



**TEARFUND**  
CHRISTIAN ACTION WITH THE WORLD'S POOR

# Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction

a tool for development organisations



**Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction:  
a tool for development organisations**

Sarah La Trobe

Professor Ian Davis

January 2005

Tearfund, 100 Church Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8QE, UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 8977 9144 Fax: +44 (0)20 8943 3594

Cover photo: Jim Loring, Tearfund

We would like to acknowledge the much-appreciated cooperation of all those who contributed to this project through spoken and written comment.

We are particularly grateful to John Twigg (Benfield Hazard Research Centre) for acting as a consultant to this project.

We are also grateful to TEAR Australia for their support in producing this paper.

Sarah La Trobe is a Tearfund Public Policy Officer for Environment and Disasters, and may be contacted by email at [sarah.latrobe@tearfund.org](mailto:sarah.latrobe@tearfund.org)

Ian Davis is a widely acknowledged expert in the field of disaster management. He is currently a visiting professor at Cranfield University.

# Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction

a tool for development organisations

FOREWORD	<b>Tearfund's approach to natural disaster risk reduction</b>	2
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Using the targets/indicators</b>	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Key influences on mainstreaming</b>	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Presentation of the targets/indicators:</b>	
	AREA 1 Policy	10
	AREA 2 Strategy	11
	AREA 3 Geographical planning	12
	AREA 4 Project cycle management	13
	AREA 5 External relations	14
	AREA 6 Institutional capacity	15
APPENDIX	<b>Terminology</b>	16

## Foreword

### Tearfund's approach to natural disaster risk reduction

*Tearfund is a Christian relief and development organisation based in Britain, working with more than 400 partners in 80 countries to tackle the causes and effects of poverty.*

*Since its establishment in 1968, Tearfund has gained considerable experience in disaster management. Through programmes implemented directly by its Disaster Response Team or indirectly through national partners, Tearfund has responded in recent years to a variety of man-made and natural disasters including Hurricane Mitch; the Orissa cyclone; the Gujarat earthquake; flooding in Bangladesh and Mozambique; droughts in Afghanistan, Southern and Eastern Africa; and, most recently, to the tsunami disaster in Asia.*

*Tearfund believes that hazards are having an increasing impact on societies as a result of rising levels of human vulnerability. In this respect disasters are not isolated events, but a manifestation of the deficiencies and weaknesses within a society, induced by human-determined paths of development.*

*Tearfund's response has been to develop closer links between its emergency and development programming through the adoption of an integrated approach to disaster management. This covers a broad range of distinct yet interrelated activities across all aspects and stages of the disaster cycle. Disaster management interventions are focused on those countries where there is a high probability of a disaster occurring. The primary strategy of vulnerability reduction is to increase the capacity of local communities and organisations to prevent, prepare for and respond to the impact of disasters. It is a strategy that combines changes at community level with changes to national and international policies and practices.*

*We have now developed performance targets and indicators to assist development organisations 'mainstream' risk reduction into relief and development planning and programming. Organisations are increasingly aware of the need to mainstream, and we believe the tool as set out in this paper represents an important contribution to making further progress. We invite feedback from potential users on the tool, as we continue to strive to integrate disaster risk reduction into our own work.*

*Tearfund recognises that preventing disasters depends in part upon our ability to build just and equitable social, economic and political structures and processes, and affirms the moral duty of all people (particularly the non-poor) to accept and fulfil their responsibilities to uphold the rights and entitlements of the poorer members of our society.*

Marcus C Oxley  
Disaster Management Director

# 1 Introduction

This paper offers a practical tool to help development organisations mainstream disaster risk reduction into their relief and development planning and programming. **Performance targets and indicators** (pages 10–15) are presented to help organisations assess, measure and monitor their progress with mainstreaming. The targets/indicators cover six key areas of organisations' work. The paper also identifies a series of factors that influence the pace of mainstreaming. This tool is significant because, while there is increasing recognition among donors and other organisations of the need to mainstream risk reduction, very little work has yet been undertaken to identify how this could be done.

The tool represents an initial attempt which should be considered as 'a work in progress'. In this context, we invite comment from relevant organisations and, especially, feedback from those which have tried to use it.

Much has been done in recent years to raise the profile of disaster risk reduction within relief and development processes. However, much remains to be achieved before it attracts the level of attention and funding needed to reduce avoidable loss of life, livelihoods and property, and to safeguard development gains. Furthermore, as pressures such as population expansion, urbanisation and global climate change make the world increasingly unsafe, it is essential to expand risk reduction measures to avert or reduce the scale of future disasters. In 2003, Tearfund undertook an extensive piece of research into the policy and practice of institutional donors on natural disaster risk reduction.<sup>1</sup> The research revealed that donors need to make significant progress with mainstreaming risk reduction into their planning and programming. This issue was further discussed by donor organisations and NGOs at a conference convened by Tearfund in 2003.<sup>2</sup> Participants at the conference identified and prioritised methods of mainstreaming risk reduction into institutional practice.

Now Tearfund, in collaboration with Professor Ian Davis (Cranfield University) and in consultation with John Twigg (Benfield Hazard Research Centre), has developed performance targets and indicators to help integrate and expand disaster risk reduction initiatives into relief management<sup>3</sup> and, particularly, into development planning and programming within development agencies. The targets and indicators outline the broad scope and progression of a policy and strategy to mainstream risk reduction. It is expected that they will be used as 'templates' for measuring mainstreaming and adjusted as necessary to suit the specific conditions that prevail within any organisation. The targets are intended to enable organisations:

- To recognise where they are, or what stage they have reached, in mainstreaming risk reduction activities into their ongoing relief and development work.
- To identify priority issues to be addressed and develop a mainstreaming strategy over a period of time, with definable, realistic and measurable goals.

---

1 Tearfund (2003), *Natural Disaster Risk Reduction: the policy and practice of selected institutional donors*

2 Supporting Natural Disaster Risk Reduction conference held in Westminster, London, in November 2003

3 Including reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Organisations can apply the targets and indicators to themselves (perhaps with the involvement of an external facilitator/s) to measure their progress with mainstreaming and take charge of their own development. Alternatively, to apply independent checks and balances, an external body such as an NGO, audit office or parliamentary committee could use the targets and indicators to assess and monitor an organisation's progress.

## 2 Using the targets/indicators

### 2.1 Key areas of mainstreaming

There are many different areas or aspects of a development agency's work within which mainstreaming should be addressed. **Six key areas**, crucial to the process of mainstreaming, are presented in this paper: policy, strategy, geographical planning, project cycle management, external relations and institutional capacity. These are based on the 'Indicators of institutionalisation' identified within the Humanitarian Practice Network's *Good Practice Review* on disaster risk reduction.<sup>4</sup> Targets and indicators for measuring mainstreaming in each of these six areas are presented on pages 10–15.

### 2.2 Defining levels of attainment

- Level 1 'Little or no progress'** Level 1 represents little or no progress with mainstreaming. The organisation undertakes disaster risk reduction in an ad hoc manner and has little or no awareness of the relevance and importance of adopting a systematic approach to reducing disaster risks within its relief and development processes.
- Level 2 'Awareness of needs'** Level 2 refers to an early stage of mainstreaming. The organisation has a growing level of awareness and understanding of the value and requirements of mainstreaming, and recognises the need for action. (It may also have **decided** to take action.)
- Level 3 'Development of solutions'** Level 3 refers to an intermediate stage in mainstreaming, where there are identifiable actions to consolidate the gains made in Level 2. The organisation is developing plans and tools to address the requirements of integrating risk reduction into its relief and development processes.
- Level 4 'Full integration'** Level 4 refers to a situation where risk reduction is fully absorbed into relief and development processes. The organisation places high importance on reducing disaster risks in a sustainable programme of action at multiple levels and within multiple

---

4 Twigg (2004), Good Practice Review no. 9, *Disaster risk reduction: Mitigation and preparedness in development and emergency programming*, Humanitarian Practice Network, ODI

sectors, and there is a comprehensive demonstration of practice. Thus Level 4 describes a situation where disaster risk reduction is ‘institutionalised’. However, this is not to suggest that an optimum level of attainment has occurred: there is still a need for further progress. The process of mainstreaming should be viewed as open-ended: while organisations should aim to achieve Level 4, they should also aim to make continuous improvements to their approach.

Two key points should be noted with regard to levels of attainment:

- The targets and indicators provide a template for organisations which can adapt them to suit their own context. It is crucial that users understand the underlying purpose of a given target/indicator and, if necessary, re-shape it to relate to individual agency decision-making processes and ‘culture’. Therefore, the placing of a given target/indicator in Level 2 or 3 is not rigid, and organisations may find it more appropriate to relocate some of them to different levels.
- When attempting to determine whether an organisation has reached Level 1, 2, 3 or 4, it may be discovered that the organisation is **between** levels, where it has progressed significantly beyond one stage without achieving the next. This mid-stage should be recognised and recorded as it may represent significant progress. An organisation may also have made **uneven** progress, where it is strong when measured against some targets/indicators and weaker when measured against others.

### 2.3 Applying the targets/indicators

Using the targets and indicators to measure organisational progress with mainstreaming requires sensitivity, judgement, experience and skill. They are generally broad, allowing organisations flexibility in developing their own criteria for measuring progress against them. However, it is crucial that when an organisation’s ‘score’ is presented, ‘evidence’ for this score must also be presented, including the type and source/s of data collected. For example, if the conclusion is reached that there is ‘growing commitment to the development of a planned risk reduction strategy’ within an organisation (Area 2, Level 2, page 11), information must be provided on how this ‘growing commitment’ was measured to validate the conclusion. In summary, collection, collation, analysis and presentation of data will be crucial to producing a meaningful ‘score’.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of any organisation, data should be collected from document review as well as from the opinions of a wide range of individuals and groups within and outside the organisation. Facilitator/s should always aim to back up conclusions with corroborating evidence. Data from interviews, for example, could be triangulated with data from written reports. This is especially relevant for large organisations within which staff may hold different views.

Qualitative and quantitative data can be collected through:

- analysing annual reports and reviews
- assessing the extent to which risk reduction is included in country assistance plans and strategies

- assessing the extent to which risk reduction is incorporated into project proposals / approved project documents
- analysing staff training and development policy
- gathering information from other recent organisational evaluations, reviews or audits
- holding one-to-one interviews with policy, regional and humanitarian team staff; country desk staff; specialist advisors, etc (a semi-structured interview approach is recommended)
- holding informal group (or team) discussion meetings / interviews
- questionnaires.

Organisations should decide whether to undertake a ‘quick and dirty’ assessment or a more in-depth thorough audit of their approach. The benefit of a thorough audit is that it could help an organisation to gain a better understanding of what its own departments are doing on the issue. Whichever method is used, it should be routinely and frequently applied so that progress – or the lack of it – can be monitored.

## **3 Key influences on mainstreaming**

### **3.1 Institutional capacity**

The need for ‘institutional capacity’ (Area 6, page 15) to support the mainstreaming process cannot be overestimated. Area 6 provides the foundation for achieving the targets in Areas 1–5 (pages 10–15). Sufficient ownership, skills and knowledge and financial resources will be crucial if an organisation is to be successful in mainstreaming.

Some of the finance required to support the mainstreaming process could be raised by organisations allocating a percentage of their humanitarian assistance budget (and/or development budget) to disaster risk reduction including the process of mainstreaming. Some donor organisations already have levies on their humanitarian assistance budgets in place, ranging from 5 to 20 per cent. For example, the Swiss government aims to spend 10 to 20 per cent of its overall humanitarian aid budget on ‘disaster prevention and preparedness’.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Tearfund (2003), *Natural Disaster Risk Reduction: the policy and practice of selected institutional donors*



## 3.2 Institutional blockages<sup>6</sup>

Staff ‘ownership’ of both risk reduction and the process of mainstreaming itself is key to attaining ‘full integration’ (ie: Level 4). As Twigg states, *‘Organisations are run by people...’*<sup>7</sup> and hence mainstreaming risk reduction will be totally dependent on enthusiastic and well-informed staff continually promoting it. If staff ‘own’ risk reduction as their responsibility, it has an excellent chance of becoming sustainable within the organisation.

Lange also observes the role and importance of ownership in achieving mainstreaming. Her statement refers to mainstreaming conflict, but can equally be applied to disaster risk reduction:

*‘Mainstreaming is ... not purely a top-down process ... indeed, cross-organisational buy-in, participation and ownership are pre-requisites for a (conflict-sensitive) organisational culture to take hold and expand ...’*<sup>8</sup>

It is wise therefore to anticipate potential barriers to ownership and consider how to address them, in order that mainstreaming may be regarded as an organisational asset rather than a liability.

Barriers to ownership include:

- 3.2.1 WORKLOAD** Staff may be concerned that an additional crosscutting issue to be mainstreamed is likely to result in a considerable amount of extra work for them, when they are already likely to be very busy. Many organisations have already witnessed the process where other concerns, such as gender awareness or environmental sustainability, have been incorporated into development planning with significant pressure on the operating staff to expand their perceptions and change their working patterns.

To address this, the organisation should recognise that the process of incorporating risk reduction at all levels and in all sectors will require considerable additional work and wider responsibility. Therefore budget support may be needed to employ additional staff to cope with the increased demands. The organisation should also be **realistic** when scheduling change (see point 3.2.5 below).

Another way to avoid over-burdening staff is to clarify and strengthen the links between disaster risk reduction and other crosscutting issues to be mainstreamed. Also, disaster risk reduction tools and methodologies should be made directly relevant to and, where possible, integrated with existing structures, procedures and activities rather than developed as separate processes that place a heavy burden on overworked staff.<sup>9</sup>

---

6 Tearfund’s research report *Natural Disaster Risk Reduction: the policy and practice of selected institutional donors* contains further analysis of institutional barriers to mainstreaming

7 Twigg (2004), Good Practice Review no.9, *Disaster risk reduction: Mitigation and Preparedness in development and emergency programming*, Overseas Development Institute

8 Lange (2004), *Building Institutional Capacity for Conflict-Sensitive Practice: The Case of International NGOs*, International Alert

9 Taken from Lange (2004), *Building Institutional Capacity for Conflict-Sensitive Practice: The Case of International NGOs*, International Alert

- 3.2.2 LACK OF LEADERSHIP** A risk reduction ‘champion’ within an organisation is important to promote disaster risk reduction internally. Without such a person/s, the issue will struggle to gain profile in the short term, and in the long term it may be difficult to achieve coordination, monitoring of progress across the organisation and engagement in strategic processes in order to mainstream the issue into normal business.

Equally important is the good leadership of line managers of relevant departments who are, in the long run, in the best position to facilitate the engagement and ownership of their staff (however inspiring and facilitative the champion may be). Good leadership does not need to be coercion; but lack of leadership or the disinterest of line managers in a subject that is meant to be mainstreamed sends a clear signal to their staff that they do not need to apply themselves, even if there is a formal policy of mainstreaming. Moreover, for the staff member keen to mainstream the issue into their work, lack of interest by their line manager can be a major disincentive.

Therefore, an important and effective combination of leadership is an institutional champion and line managers who take ownership and can then facilitate and encourage ownership in those whom they manage.

- 3.2.3 CONTROL** (versus trust) Deep resentment can arise when targets are built into agency work plans or individual job descriptions without full consultation and acceptance. Such a top-down approach ignores the opportunity for individuals at various levels in an organisation to actively contribute to the design of targets. By fully involving relevant staff in the entire process of developing targets there is a genuine opportunity for sustainable targets to be reached and maintained.

Also, it is vital for organisations to recognise that where rigid control is exercised, managers’ all-important trust in staff to reach targets can decrease as a direct consequence. Therefore the aim must be to inform and educate staff in the objectives of mainstreaming and ultimately to rely on trust rather than control to achieve these goals.

- 3.2.4 LACK OF SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE** Ownership can only be achieved if staff understand the importance and relevance of risk reduction to/for their own work. Building staff skills and knowledge is crucial to increasing understanding and, ultimately, ownership. As Twigg states, *‘the general level of understanding, capacity and commitment to risk reduction needs to be increased by information sharing and training at all levels of the organisation.’*<sup>10</sup>

Lange makes a similar observation: *‘Mainstreaming ... also necessitates maintaining open communication channels on and between all levels of the organisation and facilitating the flow of knowledge and learning ...’*<sup>11</sup>

Skills, knowledge and understanding can be developed through, for example, senior management briefings, training materials, regular courses for relief and development staff,

---

10 Twigg (2004), Good Practice Review no. 9, *Disaster risk reduction: Mitigation and Preparedness in development and emergency programming*, Overseas Development Institute

11 Lange (2004), *Building Institutional Capacity for Conflict-Sensitive Practice: The Case of International NGOs*, International Alert

and regular communication between relief and development staff including joint travel and joint participation in 'lessons learnt' exercises following major disasters. A specialist unit could be developed, to undertake research, develop and disseminate case studies, and ensure strong links between headquarters and field staff.

- 3.2.5 TIME** It is important to recognise that building staff ownership of risk reduction, and subsequently achieving 'full integration', is a **process**, and will take time. It will be helpful if an organisation understands more generally how change can be achieved, and how to manage change.

## **4 Presentation of the targets/indicators**

The tables on the following pages show targets and indicators for measuring mainstreaming in each of the six areas:

- policy
- strategy
- geographical planning
- project cycle management
- external relations
- institutional capacity.

AREA 1 **Policy**

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>● The organisation has little or no understanding of the relevance and importance of disaster risk reduction for its relief and development policy and practice.<sup>12</sup></p>	<p><b>A</b> There is general awareness within the organisation of the significance of disasters for its relief and development work, including the extent of the threat that disasters pose to the organisation's long-term development goals and objectives.</p> <p><b>B</b> The organisation recognises the need for relief and development to be linked in a coordinated approach to reducing disaster risks.</p>	<p><b>A</b> The organisation has a conceptual framework for disaster management<sup>13</sup> which recognises vulnerability as contributing to the risk of disasters.</p> <p><b>B</b> A wide cross-section of staff are engaged in a consultative process to EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inform the development of a policy which commits the organisation to mainstreaming disaster risk reduction within the organisation's relief and development operations OR</li> <li>• incorporate risk reduction mainstreaming into the organisation's existing policy structure.</li> </ul>	<p><b>A</b> The organisation has a 'policy'<sup>14</sup> on disaster risk reduction with realistic, achievable goals for mainstreaming. This is understood and accepted across the organisation.</p> <p><b>B</b> The organisation's risk reduction 'policy' commits it to addressing three critical issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensuring that development programmes/projects<sup>15</sup> supported by the organisation are protected through disaster risk reduction elements</li> <li>• ensuring that disaster relief and rehabilitation programmes/projects are managed in a developmental manner</li> <li>• ensuring that development, relief and rehabilitation programmes/projects do not increase people's vulnerability to disasters.</li> </ul> <p><b>C</b> The risk reduction 'policy' is fully endorsed by senior management.</p> <p><b>D</b> The risk reduction 'policy' is reflected in internal and external documents.<sup>16</sup></p>

12 This is reflected in its policy or public statements.

13 This should include common, widely understood risk reduction terminology.

14 This could be a stand-alone policy or a modification of another policy.

15 Including programmes/projects directly implemented by the organisation OR supported through grants, loans or Direct Budgetary Support mechanisms.

16 For example, documents outlining the organisation's vision, mission, approach, values and priorities.

AREA 2 **Strategy**

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Where the organisation undertakes disaster risk reduction, it is done on an ad hoc basis and there is little or no recognition of the need for a strategic approach to reducing risks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A</b> The organisation recognises that ad hoc decision-making for disaster risk reduction is inadequate.</li> <li><b>B</b> There is widespread awareness of the need to develop a strategic approach to risk reduction across the organisation, in response to policy directives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A wide cross-section of staff are engaged in a consultative process to EITHER:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop a strategy which mainstreams risk reduction within the organisation's relief and development operations</li> <li>OR</li> <li>• ensure that mainstreaming disaster risk reduction is a component of the organisation's existing strategy framework.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A</b> The organisation has a comprehensive mainstreaming strategy based on the conceptual framework and policy (see Area 1: Policy).</li> <li><b>B</b> The strategy is fully endorsed by senior management.</li> <li><b>C</b> The strategy is reflected in internal and external documents.</li> </ul>

AREA 3 **Geographical planning<sup>17</sup>**

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>● The organisation has little or no awareness of the need to consider disaster risks within geographical planning.</p>	<p><b>A</b> There is widespread understanding of the disaster-risk-vulnerability relationship at relevant geographical levels, and of the impact of disasters on the organisation’s work in a given geographical area.</p> <p><b>B</b> There is widespread understanding of the need to apply policy commitment to risk reduction within geographical planning (including Direct Budgetary Support mechanisms).</p> <p><b>C</b> The organisation is considering how existing geographical planning tools<sup>18</sup> can be (re)designed to take account of hazards, risks and vulnerabilities.</p>	<p>● The organisation is developing a process to ensure that all planning frameworks include disaster risk reduction (in order that planning is undertaken as outlined in Level 4).</p>	<p><b>A</b> There is ongoing analysis of the disaster environment in any given location (ie: assessment of hazards, disaster impact, vulnerabilities and risks).<sup>19</sup> This analysis involves the perspectives of local communities, NGOs and other stakeholders.</p> <p><b>B</b> Appropriate risk reduction strategies are developed on the basis of the above and integrated into new geographical plans as a matter of course.</p> <p><b>C</b> Where the organisation focuses on Direct Budgetary Support, it seeks the inclusion of disaster risk assessment and risk reduction in the national planning frameworks of disaster-prone countries (eg: NSSDs and PRSPs).</p>

17 This will be most relevant at country or regional levels.

18 Eg: guidelines for preparing country strategy papers/assistance plans and funding agreements.

19 Geographical Information Systems, and vulnerability and risk indices may be used.

AREA 4 **Project cycle management**

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>● The organisation has little or no understanding of the importance of addressing hazards, risks and vulnerabilities within project cycle management.</p>	<p><b>A</b> The organisation recognises a need for reducing disaster risks within every aspect of project cycle management, for the dual purpose of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protecting projects from disaster impact</li> <li>• ensuring that new projects do not increase disaster risks or enhance vulnerability.</li> </ul> <p><b>B</b> The organisation is considering how existing project cycle management tools<sup>20</sup> can be (re)designed to take account of hazards, risks and vulnerabilities.</p>	<p>● The organisation is developing an approach to ensure hazards, risks and vulnerabilities are addressed within project planning, implementation and evaluation according to the local context.<sup>21</sup></p>	<p><b>A</b> Project cycles routinely incorporate disaster risk reduction in planning, implementation and evaluation,<sup>22</sup> for the dual purpose outlined in Level 2.</p> <p><b>B</b> Recommendations arising from monitoring and evaluation inform project (re)design.</p> <p><b>C</b> Where explicit disaster risk reduction programmes are established, these are linked to the organisation's humanitarian/development programmes.</p>

20 Eg: appraisal and evaluation guidelines.

21 Recognising that local hazard conditions, cultural norms and administration patterns are variable, requiring local analysis and application.

22 Based on analysis of the disaster environment (see Area 3, level 4). Cost-benefit analysis may be appropriate.

AREA 5 **External relations**

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Where the organisation undertakes disaster risk reduction, it works independently and has little or no awareness of the need to collaborate with others.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The organisation recognises that it cannot act alone in the field of disaster risk reduction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A</b> All relevant stakeholders, including implementing partners and collaborating bodies,<sup>23</sup> are being identified through a 'stakeholder analysis'.</li> <li><b>B</b> Linkages are being made with key stakeholders at local, national and international levels to raise awareness of the organisation's risk reduction policy and strategy; to develop collaborative work; and to learn from others' approaches/research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A</b> The organisation supports, enables and invests in capacity development for risk reduction within its implementing partners.</li> <li><b>B</b> The organisation collaborates with other key players and relevant regional or global coordinating or networking bodies, and information, expertise and resources are shared as required. Common policies and shared strategies may be developed.</li> <li><b>C</b> The 'public face' of the organisation reflects its disaster risk reduction policy and strategy.<sup>24</sup></li> </ul>

23 These could include other agencies, NGOs, the private sector and academic bodies.

24 This includes presentation of work/research to professionals and the public.



AREA 6 **Institutional capacity**

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<p>● The organisation has little or no capacity to mainstream disaster risk reduction, and little or no recognition of the need to increase/develop its financial or human resources for this purpose.</p>	<p>● The organisation recognises that it must develop appropriate capacity including sufficient resources to support the process of mainstreaming risk reduction.</p>	<p><b>A</b> Plans are being made to develop a supportive institutional environment for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction.</p> <p><b>B</b> Tools are being developed to assess the organisation's progress with mainstreaming.</p>	<p><b>A</b> Institutional capacity is sufficient to support all the processes outlined in Areas 1–5, ie:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial resources.</li> <li>• Skills and knowledge (eg: staff training and development, materials and appropriate technical support).</li> <li>• Strong cross-organisational commitment and ownership of risk reduction policy and strategy at all levels.<sup>25</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>B</b> There are strong links between HQ and field staff, who have access to services and exchange of information.</p> <p><b>C</b> Tools are routinely used independently and comprehensively to assess the organisation's progress with mainstreaming.</p>

25 This will require internal collaboration between departments.

## APPENDIX **Terminology**

This paper includes the use of a number of words or expressions which have now entered disaster/development jargon. To avoid misunderstandings, our interpretation of these words/expressions is as follows:

**DISASTER RISK REDUCTION** Technical, social or economic actions or measures used to reduce direct, indirect and intangible disaster losses. The expression ‘disaster risk reduction’ is now widely used as a term that encompasses the two aspects of a disaster reduction strategy: ‘mitigation’ and ‘preparedness’. Tearfund defines mitigation as the measures that can be undertaken to minimise the destructive and disruptive effects of hazards and thus lessen the magnitude of a disaster. Tearfund defines preparedness as all measures undertaken to ensure the readiness and ability of a society to forecast and take precautionary measures in advance of imminent threat, and respond and cope with the effects of a disaster by organising and delivering timely and effective rescue, relief and other post-disaster assistance.

**MAINSTREAMING** This word obviously derives from the metaphor of a small, isolated flow of water being drawn into the mainstream of a river where it will expand to flow smoothly without loss or diversion. Therefore ‘mainstreaming risk reduction’ describes a process to fully incorporate disaster risk reduction into relief and development policy and practice. It means radically expanding and enhancing disaster risk reduction so that it becomes normal practice, fully institutionalised within an agency’s relief and development agenda.

Mainstreaming has three purposes:

- To make certain that all the development programmes and projects that originate from or are funded by an agency are designed with evident consideration for potential disaster risks and to resist hazard impact.
- To make certain that all the development programmes and projects that originate from or are funded by an agency do not inadvertently increase vulnerability to disaster in all sectors: social, physical, economic and environment.
- To make certain that all the disaster relief and rehabilitation programmes and projects that originate from or are funded by an agency are designed to contribute to developmental aims and to reduce future disaster risk.

**VULNERABILITY** The conditions determined by physical, social, economic, political and environmental factors or processes, which increase the susceptibility of a community to the impact of hazards.

**PERFORMANCE TARGET** A specific, well-defined target to be aimed for in the course of a programme or project and its implementation.

**INDICATOR** An indication of progress that has been reached in any given topic. Within disaster management and disaster risk reduction, there may be a wide range of social, physical and economic indicators identifying stages in development which will enable disaster managers to recognise where they now stand, defining what stage they have reached or where they need to go next.



**Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction:  
a tool for development organisations**

Sarah La Trobe  
Professor Ian Davis

© Tearfund January 2005

Tearfund is an evangelical Christian relief and development agency working with local partners to bring help and hope to communities in need around the world.



CHRISTIAN ACTION WITH THE WORLD'S POOR

100 Church Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8QE, UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 8977 9144

Website: [www.tearfund.org](http://www.tearfund.org)

Registered Charity No. 265464