimally. The capacity of the local DM institution in taking advantage of disaster risk maps has not been well developed, while institutions at the central level do not have access to disaster information in the regions to make local level risk maps. Participation of the communities in local decision-making process has also still be limited.

In future there needs to be standardization and ease of access to obtain information. The support of the media is very much required, particularly to strengthen information dissemination in the regions. It is

expected that local governments develop regulations that ensure the integration of DRR into local development plans so that budget allocation for DRR could be secured. Community participation needs to be enhanced by building a sense of ownership towards disaster risk reduction activities among the stakeholders. Bigger resources need to be allocated from the regions to develop disaster risk reduction programs.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

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

* 16 civil society members (specify absolute number)

* 22 sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)

* 0 women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)

Description:

At the national level there has been a multi-sectoral disaster risk reduction platform, the National DRR Platform (in Indonesian it is called Planas PRB), but the work of this forum has not been so prominent. It can be said that this forum has not been working in a systematic manner, with measurable work plan and allocated budget. Support in the form of required resources from the involved parties has not been significant, in particular from the representatives of the private sector; they only contributed to specific events where they could assert their visibility. Several provinces have established their own DRR platforms, but the consolidation of DRR platforms between that at the national level and the ones in the regions has not been reliable. In addition to that, understanding of the critical role of DRR platforms by the local stakeholders has also still be too limited.

Context & Constraints:

One of the constraints is that the prevailing regulation has yet to allow the multi-sectoral DRR platform to receive funding directly from the government. Another constraint is that the representation of government Ministries/Agencies in the National DRR Platform has not been consistent; there has not been any official assignment to specific officials from government offices to represent their offices in the Platform. The management of the National DRR Platform has not been supported by an executive office that is staffed by full time and dedicated personnel.

On the other hand, awareness of the existence of the National DRR Platform among government institutions at the central and local levels has not been internalized. The National DRR Platform has not been optimal in engaging the relevant stakeholders, particularly from the government and private sectors. To date information about what have been done by the National DRR Platform has yet to reach the public, and its roles and responsibilities need to be redefined in clearer terms. Moreover, the Government also needs to emphasize that disaster risk reduction is also part of the corporate social responsibility of companies.

In the future, better synergy needs to be built among the partner agencies in developing DRR programs and activities. Socialization needs to be done to introduce the existence and roles of the national and local DRR platforms. Commitment needs to be built among the multi-stakeholders at the central and regional levels to utilize optimally DRR platforms as a coordination and communication forum for DRR.

Priority for action 2

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

Priority for action 2: Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

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

* Yes: Multi-hazard risk assessment

* 0 % of schools and hospitals assessed

* 0 schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)

* No: Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments

* No: Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments

Description:

Several risk assessment efforts have been initiated at the national as well as local levels in an adequate manner. Several relevant ministries and agencies have also conducted risk mapping and analysis in accordance with their specific tasks and responsibilities, for instance the Agency for Meteorology, Climate and Geophysics (BMKG) for meteorological, climate and geophysical hazards, the Geological Agency (PVMBG/ESDM) for volcanic and land mass movement hazards, the Ministry of Public Works (PU) for flood hazards, and so forth. Unfortunately, some of these hazard analyses have not been enriched with vulnerability and capacity information of the community. Nationally there has only been one comprehensive risk analysis that was conducted by BNPB and the National Planning Board (Bappenas) with a simple methodology that resulted in comparative risk index for district/city level, which was later used in the formulation of the NDMP and NAP-DRR.

Risk analysis at the national level has not been supported with national standards in risk map making. Also, it is difficult for the regions to access the national risk map available at the central level. The existing risk maps need to be detailed and integrated into spatial planning to guide the local development planning with risk reduction considerations.

Context & Constraints:

In general the BNPB and many BPBDs still face limitations in terms of resources. The capacity of the human resources has not been sufficient and there is also budget constraint and gross lack of the required facilities and infrastructures. Disaster Management Study Centers at universities in the regions, which are expected to support the capacity building of BPBDs, have not been well developed. The involvement and participation of the relevant stakeholders in the regions can be considered as not yet

significant. In addition to the lack of understanding of disaster risk reduction and disaster management issues, there have yet to be uniformity in the terms and concepts of risks, risk maps, risk analysis, risk map elements, risk analysis parameters and relevant other things. Disaster-related information conveyed to the media and the public is often convoluted since it is not systematic and the language used is often too technical.

It is obvious that capacity development is greatly needed for risk analysis and mapping both for central and local level stakeholders. In addition to that, there needs to be a good socialization strategy and effort to encourage the people, local government and local stakeholders to become more proactive in accessing data and information related to disaster risks and other relevant data.

It is also necessary to build the capacity of the communities in understanding hazard and risk maps, risk analysis, etc. The media needs to be empowered to package and convey information that is valid and systematic and do not cause confusion among the people. In order that the general public can access easily and understand disaster-related information, such information needs to be standardized and made easy. Once socialization has been done, risk assessments need to be integrated into spatial planning to support risk sensitive development planning.

Priority for action 2: Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

* Are disaster losses systematically reported, monitored and analysed? Yes

* Yes: Disaster loss database

* No: Reports generated and used in planning

Description:

The system to monitor, store and disseminate hazard and vulnerability data has been available in government technical Ministries/Agencies in many areas to cover remote areas. All kinds of media and information technology have been used in information dissemination, including the radio, mass media, short message service broadcast and social networks such as the Facebook and Twitter. Although the reporting format and type of information available are not uniform, based on the needs of the different government agencies, the difference does not affect significantly dissemination of information. BNPB has recently developed the Indonesian Disaster Data and Information (Data dan Informasi Bencana Indonesia/DIBI) but it has yet to be maximally utilized by the different state ministries.

Context & Constraints:

One of the constraints faced is that the integration of all early warning systems hosted by the different government agencies has not been optimal. Moreover, there has not been any legal instrument that could serve as an umbrella that regulates the policy related to the monitoring, storing and dissemination of disaster data. Data facilities and infrastructures also need to be improved, besides the human resources tasked with the management of disaster data and information.

The DIBI system developed by BNPB needs to be improved and socialized in a more rigorous manner. The government also needs to develop inter-sectoral integrated network that will engage all the ministries and agencies in the provision of hazard and risk information, if possible through the existing DIBI system. Policy needs to be formulated to enhance the implementation of the DIBI system and strengthen coordination among institutions. Budget allocation from the national budget is needed as well as support from other donor organizations to enhance the DIBI system, including through the provision of facilities, infrastructures and the required human resources. Moreover, guidelines for risk mapping have yet to be formulated so that DM institutions in the regions will be able to support risk sensitive development planning.

Priority for action 2: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

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

Yes

* Yes: Early warnings acted on effectively

* Yes: Local level preparedness

* No: Communication systems and protocols

* Yes: Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination

Description:

Early Warning Systems (EWS) practices have demonstrated clearer distribution of roles and coordination among the sectors/actors in disaster management. Several provinces in highly prone areas have even developed standard operating procedures for EWS and emergency response in their areas. EWS for nearly all main hazards have been developed by the relevant ministries/agencies, particularly for major hazards such as flood, tsunami, extreme weather, extreme waves, volcanic eruption and forest fires. Several Early Warning Systems have reached the community such as EWS for volcanic eruption and flooding in several places. At the national level, the government is in the process of developing a President Instruction on the strengthening of EWS structure (at the central level) and culture (at the level of local government, university and community).

Context & Constraints:

One of the obstacles encountered is the lack of common understanding of the importance of early warning systems that reach to the lowest level of the society. The monitoring of EWS instruments and their operations as well as maintenance have not been done as best possible. There have only been a handful of provinces and districts/cities that have developed and implement Standard Operating Procedures for EWS in their regions. Currently the national government is in the process of developing a grand design for multi-hazard early warning system. The challenge is in the media infrastructure and communication facility in remote areas that is often lacking or not functioning optimally due to technical factors or lack of maintenance.

In future more support in the form of resources for the development of multi-hazard EWS needs to be mobilized. Collaboration with other parties such as the private sector in matters related to media and telecommunication needs to be built. The civil society needs to be empowered to participate in risk information dissemination and the development of community-based EWS. Emphasis needs to be given to the science and technology aspects of EWS, and their regulatory aspect as well as social aspect to reach communities living in hazard prone areas. The regulations developed should also cover EWS Standard Operating Procedures for areas that are highly at risk.

Priority for action 2: Core indicator 4

National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional DRR programmes or projects? Yes
- * Yes: Programmes and projects addressing trans-boundary issues
- * Yes: Regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks
- * Yes: Regional or sub-regional monitoring and reporting mechanisms
- * No: Action plans addressing trans-boundary issues

Description:

There been substantial progress in matters related to cross-border risk analysis. Several districts around Merapi Volcano in the border between Central Java-Yogyakarta have implemented joint cross-border risk mapping. In the period between 2010 and 2011 more joint cross-border risk assessments have been conducted among districts bordering Mount Bromo and in the mapping of the Palu-Poso river catchment areas.

Cooperation has been established within the framework of ASEAN countries and Indian Ocean countries (IO TWS for risk assessment and disaster management). In 2011 the national SAR agency, BASARNAS has hosted INSARAG meetings and International SAR Forum. Cross-border information sharing has also been done through regular meetings, AHA Center, ICG/IO TWS, PTWC, INSARAG, AADMER, AIEC, ARF Direx and non-combat joint military exercises that involve militaries from ASEAN member countries.

Context & Constraints:

Although many districts/cities, agencies and institutions have conducted independent risk assessments, joint detailed risk assessments for disaster risks that may simultaneously affect different provinces have yet to be implemented. International agreement such as that through the AHA Center has yet to be signed, although consensus has been reached. The involvement of local NGOs and communities in risk assessments has also not been optimal.

In future commitment needs to be built among policy makers in hazard-prone areas, and regional/cross-

border cooperation for risk analysis and disaster risk reduction in general needs to be increased. Collaborative ventures need to be expanded not only for capacity building but also for cross-border joint risk analysis. Engagement of the NGO communities and mobilization of resources for risk analysis need to be strengthened by the government.

Priority for action 3

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

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes
- * Yes: Web page of national disaster information system
- * No: Established mechanisms for accessing DRR information

Description:

Indonesia has developed disaster information system at the national level, through the DIBI system in BNPB, earthquake and tsunami information in BMKG, volcanic eruption and land mass movement information in PVMBG/ESDM, LAPAN has developed forest fire EWS that will soon be connected to the BNPB, and the Ministry of Communication and Information has developed information dissemination system through the media such as radio and TV. In cooperation with several mass media agencies, the ministry has piloted disaster risk information for several hazard prone areas.

Several local governments, together with non-government partners such as the university and local NGOs, have developed disaster information systems that are specific to their local needs, although such effort has not been widely distributed throughout the country.

Context & Constraints:

One of the constraints faced in the provision of disaster information that is relevant and accessible is the geographical condition of the country, particularly if we consider that Indonesia is a vast archipelagic country with thousands of islands that are scattered along the equator. Information dissemination is also hampered by internet connectivity and communication network that are still relatively limited and centered in the major islands only. The cultural obstacle of the people that is not proactive to seek disaster-related information they need also become a big challenge.

It is felt that mass media that understand the issue of disaster and disaster risk reduction needs to play a more active role. Also, the data currently available have not met the criteria for disaster risk mapping.

In future Indonesia will maximize the use of popular media as an instrument for information dissemination to the public, such as the radio, television, Hand Phone and the print media. The institutional capacity of BPBDs in the regions will also be increased to provide disaster-related information that is accessible for the public, with support from civil society organizations, religious and community leaders, and local NGOs. Disaster information will also be packaged in such a way that it will be in line with each specific community context. BNPB will serve as a "hub" for website links of organizations that have developed web-based disaster database. It is expected that the capacity of

media in disaster-related issues will also be improved.

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

* Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

* Yes: Primary school curriculum

* Yes: Secondary school curriculum

* No: University curriculum

* No: Professional DRR education programmes

Description:

The Ministry of National Education of Indonesia has issued a circular letter that encourages the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into schools through school curriculums that contain preparedness education for elementary, junior high and senior high schools for six major hazards. The education materials will include disaster risk reduction as a local content, school program, or the existing extra curricular programs. Many universities have developed centers for disaster research and disaster study as a major, and some universities; together with the BNPB, have developed DRR-based field exposure programs. The School Preparedness Programs, Village Preparedness Programs and many other disaster simulations have been implemented throughout all over Indonesia.

The Ministry of National Education will further cooperate with the BNPB to develop sustainable DRR programs and budget for this has been allocated in the national budget for DRR capacity building. Many non-government institutions have also developed various different capacity building training programs, including training for volunteers.

Context & Constraints:

One of the challenges faced is the need to build commitment in the regions to develop curriculum that contains disaster risk reduction aspects and skills to convey such materials. The government needs to facilitate and coordinate disaster risk reduction initiatives implemented by the different stakeholders, including by promoting community-based disaster risk reduction programs. Another challenging constraint is the overemphasis on development that is more geared towards physical development.

In future there needs to be a strong advocacy program in the regions to mobilize commitment. The recent One Million Safe Schools and Hospitals campaign could serve as a momentum to build commitment and cooperation. The stakeholders will also encourage the set-up of a team to accelerate the mainstreaming of DRR into schools.

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

- * Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? Yes
- * No: Research outputs, products or studies
- * No: Research programmes and projects
- * No: Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR

Description:

Government ministries/agencies at the national level have developed research methods to conduct multi-hazard risk analysis in line with their key duties and responsibilities, for example BMKG has developed tsunami Early Warning System and analysis of climate, forest fire, extreme weather, extreme wave, earthquake and flood risks; ESDM through its Geological Agency (PVMBG) has developed volcanic eruption and land mass movement Early Warning System; PU has developed flood risk analysis and so forth. The Indonesian National Science Institute (LIPI), with support from other agencies, has developed Preparedness Analysis that has been applied in several regions. BNPB has developed multi-hazard risk analysis approach and mechanism. Although there are many institutions that have conducted multi-hazard risk analysis, the coverage of these studies needs to be expanded to cover the entire Indonesia.

Context & Constraints:

The constraint in the development of methods and tools for multi-risk assessment is the absent of political commitment towards the use of science and technology and the lack of inter-agency coordination. Due to this weak coordination, it is difficult to know exactly how many relevant research initiatives have been undertaken. Also, such initiatives are usually under-funded. The cost-benefit analysis of these initiatives has never been conducted as the awareness and understanding of such efforts have not been widespread.

In future Indonesia needs to increase and enhance its disaster research, including the relevant cost-benefit analysis. It is expected that in the near future a journal that contains disaster research could be published. BNPB will become a center for the collection and dissemination of disaster research and will enhance coordination with the relevant ministries/agencies at the national level for this purpose. The result of these research endeavors will be directly used for the benefit of the wider communities. It is expected that BNPB will also advocate to the legislature (DPR) to mobilize support/political commitment and funding for disaster management and disaster risk reduction research efforts.

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Do public education campaigns on DRR reach risk-prone communities? Yes
- * Yes: Public education campaigns.
- * Yes: Training of local government
- * No: Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level

Description:

Indonesia has developed a strategy to stimulate and strengthen the awareness of the community of the importance of disaster resilience, for example through the integration of disaster risk reduction into school education. Several regions, particularly those that have experienced major disasters, have developed socialization strategy to raise awareness about disaster resilience in line with the specific hazards they face, both at the provincial and district/city levels.

In general it could be said that the commitment has been there, but it has not been comprehensive and does not cover all hazard prone areas. Coordination among government agencies is particularly weak and there is no systematic strategy.

Context & Constraints:

The constraint encountered is the absent of a grand strategy to raise public awareness that is systematic and comprehensive, such as the strategy developed by the country in controlling the number of the population through family planning (Keluarga Berencana or KB in Indonesian). Disaster management strategy at the national level has already included the disaster preparedness aspect, but in many regions the strategy is focused more on disaster response. The shift of paradigm to disaster risk reduction and preparedness has not been widespread.

It is clear that in the future Indonesia needs to formulate a grand strategy to promote public awareness to strengthen disaster resilience. The government needs to collaborate with the stakeholders, for instance with the media or neighborhood women groups at the grassroots communities to implement the strategy. Advocacy of disaster risk reduction paradigm also needs to be enhanced and increased in all hazard prone areas. Besides, the capacity of policy makers at the national and local levels needs to be enhanced to transform the response approach into preparedness paradigm and formulate the strategy to mainstream disaster risk reduction.

Priority for action 4

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

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

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

* Yes: Protected areas legislation

* No: Payment for ecosystem services (PES)

* Yes: Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)

* Yes: Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)

* Yes: Climate change adaptation projects and programmes

Description:

Indonesia has started to relate disaster risk reduction with environmental management and integrated it to its development policy, in particular through the ninth priority program in the Middle-term National Development Plan 2010-2014. Indonesian National Council for Climate Change (Dewan Nasional Perubahan Iklim/DNPI) has initiated the integration of DRR into CCA in the formulation of the National Action Plan for Climate Change. Thus, disaster risk reduction programs will be implemented in complementary with environmental conservation programs, including land use management, natural resource management and adaptation to global warming and climate change programs.

The above policy has also been supported by numerous regulations, such as the Environment Bill, the Spatial Planning Bill, the Natural Resource and Ecosystem Conservation Bill, the Forestry Bill, the Geothermal Bill, the Water Resource Bill, the Coastal Management Areas Bill, the Waste Management Bill, and the other relevant laws. Several regulations ancillary to Law No. 32 on the Environment have been drafted. There has also been a draft damage assessment tool for wetland, complete with the damage indicators. Several institutions have also implemented programs that integrate disaster risk reduction to climate change adaptation in the regions.

In practice, central-level policies have not always been aligned with those at the regional and local levels. In Riau Province, for instance, the central government puts much restriction for activities in protected forests, but the local authority let mining activities take place in the same areas. The case is also true with spatial planning related to road construction, which in the policy of the Ministry of Forestry cannot be built through national parks, but this is contested by the policies of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Public Works.

Context & Constraints:

One of the constraints related to this issue is the weak law enforcement and overlapping of regulations. Indonesia has already had many laws and their ancillary regulations, but the efforts to enforce these regulatory and policy instruments have not been so successful due to the lack of understanding and commitment of the sectors in building a synergic cooperation. Corruption has also become a big challenge.

At the community level, awareness has appeared, but community-based initiatives have often not been accommodated by the authority. The Ministry of Environment, for instance, has developed the Climate Village Project; the Ministry of Fishery and Maritime Affairs developed Disaster Prepared Village; Surabaya Green and Clean project constitutes a community-based initiative; but all these initiatives have not been integrated into the existing policies.

In the future Indonesia needs to nurture understanding of the importance of disaster risk reduction that is integrated into environmental conservation efforts and reduce compartmentalization among the sectors that manage disasters and risk reduction. Mangrove planting, for instance, needs to be seen as part of disaster risk reduction since it is also useful to prevent abrasion and provide protection against tsunamis. Institutional coordination and synergy among agencies working with disaster risk reduction and climate change issues need to be built. Emphasis needs to be given to policies that are based on sustainable development. Multi-sectoral policy advocacy and implementation needs to be enhanced, besides law enforcement for corruption cases related to natural resource and environmental management. Coordination and synergy need to be built between the central government and local governments to prevent opposing regulations issued by different government levels.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 2

Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

- * Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? No
- * No: Crop and property insurance
- * No: Employment guarantee schemes
- * No: Conditional cash transfers
- * No: DRR aligned poverty reduction, welfare policy and programmes
- * No: Microfinance
- * No: Micro insurance

Description:

Indonesia has formulated policies and development plans to reduce the vulnerability of people living in highly-prone areas, but the effort has not been comprehensive. At the present time Indonesia's position

has increased from a low income to a middle income country. This demonstrates progress or improvement in people's lives. Policies that support people's welfare have also been supported by the Law on Social Welfare and several other bills, but these bills need to be further supported by their ancillary regulations. Deliberation of Law on social protection has recently been delayed, suggesting that there has not been significant progress in reducing the vulnerability of the people.

In its Middle-term Development Plan 2010-2014, the Government of Indonesia has accommodated disaster management as its number 9 priority program. Considering that social development is a cross-sectoral effort, the commitment of the government to reduce poverty may have been included in the programs of the ministries. The Ministry of Public Works, for instance, through its PNPM program supports infrastructure development to increase the people's well-being. The Ministry of Agriculture has engaged farmers in poverty reduction programs. The Ministry of Health has integrated the concept of Safe Community into their prepared village programs. Several development programs have been designed to reduce people's vulnerability such as the Rice for the Poor, Social Security for Neglected Senior Citizens and Social Assistance Program for Heavily Disabled. All these programs are government's programs, while the private sector has also developed disaster risk insurance. However, all these programs have only seen limited implementation and limited budget commitment from the government.

Context & Constraints:

Related to this issue, one of the challenges is the lack of clarity in the criteria of those considered as poor and vulnerable. The database that contains data about poor communities has not been so comprehensive and the accuracy is also open to discussion. Moreover, monitoring and evaluation are still lacking. At the grassroots community level, the constraint is that the majority of poor people have yet to enjoy firm rights and access to land.

To encourage social development policies and plans that could reduce people's vulnerability, in the future efforts need to be done to increase understanding and capacity in formulating development policies and plans that may reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk. The community needs to be empowered to demand their rights and local governments need to be encouraged to understand right-based approach to development.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

- * Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? No
- * No: National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.
- * Yes: Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals

Description:

There have been a number of efforts by the stakeholders to related economic sector planning to reduce the vulnerability of the people. However, specific efforts to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

have only been limited to several areas that have just been hit by major disasters, particularly as part of the post-disaster recovery initiatives. The legislation that supports this issue has been enacted, i.e. the Law No. 11 year 2005 on the International Covenant on the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Related to fiscal policy there has been a program called AGEFIS 2 that attempts to predict the impact of policy decisions on the economic aspects such as economic growth, employment and the number of poor people, which are aligned with fiscal policies for climate change and economic objectives that support growth, employment and poor people (pro growth, pro jobs and pro poor).

In the field of agriculture, the Ministry of Agriculture has started to develop programs to diversify food crops to reduce vulnerability to climate change and disaster. The Ministry of Finance has developed an incentive program for business that implements disaster risk reduction through their business activities. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery has also formulated disaster risk sensitive plans that are pro job and pro poor. Several state-owned enterprises have integrated disaster risk reduction aspects in their business activities.

Context & Constraints:

The main constraint in implementing policies and plans that may reduce the vulnerability of economic activities is the lack of understanding and awareness among the relevant stakeholders and policy makers of the importance of this particular issue. Policies and planning in the economic and industry sectors have affected the people's vulnerability. Community development initiatives implemented to reduce economic vulnerability have mostly been done in the framework of stand-alone projects, so that they are not sustainable.

The raise of Indonesia's position into middle income countries has influenced the provision of development grants to Indonesia. The social economic development paradigm that is pro growth, pro jobs and pro poor has not been consistently applied by the government, the private sector and the civil society. Ministry of Manpower's Regulation related to outsourcing employment has had a significant social impact on the society. In future it is expected that the stakeholders could better develop and implement sectoral policies and plans that may reduce the vulnerability of economic activities.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

- * Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes
- * Yes: Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas
- * Yes: Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas
- * Yes: Training of masons on safe construction technology
- * No: Provision of safe land for low income households and communities

Description:

Indonesia has already had policies that regulate the planning and management of human settlements that contain disaster risk reduction considerations, for instance the Spatial Planning Bill and the Law No. 28 year 2002 on High-rise Building, the building code, micro-zoning regulations and several other regulations. In several areas that are highly-prone to earthquake, the governments and non-government partners have disseminated information to the public on the importance of earthquake-resistant building. Building artisans in those places have also been trained on earthquake safe construction. Initial efforts to certify building quality, particularly for public buildings, have also been implemented.

In the National DM Plan, fourteen hazards have been identified. The Ministry of Public Works has aligned its settlement policies with risk reduction considerations. For earthquake hazard, Indonesia has just developed guidelines and 9 Richter Scale earthquake resistant building standards that have been tested and nationally standardized. During the post Aceh Tsunami recovery, 1,000 earthquake resistant houses have been built and the model will be replicated in earthquake-prone areas.

Indonesia has already had earthquake resistant building code up to 9 SR that has been tested and nationally standardized. During the post-tsunami recovery, more than 1,000 earthquake resistant houses have been built and replicated in other earthquake-prone areas. In implementing the Green Village Program, local governments have implemented conservation measures to reduce environmental damage while at the same time improving the people's livelihoods.

Context & Constraints:

One of the challenges in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into the planning and management of human settlements is the inconsistency in the implementation of policies and regulations related to spatial and infrastructure planning. Besides the weak law enforcement, safety culture has also yet to be built, so that it is difficult to promote the issue of disaster risk reduction integration into the planning and management of human settlements.

In the future Indonesia needs to further encourage safety culture among the public, particularly in the planning and management of its citizens' settlements. Development also needs to be encouraged to incorporate people's vulnerability considerations.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Do post-disaster recovery programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR? Yes
- * 0 % of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR
- * No: Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery

Description:

Indonesia has already possessed policies to mainstream disaster risk reduction into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes through the enactment of the Chief of BNPB regulation on rehabilitation and reconstruction. The Indonesian National Disaster Management Plan 2010-2014 and

National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction 2010-2012 also contain programs and activities to integrate disaster risk reduction into recovery. The government, with support from several donors, has implemented “building back better” programs in several post-disaster areas, such as in post Yogyakarta and Central Java earthquake of 2006 and in West Sumatra after the 2009 earthquake.

Recovery of resettlement after disaster has also factored in risk reduction considerations such as the building of temporary settlements after the Wasiar Flood, the zoning of areas around volcanic areas and spatial planning after Mentawai Tsunami 2010. BNPB and Bappenas has also applied the Human Recovery Needs Assessments to complement the usual Damage and Loss Assessments. The country is in the process of revising its National Standards for construction based on a newly finalized earthquake hazard analysis. With several donors the government has also applied Post Disaster Assessment Tools for Education Sector, particularly for school buildings post-disaster.

Context & Constraints:

The constraint faced in integrating disaster risk reduction into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes is the weak coordination among the different sectors. There has not been any agency that could coordinate a comprehensive building back better initiative that takes DRR considerations into account. In providing rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance, the challenge faced also includes lack of transparency and accountability, embezzlement, complex bureaucracy related to fund disbursement, and assistance that is not in harmony with the local condition.

In the future the BNPB as the institution responsible for the conduct of disaster management needs to collaborate closer with the Ministry of Public Works and relevant other institutions in socializing the integration of disaster risk reduction into post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction. There needs to be quality control for the implementation of rehabilitation and reconstruction. Advocacy also needs to be done to encourage firm budget allocation for rehabilitation and reconstruction. Cross-sectoral coordination mechanism must be built and the interests of the local communities, particularly minority and vulnerable groups, need to be accommodated in post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

* Are the impacts of major development projects on disaster risk assessed? Yes

* Yes: Assessments of impact of projects such as dams, irrigation schemes, highways, mining, tourist developments etc on disaster risk

* No: Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

Description:

Indonesia has developed an analytical instrument to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects. Infrastructure development works have applied Environment Impact Assessment as an effort to reduce disaster risks. The policy towards that purpose has already been present, as

stipulated in the Disaster Management Bill and its ancillary regulations, but not yet in the form of more operational legislation (Perka BNPB).

To date Indonesia has made it prerequisite to conduct Environmental Impact Analysis at the individual project level. The government has also enforced the implementation of a more comprehensive Strategic Environmental Analysis as a complement for EIA for areas that have many development projects that may potentially damage the environment. As a result, for instance, the proposal to build a toll road in Surabaya has recently been rejected by the local government due to its incompatibility with the planned spatial development of the areas. The construction of Suramadu bridge, to cite another example, that connects the Java Island to Madura Island, has applied EIA and disaster risk reduction assessments. The case is also true with the construction of flood barriers in Bengawan Solo river basin.

Context & Constraints:

The constraints faced in enforcing procedures to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects include the limited budget available for this specific purpose and the lack of coordination for disaster risk reduction initiatives. In the future the BNPB needs to facilitate coordination with the Ministries and Agencies in preparing the required risk assessment instrument. As a first step, the government may examine the possibility of including disaster risk analysis for major infrastructure and development projects into Strategic Environmental Analysis.

Priority for action 5

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

Priority for action 5: Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

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

Yes

* Yes: Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

* Yes: Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Description:

Disaster risk management that employs a risk reduction perspective has been in place, but it has yet to be implemented well. The policy has not been implemented comprehensively in developing risk management capacity and technical mechanisms, several programs have been developed at the central level, but its implementation in the provincial and district/city level has not been to the maximum. All the 33 provincial governments in Indonesia have already established their Local Disaster Management Agencies, while approximately 60% of all districts/cities have done so. The regions that have set-up their own BPBDs continuously strengthen their capacity in disaster management.

In general systematic policy and commitment have yet to be observed. Several regions such as the Provinces of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, the Capital City of Jakarta, the Special Region of Yogyakarta and a handful others have already possessed disaster management policies that are relatively well developed, but still their response capacity needs to be strengthened. On the other hand, at the central level relevant ministries have endeavored to develop DRR-based school curricula, establish standards for school and hospital buildings, as well as retrofitted some schools and health facilities. At the regional level, all hospitals have set-up their Rapid Response Teams. Up to early 2011, nearly all ministries and agencies have developed preparedness programs at the community level. However, capacity for response still needs to be enhanced and coordination in emergency response needs to be improved.

Context & Constraints:

One of the constraints in this aspect is the weakness of law enforcement in the field of disaster management. Since the shift of paradigm from response to disaster risk reduction has relatively not been well socialized, risk management is often hindered by the limited vision of the related stakeholders. The lack of capacity in the regions has also become an obstacle, including the fact that many civil servants often undergo frequent official personnel rotation, so that often the personnel's understanding of their key duties and responsibilities is insufficient and the work cannot be done as best possible. Particularly in the regions, the understanding of the head of region and members of the local parliament of disaster risk reduction is still lacking, so that these decision makers do not make disaster risk reduction as a priority issue. Also, Indonesia has yet to have a disaster database cross government ministries and agencies that are regularly updated.

In the future the central government needs to support the regions to develop policy, capacity and technical as well as institutional mechanism in risk management that has a risk reduction perspective. The process may be enhanced with the creation of disaster management regulations, standards and protocols that are clear and firm. The government also needs to set-up BPBDs in all hazard-prone areas and formulate development plans that have a disaster risk reduction perspective. The quality and mechanism of coordination among the sectors and all the stakeholders needs to be enhanced too.

Priority for action 5: Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes
- * No: Contingency plans with gender sensitivities
- * Yes: Operations and communications centre
- * Yes: Search and rescue teams
- * Yes: Stockpiles of relief supplies
- * Yes: Shelters
- * No: Secure medical facilities
- * No: Dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities

Description:

At the central level there have been several contingency and preparedness plans that have been formulated. Similarly, at the regional and local levels, there have only been a few provinces and districts/cities that have formulated their disaster contingency and preparedness plans. Roughly estimated, there have only been around 20-30 districts/cities that have formulated contingency and/or preparedness plans. Most of these plans, however, were not formulated by the stakeholders, but only involved a limited number of government offices and selected representatives of the communities. Often contingency plans stay as document that are not simulated and even not used as a reference in emergency response.

Several local governments have conducted routine disaster simulation to test their contingency plans, but there has not been any monitoring and evaluation of each single hazard within a certain period, for instance once in six months. Agreement and consensus among the stakeholders related to each party's mandate in the emergency plan have also been lacking, which in the end result in the insecure basis for accountability of the plan. However, whether or not these plans have ever been simulated or tried out, there has not been any relevant data. Many disaster exercises and simulations to test and develop disaster response programs have been conducted but not in a regular manner and not programmed in the best way possible.

Context & Constraints:

One of the biggest constraints in this issue is the uneven awareness, both in the government side and the community, of the importance of disaster contingency and preparedness plans in enhancing disaster preparedness. This lack of understanding and awareness has further influenced the political will to provide sufficient budget to formulate disaster contingency and preparedness plans at the central and local levels. Several districts and cities have formulated their contingency plans with support from non-government organizations and donors, but often these contingency plans have not been followed by further review and regular disaster exercises to try out the plans. In addition to that, from all the contingency plans that have been made by the relevant ministries, international NGOs and NGOs, there has not been a database containing contingency plans that is integrated and easily accessible by the public.

In the future there needs to be continuous socialization of the importance of contingency and preparedness plans. Advocacy also needs to be done to encourage adequate budgeting for the formulation of disaster contingency and preparedness plans and encourage the integration and monitoring and evaluation of contingency plans that have been formulated. Also, efforts need to be done to demand accountability for the contingency plans formulated; meaning that the stakeholders need to review them regularly and try out the plans.

Priority for action 5: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

- * Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes
- * Yes: National contingency funds
- * No: Catastrophe insurance facilities
- * No: Catastrophe bonds

Description:

Indonesia has allocated disaster funds in the form of on-call budget, rehabilitation and reconstruction budget, and contingency budget, but mostly at the central level government. For 2011 there has been a 400% budget increase in BNPB (from Rp. 200 billion in 2010 to 800 billion) and around 108 billion may be transferred directly to the provinces. It is planned that in 2012 rehabilitation and reconstruction budgets may be used at the district/city level. Not all provinces and districts/cities have allocated disaster-related budgets, because the regulations that stipulate this issue have been ambiguous. Contingency mechanism that supports effective response and recovery has not been present in a systematic and comprehensive manner, but only partial and anecdotal.

Context & Constraints:

The biggest challenge in this aspect is the absence of clear regulations and mechanisms that govern disaster budget at the national and local levels. This has made it difficult for decision makers at the local level to allocate disaster budget. In the future the government needs to formulate unambiguous

regulations related to disaster budget. In addition to that, bureaucracy in funds disbursement needs to be made more responsive and easier, while still maintaining the transparency and accountability of the system. Cross-ministerial coordination, such as that with the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Home Affairs, the National Planning Board, the State Financial Oversight Body (BPK), and the other key institutions need to be enhanced to facilitate financial mechanism in disaster management.

Priority for action 5: Core indicator 4

Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews

Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Means of verification:

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

* Yes: Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available

* Yes: Post disaster need assessment methodologies

* No: Post disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects

* Yes: Identified and trained human resources

Description:

In an emergency and disaster situation, Indonesia has already had a system for information exchange and the materials to be disseminated. However, the standard procedure and mechanism to exchange information have only been developed at the national level and have not yet been able at the local and regional levels. There have been several emergency operation centers that possess the capacity to store and disseminate data, but this has not been present in the majority of hazard-prone areas. In addition to that, nearly all state ministries/agencies have their own database but they are still too scientific and have not been transformed into language that may be understood easily by the public.

To date, database and risk analysis have taken into account local wisdom. Methodology and capacity for damage and loss assessments have been developed (the Damage and Loss Assessments/DALA, Human Recovery Need Assessments/HRNA and Post Disaster Need Assessments/PDNA). Gender aspect has started to be included in assessment methodology. To support implementation, human resources to conduct such analysis have been identified and trained.

Context & Constraints:

The constraints faced in this aspect include the nonexistence of policies and regulations that harmonize and standardize all forms of disaster information, procedures and mechanisms that must be obeyed by all government institutions and other relevant stakeholders. Besides the absence of standards to this respect, to date investment related to the development of procedures for information exchange during hazard events and disasters, and their post-event reviews have only been minimum. Moreover, there is still a gap in integrating scientific data with information related to disaster risk reduction that is based on local wisdom.

In the future, in addition to developing the required standards for this particular field, Indonesia needs to build disaster information systems that are accessible and easily understood by the public. Special efforts need to be done to also enhance coordination among the stakeholders in promoting activities to exchange disaster information. From the viewpoint of the community, there needs to be utilization of local wisdom in the dissemination of disaster information.

Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance:

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

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

Yes

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

No

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

Indonesia has to build the capacity of disaster risk reduction stakeholders in order that they can understand better and actually internalize the paradigm of disaster risk reduction and can later mainstream DRR into regular development planning process. Besides the issue of capacity, coordination among sectors needs to be strengthened, particularly to encourage government ministries and agencies at the central level and local government units in the regions to minimize the specific interests of their agencies and advance more the common agenda for disaster risk reduction and preparedness building. The government also needs to encourage the other stakeholders to understand more and internalize disaster preparedness norms and practices.

The country has to formulate a national strategy to mainstream multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development, and later develop the relevant guidelines, instruments and regulations. Socialization of disaster risk reduction mainstreaming needs to be done in all the regions, involving the BPBDs and other relevant local government units. Advocacy also needs to be done for the provision of sufficient and sustainable resources for disaster risk reduction and disaster management.

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

Levels of Reliance:

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

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

Indonesia needs to implement continuous socialization of gender equality issue in disaster risk reduction at all levels, and involves women meaningfully in the formulation of disaster risk reduction policies and implementation of DRR efforts. Several localities have had good experiences in relevant gender aspects that are implemented by many different organizations in their risk reduction programs and this has to be expanded and replicated throughout all the country. Besides gender perspective in disaster issue, the issue of child and minority protection in disaster also needs to be promoted and advocated. Ideally the government has to institutionalize gender perspective on risk reduction and recovery through the appropriate regulatory and policy instruments.

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

facilitate and provide resources to the non-government entities to reach out to the wider public.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance:

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

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

The capacities for risk reduction and recovery in Indonesia have been very much improved. However, there have not been any efforts to identify the overall existing capacity, both at the national and local levels. The effort to enhance capacity to reduce risks and conduct recovery in a better way will be made through continuous improvement of facilities and infrastructures, and development of the quality of the human resources in disaster management. The government will also need to allocate resources for universities to strengthen disaster risk reduction-related study programs, which will in turn help increase the capacity of the local governments.

Considering the limited resources of the government, it seems that Indonesia needs to mobilize potential resources from the non-government sector, such as from the private sector, the media and even from the community itself. The empowerment of local communities in risk reduction activities and the effort to revitalize local wisdom in disaster risk reduction may also support capacity development in disaster risk reduction and recovery. Another important thing in increasing the capacity for risk reduction and recovery will be the empowerment of BNPB and BPBDs to implement their coordination functions both in a normal situation and in an emergency situation.

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.

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

There needs to be an affirmative action in disaster management in integrating human security and social equity approaches into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities. Among the efforts that could be made include the revitalization of cultural villages in several ethnic groups (such as Kampung Naga, Inner Baduy, Mentawai, and the like). It must be acknowledged that the issues of human security and social equity have not been too popular with the DRR proponents. The government needs to define clearly both these issues. Human security issue may have already been discussed as a discourse in emergency situation, but not explicitly in disaster risk reduction.

The National Agency for Disaster Management and the relevant agencies need to be enhanced to promote human security and social equity approaches in disaster risk reduction and recovery activities. Infrastructure and economic development needs to be geared not only towards physical infrastructure but one that enhances human security and social equity.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance:

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

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

Partnership among disaster risk reduction stakeholders in Indonesia has been quite good as a start. Indonesia has had its multi-stakeholder National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which is called the Planas PRB. The members of the forum constitute representatives of government institutions, universities, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, mass media and several private sector companies. In future this partnership could be intensified and it is expected that their programs may also include collaboration in concrete activities at the community level.

f) Contextual Drivers of Progress**Levels of Reliance:**

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

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

The contextual drivers that may be pursued in the future:

- Advocacy among members of the parliament for legislation, budget and oversight that are related to disaster risk reduction efforts
- Collaboration between local governments for information exchange and joint risk management for risks that are commonly faced
- Building synergy between disaster risk reduction programs and programs that address the Millennium Development Goals, including between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation programs
- Enhancement of the capacity of faith-based NGOs
- Clearer regulations in Corporate Social Responsibility

Future outlook

Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Overall Challenges:

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

It is also still difficult to build coordination among the sectors and distribution of key duties and responsibilities in disaster risk reduction among the sectors as stipulated by Law No. 24 year 2007 on Disaster Management. Many institutions are too much preoccupied with their own specific interests and have not been too willing to be coordinated by the National Agency for Disaster Management at the national level and Local Disaster Management Agencies at the provincial and district/city level. There needs to be a strong political will and understanding of the urgency of the issue to promote better coordination among offices. The government has served as a facilitator in facilitating coordination and changing development paradigm towards more capacity development.

The other challenge is the lack of integration and synchronization of disaster risk reduction policies at different government levels and between the central and local governments. Capacity development and amplification of resources have not met the expected results. Disaster risk reduction policies need to be supported with bigger resources and more budget allocation as an investment in the promotion of sustainable development. National policies are sometimes confusing for the local governments and they are formulated not in a bottom-up and participatory manner. Many policies have been born in the context of emergency so that they are not so systematic and difficult to be implemented in the regions. Policy development at the national level takes place rapidly such as in the institutional and planning aspects, but the implementation in the regions has not been as rapid due to a lack of capacity to accommodate the drive for DRR. It appears that there has been a lack of socialization on the importance of disaster risk reduction mainstreaming in the regions.

Future Outlook Statement:

In future the Indonesian government will encourage more efforts to realize the disaster risk reduction paradigm and the mainstreaming of DRR into development, by engaging all the relevant stakeholders. The role of popular media, both the print and electronic media as an instrument for information dissemination to socialize the shift of paradigm in disaster management from a responsive one to preparedness will be enhanced. It is expected that the media will package information in line with the existing frame in the society. Better coordination will also be sought with key ministries and agencies, including with non-governmental organizations too. Coordination will also be fostered at the local government level to socialize disaster risk reduction and understanding of the national multi-hazard risk management strategy to remote places. This needs to be supported with uniformed information dissemination and sharing system by the relevant stakeholders (standardized maps, instruments, etc).

BNPB will also accelerate the formulation of ancillary regulations and policies as well as technical guidelines that will be generated from DM Bill and regulations. Synchronization of all disaster risk reduction related rules and policies will be prioritized, mainly through cooperation with the national parliament at the central level and local parliaments in the region. Program actions need to be formulated at the implementation level after the enactment of the DM Bill, DM regulations and relevant ministerial decrees. Policies that are based on sustainable development need to be formulated. Multi-sectoral advocacy and policy implementation, for instance advocacy to the national parliament/DPR to obtain political support or commitment to provide more funds to DRR need to be conducted.

Sense of belonging of DRR among the relevant stakeholders, including the state ministries/agencies need to be nurtured. The effort to mainstream disaster risk reduction into development at the national and local level will be implemented in close cooperation with the National Planning Board/Bappenas and Local Planning Boards/Bappeda in the regions, with substantive and technical support from local universities. The university will help enhance the mainstreaming of DRR into the Middle-term Local Development Plans (RPJMD), the Local Disaster Management Plans (RPBD), the Local Action Plan for DRR (RAD PRB), and the Strategic Plans and Annual Work Plans of the local government units (SKPD). It is important to maintain consistency between the program planning, program implementation and the budgeting.

There has been a Circular Letter by the Ministry of National Education to mainstream DRR into schools, school curriculums that contain preparedness education (for elementary schools, junior high schools and senior high schools for six types of disaster), and development of learning materials that contain DRR (as local content, school programs or extracurricular activities). Indonesia has also implemented disaster simulation/exercises, Disaster Resilient School Concept, Disaster Resilient Villages and Disaster Management has been developed at the university as a specific study program. Efforts are on the way to develop curriculums and learning materials for all types of disaster present in Indonesia (in compliance with the DM Bill no. 24/2007).

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 overall challenge in the development and enhancement of the institutions, mechanisms and capacity at all levels, particularly at the community level, is the delay in the establishment of BPBDs in all hazard prone provinces and districts/cities. Thirty three BPBDs at provincial level have been established, however, there have only been 144 BPBDs at the district/city level out of 275 districts/cities that are hazard prone. Without the existence of agencies specializing in disaster management and disaster risk reduction, the effort to develop capacity for disaster response will be difficult to realize. Besides, the functional and structural relations between the central level government (BNPB) and the local level government (BPBDs) need to be harmonized more. BNPB/BPBDs still face limitations in terms of resources and institutional capacity (they have just been formed, the competency of its human resources in DM issues is relatively insufficient, budget limitation, lack of facilities and infrastructures in BPBD offices). Risk reduction and preparedness policies have been adequate in several regions, such as in Aceh, Jakarta, and West Sumatra but response capacity is still lacking.

Centers for the study of disaster management at the universities have not been well developed, and their involvement and engagement with the relevant stakeholders have not been significant. It is expected that these DM centers may lead in the conduct of disaster management research. The National DM Plan 2010-2014 and NAP DRR 2010-2012 have been distributed to the regions, but these documents have not been socialized among government officials at the different ministries and the general public, so that not all parties may have a sense of ownership to the documents. In the implementation of DRR and DM

related activities the different ministries/agencies tend to implement their own programs, while actually this has to be coordinated by the BNPB. With the many government and non-government institutions/agencies involved in disaster risk reduction activities, coordination and communication among stakeholders become critical in building the community's resilience to disaster. DRR forums or platforms, both thematic and region-based (local and national) face several obstacles particularly in relation to the vagueness of their functions and roles, the level of awareness of their existence among the government ministries/agencies that is still negligible, the absence of fulltime executives in the management of such forums, and the possibility of the forum to obtain funding directly from the government.

The other important challenge is the limited budget allocated to specific disaster risk reduction activities and enhancement of disaster preparedness both at the national and local levels. Capacity building initiatives can only be realized successfully with the support of adequate, flexible and sustainable budget.

Future Outlook Statement:

In addition to completing the process to establish Local Disaster Management Agencies in provinces and districts/cities that are prone to hazards, Indonesia will also push for the set-up and strengthening of disaster risk reduction forums at the national and local levels. After the BPBDs have been formed, there needs to be capacity building for the human resource of BPBDs, and synchronization of programs between the central government and local governments, besides the need for more consistency between the program planning, implementation and budgeting. A number of local DRR platform/forums, namely in Nusa Tenggara Timur (East Nusa Tenggara), Yogyakarta, Jawa Tengah (Central Java), Bengkulu, Sumatera Barat (West Sumatra), Sulawesi Utara (North Sulawesi) and Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam., as well as thematic ones, such as Merapi Forum, Slamet Mountain Forum and Solo River Forum (Forum Bengawan Solo), have also been established to support BPBDs in the development of the capacity of local governments and communities in responding to future disasters.

Inputs and recommendations from the regions need to be advanced to the national government with a view of synchronizing regulations and promoting sustainable development planning at the central and local levels that contain disaster risk reduction perspectives. The engagement and role of the Indonesian national army (TNI) need to be clarified through rules and regulations covering the normal situation (pre-disaster), during emergency response and in a post disaster situation, and budgeted in the national budget (APBN). The involvement of government ministries/agencies needs to be legalized so that DRR programs can be adopted in the ministries/agencies' development programs. In terms of cross-border activities related to risk assessment and other more general risk reduction programs, there needs to be written legal commitment among the concerned local government officials. This must not be limited to cross-border capacity building initiatives only but should also cover cross-border joint risk assessment. To support disaster research, BNPB needs to be encouraged to become a center to accumulate disaster research and disseminate the results to the wider public.

Considering the substantial budget required to build preparedness at the community level, the government will encourage the involvement and participation of non-governmental organizations, community organizations, mass media, university, business sector and other relevant stakeholders in developing and supporting community-based disaster risk reduction initiatives. Related to the importance of community's participation, there needs to be capacity enhancement of the community including in understanding risks, hazard maps and so forth. With the support and active participation of all the relevant DRR stakeholders, DRR platforms or forums will take more active roles and find the functions expected by all the relevant stakeholders.

Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of

emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges:

Indonesia is a country very prone to disaster but not many regions or local governments have possessed contingency/preparedness plans to face emergency situations. To date there has only been around 30 districts/cities or no more than 10% of the total Indonesian area that has conducted disaster preparedness and contingency planning, both at the provincial and district/city level, and sectoral contingency planning. Even if several regions have made contingency/preparedness plans, they often not prepared by the actual relevant stakeholders, but only involved several elements of the society, so that there need to be efforts to make relevant further initiatives to ensure that contingency plans may become actual operational plans during emergency response. Contingency plans are still often in the form of just documents that have been well implemented, and there have never been evaluation of contingency plans, while ideally every contingency plan for each hazard needs to be regularly evaluated, for instance every six or three months.

Several local governments have demonstrated commitment and made substantial progress, but this has not been applicable to all over Indonesia. The involvement of the civil society in the formulation and updating of contingency plans has been limited and uncoordinated, so that when they are turned into operational plans, they are not effective since the community has not been well informed about the plan and has not been involved in exercising the plan in an intensive and systematic manner. Support in the form of human resources, training, financial and infrastructure assistance and the commitment of the local leadership and the relevant local stakeholders is required in capacity building for disaster management. The stakeholders also need procedures and special guidelines to enhance coordination in aid distribution and financial assistance that are unambiguous and accountable.

Future Outlook Statement:

The capacity development of newly-formed BPBDs at the provincial and district/city levels in planning and implementing disaster management programs, including the systematic mainstreaming of risk reduction considerations into preparedness, emergency response and post-disaster recovery programs, is an important issue and it is a must. Besides through education and training for BPBDs staff members and the relevant strategic stakeholders, capacity building also needs to be done through formulation of regulations, mechanisms, guidelines and standard operating procedures that are clear, accessible and definite. Such documents need to further be disseminated and implemented in the regions all over the country in line with their specific conditions. Improvement of coordination mechanism and quality will also be needed to coordinate the sectors and relevant stakeholders to avoid or minimize procedural constraints and delays in providing financial and logistical assistance during emergency response. BNPB needs to encourage provincial/district/city BPBDs to formulate contingency plans, and subsequently advocate budget allocation for and accountability of contingency plans. There needs to be awareness raising for communities affected by disasters for the importance of disaster risk reduction in rehabilitation and reconstruction.

Related to budget for emergency preparedness, emergency response and recovery of communities affected by disasters, the government needs to formulate regulations both at the national and local levels that simplify the bureaucracy. Coordination needs to be made with ministries or agencies related to disaster management funding such as the Supreme Audit Agency, the National Planning Board, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Corruption Eradication Body, and others to simplify the financial mechanism to facilitate the distribution of financial and logistical assistance.

Stakeholders

Departments/organizations that have contributed to the report

- * UNESCO (UN & Intl) - Ardito N K
- * UN Joint Strategic Programme - DRR (UN & Intl) - Heru Pranoto, Dominiika Novi, Victor R
- * World Bank (UN & Intl) - Ruby Mangunsong, Iwan Gunawan
- * UNDP (UN & Intl) - Andry Erawan, Valentinus Irawan, Riana Nedyawati
- * AusAID (UN & Intl) - Penny Davis
- * SOS Children's Village (UN & Intl) - Julianto
- * Forum PRB DIY (NGO) - M. Maskuri
- * HFI (UN & Intl) - W. Yoner, Yuniarti W. S. Rahman, H. Parlan
- * Platform Nasional PRB (Natl Platform) (Networks & Others) - Krisna P., Hening P., Yanti K., Trinirmala
- * Unilever (Private) - Maya Tamimi, Sari Tobing
- * Danone - Aqua (Private) - Kustiawan
- * Tzu Cm Sinarmas (Private) - Abdul Muiz
- * HM Sampoerna (Private) - Santi Djiwandono, Kukuh Dwi Kristianto
- * IFRC (UN & Intl) - Rio Agusta, Fegi Dwirahmadi
- * Skala (News & Media) - Galuh, Ria, Antonius Ratu Gah, Dwi Minarto
- * Radio Netherlands (News & Media) - Barkah Jembar P
- * Berita Lingkungan (News & Media) - Rendi, Zainal, Dwi M., Akbar
- * PSMB UPN Veteran Yogyakarta (Acad & Research) - Eko Teguh Paripurno
- * Oxfam GB (UN & Intl) - Didik J Mulyono, Patricia U
- * ASB (UN & Intl) - Puthut W. Sulastomo
- * AMAN (NGO) - Monang, Meggy D
- * Yayasan Air Putih (NGO) - Agus Triwanto
- * Caritas Indoneia (UN & Intl) - Dian Lestari, Viinentia
- * Child Fund (UN & Intl) - Hadi Purwanto

- * Oase (UN & Intl) - Nina R
- * ECHO (UN & Intl) - Linda Rupidara
- * MDM (NGO) - Petra Wisse
- * Save the Children (UN & Intl) - Intan Febriani
- * UN OCHA (UN & Intl) - Titi Moektijasih, Mindaraga Rahardja, Nova R.
- * Australia-Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction (UN & Intl) - Henry Pirade
- * ADRA (UN & Intl) - Tony Kurnia
- * Emergency Capacity Building (UN & Intl) - Gunawan Zaki, Wahyu Widayanto
- * Safer Community for Disaster Risk Reduction (SCDRR (UN & Intl) - Siti Agustini, Banu Subagyo, Novri Asmi, Yusniar
- * PSKB - Institute Technology Sepuluh November/ITS (Acad & Research) - Amien Widodo
- * Masyarakat Penanggulangan Bencana Indonesia (MPBI) (NGO) - Faisal Djalal, Djuni P, Catur Sudiro, Ivan V.A.
- * LPBI-PBNU (NGO) - Dr. Latif Bustani, Avianto Muhtadi, M. Ali Yusuf
- * HOPE (UN & Intl) - dr. Slamet SS Mpdked, Willy Gosal, Donald W.
- * PKPU (NGO) - Bilal Ahmadi, Suharjani
- * Ministry of Public Works (Gov) - Tri Bayu Adji, Joko Wismoko, Guridno W.
- * POLRI (Gov) - Drs. Uden Kusuma SH
- * BNPB (National Agency for DM) Advisors (Gov) - Zainuddin Maliki, Sugimin, Sarwidi, Nyoman Kandun
- * BNPB (Nat'l Agency for Disaster Management) (Gov) - S. Triutomo, S. Nugroho, B. Wisnu W., Teddy W.S.
- * BAPPENAS (Gov) - Suprayoga Hadi, Samantha Prakosa
- * Badan Pengurus Pusat Besi Merah Putih (BMP) (Gov) - M. Salahudin Halim, Arham Bahar
- * Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery (Gov) - Fegi Nurhabni, Giri Willisandy, Akhmad M.
- * Ministry of Environment (Gov) - Deddy S. Mukna, Sri Hastuti, Engkos Kosasih
- * Ministry of Health (Gov) - Supatmi, SKM, Setiorini
- * Bakosurtanal (Gov) - Yulianto, Habib Subagio
- * LIPI (Gov) - Irina R, Yanti, Asep Kuswara

- * Ministry of Research & Technology (Gov) - Arif Rahman, Nurul Falah
- * Ministry of Transportation (Gov) - Satya Pranata, Sofyan GA
- * Ministry of Communication and Information (Gov) - Bambang Tjahjowibowo
- * Ministry of Defense (Gov) - Elita T
- * Meteorology, Climatology, Geophysic Agency (BMKG) (Gov) - Suhardjono
- * Planning Board of West Sumatra Province (Gov) - Nugroho Retno
- * Ministry of Social Affairs (Gov) - Iyah K, Felix V
- * Indonesian Red Cross (Networks & Others) - Ridwan, Mujtahidin, Bevita
- * Ministry of National Education (Gov) - Supriyono, Sri Suharti
- * Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Gov) - Masni Eriza
- * Ministry of Forestry (Gov) - Sumantri, Noor Hidayat
- * National Agency for Space and Aeronautic (LAPAN) (Gov) - M. Rokhis Khomarudin
- * Geology Agency - M. of Energy & Mineral Resources (Gov) - Wuri D., Agus Solihin
- * National Agency for SAR (BASARNAS) (Gov) - Rakhmat
- * Natl Agency for Assessment & Application of Techno (Gov) - Isman Justanto
- * BAPETEN (Gov) - Toto Heryanto, Faisal
- * Medecins Du Monde (UN & Intl) - Eva Eka P.
- * FAO (UN & Intl) - Suparta
- * World Vision (UN & Intl) - Adi Suryadini
- * Child Fund (UN & Intl) - Tanty S. Thamrin