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## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADPC</td>
<td>Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDMI</td>
<td>All India Disaster Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARD</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh Academy of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSDPS</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh State Development Planning Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATIs</td>
<td>Administrative Training Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBL</td>
<td>Building Bye Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDMO</td>
<td>Block Disaster Management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDO</td>
<td>Block Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPARD</td>
<td>Bihar Institute of Public Administration and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Bureau of Indian Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMTPC</td>
<td>Building Materials and Technology Promotion Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADME</td>
<td>Coastal Area Disaster Mitigation Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Contingency Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Climate Change Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Community Contingency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>Centre for Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDV</td>
<td>Capacity Development Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMG</td>
<td>Crisis Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>Central Police Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF</td>
<td>Calamity Relief Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIR</td>
<td>Council of Scientific and Industrial Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Central Water Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVP</td>
<td>Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDMAs</td>
<td>District Disaster Management Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>District Magistrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC</td>
<td>Disaster Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMMC</td>
<td>Disaster Mitigation and Management Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMP</td>
<td>Disaster Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM Act</td>
<td>Disaster Management Act, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGoM</td>
<td>Empowered Group of Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAA</td>
<td>Gopabandhu Academy of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIDM</td>
<td>Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOI</td>
<td>Government of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Gram Panchayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSDMA</td>
<td>Gujarat State Disaster Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>Hyogo Framework of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLC</td>
<td>High Level Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>High Powered Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR &amp; CD Plan</td>
<td>Human Resource and Capacity Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HUDCO: Housing and Urban Development Corporation
IAS: Indian Administrative Service
ICS: Incident Command System
ICT: Information and Communication Technology
IDNDR: International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction
IEC: Information, Education and Communication
IDKN: India Disaster Knowledge Network
IDRN: India Disaster Resource Network
IIA: Indian Institute of Public Administration
IIT: Indian Institute of Technology
IMD: Indian Meteorological Department
IMG: Inter Ministerial Group
INGOs: International Non Governmental Organisations
ITK: Indigenous Technology Knowledge
LBSNAA: Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration
MCRHRD: Dr. Marri Chenna Reddy Human Resource Development Institute
MHA: Ministry of Home Affairs
NBC: National Building Code
NBC: Nuclear, Biological and Chemical
NCC: National Cadet Corps
NCCF: National Calamity Contingency Fund
NCDM: National Centre for Disaster Management
NDCN: National Disaster Communication Network
NDEM: National Database for Emergency Management
NCMC: National Crisis Management Committee
NDMA: National Disaster Management Authority
NDMF: National Disaster Management Framework
NDRF: National Disaster Response Force
NDRF: National Disaster Response Fund
NEC: National Executive Committee
NIC: National Informatics Centre
NIDE: National Inventory of Disaster Equipments
NIDM: National Institute of Disaster Management
NITs: National Institutes of Technology
NPDM: National Policy on Disaster Management
NSDI: National Spatial Data Infrastructure
NSS: National Service Scheme
NTP: National Training Plan
NYKS: Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan
ODRC: Owner Driven Reconstruction Collaborative
PDRA: Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment
PRIs: Panchayati Raj Institutions
PWD: Public Works Department
RWAs: Resident Welfare Associations
SAARC: South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SAT: Satellite
SCMC: State Crisis Management Committee
SDMA: State Disaster Management Authority
SDRF: State Disaster Response Force
SFIT: Strategic Framework for Implementation of Training
SHGs: Self Help Groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIRD</td>
<td>State Institute of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPs</td>
<td>Standard Operation Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>State Response Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAoA</td>
<td>Uttarakhand Academy of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC</td>
<td>University Grants Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULBs</td>
<td>Urban Local Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISDR</td>
<td>United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTs</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report on Review of Institutions, Strategy for Standardisation & Mechanism for setting up of DRR Institute along with its Capacity Building Strategy is part of the deliverables of the Long Term Training and Capacity Building Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction in India, being carried out under the National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project of Government of India.

As a starting point it notes that an institutional system was already in place in India before the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005. At national level, it consisted of Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities for natural disasters and Cabinet Committee on Security for human induced disasters having security implications. It also consisted of a National Crisis Management Committee headed by Cabinet Secretary with Secretaries of concerned Ministries and Departments as Members to ensure effective coordination and implementation of response and relief measures in the wake of disasters. Besides, there is a Crises Management Group under the Central Relief Commissioner with nodal officers of relevant Ministries and Departments as Members.

These institutional mechanisms have not been disturbed and continue to be functional even now, except the Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities which has been discontinued recently. However, these institutional systems were basically response-oriented and did not have any legislative back up. Therefore, it was felt, after tsunami disaster as also based on the recommendations of High Powered Committee on Disaster Management, to establish a new set of institutional mechanism to take care of pre-disaster aspects and look at the entire matter in a holistic manner. It was in this background that the Disaster Management Act was enacted and institutions like NDMA, NEC, SDMAs, SECs and DDMAs were established, besides NDRF and NIDM.

The evaluation of various institutions in force, before and after enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 has been viewed under the following themes:

- Identification of legal and institutional gaps in the existing system. Based on the experience gathered since the enactment of the Act, a view of amendments to be carried out in the DM Act, 2005 is also taken for consideration of the Government. Further, the recommendations made by the Task Force to review the Disaster Management Act, 2005 are also studied.

- Analysis of the National Disaster Management Framework and the National Policy on Disaster Management; identifying gaps therein with measures required to be taken to cover these gaps.

- Synergy and adequacy of existing institutional and organisational framework to ensure there is convergence among various institutional systems put in place so that the entire network of institutions can work together as a cohesive unit and optimise outputs.

- Functioning of NDMA and NEC, in the background of functions assigned to each and looking at a future roadmap for each; also considering the recommendations made by the Task Force and to find amicable but useful options.

- Institutional systems put in place at state, district and local level in terms of the DM Act and covers State Disaster Management Authorities, State Executive Committees, District Disaster Management Authorities and role of local authorities. Models for SDMAs, functioning and structure of SDMAs and SECs, need for dedicated secretariat for SDMAs, SECs, DDMAs and re-defining the role of local authorities to enable them to discharge the functions assigned to it under the Act.

- National Institute of Disaster Management, its challenges in discharging the functions assigned to it, the bottlenecks, too much stress on training and de-motivation and frustration of faculty members. Criteria for a future roadmap for NIDM, the proposed structure etc to cover the gaps visible at present.
For the purpose of the study, identification of legal and institutional gaps has been looked at in the national as well as global perspectives. Keeping in view the paradigm shift from response to preparedness oriented approach, a National Roadmap has been conceived covering institutional mechanism; legal and policy framework; disaster prevention strategy; early warning systems; disaster mitigation, preparedness and response; National Network of Emergency Operation Centers; human resource development; and research and knowledge management. The expected inputs, areas of intervention and agencies to be involved at national, state and district levels were also identified and listed in the national roadmap. The High Powered Committee on Disaster Management Plans played a key role in the entire process.

The Disaster Management Act, 2005 was enacted on 23rd December 2005. The legislation was made under Entry 23 (Social Security and Social Insurance) in the Concurrent List of the Constitution of India. This provides the advantage of permitting the States to have their own legislation on disaster management since it is not feasible for a national Act to take care of all micro level considerations which need to have legislative back up. Besides, in a federal system where state governments draw their mandate directly under the Constitution of India like the national government, it would be appropriate to allow them to legislate to address their own concerns; more so when in the federal set up of India, the basic responsibility for undertaking rescue, relief and rehabilitation measures in the event of natural disasters is that of the State Government concerned. The role of the Central Government is supportive, in terms of physical and financial resources and complementary measures in sectors such as transport, warning and inter-state movement of food grains and other relief materials/ resources.

With the experience of about eight years since the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005, a review of Act has become necessary to take care of apparent inconsistencies or inadequacies. Keeping this in view, the Government of India constituted a Task Force to undertake the review. The Task Force has since submitted its report to the government. The report of the Task Force is now in public domain. The legal gaps identified in this document are based on study of the Act, experience of the consultants and interaction with state governments and other stakeholders during field visits to six states, independent of the report of the Task Force. Institutions have been reviewed at the national, state, district and local levels. Parallel review processes have also been considered and included.

The structure of the National Disaster Management Authority, as well as the State and District Authorities, State Plans and the overall policy framework all indicate a robust structure that is yet to fully achieve its potential and deliver the desired outputs.

Some of the key findings are as follows:

- The National Policy on Disaster Management is a very comprehensive document encompassing all phases of disaster management.
- It takes into consideration the concerns articulated in the Report of the High Powered Committee on Disaster Management and the National Roadmap as also statutory provisions contained in the DM Act, 2005.
- Besides, it also stresses on the emerging concerns like unplanned urbanization, population explosion and climate change which are intricately linked to future disasters.
- The main thrust is to integrate these measures with the development planning and various development programmes under implementation or which may be undertaken in future to ensure inclusive and sustainable development.
- Although it was the statutory responsibility of NEC, SECs and DDMAs to coordinate and monitor implementation of National Policy but none of these institutional bodies have taken any action in this regard.
There is need to put in place a vibrant and functioning mechanism to coordinate and monitor implementation of National Policy.

The state governments may lay down their own policies based on their respective vulnerabilities and consistent with the National Policy.

NIDM needs to be adequately strengthened. It is at present focused on organizing training programmes only and its other functions as laid down in the Act are getting relegated.

NIDM is not merely a training institute. It has to perform several other functions also such as research and education, documentation, development of national level information base, extending professional and policy support to Central and State Governments and State Training Institutes etc.

The institute should concentrate on training of policy makers and Master Resource Persons/Trainers. It is not necessary for them to organise a large number of training programmes.

It should extend support to State level training institutes/centres by developing trainers and training modules. As the apex level institute, it should focus on quality and not quantity of training programmes in terms of numbers.

It should also extend support to State level training institutes to develop State Training and Capacity Development Policy, Training Infrastructure, training modules for all stakeholders, Documentation of past disasters and development of case studies and process for selection of participants.

IIPA should develop adequate faculty for imparting advanced training in DRR and CCA and its integration with various development programmes being implemented by Central and State Governments.

Besides, it would also be desirable to include a capsule on DRR and CCA in all training programmes being organized by IIPA.

LBSNAA, through its Center for Disaster Management, may diversify to include DRR and CCA as also its integration with development programmes being implemented in the country, besides running specific training modules under ICS for response.

State Governments need to take accelerated action to establish their respective State Disaster Response Forces (SDRFs), dispersed in all districts. The rapid response teams of SDRFs can be trained by NDRF and they can supplement the training programmes in the state on the lines of training programmes being carried out by NDRF.

Although 31 DM Centres have been established in States and additional 11 Centres are in the process of being set up and despite the fact that most of the DM Centres have been functional for more than one and half decades, the performance of the Centres, except few, has left much to be desired.

The faculty mostly is not in position; training programmes being organized are invariably supply-driven and not demand-driven; training needs analysis has not been carried out; focused training modules have mostly not been developed; and the state governments have not assumed ownership of the DM Centres in real sense of the term.

Besides these, detailed observations and recommendations are made in the report, which may be considered by Government of India for overall legal and institutional approach and structuring, with a specific aim of long term training and capacity building for disaster risk reduction in the country.
EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONS

An institutional system was already in place in India before the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005. At national level, it consisted of Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities for natural disasters and Cabinet Committee on Security for human induced disasters having security implications. It also consisted of a National Crisis Management Committee headed by Cabinet Secretary with Secretaries of concerned Ministries and Departments as Members to ensure effective coordination and implementation of response and relief measures in the wake of disasters. Besides, there is a Crises Management Group under the Central Relief Commissioner with nodal officers of relevant Ministries and Departments as Members. The CMG’s functions are to review every year contingency plans formulated by various Ministries/Departments/Organizations in their respective sectors, measures required for dealing with a natural disaster, coordinate the activities of the Central Ministries and the State Governments in relation to disaster preparedness and relief and to obtain information from the nodal officers on measures relating to above. The CMG, in the event of a natural disaster, meets frequently till the situation is stabilized to review the relief operations and extend all possible assistance required by the affected States to overcome the situation effectively. The Resident Commissioner of the affected State is also associated with such meetings. There is also a High Level Committee consisting of Ministers of Agriculture, Home, Defence and Finance to decide about the release of funds from National Calamity Contingency Fund (NCCF), now known as National Disaster Response Fund, to sanction funds to states where the Calamity Relief Fund of the State is not sufficient for this purpose. There is also a National Emergency Operation Centre to assist the Central Relief Commissioner in the discharge of his duties. The activities of the Control Room include collection and transmission of information concerning natural calamity and relief, keeping close contact with governments of the affected States, interaction with other Central Ministries/Departments/Organizations in connection with relief, maintaining records containing all relevant information relating to action points and contact points in Central Ministries etc., keeping up-to-date details of all concerned officers at the Central and State levels.

The Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities has been discontinued recently by the present Government, keeping in view that it had not met even once during last several years. Besides, in case of a major disaster, the Central Government, normally, constitutes a Group of Ministers (GoM), with Ministers of relevant Ministries/Departments as members. These may vary based on nature and needs of each disaster. For instance, in case of tsunami, supply of drinking water to remote islands in Andaman and Nicobar became a crucial issue due to salinity of normal drinking water sources whereas it was not a key issue in case of Super Cyclone or Bhuj earthquake.

At State level, there is a State Crises Management Committee under the Chief Secretary. The Committee is required to take into consideration the instructions and guidance received, from time to time, from the Government of India and formulates action plans dealing with different natural disasters. Besides, there are State EOCs and State Relief Manuals.

These institutional mechanisms have not been disturbed and continue to be functional even now. However, these institutional systems were basically response-oriented and did not have any legislative back up. Therefore, it was felt, after tsunami disaster as also based on the recommendations of High Powered Committee on Disaster Management, to establish a new set of institutional mechanism to take care of pre-disaster aspects and look at the entire matter in a holistic manner. It was in this background that the Disaster Management Act was enacted and institutions like NDMA, NEC, SDMAs, SECs and DDMAs were established, besides NDRF and NIDM. The functions of the institutional mechanism in force before the enactment of DM Act as also institutions set up with the enactment of DM Act are discussed at length in Section 1 of this report.

Even before the enactment of the national Act, Gujarat and Bihar had enacted their own state Acts. Besides, Odisha and Gujarat had also established their State Disaster Management Authorities.
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system has not been disturbed. In fact, since DM Act has been enacted under the Concurrent List of the Constitution of India, it enables the State Governments to enact their respective laws for disaster management so far these do not contradict the provisions contained in the DM Act.

The evaluation of various institutions in force, before and after enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 has been undertaken in this report in six sections.

Section 1 discusses identification of legal and institutional gaps in the existing system. Based on the experience gather since the enactment of the Act, it also recommends the amendments to be carried out in the DM Act, 2005 for consideration of the Government. Further, it also discusses the recommendations made by the Task Force constituted to review the Disaster Management Act, 2005.

Section 2 analyses the National Disaster Management Framework and the National Policy on Disaster Management; identifies gaps therein with measures required to be taken to cover these gaps.

Section 3 deals with synergy and adequacy of existing institutional and organisational framework to ensure there is convergence among various institutional systems put in place so that the entire network of institutions can work together as a cohesive unit and optimise outputs.

Section 4 attempts to review the functioning of NDMA and NEC, in the background of functions assigned to each and suggests a future roadmap for each; it also considers the recommendations made by the Task Force and seeks to find amicable and useful options.

Section 5 attempts to evaluation institutional systems put in place at state, district and local level in terms of the DM Act and covers State Disaster Management Authorities, State Executive Committees, District Disaster Management Authorities and role of local authorities. It also discusses various models for SDMAs, functioning and structure of SDMAs and SECs, need for dedicated secretariat for SDMAs, SECs, DDMAs and also tends to re-define the role of local authorities to enable them to discharge the functions assigned to it under the Act.

Section 6 deals with National Institute of Disaster Management, whether it has been able to discharge the functions assigned to it, the bottlenecks, too much stress on training and de-motivation and frustration of faculty members. It also attempts to work out the future roadmap for NIDM, the proposed structure etc to cover the gaps visible at present.

The legal, institutional and organisational arrangements are already in place. The purpose of the exercise under Component ‘D’ is to ascertain whether these systems have been able to achieve the objectives assigned to each under the Act; what are the gaps observed and measures to be taken to bridge these gaps.
SECTION 1: IDENTIFICATION OF LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL GAPS

Introduction

National Perspective

India has been vulnerable, in varying degrees, to a large number of natural, as well as, human-made disasters on account of its unique geo-climatic and socio-economic conditions. It is highly vulnerable to floods, droughts, cyclones, earthquakes, landslides, avalanches and forest fires. Out of 36 states and union territories in the country, including Telangana state created recently, 28 of them are disaster prone. Almost 58.6 per cent of the landmass is prone to earthquakes of moderate to very high intensity; over 40 million hectares (12 per cent of land) are prone to floods and river erosion; of the 7,516 km long coastline, close to 5,700 km is prone to cyclones and tsunamis; 68 per cent of the cultivable area is vulnerable to drought and hilly areas are at risk from landslides and avalanches.

One of the ten worst disaster prone countries in the world, the contributing factors to make it more vulnerable include adverse geo-climatic conditions, topographic features, environmental degradation, population growth, urbanisation, industrialization, non scientific development practices etc. The factors either in original or by accelerating the intensity and frequency of disasters are responsible for heavy toll of human lives and disrupting the life supporting system in the country.

The conversion of hazard into disasters, or, for that matter, the impact of disasters is primarily based on the following four factors which have a multiplier effect:

- Hazard frequency and severity due to geo-climatic and environmental conditions
- Physical vulnerability caused by man-made intervention in the use and management of land and natural resources, construction of buildings and infrastructure, and protection of the environment
- Poverty due to fairly high segment of economically disadvantaged population
- Social due to socially disadvantaged population, be it caste, community or gender bias.

The vulnerabilities to disasters in India have been escalating with the increasing population leading to additional settlements in more disaster prone areas; accelerating urbanization, social and gender bias and changing modes of construction. It is also the poor who are most vulnerable to disasters. Their habitats are fragile and because of their extreme poverty, they have to settle in marginal areas which are most vulnerable to natural hazards. Recurrent disasters further marginalize the poor.

Disasters wipe out development gains achieved over the decades. Development, therefore, cannot be sustainable unless mitigation measures are made part of developmental process itself. The huge expenditure incurred on post-disaster relief is an indicator that if mitigation and preparedness measures are put in place and resources are invested in the core area of human resource development, the expenditure being incurred on response and relief will be drastically reduced, not to speak of reduction in the loss of lives, community assets and infrastructure. The economic loss due to disasters accounts for 2% of the GDP every year as per the study of the World Bank, which mounted from 36 thousand crore during 1991-95 to 86 thousand crore during 2001-05.

Global Perspective

At the global level, there has been considerable concern over natural disasters. Even as substantial scientific and material progress is made, the loss of lives and property due to disasters has not
decreased adequately. In fact, the human toll and economic losses have mounted. It was in this background that the United Nations General Assembly, in 1989, declared the decade 1990-2000 as the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) with the objective to reduce loss of lives and property and restrict socio-economic damage through concerted international action, especially in developing countries.

The Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation and its Plan of Action adopted in 1994 provided landmark guidance on reducing disaster risk and the impacts of disasters. The review of progress made in implementing the Yokohama Strategy identified major challenges in ensuring more systematic action to address disaster risks in the context of sustainable development and in building resilience through enhanced national and local capabilities to manage and reduce risk. The review stressed the importance of disaster risk reduction being underpinned by a more pro-active approach to informing, motivating and involving people in all aspects of disaster risk reduction in their own local communities. It also highlighted the scarcity of resources allocated specifically from development budgets for the realization of risk reduction objectives, either at the national or the regional level or through international cooperation and financial mechanisms, while noting the significant potential to better exploit existing resources and established practices for more effective disaster risk reduction.

The specific gaps and challenges were identified in the following five main areas:
- Governance: organizational, legal and policy frameworks;
- Risk identification, assessment, monitoring and early warning;
- Knowledge management and education;
- Reducing underlying risk factors;
- Preparedness for effective response and recovery.

The Hyogo Framework for Action, 2005-15, drawing on the conclusions of the review of the Yokohama Strategy and the IDNDR, and on the basis of deliberations at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction held in January, 2005 at Kobe, Hyogo, Japan, and especially the agreed expected outcome and strategic goals, adopted the following five priorities for action by all member countries of the United Nations:
- Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.
- Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.
- Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.
- Reduce the underlying risk factors.
- Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

UN defines Disaster Risk Management as the systematic process of using administrative directions, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement policies, strategies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disasters (UNISDR, 2009). According to UNISDR (2009), DRM activities may be categorized into the following essential elements:
- Risk Assessment and Analysis
- Disaster Preparedness
- Mitigation
- Risk Transfer
- Response, Rescue & Relief
- Recovery, Rehabilitation & Reconstruction
Paradigm shift in India-The Background

The super cyclone in Orissa in October, 1999 and the Bhuj earthquake in Gujarat in January, 2001 underscored the need to adopt a multi dimensional endeavour involving diverse scientific, engineering, financial and social processes; the need to adopt multi-disciplinary, multi-sector and multi-stakeholder participatory approach and incorporation of risk reduction in the developmental plans and strategies. It was also recognized that the capabilities of people in India have to be built to enable them to work towards their own risk reduction.

The Group of Ministers which examined this issue, inter alia recommended that it is imperative that appropriate procedures, structures etc are expeditiously put in place to cope with national calamities like cyclones, floods, earthquakes etc. Since disaster management requires dealing with one or more authorities with the intervention of central police organizations, the law and order machinery etc. it may be appropriate to transfer this subject from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Home Affairs (with the exception of drought relief and famine which would continue to be handled by the Ministry of Agriculture and epidemics by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare). The Group of Ministers had, therefore, recommended that the Allocation of Business Rules may be amended for this purpose3.

In the light of the above mentioned recommendation, the Government of India (Allocation of Business ) Rules 1961 were amended in February, 2002 transferring the subject of Disaster Management (except drought and epidemics) and those disasters which have not been specifically allotted to any other Ministry, to the Ministry of Home Affairs. The work was effectively transferred to the Ministry of Home Affairs from 1st June, 2002.

With the transfer of work to the Ministry of Home Affairs, there was change in orientation and a pro-active approach in place of re-active approach was adopted. It brought about a change in focus from mere post disaster response and relief to holistic preparedness and mitigation. To remove earlier inadequacies, the Government of India increasingly insisted on intensive multi-departmental involvement and pro-active mainstreaming of disaster management into all Government activities, particularly developmental initiatives. The multi disciplinary approach involves partnership with a large number of Ministries/Departments such as Health, Water Resources, Environment and Forests, Agriculture, Railways, Atomic Energy, Defense, Chemicals, Science & Technology, Telecommunication, Urban Development, Rural Development, India Meteorological Department and Civil Defense.

National Roadmap

Keeping in view the change in orientation, a review of disaster management mechanism was carried out by the Government of India after the Gujarat earthquake. It was noted that there was a felt need to build up holistic capabilities for disaster management so as to be able to handle both natural and human-induced disasters. The Government of India, therefore, brought about a change in policy which emphasizes mitigation, prevention and preparedness. A strategic National Disaster Management Framework (National Roadmap) was drawn up for reducing the country’s vulnerability to disasters with the mandate that action for reducing the vulnerabilities shall be taken in accordance with the Roadmap.

The National Roadmap covers institutional mechanism; legal and policy framework; disaster prevention strategy; early warning systems; disaster mitigation, preparedness and response; National Network of Emergency Operation Centers; human resource development; and research and knowledge management. The expected inputs, areas of intervention and agencies to be involved at

---

3 Disaster Management in India, 2004. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India
national, state and district levels were also identified and listed in the national roadmap. The national roadmap was shared with all State Governments and Union Territory Administrations, Ministries/Departments of the Government of India, International agencies and other concerned Organizations. The State Governments were advised to develop their respective roadmaps taking the national roadmap as a broad guideline. This has brought about a convergence of activities being undertaken by all participating organizations and highlighted the need for a uniform approach as a national theme for disaster mitigation and preparedness.

**High Powered Committee on Disaster Management**

In order to look into the entire gamut of disaster management in India, the Government constituted a High Powered Committee on Disaster Management (HPC on DM) in August, 1999. The Members of the HPC were drawn from the Ministries/States/NGOs and experts from relevant fields. It was a first attempt in India towards drawing up a systematic, comprehensive and holistic approach towards disasters.

The original mandate of HPC was confined to preparation of management plans for natural disasters. It was expanded subsequently to include man-made disasters also. The enhanced terms of reference of the HPC were as follows:-

- To review existing arrangements for preparedness and mitigation of natural and man-made disasters including industrial, nuclear, biological and chemical disasters;
- Recommend measures for strengthening organizational structures; and
- Prepare model plans for management of these disasters at the National, State and District level.

The HPC submitted its report in October, 2001. The major recommendations made by HPC were briefly as follows:-

- Inclusion of disaster management in the Concurrent List of the 7th Schedule of the Constitution and enactment of a National Calamity Management Act as also State Disaster Management Acts.
- Constitution of a permanent Cabinet Committee on Disaster Management and an all Party National Committee on Disaster Management.
- Creation of separate Departments of Disaster Management and Mitigation in States and the Ministry of Disaster Management in the Union Government.
- Establishment of a National Institute of Disaster Management as a Centre of Excellence for creation of knowledge network and its dissemination including training and networking with State level training Institutes.
- Creation of state of the art Emergency Operation Centers at State and District level.
- Creation of a National Fund for rehabilitation and reconstruction and a separate National Fund for prevention and mitigation.
- Preparation of large-scale digital maps, topographic maps, seismic micro zoning and satellite remote sensing.
- Development of a sound information database and documentation of previous disasters.
- Development of District Disaster Management Plans and their integration with the State Plans and the National Plan.
- Preparation of Panchayat, local body and community level Disaster Management Plans.
- Strengthening of forecasting/warning and alert systems.
- Human Resource Development by training of Police and Para Military personnel, Fire Services personnel, Civil Defence/Home Guards, Territorial Army, ex-servicemen, National Cadet Corps, National Service Scheme, Scouts and Guides, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan and Youth Clubs.
- Collaboration with SAARC and neighbouring countries for forecasting, information sharing and pooling of resources.
- Trigger mechanism to simultaneously activate response on all fronts.
- Development of a standard cache of equipments for search & rescue and medical response.
- Evolvement of minimum standards of relief.
- Preparation of Disaster specific medical plans.

In the aftermath of Bhuj Earthquake, a Working Group on Disaster Management was constituted under the Chairmanship of Mr. Sharad Pawar, a former Chief Minister and Cabinet Minister and the then Vice-Chairman of National Committee on Disaster Management constituted under the Chairmanship of the then Prime Minister soon after Bhuj earthquake, with the Members of the High Powered Committee as the Members of the Working Group. The Working Group submitted its report to the Prime Minister in June, 2003 and by and large endorsed the recommendations made by the High Powered Committee brought out above.

The Government considered and accepted most of the recommendations of the High Powered Committee and the Working Group. Initially it was felt that since disaster management is primarily the responsibility of the State Governments and the Central Government provides financial and logistic support in case of major disasters, the State Governments should enact the state legislation on the subject. The State Governments were advised accordingly. However, after the tsunami disaster in December, 2004, it was decided in the All Party meeting held under the Chairmanship of Prime Minister on 9th January, 2005 to enact a Central Legislation covering all aspects of disaster management – prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction – and constitute Disaster Management Authorities at National, State and District level.

**Legal and Institutional Systems in force prior to enactment of DM Act, 2005**

However, before going into the institutional mechanisms put in place through the Disaster Management Act, 2005, it may be appropiate to examine the institutional mechanisms which were already in place before the national Act was enacted and which continue to subsist even after the DM Act was enacted. In other words, The DM Act supplements and does not supplant the institutional mechanisms in place before the enactment of DM Act, which still continue to be in force and are briefly given below.

**National Level**

**National Crises Management Committee (NCMC):** Cabinet Secretary, who is the highest executive officer, heads the NCMC. Its Composition is:

1. Cabinet Secretary.......................................................... Chairperson
2. Home Secretary............................................................ Member
3. Defence Secretary........................................................... Member
4. Health Secretary............................................................ Member
5. Secretary, M/Power........................................................ Member
6. Chairman, Railway Board............................................ Member
7. Secretary, Urban Employment & Poverty Alleviation...... Member
8. Secretary, Petroleum & Natural Gas............................. Member
9. Secretary, Shipping........................................................ Member
10. Secretary, Road Transport & Highways....................... Member
11. Secretary, Telecom....................................................... Member
12. Secretary, Rural Development.................................... Member
13. Agriculture Secretary.................................................. Member
14. Secretary, Drinking Water Supply............................... Member
15. Secretary, Food & Public Distribution.......................... Member
16. Secretary, Water Resources......................................... Member
17. Joint Secretary, Cabinet Secretariat............................. Convener
The Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India will provide necessary secretariat assistance. The NCMC ensures effective coordination and implementation of response and relief measures in the wake of disasters. It also gives direction to the Crisis Management Group as deemed necessary. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs is responsible for ensuring that all developments are brought to the notice of the NCMC promptly. NCMC can direct Secretary of any Ministry/Department/Organization for specific action needed for meeting the crisis situation.

**Crisis Management Group:** The Central Relief Commissioner in the Ministry of Home Affairs is the Chairman of the CMG, consisting of senior officers (called as nodal officers) from various concerned Ministries. The CMG’s functions are to review every year contingency plans formulated by various Ministries/Departments/Organizations in their respective sectors, measures required for dealing with a natural disaster, coordinate the activities of the Central Ministries and the State Governments in relation to disaster preparedness and relief and to obtain information from the nodal officers on measures relating to above. The CMG, in the event of a natural disaster, meets frequently till the situation is stabilized to review the relief operations and extend all possible assistance required by the affected States to overcome the situation effectively. The Resident Commissioner of the affected State is also associated with such meetings.

**Cabinet Committee/Task Force:** There are already two Cabinet Committees in place; the Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities for natural disasters and the Cabinet Committee on Security which inter alia looks into the aspects of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) disasters. The Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities has been discontinued recently by the new Government keeping in view that it had not met in last several years. Besides, the Union Cabinet may set up a Cabinet Committee/Task Force / Group of Ministers for effective coordination and implementation of relief measures in the wake of a natural disaster. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs acts as the Secretary of the Committee. Such Committees/Task Force/Group of Ministers had been set up in the wake of Super Cyclone of Orissa in 1999, Earthquake of Gujarat 2001, severe floods in 2000, drought in 2002, and tsunami in 2004.

**Control Room (Emergency Operation Room):** An Emergency Operations Center (Control Room) exists in the nodal Ministry of Home Affairs, which functions round the clock, to assist the Central Relief Commissioner in the discharge of his duties. The activities of the Control Room include collection and transmission of information concerning natural calamity and relief, keeping close contact with governments of the affected States, interaction with other Central Ministries/Departments/Organizations in connection with relief, maintaining records containing all relevant information relating to action points and contact points in Central Ministries etc. and keeping up-to-date details of all concerned officers at the Central and State levels.

**Contingency Action Plan:** A National Contingency Action Plan (CAP) for dealing with contingencies arising in the wake of natural disasters has been formulated by the Government of India and it had been periodically updated. It facilitates the launching of relief operations without delay. The CAP identifies the initiatives required to be taken by various Central Ministries/Departments in the wake of natural calamities, sets down the procedure and determines the focal points in the administrative machinery.

**State Level**

At the State level, a State Crisis Management Committee has been set under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary, who is the highest executive functionary in the State. All the concerned Departments and organizations of the State and Central Government Departments located in the State are represented in this Committee. The Committee is required to take into consideration the
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instructions and guidance received, from time to time, from the Government of India and formulates action plans dealing with different natural disasters. It is also required to have the district level plans formulated by District Collectors/Deputy Commissioners. An officer of the level of Secretary in the State Government is designated as Relief Commissioner, who is the nodal officer in the State for disaster management.

The Relief Commissioner is required to establish an Emergency Operation Center (Control Room) as soon as a disaster situation develops. Most of the states have now set up 24x7 EOCs which function round the year. The Control Room is required to have all information relating to the forecasting and warning of disaster, action plan for implementation and details of contact points and various agencies. It should have updated information about the Air Force, the Army and the Navy for quick interaction in times of emergencies. The other responsibilities of the Control Room are:

- Transmitting to the Central Relief Commissioner information as to the development of a crisis situation as a result of natural disaster on continuous basis till the situation improves;
- Receiving instructions and communicating to the appropriate agencies in the State, for immediate action;
- Collection and submission of information relating to implementation of relief measures to the Central Relief Commissioner; and
- Keeping the State level authorities apprised of the developments on a continuing basis.

**State Relief Manuals:** Each State Government has relief manuals/codes which identify the role of each officer in the State for managing the natural disasters. These are reviewed and updated periodically based on the experience of managing the disasters and the needs of the State.

**District Level**

District level is the key level for disaster management related activities. The Collector or Deputy Commissioner is the chief administrator in the district. He is the focal point for preparation of the district level plans and for directing, supervising and monitoring relief measures for the natural disasters. A District Level Co-ordination and Relief Committee is constituted and is headed by the Collector as Chairman with participation of all other related government and non governmental agencies and departments in addition to the elected representatives. The Collector is required to maintain close liaison with the Central Government authorities in the district, namely Army, Air Force and Navy, Ministries of Communications, Water Resources, Drinking Water, Surface Transport, who could supplement the effort of the district administration in the rescue and relief operations. He is also required to take all steps for enlistment of voluntary efforts and channelizing the non-government organization response to natural disasters. He also closely interacts with different implementation agencies and furnishes information on a daily basis to the State Relief Commissioner on implementation of rescue and relief measures.

**Shared responsibility**

It needs to be mentioned that the responsibility for carrying out all the activities and tasks of disaster risk management do not fall under one single institution but traverse the lines of responsibility of several governments, private and non-government organizations. At times, the performance of these activities requires inter-institutional coordination in order to harmonize planning strategies and action plans, share technical expertise, clarify roles and mandates, and agree on the pooling of resources.

**The Disaster Management Act, 2005**

Even before the Disaster Management Act, 2005 was enacted, the Government of Gujarat, in the aftermath of Bhuj earthquake, enacted the Gujarat State Disaster management Act, 2003. The purpose of this Act was to provide for effective management of disasters, for mitigation of effects of
disasters, for administering emergency relief during and after occurrence of disasters and for implementing, monitoring and coordinating measures for reconstruction and rehabilitation in the aftermath of disasters. The Act also lays emphasis on moving from relief to all phases of disaster management i.e. mitigation, relief, reconstruction and rehabilitation by clarifying the roles of principal entities in disaster management. Soon thereafter, the Bihar Disaster Management Act was also enacted. However, after the enactment of the national Act, Bihar has adopted the national Act.

After the tsunami disaster in December 2004, it was felt that while the response of the Government and other relevant agencies had been adequate, it could be improved further if appropriate preparedness and capacity building measures are put in place together with an effective coordination mechanism, and the necessary legislative mandate. The Disaster Management Act, 2005 was enacted on 23rd December 2005 in this context. The legislation was made under Entry 23 (Social Security and Social Insurance) in the Concurrent List of the Constitution of India. This provides the advantage of permitting the States to have their own legislation on disaster management since it is not feasible for a national Act to take care of all micro level considerations which need to have legislative back up. Besides, in a federal system where state governments draw their mandate directly under the Constitution of India like the national government, it would be appropriate to allow them to legislate to address their own concerns; more so when in the federal set up of India, the basic responsibility for undertaking rescue, relief and rehabilitation measures in the event of natural disasters is that of the State Government concerned. The role of the Central Government is supportive, in terms of physical and financial resources and complementary measures in sectors such as transport, warning and inter-state movement of food grains and other relief materials/resources.

The Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 states “The Government have decided to enact a law on disaster management to provide for requisite institutional mechanisms for drawing up and monitoring the implementation of the disaster management plans, ensuring measures by various wings of Government for prevention and mitigating effects of disasters and for undertaking a holistic, coordinated and prompt response to any disaster situation.”

The salient features of the Disaster Management Act include putting in place an institutional mechanism in the country by establishment of-
- A National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) at central level
- National Executive Committee at central level
- State Disaster Management Authorities at states’ level
- State Executive Committees at states’ level
- District Disaster management Authorities at districts’ level
- A National Institute of Disaster Management at national level
- National Disaster Response Force at national level

The National Authority shall have the responsibility for laying down the policies, plans and guidelines for disaster management. It will be assisted by a National Executive Committee of Secretaries which shall also be responsible to ensure compliance of directions issued by the Central Government for the purpose of disaster management in the country.

The State Authority shall have the responsibility for laying down policies and plans for disaster management in the State. The Chief Secretary, who will be the Chairperson of the State Executive Committee which will assist the State Authority, would also be the ex-officio Member of the State Authority.

Besides, each State Government shall establish a District Disaster Management Authority (DDMA) for every district in the State. The Authority shall be headed by the Collector or District Magistrate or Deputy Commissioner, as the case may be, and will have an elected representative of the local
authority as Co-chairperson. However, in any district where a zilla parishad exists, the Chairperson thereof shall be the co-Chairperson of the District Authority, provided that in the tribal areas, the Chief Executive Member of the district council of autonomous district shall be the co-Chairperson. The District Authority shall act as the district planning; coordinating and implementing body for disaster management and take all measures for the purpose of disaster management in the district in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the National Authority and State Authority.

The National Institute of Disaster Management shall function within the broad policies and guidelines laid down by the National Authority and will be responsible for planning and promoting training and research in the area of disaster management, documentation and development of national level information base relating to disaster management policies, prevention mechanism and mitigation measures.

The National Disaster Response Force has been constituted for the purpose of specialist response. The general superintendence, direction and control of the Force shall vest in the National Authority while the command and supervision of the Force shall vest in the Director General of the Force.

The Act also entrusts specific functions to Central and State Governments. The Central Government is responsible to take all measures, as it deems necessary or expedient, for the purpose of disaster management. It would be responsible for coordination of actions of the Ministries or Departments of the Government of India, State Governments, National Authority, State Authorities, governmental and non-governmental organizations; ensure integration of measures for prevention of disasters and mitigation by Ministries or Departments of the Government of India in their development plans and projects; ensure appropriate allocation of funds; deployment of Armed Forces and coordination with UN and other international organizations and Governments of other countries. The Act also lays down the responsibility of each Ministry or Department of Government of India which include taking necessary measures for mitigation, preparedness and capacity building; integrate into its development plans and projects, the measures for prevention or mitigation of disasters; responding effectively and promptly to any threatening disaster situation or disaster etc. Besides, each Ministry or Department is required to prepare a disaster management plan for this purpose. Similar functions have been assigned to the State Governments and the Departments of the State Governments.

The local authorities have been assigned functions which include ensuring training of its officers and employees, maintenance of resources relating to disaster management as to be readily available for use in the event of any disaster; ensure all construction projects under it conform to the standards and specifications laid down for prevention and mitigation of disasters and carry out relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction activities in the affected areas. The local authority may take such other measures as may be necessary for disaster management.

Further, the Act provides for constitution of Disaster Response Fund and Disaster Mitigation Fund at National, State and District level. It also provides for every Ministry or Department of the Government of India and the State Governments to make provisions in its annual budget for the purpose of carrying out the activities and programmes set out in the disaster management plan. It also makes special provision for emergency procurement of resources in a disaster situation.

It may be mentioned that the institutional arrangements put in place through Disaster Management Act, 2005 supplement and do not supplant the institutional arrangements already in force before the enactment of the Act. The existing institutional arrangements have therefore to be seen as an integrated whole, be it in place before the enactment of the Act or were put in place through the enactment of the Act.
Legal and institutional gaps

With the experience of about eight years since the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005, a review of Act has become necessary to take care of apparent inconsistencies or inadequacies. Keeping this in view, the Government of India constituted a Task Force to undertake the review. The Task Force has since submitted its report to the government. The report of the Task Force is now in public domain. The legal gaps discussed below are based on study of the Act, experience of the consultants and interaction with state governments and other stakeholders during field visits to six states, independent of the report of the Task Force. The comments on the salient recommendations made by the Task Force are given separately in this section.

**Definition of community**

The Disaster Management Act, 2005 does not define “community” or “beyond the coping capacity of community”. During interactions with state governments, it was mentioned that both these terms need to be defined since, in the absence of definition of these terms, disasters cannot be defined comprehensively. Besides, one of the functions assigned to the district authorities is to “facilitate community training and awareness programmes”. The legal mandate towards communities should therefore be clearly brought out by adding definition of these two terms.

This issue was considered at the time of enactment of the Act. It was felt that community is a dynamic concept since a person may be part of different communities within a day. Similarly “coping capacity of community” varies from area to area and also within the same area due to social, economic, age, otherwise-able etc. the coping capacity of an individual may also vary at different points of time. However, it is felt that an attempt should be made to define these two terms, at least in a generic manner, if not too precisely.

**Definition of recovery**

The Disaster Management Act, 2005 defines ‘reconstruction’ but does not define ‘recovery’. In fact the Act does not refer to recovery at all. Once emergency needs have been met and the initial crisis is over, the people affected and the communities that support them are still vulnerable. Recovery activities include rebuilding infrastructure, health care, rehabilitation and restoration of means of livelihood. These should blend with development activities, such as building human resources for health and developing policies and practices to avoid similar situations in future. Recovery is also linked to sustainable development, particularly in relation to vulnerable people such as those with disabilities, elderly people, children and other marginalized groups.

The National Policy on Disaster Management links recovery with safe development by laying emphasis on plugging the gaps in the social and economic infrastructure and infirmities in the backward and forward linkages. It stresses the need to support and enhance the viability of livelihood systems, education, health care facilities, care of the elderly, women and children, etc. Other aspects stressed in this context are roads, housing, drinking water sources, provision for sanitary facilities, availability of credit, supply of agricultural inputs, upgrading technologies in the on-farm and off-farm activities, storage, marketing, etc. Therefore, recovery refers to holistic safe development while reconstruction is only a part of it. The Disaster Management Plans of most of the state governments also include a recovery plan. It is, therefore recommended that recovery should not only be defined but appropriate provisions for it should be included in the Act.

**Role of NDMA vis-à-vis MHA**

There is still need for clarity of roles of NDMA vis-à-vis MHA. The role of NDMA has been primarily envisaged in pre-disaster aspects like mitigation, preparedness etc while MHA is primarily perceived
as responsible for response and relief. On the other hand, the general superintendence, direction and control of the National Disaster Response Force, whose main function is in the response phase, vests in NDMA. Based on main functions assigned to NDMA which include laying down and approving policies, guidelines and national Plan, coordinating enforcement and implementation of policies and plans, recommend provision of funds for mitigation, international cooperation and laying down broad policies and guidelines for NIDM, it may be more appropriate to call it National Disaster Mitigation Authority with response being the responsibility of Ministry of Home Affairs. In any case, the functions of NDMA and MHA need to be clearly defined in the Act itself so as to remove any possibility of confusion. It was mentioned by state governments that there is some ambiguity about the role of NDMA in the response phase which needs to be made very clear to them. This will also spare NDMA from avoidable criticism if response is not up to the mark as in case of recent heavy rainfall and landslides in Uttarakhand in June, 2013.

The mandate of NDMA may include awareness generation, early warning systems, development of policies, plans and guidelines, mitigation measures, training and capacity building, preparedness including development of NDRF, conduct of mock drills, media campaign and recovery in the post disaster phase. NDMA may also be responsible for implementation and coordination of above measures and also extending professional support directly or through NIDM, to state governments as also bringing together all stakeholders.

Besides Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, NDMA has eight members. At least four of these eight members should be DM professionals with proven track record.

**National Executive Committee**

The National Executive Committee is headed by Secretary in charge of the Ministry or Department of Disaster Management (presently Ministry of Home Affairs) with secretaries of 15 concerned departments as members, all on ex-officio basis. It has twin functions to perform; to assist the NDMA in the discharge of its functions and ensure compliance of directions issued by the Central Government for the purpose of disaster management in the country. The main functions of the NEC are:

- To implement the policies and plans of the National Authority.
- Act as the coordinating and monitoring body for disaster management.
- Prepare the National Plan to be approved by the National Authority and monitor its implementation.
- Coordinate and monitor the implementation of National Policy for disaster management.
- Lay down guidelines for preparing disaster management plans by Ministries and Departments of Government of India and State Authorities.
- Provide technical assistance to State Governments and State Authorities.
- Monitor the implementation of guidelines issued by the National Authority.
- Monitor, coordinate and give directions regarding mitigation and preparedness measures to be taken by Ministries, Departments and agencies of the government.
- Evaluate preparedness at all government levels for responding to any threatening disaster situation or disaster and give directions, where necessary, for enhancing such preparedness.
- Plan and coordinate specialised training programs for different levels of officers, employees and voluntary rescue workers.
- Coordinate response in the event of a threatening disaster situation or disaster.
- Promote general education and awareness related to disaster management.
- Perform such other functions as may be required by the National Authority.

Despite immense responsibilities entrusted to NEC and keeping in view that all its members are ex-officio members holding charge of independent Ministries and Departments, no exclusive secretariat has been provided to NEC with the result that it has not been able to do justice to the functions.
assigned to it. It is necessary that NEC may have an exclusive secretariat with professional support to enable it to discharge its functions. The DM Division in the Ministry of Home Affairs with its skeleton staff is not in a position to function as a secretariat of NEC, in addition to discharging its functions within MHA. Therefore, de facto, NEC meets rarely and mostly in the backdrop of a major disaster. NEC should therefore be provided full time officers and support staff with arrangements to engage professional resource persons from time to time, as may be decided by the chairperson of the NEC. The secretariat may be headed by a full time officer of the rank of Special Secretary/ Additional Secretary.

**Mitigation Fund at National, State and District level**

The Act envisaged creation of a Mitigation Fund at national, state and district level for projects exclusively for the purpose of mitigation. At national level, the central government was required to provide such amounts as may be decided, after due appropriation made by Parliament by law in this behalf. Unfortunately, the central government has not complied with this statutory obligation so far. While several reasons can be advanced for not providing such funds, the real reason is that governments, be it at national or state level, have not come out of response mode despite a lot of talk about paradigm shift from response to mitigation. There is also lack of political will since mitigation measures do not have the visibility which is generally observed during response phase. However, it is due to mitigation and preparedness measures taken that the recent Odisha cyclone in 2013 saw only 23-24 deaths in sharp contrast to over 10,000 deaths during super cyclone in 1999. On the other hand, lack of adequate mitigation and preparedness measures in Uttarakhand resulted in several thousand deaths during very heavy rainfall and landslides during 2013. During field surveys, most of the District Magistrates stressed the need for mitigation fund to enable them to take precautionary measures before the monsoon or cyclone seasons. Considering that governments spend about 40 thousand crore on response and relief over the period of five years, this lack of trust in spending even a fraction of this amount during pre-disaster phase is difficult to understand. At district level, there are no discretionary funds even for minor interventions unless projects are developed and approved. It was generally observed during field surveys that level of awareness is very low, training and capacity building is still in infancy and human resource for mitigation activities is just not available. People deployed during monsoon and cyclone seasons are diverted to other activities once the flood/ cyclone season is over.

It is therefore necessary that mitigation funds should be established at national, state and district level, as envisaged in the DM Act. To begin with, the quantum of funds may be about 50% of funds provided for response during the first five years and subsequent releases may be linked to expenditure incurred by different states. This fund may be applied to training and capacity building, awareness generation, development of response teams, conduct of mock drills, hiring adequate human resource and minor interventions to be taken at grass root level through local authorities.

**State Disaster Management Authorities**

Most of the SDMAs have its members in ex officio capacity. Few SDMAs, which have exclusive officers and staff, such as Bihar, Odisha and Gujarat, are quite active. Other SDMAs, which have no full time members or exclusive secretariat, are almost non-functional. Their meetings are held very infrequently and that too in the backdrop of a disaster or impending disaster situations. For instance, Uttarakhand SDMA had not held a single meeting since its constitution in 2007 till the recent disaster in June, 2013. Although the Act provides that the State Government shall provide the State Authority with such officers, consultants and employees as it considers necessary, for carrying out the functions of the State Authority, in most cases, no such staff has been provided with the result that these have become virtually redundant authorities. The SDMAs are supposed to be provided secretariat assistance by the Disaster Management Department. Considering that, in most states, the Revenue and Relief Departments were designated as Disaster Management Departments also
without any additional officers and staff; they have no spare capacity to look after the duties assigned to SDMAs. Besides, the officers and employees have generally not been provided training in specially designed training capsules with the result that their capacity has not been built.

The powers and functions assigned to the State Authority are to:

- Lay down policies and plans for disaster management in the state;
- Lay down the State Disaster Management Policy;
- Approve the State Plan in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the National Authority;
- Approve the disaster management plans prepared by the departments of the state;
- Lay down guidelines to be followed by the departments of the state government for integration of measures for prevention of disasters and mitigation of their effects, in their development plans and projects and provide necessary technical assistance for this purpose;
- Coordinate the implementation of the state plan;
- Recommend provision of funds for mitigation and preparedness measures;
- Review the development plans of different departments to ensure that prevention and mitigation measures are integrated therein;
- Review the measures being taken for mitigation, capacity building and preparedness by the state departments and issue such guidelines as may be necessary;
- Lay down detailed guidelines for minimum standards of relief to persons affected by disasters in the state provided that such standards shall not be less than the minimum standards laid down in the guidelines of National Authority;
- In case of an emergency, the Chairperson of the State Authority has the powers to exercise all or any of the powers of the State Authority subject to post facto ratification by the State Authority.

In most cases, even a beginning has not been made to attend to the responsibilities assigned to it. It is true that in most states, State Disaster Management Plans have been prepared but generally these were outsourced to outside agencies and no action in pursuance thereof has been taken by the state authorities. The states mostly remain in the response mode and very little, if any, action has been taken on pre-disaster aspects. Even the NDMA guidelines have not, by and large, been implemented.

Another inconsistency observed is that while NDMA can only recommend guidelines for minimum standards of relief to be provided to persons affected by disasters, the SDMAs shall lay down detailed guidelines for providing standards of relief to persons affected by disasters in the state. Obviously, at national level, NDMA shall only recommend and final decision on minimum standards of relief will be taken by the Central Government, which is quite right too, keeping in view the substantial financial implications. In that case, the same system should be in force at state level too. In other words, while SDMAs may recommend standards of relief, final view should be taken by the state government.

It is, therefore necessary for state governments, to take following measures:

- At least four out of the eight members of SDMAs may be full time members, of which at least two may be DM professionals with proven track record.
- SDMAs should have exclusive secretariat under section 16 of the Act.
- Section 19 may be amended to bring it in line with section 12 for standards of relief.

**State Executive Committees**
The constitution of SECs provides that it shall be headed by Chief Secretary with four Secretaries to the government of the state of such departments as the state government may think fit. The functions entrusted to the SEC are to:

- Coordinate and monitor the implementation of the National Policy, National Plan and the State Plan;
- Examine vulnerability of different parts of the state to different disasters and specify measures to be taken for their prevention or mitigation;
- Lay down guidelines for preparation of disaster management plans by the state departments and District Authorities and monitor their implementation;
- Monitor implementation of guidelines laid down by State Authority for integrating measures for prevention and mitigation of disasters by the departments in their development plans and projects;
- Evaluate preparedness at all governmental and non-governmental levels to respond to any threatening disaster situation or disaster and give directions, where necessary, for enhancing such preparedness;
- Coordinate response to a threatening disaster situation or disaster;
- Give directions to any state department or any other authority or body in the state regarding actions to be taken in response to any threatening disaster situation or disaster;
- Promote general education, awareness and community training for different disasters to which different parts of the state are vulnerable and measures that may be taken by such community to prevent, mitigate and respond to such disaster;
- Provide necessary technical assistance or give advice to district and local authorities for carrying out their functions effectively;
- Advise the state government regarding all financial matters related to disaster management;
- Examine the constructions in any local area to ensure compliance of prescribed standards, by giving directions to district and local authorities, where necessary;
- Provide information to National Authority relating to different aspects of disaster management;
- Lay down, update and review the state level response plans and guidelines and ensure that district level response plans are prepared, reviewed and updated;
- Ensure that communication systems are in order and the disaster management drills are carried out periodically;
- Perform such other functions as may be assigned to it by the state authority or as it may consider necessary.

The functions of SEC include, as in case of NEC, to assist the State Authority in the performance of its functions and the compliance of directions issued by the state government under the Act. Besides, SEC is required to coordinate response in the event of any threatening disaster situation or disaster. In other words, there is some confusion as to which agency is responsible for response—state government through State Crisis Management Committee/DM Department or SEC. This needs to be very clear since districts should know which agency they have to approach in case of a threatening disaster situation or disaster.

Besides, the restriction that SEC may consist of, besides Chief Secretary, four secretaries of state departments, is too restrictive; more so when in case of NEC there are 15 secretaries besides chairperson. This decision may be left to state government. It is suggested that while a ceiling may be prescribed, state government should have adequate flexibility to determine the departments whose secretaries should be members of SEC. Therefore, the following issues need to be considered and if necessary, DM Act may be amended to provide for:

- Section 20(2)(b) may be amended to state “Not more than 10 secretaries to the government of the state of such departments, as the state government may think fit, ex officio”
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- SEC may have exclusive secretariat headed by an officer of the rank of special secretary/additional secretary with such officers, consultants and employees, as the state government may think fit, for carrying out the functions of SEC.
- It should be clearly laid down, through appropriate amendment as to the institution which shall be responsible for response, be it SCMC, Revenue, Relief and Disaster Management Department or the State Executive Committee.

**State level DM Institutions**

At national level, the National Institute of Disaster Management functions under the broad policies and guidelines laid down by the NDMA. NIDM also extends professional support to NDMA and MHA. Training and capacity building has been observed as a major deficient area in states. The SDMAs do not enjoy such support from any institution except in case of Gujarat which has established its own Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management. There is need to provide institutional support to state governments/SDMAs which can assist them in developing training modules, impart training, assist in finding gaps and action needed to bridge such gaps and documentation of disasters together with development of case studies for improvement in existing systems. It is not necessary to establish separate institute of disaster management in each state. The DM Centers at ATIs can possibly undertake these activities with the support of NIDM provided these are suitably strengthened and their capacity is built. A suitable provision needs to be included in the Act for this purpose and identified institute and functions to be performed by it can be laid down by each state government through rules to be made by them under the Act. Lack of professional support at state level is a major handicap since they do not have back up of a professional institute, as in case of NDMA. Once a legal provision is made in the DM Act in this regard, each state government can either identify one of the existing institutes for this purpose or establish a new institute and provide necessary infrastructure and faculty to take care of their needs. NIDM can extend support by training faculty but cannot be expected to assume this responsibility for all states, unless it has its Sub-Centres in different parts of the country to meet the needs of one or more states at each Centre.

**District Disaster Management Authority**

The field visits to six state governments revealed that DDMAs have just been constituted on paper and their meetings are not held. Most of the district magistrates were of the view that DDMAs were not needed since DM in his monthly or fortnightly meetings with district level officers also considers issues relating to disaster management, which is invariably an agenda item in their periodic meetings. At the same time, it was conceded by DM and other district level officers that all functions assigned to DDMA are not discussed threadbare in the departmental meetings, particularly actions required to be taken by DDMA during pre-disaster situations. The main handicap is that DDMAs do not have exclusive secretariat and actions in any case are required to be taken by district level department heads. Another point mentioned by majority of district magistrates was that they did not have professional support at district level nor any such support is provided by SDMA, with the result that they face considerable problem in developing or updating District Disaster Management Plans or undertake hazard vulnerability and risk analysis. In short, there is no support mechanism in place.

- It is therefore felt that each DDMA may have a limited but exclusive secretariat with arrangements to hire professional help.
- Besides, training of district level officers in specially developed training modules was necessary.
- Additionally, there should be some training institute at district level with adequate DM faculty to train different stakeholders. It should have capacity to develop specially designed training modules with requisite training materials.

**Municipal Corporations**
The municipalities including municipal corporations in mega-cities are considered local authorities in terms of the Disaster Management Act, 2005. In pursuance of Section 41 of the Act, local authorities have to function “subject to the directions of District Authority”. However major municipal corporations encompass more than one district and are entrusted with several functions related to disaster management. For instance, Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai has jurisdiction over two districts and is responsible to provide basic civic amenities including special services during a disaster. Similarly, Delhi used to have one municipal corporation which has since been trifurcated. Even after trifurcation, North Delhi Municipal Corporation covers Districts of Central Delhi, North Delhi, North West Delhi; South Delhi Municipal Corporation covers Districts of South Delhi, West Delhi, South West Delhi (excluding Delhi Cantt) and East Delhi Municipal Corporation has jurisdiction over Districts of East Delhi and North East Delhi. Such corporations cannot be expected to function subject to the directions of District Authorities whereas, in practice, they are discharging several functions assigned to the District Authorities. The situation may be similar in several other mega-cities. The Government of Maharashtra found a way out by entrusting the functions of two District Authorities to the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai, in addition to the functions to be discharged by it as a local authority. The District Authorities for the two districts falling within the jurisdiction of Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai have not been constituted. In order to take care of this anomaly, an appropriate amendment may be made in the Disaster Management Act, 2005 to give the legal mandate for disaster management to Municipal Corporations in mega-cities having jurisdiction over more than one district.

**Local Level**

At local level, in blocks, additional charge of disaster management is given to an officer. In few states like West Bengal, there is a Block Disaster Management Officer (BDMO). Two clerical support staff are provided to BDMO for 3-4 months during flood season. These officials are deputed from district level and are withdrawn after the flood season. These officials are neither trained nor have the commitment since they know their posting is temporary for 3-4 months only. Even BDMOs or officers given additional charge of disaster management in other states are not adequately trained. These officers, including BDMOs, are entrusted with other duties during the remaining 8-9 months. Therefore, they neither have the time nor capacity to take up mitigation measures in villages or generate awareness. The community level Disaster Risk Management Programme in five of the six states (Andhra Pradesh was not covered) where it was being implemented under GOI-UNDP DRM Programme has been de facto discontinued, although in some states the posts of District Project Officers are being continued on contract basis.

While the DM Act prescribes certain functions for local authorities, there is no provision of posts to ensure that these functions are performed. Besides, contract staff is not motivated due to lack of promotion prospects and renewal of contracts on periodic basis. They are also not entitled to normal government benefits like pension, medical facility, transport allowance etc. This is a major demotivating factor. A statutory provision therefore needs to be included in the DM Act to provide for a post of Block Disaster Management Officer in each block and these officers should be available for DM work throughout the year.
GP Level
On an average, there are over 100 villages in each block. It is just not feasible for a BDMO to take care of village level activities in all villages, even if there is a full time BDMO. Besides, elected members of GPs are neither trained adequately nor have administrative of financial powers to take up mitigation measures on their own. The functions to be performed at village level, as brought out in SWOT Report, include:

- Responsibilities assigned to it under Section 41 of the DM Act
- Preparation of Village Disaster Management Plan through a participatory exercise with the community;
- Action Plan for DRR and CCA interventions
- Ensure training of seven Task Forces through the assistance of Village Development Officer
- Oversee maintenance of identified village shelter(s) including shelter for livestock in case of a calamity
- Supervise the working of Task Forces in case of a disaster or threatening disaster situation
- Facilitating organisation of mock drills
- Any other function related to disaster management, as may be assigned by the District Administration/District Authority/ Block Development Officer

In order to render assistance to GPs and carry out above functions, the Village Development Officers need to be given intensive training to carry out the above functions within the overall guidance of BDMO. The GP members also need to be provided adequate training to ensure supervision of these functions. It would be appropriate to include in DM Act the functions to be performed by the Village Development Officer in the context of disaster management. Alternately, a general provision may be included and, in pursuance thereof, the State Governments may detail the functions to be performed by Village Development Officers in rules made under the Act. The type of training to be provided and other details have been discussed at length in SWOT Report.

Amendments to be made in the Disaster Management Act, 2005

- Include definitions of Community, coping capacity of community and Recovery
- There is some ambiguity about the role of NDMA vis-à-vis MHA in the response phase which needs to be made very clear in the Act.
- At least four of the eight members of NDMA should be DM professionals with proven track record.
- Mitigation funds should be established at national, state and district level, as envisaged in the DM Act.
- At least four out of the eight members of SDMAs may be full time members, of which at least two may be DM professionals with proven track record.
- NEC should be provided full time officers and support staff with arrangements to engage professional resource persons from time to time.
- SDMAs should have exclusive secretariat under section 16 of the Act.
- Section 19 may be amended to bring it in line with section 13 for standards of relief.
- Section 20(2)(b) may be amended to state “Not more than 10 secretaries to the government of the state of such departments, as the state government may think fit, ex officio.
- SEC may have exclusive secretariat headed by an officer of the rank of special secretary/ additional secretary with such officers, consultants and employees, as the state government may think fit, for carrying out the functions of SEC.
- It should be clearly laid down, through appropriate amendment as to the institution which shall be responsible for response, be it SCMC, Revenue, Relief and Disaster Management Department or the State Executive Committee.
- The DM Centers at ATIs can possibly undertake their activities with the support of NIDM provided these are suitably strengthened and their capacity is built. A suitable provision needs to be included in the Act for this purpose and identified institute and functions to be performed by it can be laid down by each state government through rules to be made by them under the Act.
**Role of other stakeholders**

It is just not feasible for government to take care of all disaster management related functions without active involvement of community. The DM Act at present does not provide the duties and responsibilities, including their rights in respect of other stakeholders such as NGOs, SHGs and volunteers. There should be an appropriate provision in the Act listing out the duties and responsibilities of these voluntary organizations as also their rights such as obligation of government to organize training programmes for them, generate awareness and their recognition through issue of identity cards as voluntary rescue workers etc.

The reservation in making such a provision initially was that since these are non-government functionaries, they cannot be assigned responsibilities statutorily since they are under no obligation to perform these functions and be held liable if they fail to perform such functions. However, such functions have to be seen as social obligations. The DM Act needs to be perceived as social legislation. If Constitution of India can provide for Fundamental Duties, there is no reason why a social legislation cannot include social obligations for the welfare of the entire community. The DDMA’s are statutorily liable, under section 30(2) (xii) and 30(2) (xiii), to discharge following functions:

- Organise and coordinate specialized training programmes for different levels of officers, employees and **voluntary rescue workers** in the district.

- Facilitate community training and awareness programmes for prevention of disaster or mitigation with the support of local authorities, governmental and **non-governmental organisations**.

Therefore, a corresponding duty can be caused for volunteers including NGOs and SHGs by making a suitable provision in the Act.

**Private Sector**

Similarly, responsibilities on private sector, particularly those which utilize hazardous chemicals may be provided, not only for their employees but also for people living in the area through an appropriate provision in the Act, as a part of corporate social responsibility.

---

**Amendments to be made in the Disaster Management Act, 2005**

- Each DDMA may have a limited but exclusive secretariat with arrangements to hire professional help.
- Training of district level officers in specially developed training modules is necessary.
- Additionally, there should be some training institute at district level with adequate DM faculty to train different stakeholders. It should have capacity to develop specially designed training modules with requisite training materials.
- An appropriate amendment may be made in the Disaster Management Act, 2005 to give the legal mandate for disaster management to Municipal Corporations in mega-cities having jurisdiction over more than one district.
- A statutory provision needs to be included in the DM Act to provide for a post of Block Disaster Management Officer in each block and these officers should be available for DM work throughout the year.
- An appropriate provision may be included in DM Act about the functions to be performed by the Village Development Officer in the context of disaster management or a general provision may be made in the Act and their duties may be laid down by state governments in the rules made under the Act.
- The type of training to be provided and other details have been discussed at length in SWOT Report.
- There should be an appropriate provision in the Act listing out the duties and responsibilities of voluntary organizations as also their rights such as obligation of government to organize training programmes for them, generate awareness and their recognition through issue of identity cards as voluntary rescue workers etc.
- Responsibilities on private sector, particularly those which utilize hazardous chemicals may be provided, not only for their employees but also for people living in the area through an appropriate provision in the Act, as a part of corporate social responsibility.
- The government’s commitment as also the commitment of various institutions established under the DM Act should be made very clear and unambiguous by adding appropriate provisions for each institution established under the Act for vulnerable women, children, elderly and otherwise able
- There should be an appropriate provision in the Act listing out the duties and responsibilities of these voluntary organizations as also their rights such as obligation of government to organize training programmes for them, generate awareness and their
**Special provision for vulnerable women, children, elderly and otherwise able**

Considering the socio-economic situation in the country, certain vulnerable sections of population are invariably left out to fend for themselves in case of disasters, primarily because they have not been mainstreamed and are glossed over under ‘cross cutting issues’. The government’s commitment as also the commitment of various institutions established under the DM Act should be made very clear and unambiguous by adding appropriate provisions for each institution established under the Act. At the outset, it may be stressed that all women should not be treated as vulnerable. Women are a resource and by treating them as vulnerable, we are leaving out a resource which constitutes almost 50% of the population of the country. Expectant women, nursing mothers, mothers with young children and women with some medical handicap alone can be considered as vulnerable. Besides, there are children, elderly (both men and women), and otherwise able persons who all may be considered vulnerable, particularly in a disaster situation since they need special assistance on priority basis. A provision for assisting them on priority basis, be it evacuation, relief distribution or recovery, needs to be incorporated for all institutions created under the Act and re-emphasised to all institutions existing before the enactment of the DM Act. There is need to move from lip service to the cause to actual assistance to most needy by safeguarding their interests in legal terms. Appropriate provisions for this purpose need to be incorporated in the DM Act.

**Comments on the Report of Task Force for review of the Disaster Management Act, 2005**

The report of the Task Force for review of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 has now been put in public domain by the Ministry of Home Affairs through their website inviting comments from public on the recommendations made by the Task Force. The comments on some of the recommendations made are given below.

**Role and functions of NDMA (Para 8.1)**

This is apparently an attempt to distance the government from prevention, mitigation and preparedness leaving it to deal with response only. Implementation of statutorily mandated policies, guidelines and plans is essentially a function of the government. The policies are decided with the approval of Cabinet, as in case of National Policy on Disaster Management. NDMA is only facilitating the process. Besides, response cannot be prompt and effective, if it de-linked with preparedness and mitigation. This function was assigned to National Executive Committee, which is a body consisting of secretaries of key Ministries and Departments of Government of India. Moreover, if Ministries/Departments are disassociated with this function, disaster risk reduction will not get integrated with development programmes of different Ministries. It sounds strange that while Prime Minister, as Chairperson of the Authority would still be responsible for this function, he, as the head of government, would not be directly concerned with disaster risk reduction and would not have the support of Ministry of Home Affairs and other concerned Ministries to ensure implementation of policies, plans and guidelines. The fact that NEC has failed to discharge its functions over last eight years, should have made the Task Force to investigate why it happen and proposing remedial measures; instead of suggesting de-linking of government from these functions, by abolishing the NEC itself. This recommendation virtually amounts to Government outsourcing implementation of its policies and plans, which is not desirable.

On the other hand, Government, through its Ministries and Departments, would still be accountable to Parliament for actions taken to implement its policies and plans. NDMA is expected to facilitate government’s functions and not take over such function altogether.

Besides, the recommendation is silent on ‘recovery’. The plans and process for the same may be worked out by NDMA but these are to be considered and funds provided for this purpose by the government, if necessary with the approval of Cabinet.
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Therefore while policies, guidelines and plans may be prepared by NDMA, its implementation and coordination with state governments is a function of the government, to be discharged through concerned Ministries and Departments as also the parliamentary accountability which cannot be divested from Ministries/Departments of Government of India.

Transfer of functions from NEC to NDMA (Para 8.1.2)
Transfer of functions like preparation of National Plan; monitoring, coordination and giving directions regarding mitigation and preparedness to Ministries or Departments; planning and coordination of specialised training programmes for officers, employees and voluntary rescue workers from NEC to NDMA has been proposed in the background of suggesting that NEC may be disbanded as also since NEC has failed to perform these functions since the enactment of the DM Act. As stated above, the Task Force has not gone into the issue why NEC could not perform these functions.

The reason is that NEC does not have its exclusive secretariat. The secretaries of different Ministries/Departments do not have spare capacity to take care of these functions in the absence of dedicated secretariat. The DM Division in MHA, which is supposed to provide this assistance, does not have adequate staff or professional support to provide the requisite assistance, considering that they have to take care of all administrative matters relating to NDMA, which require approval of government. The Ministry of Finance had sanctioned 32 posts for DM Division in 2005 but these posts were not given with the establishment of NDMA since a pre-condition imposed was abolition of the posts already sanctioned for DM Division of MHA, before sanction of posts for NDMA.

If one looks at the functions assigned to NEC under the Act, it becomes quite obvious that one has to provide trained manpower to ensure discharge of these functions, in addition to professional support. NEC was not only required to assist NDMA but also had the responsibility for implementing the policies and plans of the National Authority and ensures compliance with the directions issued by the Central Government for the purpose of disaster management in the country. In the absence of adequate secretariat or adequate strengthening of DM Division in MHA, NEC was destined to fail and it failed. Instead of correcting the aberrations created and making NEC functional, the proposal to abolish NEC will create major gaps in the DM institutional systems. Firstly, it deprives the government of the joint wisdom of a large number of secretaries in disaster risk reduction; affects coordination with the state governments, limits its capacity to provide technical assistance to state governments and creates a roadblock in ensuring integration of disaster risk reduction with the plans and programmes of different Ministries and Departments. It dilutes government’s commitment to Hugo Framework of Action, to which India is a signatory and distances Government Departments from NDMA on the one hand and state governments on the other so far as prevention, mitigation and preparedness are concerned.

It is somewhat strange that while Government incurs an estimated expenditure of over 40 thousand crore in five years from National and State Disaster Relief Funds on response and relief alone, it feels shy of incurring expenditure of even 50% of this amount for disaster risk reduction and has deprived NEC of minimum support staff and professional support to allow it to discharge its statutory obligations. In the process, it is even prepared to overlook the vast experience and authority of secretaries of key central government Ministries and Departments, which, put together, could provide immense support to the DRR agenda, eventually taking it to grass root level through state and district level governments.

Therefore, NEC should be continued with adequate secretariat and professional support to enable it to integrate prevention, mitigation, preparedness, training and capacity building with response and relief. The recent handling of very severe cyclone in Odisha with 23-24 deaths only as compared to Super Cyclone of 1999 which resulted in over 10,000 deaths is an example of how effective
mitigation, preparedness and capacity building measures could be to mitigate the miseries of people and reduce government’s expenditure on response, relief and compensation.

**Structure of NDMA (Para 8.2.4)**

The recommendation that there may be five Ministers of key Ministries, besides Prime Minister, as members of NDMA only shows we have not learnt from the experience of SDMAs with all members including Ministers as members, ex officio. When Prime Minister is taking NDMA meetings, all concerned Ministers can be requested to participate as special invitees. Besides, a full time member can be made vice-chairperson of Authority with senior ministers including Home Minister, as members is difficult to comprehend. The government is highly hierarchal and a professional who is vice-chairperson also, can hardly function in that capacity with five senior ministers present as members. While the total number of members may be reduced, if so desired, it should be a judicious mix of experienced retired senior bureaucrats and professionals. Besides, retired senior bureaucrats are an asset due to their vast experience from field to national level and can play a useful role through advocacy with state governments, coordination and monitoring implementation. Excluding Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, if there are 8 members, at least 50% should be professionals. However, all members and Vice-Chairperson should be full time members.

Certain restrictions have been proposed by the Task Force for appointment of members such as a member shall not be eligible for second term as member and the maximum age for a member may be 65 years. There should not be a restriction on second term if a member has performed well; in other words it should be performance-linked. Similarly, restriction on age to function as member up to 65 years only may be counter-productive particularly in case of professionals since eminent professionals may achieve this distinction in advanced age. Besides, the number of professionals in different disciplines of disaster management in the country is quite limited at least at present. Therefore, if age restriction has to be imposed, it may be 70 years instead of 65 years.

As for process of selection, it may be left to discretion of Prime Minister. However, if a committee is to be constituted to assist the Prime Minister, the composition suggested by the Task Force may not be helpful, since they may not have domain knowledge of the subjects or experts available in relevant fields. The Committee may consist of Cabinet Secretary, Principal Secretary to Prime Minister and two subject experts. The Committee may recommend names to Prime Minister and the final decision may rest with Prime Minister.

**National Executive Committee (Para 8.4.1)**

The NEC may be continued with Cabinet Secretary as Chairperson and Home Secretary as a member, as proposed by the Task Force. There is no objection to calling it National Crisis Management Committee, so far it discharges all the functions laid down for NEC, including additional functions being discharged by NCMC at present. The Committee may meet at least once in three months or at more frequent intervals, if so desired by its Chairperson. It may have its own secretariat plus professional support, as and when needed. If DM Division of MHA has to provide secretariat support to NEC/ NCMC, it should be suitably strengthened by restoring 30 posts sanctioned in 2005, in addition to its existing strength.

**National Institute of Disaster Management (Para 8.5)**

Despite provision in the Act, NIDM has not made their Regulations so far. It needs to be given adequate autonomy and flexibility. It needs to develop its own vision and mission, keeping in view the functions assigned to it under the Act. Eventually, it should aim to achieve the status of a deemed university. There are administrative problems which have not been settled so far with the result there is discontentment among faculty members and other staff and they are becoming demotivated. The administrative issues need to be sorted out quickly and faculty further strengthened. The Central Government should be involved in the approval of creation of posts and NIDM should have flexibility to sanction and fill up the posts. The activities of NIDM need to be diversified to cover
all functions mentioned in the Act. At present it is mainly functioning as a training institute only. Functions like documentation, research, development of national level information base, support to Central and State Governments for formulation of policies, strategies, disaster management framework etc.

**State Disaster Management Authority (Para 8.7)**

It is considered that the Act should not try to impose restrictions on Chief Ministers about the constitution of SDMAs. It would, however, be advisable to have at least 50% of the members who are professionals in different disciplines of disaster management. SDMAs, as in case of NDMA need to have exclusive secretariat and full time members. It has been observed that at present most of the SDMAs which have all ex officio members have become almost non-functional. Besides, SDMAs become visible only when there is a disaster and are almost dormant so far as pre-disaster aspects are concerned. However, it may be appropriate for NDMA to lay down guidelines for SDMAs about their constitution, secretariat, institutional support, and attention to awareness generation, prevention, mitigation, preparedness, training and capacity building, keeping in view the functions assigned to SDMAs, instead of making it mandatory by amending the Act. The amendment proposed by the Task Force may be considered by NDMA while framing the guidelines and the Act should not be amended to make these changes.

**State Executive Committees (8.8)**

For the reasons brought out for retention of NEC, the recommendation for discontinuing SECs is not supported. It is true SEC are non operational in most of the states, the reason being that it has no exclusive secretariat and, as at the Center, the mindset is still response oriented. Since SDMAs which do not have exclusive secretariat and where members are holding their positions on ex officio basis, are also mostly non functional, discontinuing SEC would dilute attention on pre-disaster aspects. SCMC may be entrusted with the functions of SEC but when SECs could not handle it, it may be too farfetched to suppose that SCMC, which generally meets only for response and relief, would have time or inclination to consider pre-disaster aspects. Instead of disbanding SECs, there is need to revive and activate both SDMAs and SECs in States. The institutional mechanism put in place through DM Act is proposed to be discontinued, even when these have not even become functional. Discontinuance of SECs will have a direct impact on integration of DRR with development programmes at state level, coordination among different departments of state governments, taking forward community based Disaster Risk Management Programme, training and capacity building from state to community level etc. The Task Force has drawn a line between pre-disaster aspects and response and relief; the first to be handled by NDMA/ SDMAs and second by MHA/ Relief/ DM Departments. It hits at the very roots of efforts to integrate all phases of disaster management.

It is, therefore considered that SECs may be retained and state governments may provide exclusive secretariat to them to ensure these become really functional. There is also need for advocacy on the part of NEC with SECs to ensure that they discharge the functions entrusted to them under the Act effectively.

**District Disaster Management Authorities (8.9) and Local Authorities (8.10)**

The recommendations made by the Task Force are supported.
SECTION 2: ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

National Disaster Management Framework

Soon after transfer of DM as a subject to the Ministry of Home Affairs, a National Disaster Management Framework was developed in MHA in 2002 to chalk out future work plan. It was shared with the state governments and also discussed in a workshop with UN agencies and other stakeholders. The Framework was revised in 2004 to make it a more comprehensive Roadmap to build up holistic capabilities for disaster management so as to be able to handle both natural and human-induced disasters.

The National Roadmap is a statement of actions to be taken at various levels for disaster risk reduction and prompt and efficient response. In fact, the Disaster Management Act, 2005 and the National Policy of Disaster Management, 2009 flow from the conceptual framework outlined in the National Roadmap. A copy of the National Disaster Management Framework is at Annexure I.

The Roadmap was again shared with the state governments and they were advised that, based on National Roadmap, they may develop their respective state roadmaps. It describes Expected Outputs, Areas of Intervention and Agencies/sectors to be involved and resource linkages in the following subjects related to disaster management aspects:

I. Institutional Structure;
II. Disaster Prevention and Mitigation;
III. Early Warning Systems;
IV. Disaster Preparedness, Mitigation and Response; and
V. Human Resource Development.

I. Institutional Structure

The institutional structure envisaged at national level refers to constitution of National Disaster Management Authority with appropriate legal, financial and administrative powers, Roles and responsibilities of NDMA including policies for disaster reduction and mitigation, response coordination, relief and rehabilitation coordination and enactments and amendments. At state level, similar action had to be taken with state specific provisions and needs. It prescribed creation of state departments of disaster management and Authority, if necessary. At district level, it provided for constitution of Disaster Management Committees under District Magistrate.

It will be seen that, at that stage in 2004, there was no decision to establish SDMAs and DDMAs, the rationale being that an Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) set up to examine the recommendations of the High Powered Committee (HPC) felt that it was a subject matter within the domain of state governments. Despite the IMG not supporting enactment of a national Disaster Management Act, the Roadmap provided that an enactment be made at national level. The decision to enact the National Disaster Management Act was taken by the Central Government after the Tsunami disaster in December, 2004. The institutional structure, as envisaged in the DM Roadmap, has been put in place through the DM Act. Despite this, the institutional structure is not working very well although Disaster Management Authorities have been established at national, state and district level. The reasons for the same have been discussed in Section 1 under “Identification of legal and institutional gaps”.
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II. Disaster Prevention/ Mitigation

The expected outcomes of disaster prevention and mitigation component included Risk/Vulnerability assessment and dissemination, Preventive structural measures developed and incorporated in all public and private development initiatives, Development of long-term sustainable options for different zones keeping in view disaster prevention and mitigation aspects, Community/village/Panchayat/Block/district, State and national disaster mitigation/ reduction strategy and plans.

The approach to risk and vulnerability assessment and dissemination was proposed through development and enforcement of guidelines, earthquake, flood and warning manuals and codes for all zones, safe housing atlas for the country-zone wise, dissemination of techno-legal and legal provisions. The agencies involved were proposed as:

- A committee of BIS, IITs, CSIR, HUDCO, BMPTC to develop these norms to be constituted
- Empower States, Local-self governments to develop and enforce codes/norms regulations.
- User-friendly atlas with design details for various risk zones in vernacular languages
- DAVP-mass communication-print and electronic media, Dept. of Education-curriculum of schools, colleges, universities and technical institutes.
- Development of IEC resource materials and dissemination by MHA through all line Ministries, State Governments, local self-bodies.
- To be included in the basic (initial training curriculum of all senior and middle civil services in the country.

While the National Building Code was updated and Building Bye Laws have been revised for adoption by different states, it has not really made a dent at ground level. Even where Municipal Corporations have revised their building bye laws, the implementation mechanism is quite weak and leaves much to be desired. The problem is compounded further since there is no techno-legal regime in force for rural areas and over the last few decades, pucca and semi pucca constructions are coming up fast in villages. As per the field surveys in six states, 27.3% rural houses are pucca and 23.4% are semi-pucca, without following any building safety regulations. This is a major gap which needs to be bridged by strengthening implementation of building bye laws in cities, training engineers and architects both in public and private sectors, to ensure compliance with building safety regulations and putting in place techno-legal regime in rural areas and empowering local self governments to take up its implementation vigorously, by providing them sufficient technical support. Very little, if any, effort has been made to develop and disseminate user-friendly atlas with design details for various risk zones in vernacular languages. Besides, awareness needs to be generated through mass communication and by incorporating it through the curriculum of schools, colleges, universities and technical institutes.

IEC materials had been developed initially under the GOI-UNDP Disaster Risk Management Programme. With the conclusion of the programme by UNDP, the state governments have not really taken up the ownership of the programme and carried it forward. IEC materials need to be developed and disseminated by NDMA through state governments, district administrations, local governments and other stakeholders on all aspects of disaster prevention and mitigation. It requires sustained action coupled with making available technical support. This can be institutionalised by adding it in the disaster management plans at state, district, block and community level.

Civil servants need to be exposed to the need for developing and implementing building safety regulations. At present, it is perceived as a technical subject meant for engineers and architects. Unless the senior civil servants are sensitized and implementation of these regulations is monitored by them, it is not likely to show tangible results. Besides, elementary training has to be imparted to masons to ensure building safety parameters are incorporated while constructing buildings, be it urban or rural areas.
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The national Roadmap had also advocated development of long-term sustainable options for different zones keeping in view disaster prevention and mitigation aspects. The strategy suggested was engagement of specialists for development of plans including alternate approaches, cost-benefit appraisal of these plans based on minimum losses criteria, and financing of structural and non-structural solutions like cyclone shelters, dams/barrages, flood shelters etc.

Several state governments have engaged technical institutes/ experts for preparation of Disaster Management Plans. However, few state governments only have included an Action Plan after identification of gaps to bridge such gaps in a given time period. The cost benefit analysis of these plans based on minimum loss criteria has also not been carried out. Cyclone and flood shelters have been constructed in several states and the work is still going on. The Planning Commission has now allocated funds for mitigation activities which need to be utilized to gain optimum benefits. A social audit of expenditure incurred needs to be carried out by NDMA through SDMAs in different states and, if necessary, extend necessary technical support to states through NIDM and other national institutes to ensure structural and non-structural solutions are identified and implemented. It would be better if the Action Plan of each state government, as a part of Disaster Management Plan outlines the projects to be undertaken in three broad categories, short term, medium term and long term so that prevention and mitigation measures are completed over the next 10-15 years. Financial assistance is also being provided through external agencies like World Bank for taking up specific projects like National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project. It may be ensured that maintenance of assets created is also provided for on regular basis. While action has been initiated, it needs to be accelerated in a time bound manner.

Another key intervention area identified in the National Roadmap relates to development and implementation of Community/village/Panchayat/Block/district, State and national disaster mitigation/reduction strategy and plans through:

- Strong social mobilization and awareness campaigns
- Increased participation in decentralized planning
- Disaster appraisal to be one of the integral components of the development plan
- Identify and prepare mitigation projects for inclusion in the development plans and implementation with earmarked allocation.

While awareness campaigns have been launched through mass media by NDMA and some state governments, it has not achieved desired results, as observed during field surveys in six states. Strong social mobilization would be possible with the active involvement of local self governments, NGOs, SHGs and volunteers. This is a weak area in almost all states. The participation of community in these initiatives is still lukewarm. Besides, disaster risk reduction has still not been made an integral part of development planning, though some state governments have made a beginning. The main drawback in the present strategy is that there is no convergence of different stakeholders to ensure that disaster risk reduction is integrated with all aspects of development. In fact, the idea of decentralized planning with bottom up approach has still not been institutionalised through local authorities. These gaps need to be bridged in future planning. Above all, mechanism to ensure that what is planned is implemented in a time bound manner has still not been put in place. This is a major gap which needs to be taken care of.

III. Early Warning Systems

The Early Warning Systems in the country was one of the focus areas in the National Roadmap. The improvements suggested were:

- Advanced hazard-tracking systems for climatological and geological hazards
- Application of state-of-the-art modeling techniques and systems for early warning
- Hazard warning-vulnerability modeling for each state/district on GIS platform
- State-of-the-art Emergency Operations Centre (MHA) with full-time professionals
Stand by EOC at another location in the country
- Mobile EOCs
- Developing disaster inventories for analysis of trends and tendencies.
- Hazard warning-vulnerability modeling for each district
- State-of-the-art Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) at the state HQ with a stand-by facility at another location
- Mobile EOCs with state nodal agency
- District Emergency Operations Centre
- Communication strategy for early warning
- Panchayats/urban bodies to disseminate early warning thru DMT group in the village (s)

While IMD and CWC have improved the existing systems for early warning to some extent, it has not really trickled down to community level for dissemination of warnings on real time basis. Application of state of the art hazard warning/ vulnerability warning is yet to take roots at state/ district level although few state governments have made a beginning like Gujarat and Assam. The EOC in MHA needs to be strengthened by engaging full time professionals; at present the National EOC is being run by CPMF personnel. The system of mobile EOCs is still to be established. A beginning was made to develop comprehensive inventory of human and material resources through India Disaster Resource Network (IDRN), but it was not regularly updated at state and district level with the result that it has become outdated and very few districts are making use of it. Real time dissemination of warnings is still a challenge. The District EOCs have been set up but their communication linkages with all revenue, police and block offices need lot of strengthening. Besides, in the event the conventional communication networks fail, there is no back-up plan to have effective and functional alternate communication network. SAT Phones have been provided in State EOCs but these are not available at district and block level. Even in the state EOCs, all personnel are not adequately trained in operating the SAT Phones.

At the same time, few states have shown imagination and made concerted efforts to ensure warnings are disseminated at community level well in time by a combination of technology and traditional means. In Odisha, during the recent very severe cyclone, dissemination of warnings and evacuation showed excellent results in terms of reducing casualties. On the other hand, dissemination of warning to community in the heavy rainfall in Uttarakhand in June, 2013 was not effective with the result that heavy rainfall followed by multiple landslides came as a shock to affected community. Therefore lot of attention has to be paid to improve the existing systems for dissemination of warnings from state down to community level. Local governments have almost no role in dissemination of warnings; they neither have the equipments nor training to know how to go about it and it is being attended to by revenue officials from district/ block level. It also leads one to conclude that the gaps identified in the National Roadmap have not been considered and remedial measures taken during the last ten years.

A practical implementable communication strategy needs to evolved, particularly at state, district and local level, and implemented in a time bound manner. It is true implementation has to undertaken by state governments. It needs to be closely monitored by SDMAs and NDMA. When SDMAs are almost non-functional in most of the states and NDMA is over-cautious in imposing itself on states for monitoring implementation to ensure a vibrant communication network with adequate redundancies with last mile connectivity, real time dissemination of early warnings would necessarily remain a dream, leaving the community to fend for themselves in disaster situations.

IV. Disaster Preparedness, Mitigation and Response

The National Roadmap had envisaged following strategy for this purpose:

- Community based village preparedness mitigation and response plans through enhancement of community capacity in all multi-hazard prone states and districts to respond effectively to disasters in future.
- District disaster preparedness and response plans to enhance capacity of the district team to respond to disasters by preparing and implementing District preparedness and response plans, district inventory of resources and gaps, stockpiling strategy and warehousing, constitution and training of District DMT, “local and district response teams for designated areas” for evacuation, search and rescue, road and debris clearance, health, trauma management etc.
- State preparedness and response plans to enhance capacity of the state administration to respond to disasters by putting in place state preparedness and response plans, State inventory of resources and gaps and constitution of State DMT and training and equipping these teams.
- State response teams for evacuation, search and rescue, road and debris clearance, health, trauma management by constitution of State Disaster Rapid Action Force with one company of the Armed Reserve Police of all Battalions to be trained as rapid response teams with other members drawn from health, PWD, Forest, Fire Services, Water rescue, Collapsed structure search and rescue, Fire rescue etc.
- National level preparedness and response plans by specialised and self-contained Search and Rescue Teams and web-enabled and easy-to-access inventory of resources

It will be observed that the approach proposed is to start at community level. It has to be conceded that whatever state of the art arrangements exist at national and state level, most of the casualties will occur and damage done by the time specialised rescue teams reach the site of disaster. It is therefore necessary to prepare the community to initiate action and take necessary measures till the state and national level teams reach the site of disaster. This can be attended to by developing and implementing village level mitigation, preparedness and response plans. These plans could be a part of a comprehensive Disaster Management Plan at village level. The measures to be taken should include setting up DMCs and DMTs in each village in hazard prone areas; train these teams to develop their preparedness and response plans which shall inter alia include development of village level inventory of both human and material resources; identification or construction of multi-purpose safe shelters and its maintenance; stock piling of relief materials; development of evacuation plan and familiarizing the community with it; mainstream these plans with annual development plans of all panchayats and local bodies; train DMTs in all response functions such as early warning dissemination, search and rescue, first aid, trauma management, shelter and livelihood loss prevention techniques etc; mainstream capacity building of the teams with programme extension of all line departments; and organisation of mock drills of the community and Panchayats at regular intervals.

At present, as brought out during field surveys, firstly the village DMPs have either not been prepared and, even if prepared, are not readily available with most of the village GPs. Secondly, where such DMPs could be traced, these had not been updated on annual basis. Thirdly, the DMPs looked more like a telephone directory containing numbers of concerned officers and agencies and did not have mitigation, preparedness and response plans as its components. The village DMPs in few states had been prepared under the GOI-UNDP DRM Programme and then forgotten; even these plans had been prepared through a cookie cutter approach and might not be relevant keeping in view the risk and vulnerability profile of respective villages. It is true that DMCs and DMTs (Task Forces) had been constituted under the programme and imparted some training. However, there was no follow up refresher training, most of the members of the teams had migrated out of villages for occupations or marriages and these members had not been substituted and trained. No mock drills were being conducted. DDMAs had not taken cognizance of these issues since these bodies had also become non-functional. As for District Magistrates’ meetings, these issues were not even discussed. Their concern was primarily response-oriented and mitigation and preparedness did not get any attention.
Of the six states covered during field surveys, Andhra Pradesh was the only state which was not covered under GOI-UNDP Programme and yet it had constituted village level Task Forces on its own and imparted training to community members on such Task Forces. Even in villages of Andhra Pradesh, all the actions mentioned above were not being taken. At the same time, community level training and village level preparedness had been initiated in Andhra Pradesh, which is commendable, and, to a lesser extent, in Odisha.

At district level, it was suggested that Disaster preparedness and Response Plans may be prepared to enhance capacity of the district team to respond to disasters. In addition, district inventory of resources and gaps, stockpiling strategy and warehousing, constitution and training of District DMT and “local and district response teams for designated areas” for evacuation, search and rescue, road and debris clearance, health, trauma management etc. may also be developed. The objective was to ensure specialized training of the members of the DMT at district and sub-district levels; conduct of mock drills at regular intervals; one company of the Armed Reserve Police to be trained as rapid response teams with other members drawn from Health, PWD, Fire, water rescue, collapsed structure search and rescue, fire rescue etc.

However, in most of the districts covered during field surveys, no such activity had been undertaken at district level although in Gujarat, it was mentioned that there was a plan to develop one company of state police in each district as rapid response teams. As of now, there were no such teams except in Gujarat where Fire Services personnel had been trained in rescue operations also, supported with equipments. The district level inventory of resources had not been updated and very few district magistrates were making use of it. It is obvious that unless the district level officers actually make use of such inventory in case of disasters to locate resources, its need would not be felt and consequently such resource inventory would either not be prepared or, if prepared, was not likely to be updated.

Similarly, at state level, action on above lines had to be taken to enhance capacity of the state administration to respond to disasters. Most of the states stated that they planned to develop State Disaster Response Force. However, as of now, the reliance was mostly on NDRF Battalions. State inventory of resources had been developed by few state governments but since the system of updating the resource inventory had not been institutionalised at district level, it is difficult to say to what extent such resource inventories could be considered up to date. Therefore, the overall conclusion is that there are still several gaps, based on National Roadmap, which need to be covered by different state governments from state to community level.

At national level, preparedness and response plans had to be prepared, besides specialised and self-contained Search and Rescue Teams and web-enabled and easy-to-access inventory of resources for Hydrological disasters (cyclones and floods), Nuclear/Radiological/Chemical/Biological disasters, and Geological disasters (earthquakes and landslides). As for web-based inventory, it was envisaged to link all Inventories at all levels through a web-link to be designated as National Inventory of Disaster Equipments (NIDE). NIC connectivity to be used for the purpose-or-a dedicated link between national and state DMAs could be used. Also, periodical census of NIDEs including using secondary data was suggested to be conducted.

At national level, 10 battalions of NDRF have been raised and equipped and located in different parts of the country, keeping in view the vulnerability of different areas and strategic requirements. Each battalion has six Coys with three teams each, consisting of 45 personnel each, making a total of 180 teams. The teams have been assured air mobility to be provided by Ministry of Defence (Air Force) “promptly on demand”. NDRF has specialised teams for NBC disasters as also for deep diving in flood situations for rescue. The NDRF teams have done very good work in disaster situations. During the period 2007 to 2010, NDRF has intervened in 85 different incidents and rescued 1.41 lakh victims. Even in normal times, they undertake awareness campaign, impart training to other stakeholders in
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search and rescue and conduct mock drills. The Task Force to review the Disaster Management Act has also stated that NDRF is a success story for NDMA. Since response and relief is with Ministry of Home Affairs, deployment of NDRF teams is made by NDMA at the instance of MHA/ State Governments.

As for web-based resource inventory, action had been initiated about 10 years back by setting up India Disaster Resource Network (IDRN). IDRN is a nation-wide electronic inventory of resources that enlists equipment and human resources, collated from district, state and national level Government line departments and agencies. The inventory also has informative details of NGOs and private sector including around 5000 corporate members registered with Confederation of Indian Industry and 33000 builders, contractors and construction companies registered with Builder’s Association of India and other public sector undertakings. IDRN is a web based platform, for managing the inventory of equipments, skilled human resources and critical supplies for emergency response. The primary focus is to enable the decision makers to find answers on availability of equipments and human resources required to combat any emergency situation. This database will also enable them to assess the level of preparedness for specific vulnerabilities.

The online inventory of resources is hosted in the National Informatics Centre (NIC), New Delhi. Authorized Government officers have the access to the Portal and the district authority is responsible for the updating of data received from various line departments. Data is monitored and maintained at the central level by National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM). Besides NIDM is responsible for the overall administration of the portal. However, NIDM is not responsible for collecting, updating & validating the data. Only district level authority is responsible for updating the data.\(^6\)

The main bottleneck is that data is not being updated at regular level by all districts with the result the actual location of resources and their availability becomes often suspect. This is a gap which needs to be filled in if IDRN has to be optimally utilised.

V. Human Resource Development

The National Disaster Management Framework lays down the following Roadmap for Human Resource Development

- National capacity building as a national agenda through development of capacity building plans including national training plan (NTP)---need assessment of the skill sets and quantity and their availability;
- Specialised training facilities set up
- Professional human resource available in the country for all DM operations including health professionals; engineers, architects, and planners; agricultural universities
- All Govt. functionaries at all levels receive basic training in basic preparedness and response functions including All India Services, Central services, State administrative services, District cadres and local self government;
- NGOs/ CBOs, Youth Organisations, School/ College students i.e. NCC/NSS/Scout & Guides.
- Public awareness and community training

The areas of intervention for health professionals included crisis prevention response and recovery, and trauma management in MBBS curriculum; for architects, engineers and planners, it included hazard mitigation technologies including knowledge of all techno-legal provisions in degree and PG courses; and for agricultural universities the focus proposed was on crisis prevention response and recovery in Agricultural sector in degree and PG course.

As for government functionaries, it envisaged creation of centres for training of trainees and facilities in all post recruitment training institutions for categories of staff.

\(^6\) [www.idrn.gov.in](http://www.idrn.gov.in)
As for NGOs/ CBOs, the representatives of national/state/district/local level NGO/CBOs to be provided training on disaster management. For youth organisations, school/ college students, it envisaged that they should be provided training in the emergency response and public awareness generation. Schools and colleges need to prepare a volunteer force by orienting students in emergency response and public awareness generation through various co-curricular activities like drawing, essay, poster and debate competitions and skill training in emergency response i.e. drills, simulation exercises etc.

For public awareness, the Roadmap proposed awareness generation of the local community and capacity building of the community at local level to impart skill training like mock drills rehearsals etc. Among various alternatives, visual media like television and film can be utilised for social preparation and public awareness generation. Also, specific programmes on disaster management be telecasted in various TV channels like Doordarshan, Gyan Darshan, and Discovery Channels etc. The media professionals of Doordarshan and private TV Channels and Film producers can be sensitised and encouraged to integrate DM components in different programmes for public awareness.

The national capacity building in disaster management, though being advocated since 2004 has not made significant headway. This has been brought out in SWOT Analysis, based on field surveys in six states. The gaps identified therein have to be filled in for which strategy has been proposed in SWOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps identified based on National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Although a much more elaborate institutional structure, compared to one envisaged in NDMF, has been put in place, it is not fully functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Even where Building Bye Laws have been updated, the implementation mechanism is too weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no techno legal regime in force in rural areas although pucca and semi pucca constructions are rapidly coming up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster prevention/ mitigation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very little effort has been made to develop and disseminate user-friendly atlas with design details for various risk zones in vernacular languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Awareness needs to be generated through mass communication and curricula of schools, colleges, universities and technical institutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IEC materials need to be developed and disseminated by NDMA through state governments, district administrations, local governments and other stakeholders on all aspects of disaster prevention and mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It requires sustained action coupled with making available technical support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senior civil servants need to be sensitized in building safety regulations to enable them to monitor its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training has to be imparted to masons to ensure building safety parameters are incorporated while constructing buildings, be it urban or rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for development of plans including alternate approaches, cost-benefit appraisal of these plans based on minimum losses criteria, and financing of structural and non-structural solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to develop plans from state to community level with following approaches:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Strong social mobilization and awareness campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Increased participation in decentralized planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Disaster appraisal to be one of the integral components of the development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify and prepare mitigation projects for inclusion in the development plans and implementation with earmarked allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is need for strong social mobilization with active involvement of local self governments, NGOs, SHGs and volunteers. This is a weak area in almost all states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The participation of community in these initiatives is still lukewarm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Besides, disaster risk reduction has still not been made an integral part of development planning, though some state governments have made a beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The main drawback in the present strategy is that there is no convergence of different stakeholders to ensure that disaster risk reduction is integrated with all aspects of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In fact, the idea of decentralized planning with bottom up approach has still not been institutionalised through local authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis.

Two programmes for training of engineers and architects had been taken up initially by MHA and later on by NIDM. These programmes brought out many bottlenecks particularly due to the period of training and reluctance of state governments to depute their engineers and architects for long term training. The private sector including practicing engineers and architects did not evince much interest since there was no statutory obligation to undergo such training and it could not be linked to their licenses to practice, since these matters fell within the jurisdiction of All India Institute of Technology level mitigation, preparedness and response plans. These are to be put in place.

Gaps identified based on National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF)

Early Warning System

- While IMD and CWC have upgraded the EWS, real time dissemination to community level is still a challenge.
- The District EOCs have been set up but their communication linkages with all revenue, police and block offices need lot of strengthening.
- Besides, in the event the conventional communication networks fail, there is no back-up plan to have effective and functional alternate communication network.
- EOC in MHA needs to be strengthened by engaging full time professionals.
- The system of mobile EOCs is still to be established.
- Local governments have almost no role in dissemination of warnings; they neither have the equipments nor training to know how to go about it.
- A practical implementable communication strategy needs to evolved, particularly at state, district and local level, and implemented in a time bound manner.
- It needs to be closely monitored by SDMAs and NDMA to ensure a vibrant communication network with adequate redundancies and last mile connectivity.

Disaster Preparedness, Mitigation and Response

- Since community is the first responder, it is necessary to prepare the community to initiate action and take necessary measures till the state and national level teams reach the site of disaster.
- This can be attended to by developing and implementing village level mitigation, preparedness and response plans. These plans could be a part of a comprehensive Disaster Management Plan at village level.
- The measures to be taken should include setting up DMCs and DMTs in each village in hazard prone areas; train these teams to develop their preparedness and response plans which shall inter alia include development of village level inventory of both human and material resources; identification or construction of multi-purpose safe shelters and its maintenance; stock piling of relief materials; development of evacuation plan and familiarizing the community with it.
- These plans may be mainstreamed with annual development plans of all panchayats and local bodies.
- DMTs may be trained in all response functions.
- The village DMPs have either not been prepared and, even if prepared, are not readily available with most of the village GPs.
- While such DMPs could be traced, these had not been updated on annual basis.
- The DMPs looked more like a telephone directory of concerned officers and agencies and did not have mitigation, preparedness and response plans as its components.
- No mock drills were being conducted. DDMAs had not taken cognizance of these issues since these bodies had also become non-functional.
- As for District Magistrates’ meetings, these issues were not even discussed. Their concern was primarily response-oriented and mitigation and preparedness did not get any attention.
- Disaster preparedness and Response Plans may be prepared to enhance capacity of the district team to respond to disasters.
- District inventory of resources and gaps, stockpiling strategy and warehousing, constitution and training of District DMT and “local and district response teams for designated areas” for evacuation, search and rescue, road and debris clearance, health, trauma management etc. may also be developed.
- One company of the Armed Reserve Police to be trained as rapid response teams with other members drawn from Health, PWD, Fire, water rescue, collapsed structure search and rescue, fire rescue etc for each district.
- Similarly, at state level, action on above lines had to be taken to enhance capacity of the state administration to respond to disasters.
- Most of the states stated that they planned to develop State Disaster Response Force. However, as of now, the reliance was mostly on NDRF Battalions.
- State inventory of resources had been developed by few state governments but since the system of updating the resource inventory had not been institutionalised at district level, it is difficult to say to what extent such resource inventories could be considered up to date.
- At national level, preparedness and response plans have yet to be prepared as part of National Plan.
- NDRF with 10 battalions having 180 SAR Teams of 45 personnel each have been developed and are operational.
- Web-enabled and easy-to-access inventory of resources for Hydrological disasters (cyclones and floods), Nuclear/Radiological/Chemical/Biological disasters, and Geological disasters (earthquakes and landslides) are to be put in place.
- Although IDRN has been developed, the main bottleneck is that data is not being updated at regular intervals by all districts with the result the actual location of resources and their availability becomes often suspect. This is a gap which needs to be filled in if IDRN has to be optimally utilised.
Engineers and Council of Architects. Therefore, it requires consistent advocacy with these organisations to motivate engineers/ architects to participate in these trainings. Another option may be to make it mandatory for practicing engineers and architects to qualify in disaster resilient construction practices through face to face or distance learning programmes within a stipulated period of say five years, failing which their license to practice may be suspended till they qualify in the desired technologies.

Training is being imparted to some of the government officers/ employees through NIDM, IIPA and state level training institutes. However, the constraints are lack of well qualified adequate faculty, particularly at state institutes, lack of focused training modules based on their job description etc. These issues have been highlighted in the SWOT Analysis as also in the Strategic Framework for Implementation of Training (SFIT). It is unfortunate that these actions are being taken only now under NCRMP whereas the National Disaster Management Framework had highlighted and mandated these actions as early as 2004.

The training of NGOs/ CBOs/ local self government/ students and teachers as also community had been initiated under the GOI-UNDP DRM Programme in the 176 districts in 17 states during the period 2003-2009. However, the ownership of the programme was not really accepted by respective state governments with the result that, after conclusion of the programme, the training programmes have been by and large discontinued. Again, this issue has been dealt with in detail in SWOT Analysis and the strategy to take forward different training programmes has also been proposed therein. The report also quantifies the number of personnel to be trained in the first phase.

The strategy for awareness generation and media training and management has been worked out separately to take care of these gaps, which need to be followed and implemented scrupulously.

It will be observed that crucial gaps in different phases of disaster management had been identified and shared with the state governments, based on National Disaster Management Framework, as early as 2004. It is not as if no action was taken to fill in these gaps. However, sustained action based on pre-defined strategy, was not taken by the central and state governments including NDMA and SDMAs, with the result that progress achieved so far is almost insignificant. These gaps now need to be bridged in a time bound manner, based on strategy worked out in SWOT Analysis and SFIT, further strengthened by model TOTs and awareness generation strategy as also media sensitization.

### Human Resource Development

- National capacity building as a national agenda through development of capacity building plans including national training plan (NTP)—need assessment of the skill sets and quantity and their availability has yet to be taken up in right earnest.
- Specialised training facilities need to be considerably strengthened.
- Professional human resource available in the country for all DM operations including health professionals; engineers, architects, and planners; agricultural universities are to be trained.
- All Govt. functionaries at all levels to be imparted basic training in basic preparedness and response functions including All India Services, Central services, State administrative services, District cadres and local self government. This action, though initiated, has to be geared up.
- NGOs/ CBOs, Youth Organisations, School/ College students i.e. NCC/NSS/Scout & Guides have to be imparted training.
- Public awareness and community training needs to be accelerated particularly of the local community and capacity building of the community at local level to impart skill training like mock drills has to be organised.
- The national capacity building in disaster management, though being advocated since 2004 has not made significant headway. This has been brought out in SWOT Analysis, based on field surveys in six states. The gaps identified therein have to be filled in for which strategy has been proposed in SWOT Analysis/ SFIT.
- Crucial gaps in different phases of disaster management had been identified and shared with the state governments, based on NDMF, as early as 2004. It is not as if no action was taken to fill in these gaps. However, sustained action based on predefined strategy, was not taken by the central and state governments including NDMA and SDMAs, with the result that progress achieved so far is almost insignificant.
- These gaps now need to be bridged in a time bound manner, based on strategy worked out in SWOT Analysis and SFIT, further strengthened by model TOTs and awareness generation strategy as also media sensitization and training.
and training, which are additional deliverables under this Study.

National Policy on Disaster Management

Background

Soon after the finalization of the National Disaster Management Framework (National Roadmap), an exercise for formulation of the National Policy on Disaster Management (NPDM) was initiated with the intention to bring it out co-terminus with the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005. However, while the Disaster Management Bill, 2005 was still in process, the National Disaster Management Authority was constituted by issue of an executive order in May, 2005 and the Vice-Chairperson and few Members were appointed in September, 2005. Keeping in view the proposed provisions of the Bill, which inter alia provided that the National Authority shall have the responsibility to lay down policies on disaster management, the Ministry of Home Affairs referred the first draft of the National Policy to NDMA for detailed consideration. The National Authority held a series of consultations as also discussions with the Ministry of Home Affairs and NIDM before finalizing the draft NPDM and transmitted it to the Ministry of Home Affairs for undertaking the process of inter-ministerial consultations and obtaining the approval of the Cabinet. The National Policy on Disaster Management was finally approved by the Cabinet on 23rd October, 2009.

Vision of the Policy

The vision of NPDM, as articulated in the policy is “to build a safe and disaster resilient India by developing a holistic, proactive, multi-disaster oriented and technology driven strategy through a culture of prevention, mitigation, preparedness and response” The vision gives expression to the concepts enunciated by the High Power Committee on Disaster Management and is in line with the course of action laid down in the National Roadmap.

Approach

The National Policy states that a holistic and integrated approach will be evolved toward disaster management with emphasis on building strategic partnerships at various levels. The themes underpinning the policy are:

- Community based DM, including last mile integration of the policy, plans and execution.
- Capacity development in all spheres.
- Consolidation of past initiatives and best practices.
- Cooperation with agencies at national and international levels.
- Multi-sectoral synergy.

Salient Objectives of the Policy

The objectives of the national policy on disaster management are:

- Promoting a culture of prevention, preparedness and resilience at all levels through knowledge, innovation and education.
- Encouraging mitigation measures based on technology, traditional wisdom and environmental sustainability.
- Mainstreaming disaster management into the developmental planning process.
- Establishing institutional and techno-legal frameworks to create an enabling regulatory environment and a compliance regime.
- Ensuring efficient mechanism for identification, assessment and monitoring of disaster risks.
- Developing contemporary forecasting and early warning systems backed by responsive and failsafe communication with information technology support.
- Promoting a productive partnership with the media to create awareness and contributing towards capacity development.
• Ensuring efficient response and relief with a caring approach towards the needs of the vulnerable sections of the society.
• Undertaking reconstruction as an opportunity to build disaster resilient structures and habitat for ensuring safer living.

**Important features of the Policy**

The policy elaborates the institutional and funding mechanisms put in place through the Disaster Management Act, 2005 such as Disaster Management Authorities at national, state, district and local level; Executive Committees at national and state level; Disaster Mitigation and Response Funds at national, state and district level; National Institute of Disaster Management and the National Disaster Response Force. It also encompasses the existing institutional arrangements already in force before the enactment of the Act such as Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities (since discontinued), Cabinet Committee on Security, National Crisis Management Committee, Crisis Management Group, role of Central and State Governments and their Ministries and Departments as also the role of Armed Forces, Central Para Military Forces, State Police Forces, Civil Defence and Home Guards and Fire Services in response during disasters. It further states that States will be encouraged to create response capabilities from within their existing resources. To start with, each state may aim at equipping and training one battalion as their respective State Disaster Response Force (SDRF), including women members. The SDRFs will be imparted training by NDRF and its training institutes. It is also proposed to strengthen the youth based organizations like National Cadet Corps (NCC), National Service Scheme (NSS) and Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS). The potential of these youth based organizations will be optimized to support all community based initiatives and DM training would be included in their programmes. Further, NDMA will ensure mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in developmental agenda in all existing and new developmental programmes and projects shall incorporate disaster resilient specifications in the design and construction. The Planning Commission will give due weightage to these factors while allocating resources.

**Mitigation measures**

A separate chapter in the policy deals with disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness measures. The policy advocates a multi-pronged approach to be adopted to undertake mitigation measures, as below:

• Building mitigation measures into all development projects.
• Initiating national level mitigation projects by the NDMA, in high priority areas, with the help of the Central Ministries and Departments concerned and the States.
• Encouraging and assisting State level mitigation projects in accordance with the guidelines.
• Indigenous knowledge on disaster and coping mechanisms; particularly those adopted by various States will be given due weightage with special focus on protection of heritage structures.
• Hazard zonation, mapping and vulnerability analysis in a multi-hazard framework will be carried out utilizing Geographic Information System (GIS) based databases such as the National Database for Emergency Management (NDEM) and National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).
• Action plans for checking unplanned urbanization and ensuring safer human habitat against all forms of disasters will be recognized as priority areas.
• Critical infrastructure like dams, roads, bridges, flyovers, railway lines, power stations, water storage towers, irrigation canals, delta water distributor network, river and coastal embankments, ports and other civic utilities are to be constantly monitored for safety standards in consonance with worldwide safety benchmarks and strengthened, where deficient. The building standards for these infrastructures need to be aligned to the safety norms and concerned Departments/Authorities would ensure the requisite actions.
Eco Systems of forests, islands, coastal areas, rivers, agricultural urban environment and industrial environment are to be considered for restoration of ecological balances and sustainable development. Zonal regulations must ensure the preservation of natural habitats.

There are definite indications that climate change would increase the frequency and intensity of natural disasters like cyclone, flood and drought in the coming years. In order to meet these challenges in a sustained and effective manner, synergies in our approach and strategies for climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction shall be encouraged and promoted.

**Preparedness measures**

The policy also highlights preparedness measures which need to be taken, as below:

- States/UTs have to accord highest priority to building up their own DM capabilities. While the national plan will be prepared by the NEC, the disaster and domain-specific plans will be made by the respective central ministries and departments.
- State and District plans will be prepared for their specific disaster related vulnerabilities in accordance with the guidelines issued by NDMA.
- The participation of all stakeholders, communities and institutions in the preparation of these plans will inculcate a culture of preparedness. A bottom-up approach needs to be adopted for better understanding and operationalisation of these plans.
- It is essential to establish, upgrade and modernize the forecasting and early-warning systems for all types of disasters. The nodal agencies responsible for monitoring and carrying out surveillance, for specific natural disasters, will identify technological gaps and formulate projects for their upgradation, in a time bound manner.
- ICT tools need to be used for data receptions, forecasting and timely dissemination
- The basic communications and IT support requirements for disaster management correspond to the following three levels:
  - Decision makers and disaster managers at all levels.
  - Real time dissemination of advance warnings and information to the concerned authorities at various levels and threatened community.
  - Last mile connectivity at the disaster site for control and conduct of rescue and relief operations.
- A National Emergency Communication Network, involving the contemporary space and terrestrial-based technologies in a highly synergistic configuration and with considerable redundancy, will be developed. This Network will ensure real time dissemination of warnings and information up to the affected community and local authorities.
- The establishment of Emergency Operations Centers at the national, state, metros and district level and equipping them with the contemporary technologies and communication facilities and their periodic up-gradation, will be accorded priority. For the last mile connectivity and control of the operations at the disaster hit areas, availability of portable platforms will be catered for.
- The NDMA, in close coordination with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, states and premier medical research institutes will formulate policy guidelines to enhance capacity in emergency medical response and mass casualty management. DM plans for hospitals will include developing and training of medical teams and paramedics, capacity building, trauma and psycho-social care, mass casualty management and triage.
- Creation of mobile surgical teams, mobile hospitals and heli-ambulances for evacuation of patients is a crucial component of DM efforts.
- State Governments will be encouraged to plan a series of exercises for various types of disasters in collaboration with NDMA to enhance the response level of various stakeholders.
- The efforts of the states/UTs for community participation for disaster preparedness will be encouraged. As first responders to any disaster, communities will be trained in the various
aspects of response such as first-aid, search and rescue, management of community shelters, psycho-social counseling, distribution of relief and accessing support from government/agencies etc. Community plans will be dovetailed into the panchayat, block and district plans.

- Women and youth will be encouraged to participate in decision making committees and action groups for management of disasters.
- The participation of civil society stakeholders and Public Private Partnership between the Government and private sector will be encouraged to empower the community and generate awareness through their respective institutional mechanisms.
- Effective partnership with the media will be worked out in the field of community awareness, early warning and dissemination and education.

**Techno Legal Regime**

In view of the construction boom and rapid urbanization, municipal regulations such as development control regulations, building bye-laws and structural safety features need to be revisited. These regulations may be reviewed periodically to identify safety gaps from seismic, flood, landslide and other disasters and suitable modifications should be made to align them to revised building codes of the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS).

Central Ministries and Departments concerned in consultation with scientific institutions will carry out analysis of environmental and hazard data for formulation of alternative land use plans for different geographical and administrative areas with a holistic approach. This is more relevant to mega cities, metros and high-density urban settlements for safer location of habitat and other critical facilities. A review of master plans and their compliance, on priority, will be essential and regarded as the paramount responsibility of the states/UTs. At macro-level, there is a need for preparation of land use planning based on the inventory database of various uses. As far as urban settlements are concerned, the future land use is to be assessed keeping in view the anticipated intensity of development.

The design and specification of houses being constructed, under the Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) and other government welfare and development schemes, will also be re-examined to ensure hazard safety. Building codes will be updated every five years as a mandatory requirement and also put in the public domain. Observance of National Building Code should be made mandatory in all the State/ Municipal building bye-laws. Training of engineers, architects, small builders, construction managers and artisans has already been started and need to be intensified at the state and district level. Safe schools and hospitals (with large capacity) and national monuments besides other critical lifeline buildings will be regarded as a national priority. Enabling provision shall be made in all the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and design the school buildings/hostels with earthquake resilient features and to equip them with appropriate fire safety measures.

There is a need for putting in place a sound compliance regime, with binding consequences, to ensure the effectiveness of techno-legal and techno-financial provisions. It is important to ensure that monitoring, verification and compliance arrangements are in place both at the national and state level. It will be the responsibility of all stakeholders concerned, to implement these provisions. Adoption of best management practices like self certification, social audit, and an external compliance regime including audit by professional agencies, need to be encouraged through development and design of tools such as IT-enabled monitoring software to suit the DM systems in India, in consultation with various stakeholders and knowledge institutions for adoption after due trial and validation. After having put the techno-legal and compliance system in place, the states/UTs will also ensure their enforcement by establishing an effective mechanism, under the provisions of the Act.

**Response**
It is the primary responsibility of the State Governments/SDMAs to monitor and assess any developing situation and keep NDMA and NEC apprised of the same. They will also be responsible to constantly evaluate their own capabilities to handle that situation and project the anticipated requirements for the central resources well in time. Inter-State assistance and cooperation will be encouraged. The States/UTs will also be responsible to develop their own response potential progressively and complete the process at the earliest. This will comprise training and equipping of state response forces, community preparedness, training and creation of response caches at the district level. District level preparations will provide the cutting edge to all response activities. Local authorities, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) will play a significant role in the entire process, particularly in response and rescue operation, relief and rehabilitation, awareness generation and disaster preparedness, restoration of livelihood options and coordination with Non-Governmental Organizations and civil society.

All Central Ministries, State Governments, District Authorities and other stakeholders will prepare SOPs in consonance with the National and State Plans. The SOPs will be prescribed for activities like search and rescue, medical assistance and casualty management, evacuation, restoration of essential services and communication at disaster sites, etc. The other important activities are provision of food, drinking water, sanitation, clothing and management of relief camps. Detailed SOPs will also be devised by all concerned for dispatch, receipt and deployment of central resources.

The Incident Command System (ICS) is essentially a management system to organize various emergency functions in a standardized manner while responding to any disaster. It will provide for specialist incident management teams with an incident commander and officers trained in different aspects of incident management, such as logistics, operations, planning, safety, media management, etc. It also aims to put in place such teams in each district by imparting training in different facets of incident management to district level functionaries. The emphasis will be on the use of technologies and contemporary systems of planning and execution with connectivity to the joint operations room at all levels.

The voluntary deployment of the nearest medical resources to the disaster site, irrespective of the administrative boundaries, will be emphasized. Mobile medical hospitals and other resources available with the centre will also be provided to the states/UTs in a proactive manner. The policy also emphasizes the need for animal care and dissemination of accurate information through electronic and print media.

**Relief and Rehabilitation**

The relief needs to be prompt, adequate and of approved standards. Guidelines defining minimum standards of relief are in the process of being prepared by the NDMA. The important features of relief and rehabilitation emphasized in the policy are briefly:

- Settlement of temporary relief camps
- Management of relief supplies
- Review of standards of relief
- Temporary Livelihood Options and Socio-Economic Rehabilitation, and
- Provision of intermediate relief centres

**Reconstruction and Recovery**

The approach to the reconstruction process has to be comprehensive so as to convert adversity into opportunity. Incorporating disaster resilient features to ‘build back better’ will be the guiding principle. This phase requires the most patient and painstaking effort by all concerned. The administration, the stakeholders and the communities need to stay focused on the needs of this phase as, with the passage of time, the sense of urgency gets diluted. The appropriate choice of technology and project impact assessment needs to be carried out to establish that the projects...
contemplated do not create any side effects on the physical, socio-cultural or economic environment of the communities in the affected areas or in their neighbourhood. Systems for providing psycho-social support and trauma counseling need to be developed for implementation during reconstruction and recovery phase. The salient aspects of reconstruction and recovery emphasized in the policy document are:

- Owner driven construction
- Speedy construction
- Linking Recovery with Safe Development, and
- Restoration of means of livelihood

**Capacity Development**

The approach to capacity development will include:

- According priority to training for developing community based DM systems for their specific needs in view of the regional diversities and multi-hazard vulnerabilities.
- Conceptualization of community based DM systems at the national level through a consultative process involving the states and other stakeholders with the state and local level authorities in charge of implementation.
- Identification of knowledge-based institutions with proven performance.
- Promotion of international and regional cooperation.
- Adoption of traditional and global best practices and technologies.
- Laying emphasis on table-top exercises, simulations, mock drills and development of skills to test the plans.
- Capacity analysis of different disaster response groups at State/ District/ Local levels.

In the field of capacity development, priority will be given to training of DM officials, functionaries, trainers, elected representatives and communities. DM training and orientation of professionals like doctors, engineers, and architects will be given due importance. Further, expansion of DM training in educational institutions at all levels including schools, with orientation towards practical requirements will be given due weightage. The NIDM will play an important role in developing and facilitating the implementation of the national training schedule for DM. It will also be the nodal institution for regional and international cooperation for training. There are a number of renowned institutes in various states, which are imparting training in DM. These will be strengthened with financial assistance and such efforts will be replicated by States/UTs. Also, the DM cells in all administrative training institutes, police academies, states institutes of rural development, the four paramilitary training centres of the NDRF and the National Training Academy will contribute significantly in developing DM related skills. The capacity of existing institutes needs to be upgraded in accordance with regional and local requirements.

Training of communities will include awareness, sensitization, orientation and developing skills of communities and community leaders. Assistance from NDRF, Civil Defence and NGOs/ other voluntary organizations such as the Red Cross and Self-Help Groups will be encouraged. The overall responsibility to give impetus to leadership and motivation will rest with local authorities, PRIs and ULBs under the overall guidance of State and District authorities. As for Professional Technical Education, the curricula of graduate and postgraduate level courses in architecture, engineering, earth sciences and medicine will be reviewed by the competent authorities to include the contemporary knowledge related to DM in their respective specialized fields. At the national level, the Ministry of Human Resource Development will encourage development of DM as a distinct academic discipline, in the universities and institutes of technical excellence. The introduction of the subject of DM, by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, in the curriculum through the Central Board of Secondary Education, will be extended to all schools through their Secondary Education Boards. State Government will also ensure the inclusion of Disaster Management curriculum through State School Boards. The education content will inculcate skill based training.
psychological resilience and qualities of leadership. The role of NCC and Boys Scout may also be included in schools and colleges for disaster management related work. Disaster education will aim at developing a culture of preparedness and safety, besides implementing school DM plans.

The up-gradation of the skills of artisans is another crucial component of Capacity building process. The Central Ministries and Departments concerned will ensure the availability of resources for sustainable programs to train artisans. The States will be encouraged to promote this activity vigorously. The guidance of Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and National Institutes of Technology (NITs) will be sought to plan these programmes. The implementation will be assisted by Industrial Training Institutes (ITIs) and other Central, Regional and State Vocational Training Institutes. Private builders, contractors and NGOs are expected to play a significant role in utilizing trained artisans. Other professional groups such as paramedics, social workers, plumbers, sanitary fitters and safety auditors also play a very important role in community based DM. These groups will also be provided training through suitable programmes.

**Other features of the Policy**

- The other salient features of the policy included in the document relate to:
- Synergetic Application of Science and Technology
- Knowledge Institutions
- Knowledge Dissemination through Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)
- Indigenous Technical Knowledge (ITK)
- India Disaster Resource Network (IDRN)
- India Disaster Knowledge Network (IDKN)
- Documentation of Best Practices and Research

### National Policy on Disaster Management

- The National Policy on Disaster Management is a very comprehensive document encompassing all phases of disaster management.
- It takes into consideration the concerns articulated in the Report of the High Powered Committee on Disaster Management and the National Roadmap as also statutory provisions contained in the DM Act, 2005.
- Besides, it also stresses on the emerging concerns like unplanned urbanization, population explosion and climate change which are intricately linked to future disasters.
- The main thrust is to integrate these measures with the development planning and various development programmes under implementation or which may be undertaken in future to ensure inclusive and sustainable development.
- Although it was the statutory responsibility of NEC, SECs and DDMAs to coordinate and monitor implementation of National Policy but none of these institutional bodies have taken any action in this regard.
- There is need to put in place a vibrant and functioning mechanism to coordinate and monitor implementation of National Policy.
- The state governments may lay down their own policies based on their respective vulnerabilities and consistent with the National Policy.

- Identification of Needs and Promotion of Research

### Road Ahead

In conclusion, while outlining the ‘Road Ahead’ the policy document mainly enunciates the future roadmap as follows:

“THE enunciation of this policy represents merely the first step in the new journey. It is an instrument that hopes to build the overarching edifice within which specific actions need to be taken by various institutions and individuals at all levels. The central theme is the belief that a disaster intelligent and resilient community, duly empowered by a newly created DM Structure, working in cohesion multi-sectorally, will help realize the national vision. This policy will have served its
purpose, if those that are charged with the responsibility of carrying the task forward, find that their hands have received from it, the strength and direction that they need.”

**Analysis of Gaps**

It will be observed that the National Policy on Disaster Management is a very comprehensive document encompassing all phases of disaster management. It takes into consideration the concerns articulated in the Report of the High Powered Committee on Disaster Management and the National Roadmap as also statutory provisions contained in the Disaster Management Act, 2005. Besides, it also stresses on the emerging concerns like unplanned urbanization, population explosion and climate change which are intricately linked to future disasters which the country might face, if actions to address these aspects are not initiated from now onwards to mitigate their impact in future. The policy document is in public domain and has been shared with all state governments, district administrations and other stakeholders. The main thrust is to integrate these measures with the development planning and various development programmes under implementation or which may be undertaken in future to ensure inclusive and sustainable development.

Despite the fact that the policy was enunciated, with the approval of the Cabinet, almost five years back, the main gap which may be perceived is its implementation, which has not been taken up seriously by NDMA, NEC or state and district governments. Logically, it was for the NEC to take tangible steps to coordinate and monitor the implementation of the policy, based on Action Plans prepared for different phases of disaster management. Under the Act, NEC has been entrusted with the responsibility to coordinate and monitor the implementation of National Policy\textsuperscript{7}. However, since NEC is almost non-functional, primarily due to lack of exclusive secretariat and failure of MHA to extend gainful secretariat assistance to NEC due to their own limitations, the policy has by and large remained on paper. Again, the State Executive Committees were also statutorily mandated to coordinate and monitor implementation of the National Policy\textsuperscript{8}. However, the SECs are almost non-existent functionally. It is in this context that the Task Force for review of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 suggested that NEC may be abolished and certain functions assigned to it may be entrusted to NCMC. In this context, it has specifically been urged that NEC (or NCMC, if it takes over the functions of NEC) may have a permanent secretariat to be arranged from outside the MHA and it should continue to report to NDMA\textsuperscript{9}. Similarly, DDMAs have specifically been assigned the responsibility to coordinate and monitor the implementation of the National Policy\textsuperscript{10}. It is therefore seen that it is a statutory responsibility for NEC, SECs and DDMAs to coordinate and monitor implementation of National Policy but none of these institutional bodies have taken any cogent action in this regard.

There is need to put in place a vibrant and functioning mechanism to coordinate and monitor implementation of National Policy. The state governments may lay down their own policies based on their respective vulnerabilities and consistent with the National Policy.

---

\textsuperscript{7} Clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 10 of the DM Act, 2005
\textsuperscript{8} Clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 22 of the DM Act, 2005
\textsuperscript{9} Paragraph 4.6.3 at page 64 of the Report of the Task Force
\textsuperscript{10} Clause (ii) of sub-section (2) of section 30 of DM Act, 2005.
SECTION 3: EXISTING INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL FRAMEWORK: SYNERGY AND ADEQUACY

The institutional and organisational framework already in place before the enactment of the DM Act, 2005 and the institutional structure put in place through the enactment of DM Act, role of MHA vis-à-vis NDMA and other stakeholders has been discussed at length in Section 1. The institutional structure has also been considered in the report of the Task Force on the review of Disaster Management Act, 2005. The recommendations made therein have also been considered and analysed in Section 1. The present section therefore considers the training institutes’ network for disaster management in the country and examines the synergy among them as also their adequacy.

National Level

National Institute of Disaster Management

The National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM) is the only government institute at national level, exclusively working for training and capacity building in the field of disaster management. It was established in 2003, after the erstwhile National Centre for Disaster Management (NCDM) at IIPA was converted into an Institute. It was made a statutory body by incorporating it in the Disaster Management Act, 2005 with enhanced functions. NIDM functions within the broad policies and guidelines laid down by NDMA and is responsible for planning and promoting training and research, documentation and a national-level information base in the areas related to disaster management. Its mandate encompasses DM policies, prevention mechanism and mitigation measures. It is required to formulate and implement a comprehensive Human Resource Development Plan; develop training modules; organise training programmes; provide assistance for national level policy formulation; extend assistance to the training and research institutes for development of training and research programmes for all stakeholders; undertake training of faculty members of state level training institutes; provide assistance to State Governments and state level training institutes in the formulation of state level policies, strategies, and disaster management framework and any other assistance as may be required by state governments or state training institutes for capacity building of stakeholders, governments including its functionaries, civil society members, corporate sector and people’s elected representatives; develop educational materials for academic and professional courses; promote awareness among stakeholders; organise and facilitate study courses; undertake publication of journals, research papers and books; establish and maintain libraries etc.

Being the only apex level national institute in the country with vast professional responsibilities, it has been provided some autonomy by enabling it to make its own regulations and establish a Governing Body under the regulations to carry out the decisions of the institute, which has been constituted by the Central Government under the Disaster Management (NIDM) Rules, 2006.

The functions being discharged by NIDM vis-à-vis the responsibilities entrusted to it, the need for strengthening it and other related issues have been examined in a separate section 6.

Indian Institute of Public Administration

The Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) was set up in 1954. The purpose of establishing the Institute was to undertake such academic activities as would enhance the managerial capabilities and leadership qualities of the executives in the government and other public service organization. It has several departments such as Anthropology, Economics, Executive Education, Geography, History, International Relations, Public Administration, Political Science, Social Science, and Sociology. It imparts training to senior as well as middle rung government officers. Its main prestigious course is Advanced Professional Programme in Public Administration, a 9 month programme for All India and Central Services, Defence Services, and State Governments. The course content of the programme
also includes a capsule on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. Besides, it also organizes a basic five day course on disaster management for middle rung officers.

When the erstwhile National Centre for Disaster Management was set up at IIPA in 1994-95, it gradually developed a faculty which continued till 2003. However, with the establishment of National Institute of Disaster Management, the faculty was transferred to NIDM except an IIPA Professor who was in charge of NCDM. Considering large number of programmes being organized by IIPA for middle rung and senior government officers both for Central and State Governments and the need to train a very large number of government officers as worked out in the SWOT Analysis, it is only appropriate that IIPA should develop adequate faculty for imparting advanced training in DRR and CCA and its integration with various development programmes being implemented by Central and State Governments. Besides, it would also be desirable to include a capsule on DRR and CCA in all training programmes being organized by IIPA.

Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA), Mussoorie

LBSNAA conducts induction and in-service training programmes for IAS Officers. The academy also conducts Mid Career Training Programmes for officers of the Indian Administrative Service as also short-duration training programmes in various aspects of governance and public administration. The academy is assisted in research in areas of governance and public administration by a number of research centres. The most important research centre of the academy is the National Institute of Administrative Research. The academy also has the Centre for Disaster Management, the Centre for Rural Studies, the Gender Centre and the Centre for Rural Credit.

The Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India has set up the Centre for Disaster Management (CDM) at LBSNAA for functioning as nodal institution to impart comprehensive training on disaster management with a special focus on the Incident Command System. The center was established and started functioning from Aug 2003. The Centre has been conducting a number of training programmes and has also been formulating the national strategy for adaptation of the global best practices to suit Indian conditions. It has also taken up the task of setting up and initiating training at regional training centers in the country. The Centre is involved in training officers belonging to IAS and other civil services at induction as well as in-service level in the field of disaster management, use of IT, HAM Radio, action research projects, documentation of best practices, development of films, case studies, teaching materials etc.

It has tie up with six Regional Centres at Hyderabad, Guwahati, Ranchi, Pune, Bhopal and Jaipur for imparting training in Incident Command System for disaster management. It has developed 18 Core Trainers in ICS and has trained 648 officers in Basic and Intermediate ICS Courses, besides several other officers in different capsules of ICS courses.

LBSNAA, through its Center for Disaster Management, may diversify to include DRR and CCA as also its integration with development programmes being implemented in the country, besides running specific training modules under ICS for response.

National Disaster Response Force

In almost all the states visited, it was observed that the National Disaster Response Force (NDRF) has done excellent work in imparting training to different stakeholders, particularly the state police forces. The salutary model of imparting training adopted by NDRF is that it not only trains different stakeholders, but simultaneously develops Master Trainers among them so that future training programmes including refresher training programmes may be organised in-house by such organisations obviating the need to depute trainees again and again to NDRF. This model of imparting training is, however, by and large not being followed by the State Governments and State
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Training Institutes. There is also a system in place to assess the quality of training programmes being organised by NDRF. Even in their case, they have no control over the selection of trainees. The NDRF has conducted a number of training and capacity building initiatives in Bihar on disaster management. It is also extending support to train state response personnel in diving which is necessary in case of floods to rescue people. NDRF has also supported the state in conducting trainings and mock drills in the flood belt. There is a dedicated pool of master trainers in the NDRF, who sustain the momentum on the ground. Similarly, in Odisha, NDRF has sensitized and trained state government officials as also members of rapid response teams. Similar initiatives have been taken in West Bengal also.

The National Disaster Response Force (NDRF) has given an impetus to training in Gujarat. The 6th NDRF Battalion, which is a non-NBC Battalion having strength of about 1265 personnel with 6 operational coys, is located at Ahmedabad. Each coy has three Teams, each consisting of about 45 personnel. The jurisdiction of 6th Battalion extends to Gujarat, Rajasthan, 31 out of 50 districts in Madhya Pradesh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu. In normal situations, Battalion undertakes functions related to community capacity building, awareness generation, training, do’s and don’ts during disasters in schools both for students and teachers, training and capacity building of NGOs, Industries, NCC, Civil Defence and Home Guards. The other functions include conduct of mock drills (particularly in schools), organisation of exhibitions, fire safety precautions. NDRF is now being deployed during pre-monsoon period also in flood prone areas; the pre-deployment has instilled confidence among people.

The NDRF organizes 3 months basic course for Master Trainers at Battalion Headquarters. More than 40 Master Trainers have been trained at Battalion Hqs. Three days short term course is organised for NGOs, Industries, NCC, Civil Defence and Home Guards (15 days). NDRF has also initiated action to undertake training of SDRF coys. It is proposed to train 11 coys of 100 each (total 1100 personnel) for each district. The strategy is to train SDRF personnel from State Reserve Police of which Master Trainers are picked up and trained further so that they can continue training of personnel in their respective organisations. Same strategy is being followed for trainees from other organisations. The battalion has 36 civil engineers for structural safety, inspection of construction materials etc.

What is needed is accelerated action by State Governments to establish their respective State Disaster Response Forces (SDRFs), dispersed in all districts. The rapid response teams of SDRFs can be trained by NDRF and they can supplement the training programmes in the state on the lines of training programmes being carried out by NDRF.

State Level

DM Centres in States

The Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture had extended financial grants to state governments for establishment of DM Centres, mostly at ATIs for training and capacity building. The scheme was transferred to Ministry of Home Affairs with the transfer of disaster management related work. The Ministry continued to extend financial support to DM Centres. The guidelines were revised to extend enhanced support for four faculty members to each DM Centre. It was, however, felt that Ministry can only provide financial support only, whereas there was need to extend, besides professional support, other logistic support also to these Centres. Accordingly, the scheme was transferred to NIDM, which continued to provide financial support and, to a limited extent, professional support also.

The Government of India, through NIDM, supports a four member faculty and two support staff besides the programme expenses of the Disaster Management Centres of the Administrative Training Institutes or other nodal institutes nominated by the states under a Central Sector Non-Plan Scheme (2007-12). Thirty one such centres have been set up throughout the country, one in each...
state and two each in Assam and U.P. The training programmes of the centres and NIDM are developed through a consultative process at the Annual Training Conference attended by the Relief Commissioners of the states, Director Generals of the ATIs, and representatives of the concerned nodal ministries and departments of the Government of India. Every centre has to conduct a minimum of 25 training programmes and train at least 400 participants annually. Together the centres train more than 35000 cutting edge functionaries of the government.

**Disaster Management Centers in States**

**Name of the Institute Acronyms**

1. Andhra Pradesh Hyderabad: AMR-Andhra Pradesh Academy of Rural Development
2. Arunachal Pradesh Itanagar: Administrative Training Institute ATI
3. Assam Guwahati: Assam Administrative Staff College AASC
4. Assam Tezpur: Tezpur University
5. Bihar Patna: Bihar Institute of Public Administration & Rural Development
6. Chhattisgarh Raipur: Chhattisgarh State Institute Academy of Administration
7. Delhi New Delhi: Directorate of Training, Union Territory Civil Services DOT
8. Goa St. Inze: Panji Fire Institute
9. Gujarat Gandhinagar: Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management GIDM
10. Haryana Chandigarh: Haryana Institute of Public Administration HIPA
11. Himachal Pradesh Shimla: Himachal Pradesh Institute of Public Administration
12. Jammu & Kashmir Srinagar: J&K Institute of Management, Public Administration and Rural Development
13. Jharkhand Ranchi: Shri Krishna Institute of Public Administration SKIPA
14. Karnataka Mysore: Administrative Training Institute ATI
15. Kerala Thrivunanthapuram: Institute of Land Management ILM
16. Madhya Pradesh Bhopal: Disaster Management Institute DMI
17. Maharashtra Pune: Yashwantrao Chavan Academy of Development Administration YASHADA
18. Manipur Imphal: State Academy of Training SAT
19. Meghalaya Shillong: Meghalaya State Administration Training Institute ATI
20. Mizoram Aizawl: Administrative Training Institute ATI
21. Nagaland Kohima: Administrative Training Institute ATI
22. Orissa Bhubaneswar: Gopabandhu Academy of Administration GAA
23. Punjab Chandigarh: Mahatma Gandhi State Institute of Public Administration MGSIPA
24. Rajasthan Jaipur: Harish Chandra Mathur Rajasthan Institute of Public Administration HCMRIPA
26. Tamil Nadu Chennai: Anna Institute of Management AIM
27. Tripura Agartala: State Institute of Public Administration & Rural Development SIPARD
28. Uttar Pradesh Lucknow: Uttar Pradesh Academy of Administration & Management UPAAM
*29. Uttar Pradesh Lucknow: Deen Dayal Upadhayya State Institute of Rural Development DDUSIRD*
30. Uttarakhand Nainital: Uttarakhand Academy of Administration UAOA
31. West Bengal Kolkata: Administrative Training Institute ATI

In addition, additional DM Centres in 11 States have been approved in principle by Government of India, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Orissa These centres are in the process of being set up in consultation with the concerned states, except that of UP, which has already been set-up.

Despite the fact that most of the DM Centres have been functional for more than one and half decades, the performance of the Centres, except few, has left much to be desired. The faculty
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mostly is not in position; training programmes being organized are invariably supply-driven and not demand-driven; training needs analysis has not been carried out; focused training modules have mostly not been developed; and the state governments have not assumed ownership of the Centres in real sense of the term.

For instance, in the states visited during field surveys, it was observed that:

- The DM Centre at Kolkata has only two faculty members who are WBCS officers and are not academically qualified keeping in view the qualifications prescribed for Professors/Associate Professors. Only basic training programmes are being organised and there is no attempt to develop separate training programmes for different stakeholders. Whatever little training is being imparted focuses on response related training and disaster risk reduction related training is almost non-existent. Despite having a full-fledged DM Directorate, there is no strategic planning for imparting training nor is there any human resource development plan or even a framework. Similarly, technical training for engineers, architects, town planners, masons, doctors, paramedics etc is marginal. The teachers and students had not been adequately trained except that some awareness had been generated.

- On the other hand, the DM Centre at Bihar Institute of Public Administration and Rural Development (BIPARD) has introduced a robust three tier training mechanism and Specific DM module has been developed and disseminated. However, its Disaster Management faculty needs to be strengthened. Training and capacity building methods should be hands on and practical rather being classroom based. Training to Programme Officers, BDOs, DDCs on disaster management have been organized periodically in BIPARD and SIRD. However it is felt that there is a long way to go from here. As BDOs are the main focal points of development and governance in the rural context, they need to be rigorously trained and re-trained. Now onwards, selected officers will be trained and qualified as master trainers. It is however felt that the training should be more need based. An ambitious project of Rs. 42 crore has been commissioned on training of engineers, architects and masons to BIPARD, which is a challenge to implement, due to lack of capacity in BIPARD; in BMTPC to whom the project has been further awarded by BIPARD, and in institutions like the IITs which have in turn been engaged by BMTPC. A highlighted need therefore is to build the capacity of those whose job is to build capacity in the sector. There is, however, no constraint of funds and BIPARD is organizing training on DRR including mitigation and preparedness. This has been made possible due to active interest being taken by Bihar SDMA to improve the training capacity of BIPARD.

- In Odisha, the state departments and key officials have been sensitized mainly by OSDMA, and also by the NDRF, Gopabandhu Academy of Administration Bhubaneshwar and Red Cross, especially after the experience of Odisha super cyclone. However, there is an acute need of sustained training on disaster risk reduction and response across different developmental themes in various departments. At the Revenue and Relief department, almost 10 training programs have been organised in the last 6 months so far. Although funds for training are not a problem but there is lack of resources to build capacity on Disaster Management. The department is planning to provide funds to districts for district, block and community level trainings. At district level, training is to be imparted to emergency officers. The trainers will be drawn from state level. There is, however, need for greater involvement of DM Centre at Gopabandhu Academy of Administration (GAA) in training of different stakeholders as also trainers, based on focused training programmes developed on the basis of training needs analysis.

- In Gujarat, a separate Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management has since been established. The GIDM is still awaiting recruitment of faculty and presently training programmes are held with the assistance of guest faculty, since there is only a Deputy Director available full time.
in GiDM. GSDMA has also been organizing several training programmes. The training programmes being organized by GiDM broadly fall in two categories; theoretical training (mainly class-based) and practical training (hands-on and field based). The theoretical training may further be divided in four categories. These are (a) Preparation of plans at the district and taluka levels; (b) Sensitization about disaster management and it’s mainstreaming into development plans and programmes primarily for mixed audience; (c) Operational aspects such as how to work in a control room; incident command system etc.; and (d) Response and recovery. However, at present the training programmes are primarily focused on capacity building of government official whereas, the training programmes should aim at all stakeholders, particularly, government, NGOs and Media. Additional CEO, GSDMA is aware of this constraint and they plan to take action to rectify the position. The practical training programmes undertaken primarily relate to (a) Urban search and rescue; these are organized mainly at Vadodara; the duration of training ranges between 1 week to 1 month depending on the needs of the target audience, which comprise municipal staff, fire and rescue workers, state response police (SRP) forces, volunteers etc.; (b) Flood rescue training; the duration is of 12 days: mainly for state response police (SRP) forces, home guards, civil defense personnel and volunteers; the trained people are also given a kit containing life jacket, life buoy and rings.

- While it is encouraging that training programmes have been diversified and dispersed among several agencies, it is essential that adequate faculty is provided at GiDM at the earliest; otherwise the facilities and infrastructure created therein is likely to be wasted. Besides, considering the facilities and hostel accommodation already created at GiDM, with adequate faculty as also support from IIT, Gandhi Nagar, GiDM can be developed as a Centre of Excellence for earthquakes.

- As for Uttarakhand, The DM Cell at Uttarakhand Academy of Administration (UAoA), Nainital and Disaster Mitigation and Management Centre (DMMC) are two training centres at state level which provide training in disaster management. DMMC is also imparting training to volunteers, engineers and other stakeholders whereas DM Cell is mainly engaged in training government officials in 3-5 days’ training programmes. It has at present no faculty except an Assistant Professor and organizes its training programmes through the assistance of guest faculty. Considering that UAoA has good infrastructure, the capacities available are not being put to optimum use due to lack of adequate faculty as also ownership by ATI. Another handicap is that there is no interaction between DMMC and the DM Cell. In Uttarakhand DM Cell, ATI is the only nodal institute at the state level for DM trainings. The DM Unit at UAoA has six sanctioned posts-Professor-1, Associate/Assistant Professor-3, Technical Assistant-2. Against this, the staff in position is two only- Assistant Professor-1, Technical Assistant-1. At present trainings are being imparted through guest faculties. Training courses are organised at the Academy as also in different districts. The sponsors of training programmes include NIDM, DoPT, BPR&D, and State Police etc. During 2011-2012, the DM Faculty organised 32 DM Courses for 925 participants, which is excellent performance considering the norms set for DM Faculty were 20 courses covering 400 participants. During 2012-13, the DM Faculty has/ is scheduled to organise 34 training programmes. Mainly, these courses are being organised with the assistance of a retired Associate Professor, pending filling up of sanctioned posts. Apart from that, Uttarakhand Institute of Rural Development at Rudrapur imparts training in rural areas in agriculture and disaster management. Also the urban HUDCO Centre imparts training to PRI/ULB members. Besides, DMMC is also engaged in departmental coordination, facilitation of state and district disaster management plans, HRVA analysis, resource mapping, post-disaster surveys. The state also has 30 master trainers who are certified by NIM.
Andhra Pradesh has a large number of training institutions across all sectors, but there are no cross linkages between these with gaps as well duplication in training efforts. Ad-hoc training mechanism of getting resource persons or resource agencies from outside to conduct training programmes leads to lack of long term strategic linkages as well as long term sustainability of the capacity within the sectoral departments and the training institutions. Institutes like APSDPS are doing very good research and capacity building efforts, but lack the outreach to draw benefits from the work. Presently each district of the state has MCRHRD linked and ETC (extension) training institutions present, which can be used as platforms but they lack capacity hence releasing of funds to them is of no use as these remain unutilized. There is a need of establishing cross-sectoral linkages between various departments and then identifying the needs of training. State Disaster Management Authority can serve as the platform where exchange between departments could be useful. MCRHRD DM centre conducted 68 training programmes, 29 at the centre, and others at district levels in 2012-13 but more emphasis on community based DRM is required. Even after 8 years, mandal officers are not aware of the DM Act. Funding problem is acute in MCRHRD since NIDM funding stopped in March 2013 and now programmes are awaiting the 13th Finance Commission funds. MCRHRD provides training till district level and APARD below district – mandal and local level. Both the institutes meet frequently and have good understanding and also prepare a calendar jointly and send it to NIDM. Until 2005, there was no training on Fire safety but now the training school has been established with the funding of GOI.

The existing training programmes are quite theoretical; however, practical approach is more important to deal with disaster management training. There is a need to contextualize the training modules that have to be developed for the different geographical conditions. The capacities of workers need to be enhanced further, especially in the urban development and administration department, to perform under difficult circumstances. Apart from the nodal department, the capacity building of officials of other departments also need to be developed, at the earliest.

The senior municipal staff receives brief training of 3 days on DM at APARD, but training of other core people should be done, and they need to stay on and not get transferred frequently. Town Planning, Health, Engineering and Urban Poverty people need specific training. The district training centre is under the DC, but there are no DM courses there. There is a need to have an URBAN DM COURSE here. However a holistic approach is required to train the workers and the task forces working on the ground. Currently they are not adequately capacitated from disaster preparedness angle. There are no master trainers with the district administration. The irony is that nodal district level officials have not received any specific training on the disaster preparedness and emergency management. They are overloaded due to handling of multiple profiles at a time. Lack of training infrastructure, as well as manpower at the district and sub district level, is a major challenge for the administration. There is no dedicated funding for disaster preparedness training and conducting of mock drills. The biggest challenge is to manage the resources, besides the DM trainings. At the district level, officials shared that a two day training was conducted on DM by APARD Hyderabad in March 2013, which was an introductory course, not very substantial. No district level training is carried out.

In the Rural Development sector there is no training programme on DM. The focus of work here is women’s empowerment mainly through SHGs. Financial assistance is given and social activities are supported. There is no component of disaster preparedness or mitigation in these activities. There is no scheme for crop or asset insurance through this department. In villages, PRI members indicate that communities have received some training on Disaster Management from APARD but no schedule for training has been fixed so
far both at the district and sub district level. Trained task forces are formed in some of the villages and are active. However, no dedicated funding on Disaster Management and infrastructure has been allocated from the government. Some of the NGOs like CADME, Sanghamitra and Action are quite active and have conducted a number of trainings on first aid, search and rescue, warning, psycho-social aspects, school safety, damage assessment and various allied disaster management issues. Civil Defence provides Training in small capsules. There is a need to conduct mock drills but till now no steps have been taken. There is lack of proper bottom up approach.

Besides, in all six states, it was observed that the DM Centres have not undertaken any work relating to research and education, development of State HR Plan, documentation of past disasters and development and sharing of case studies. NIDM could have extended professional support to take care of these aspects, which has not been possible due to NIDM’s limitations. The common denominator for these six states, and may be for all states where financial support for DM Faculties has been extended by Central Government may briefly be summarized as follows:

- The DM Faculty consisting of four faculty members and two support staff is not in position in almost all DM Centres.
- The faculty is not adequately trained and is hazy about its own objectives.
- There is no State HR Plan in place, which needs to be developed by these DM Centres.
- There is no training needs analysis with the result that training is primarily supply driven and not demand driven.
- Specific training programmes for different departments and stakeholders have not been developed.
- Focused training modules and training materials for different stakeholders have not been developed.
- Very little, if any, work has been undertaken on research and education, documentation, development of case studies and lessons learned simulation exercises etc.
- With Finance Commission providing funds directly to state governments, these are not necessarily trickling down to DM Centres or other training institutes.
- There is no guidance or direction from SDMA or SEC about the training programmes to be undertaken.
- NIDM has failed to provide professional support to DM Centres, the purpose for which the scheme was transferred from MHA to NIDM.
- There is lack of adequate interaction among training institutes in the states and sharing of lessons learned
- There is too little focus on DRR, mitigation or mainstreaming of DRR in development programmes
- There are no tie ups for training to technical personnel such as engineers, architects, town planners and builders, masons, medical personnel, officers at sub-district level dealing with different facets of disaster management.
- NGOs, SHGs and volunteers are just ignored by DM Centres.
- No focused training modules for corporate sector and media management.
- Lack of data base on personnel trained and their present deployment as also their availability in case of need.
- Lack of development of Master Trainers and ensuring their availability to impart training to other stakeholders in the specific fields in which they have been designated as Master Trainers.

**District Level**

At district or sub-district level, there are no District Training Centres exclusively for disaster management. The training Centres of other sectors have not really taken DM on board. Training at district and sub-district level can be provided through the chain of Master Trainers and Trainers.
However, in the absence of State HR Plans and Training Needs Analysis, almost no state has taken any proactive action to develop a comprehensive plan for training of different stakeholders at district and sub-district level.

At the sub district level, only a group of people are trained and know-how to tackle disaster situations is very limited. For example, on the issue of drought management, the trainings on efficient water management and allied irrigation issues have been provided in Andhra Pradesh with support from the concerned subject matter specialists of related departments up to the district level in the drought prone region of the state, but does not seem to have adequately percolated down to the grassroots level significantly enough to have an impact on local practices. Similarly, people are yet to be adequately trained on urban risks in almost all states, and specifically on the earthquake risks. Though some initial training programs have been conducted by few state governments and NDRF, there is a long way to go. Generally, it was observed that the selected volunteers are trained in First Aid, Search & Rescue etc., however there is a need of an organised and dedicated pool of master trainers, who can sustain the disaster management capacity building agenda on the ground.

At the GP level, villagers usually do not recall having received any training regarding disaster preparedness and there is no group formation in their village for generating awareness or practicing preparedness measures related to disasters. Villagers are open to trainings against different disasters to which they are vulnerable. Relevant information during disasters should be given as during emergency people feel lost due to lack of right information. Only a very small group of people are trained and know-how to tackle disaster situations is virtually non-existent at the community level. No rigorous training has been given to the community pertaining to disasters to which they are vulnerable that could have built long-term capacity. There is a need for special thematic focus in specific areas such as floods and drought, since the areas affected by these disasters have to deal with unique problems. Community members across the board suggested that training needs should be a sustained programme and not one-off events; these should be organised at the village level so that more people and particularly women can participate, and that location-specific skills be provided and not general theoretical inputs, which are not very helpful.

In the schools across the states, no sustained training has been provided to children or school teachers. Although the school curricula contained chapters on disasters but children in almost all states visited were not able to recall what they were taught in those chapters. Children suggested that practical training should be given on a regular basis. There are fire extinguishers in some schools but school community is not aware how to use it. Posters on WASH have been provided to the schools under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan and by UNICEF, but it is hard to trace their behavioural impact. It was observed that there were cracks in several school buildings. According to teachers, engineers come from the department to inspect buildings but no follow up action is taken. The roofs of the school kitchens is generally made of loose tin sheets, particularly in Andhra Pradesh and were vulnerable at times of disasters like windstorms. Some children reported that they face difficulties while commuting to school during monsoons due to water logging and flood like situations in local drains and rivulets even when there are no major floods in the region.

In the schools in urban areas also it was reported that the information on Disaster Management is provided in theoretical ways but a hands-on training was rarely conducted. The girls studying in Madarsas shared that there should be training in Madarsas and it should reach out to all children. In their community there is no other place where such trainings could be provided to girls. The school teachers stated that, where some training had been provided to them, it was mainly focused on other issues like gender and health concerns and very little, if any, information was provided on disaster management. The local Red Cross Chapter in some districts had given information to the community about Disaster Management through an orientation in the Islamia Madarsa itself. Other than this, no other department or organization provided any information.
The women expressed the need for conducting First Aid training in the community. They are willing to get trained on other issues as well. The women shared about the problem of alcohol consumption amongst the men and domestic violence. These could also be dealt with through a multi-purpose group that would address all kinds of local risks. The women stated that they wanted to help but lacked information and capacity. When asked whether such kind of education would be helpful in schools and colleges, the women shared that most of them are illiterate but if such kind of training is imparted to children, their foundation could be strengthened and it will help them to face difficulties in their lives. Besides, if the children learn these things in school, they would come and share with the families at home. In brief, women felt that training programmes should be inclusive covering all social problems besides disaster management, health and hygiene so that they could adopt an integrated approach to take care of all problems affecting the community.

Considering the other sectors of study, there is a need to build capacities of the hospitals and local health centres to handle any emergency situation. The existing education and health modules need to be re-looked from training and capacity building point of view. There is need to provide substantial inputs on how to mainstream DRR in the curriculum in a more meaningful manner. PRIs can play a very useful role in this context but their training programmes do not deal with these aspects in detail. Besides, they are not assigned any useful role in disaster situations and most of the functions are undertaken directly by revenue officials with the assistance of school teachers and ICDS workers, ignoring the PRIs. PRI members felt that they need to be given specific role in disaster management and trained adequately to discharge such role. The PRI members in almost all districts covered during field surveys were ignorant of the functions assigned to them under the Disaster Management Act, 2005. Although selected PRI members have been exposed to training in few GPs such as Jaleshwar Block in Balasore District in Odisha on floods, the task forces are still not adequately equipped to respond to any unforeseen situation.

There are no well established institutional systems in place for training of private bodies, corporate sector, volunteers and community members. Their training needs have not been assessed. A beginning was made under the GOI-UNDP DRM Programme but it has not been carried forward by respective state governments. A major reason for this gap is that the states have not developed their respective HR and CD Plans for all stakeholders with the result that the number of people to be trained among different stakeholders has not been quantified. Besides, specific training modules for training of different stakeholders have not been developed. Due to this, even in some states where training is imparted to NGOs and volunteers, they are trained in the same modules as for BDOs and other government officials, which training is not very useful for other stakeholders. Besides, all trainings still continue to be primarily response-centric and DRR is not receiving the attention it deserves.
Even for response-centric training, although it is universally acknowledged that the community is the first responder everywhere, unfortunately poverty and lack of education have rendered the community rather helpless and very little capacity has been seen on organized response. Most of the DM programmes have not reached beyond the block office levels. Though there are disaster management plans and procedures on record, at the grass root level people are not clear even on basic issue as to whom they should contact in an emergency, or how they will be informed to deal with such situations. This shows the real story of ground zero, where community volunteers/workers/RWAs/Ward/GP and Village members are still struggling with the disaster management issues. They hardly manage fire fighting; for them disaster risk mitigation is a long way to go. As they
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**Existing Institutional and Organisational Framework: Synergy and Adequacy**

**National Level**

- NIDM needs to be adequately strengthened as discussed at length in Section 6.
- IIPA should develop adequate faculty for imparting advanced training in DRR and CCA and its integration with various development programmes being implemented by Central and State Governments.
- Besides, it would also be desirable to include a capsule on DRR and CCA in all training programmes being organized by IIPA.
- LBSNAA, through its Center for Disaster Management, may diversify to include DRR and CCA as also its integration with development programmes being implemented in the country, besides running specific training modules under ICS response.

**State Level**

- State Governments need to take accelerated action to establish their respective State Disaster Response Forces (SDRFs), dispersed in all districts. The rapid response teams of SDRFs can be trained by NDRF and they can supplement the training programmes in the state on the lines of training programmes being carried out by NDRF.
- Although 31 DM Centres have been established in States and additional 11 Centres are in the process of being set up and despite the fact that most of the DM Centres have been functional for more than one and half decades, the performance of the Centres, except few, has left much to be desired.
- The faculty mostly is not in position; training programmes being organized are invariably supply-driven and not demand-driven; training needs analysis has not been carried out; focused training modules have mostly not been developed; and the state governments have not assumed ownership of the Centres in real sense of the term.
- **At State DM Centres:**
  - The DM Faculty consisting of four faculty members and two support staff is not in position in almost all DM Centres.
  - The faculty is not adequately trained and is hazy about its own objectives.
  - There is no State HR Plan in place, which needs to be developed by these DM Centres.
  - There is no training needs analysis with the result that training is primarily supply driven and not demand driven.
  - Specific training programmes for different departments and stakeholders have not been developed.
  - Focused training modules and training materials for different stakeholders have not been developed.
  - Very little, if any, work has been undertaken on research and education, documentation, development of case studies and lessons learned, simulation exercises etc.
  - With Finance Commission providing funds directly to state governments, these are not necessarily trickling down to DM Centres or other training institutes.
  - There is no guidance or direction from SDMA or SEC about the training programmes to be undertaken.
  - NIDM has failed to provide professional support to DM Centres, the purpose for which the scheme was transferred from MHA to NIDM.
  - There is lack of adequate interaction among training institutes in the states and sharing of lessons learned.
  - There is too little focus on DRR, mitigation or mainstreaming of DRR in development programmes.
  - There are no tie ups for training to technical personnel such as engineers, architects, town planners and builders, masons, medical personnel, officers at sub-district level dealing with different facets of disaster management.
  - NGOs, SHGs and volunteers are just ignored by DM Centres.
  - No focused training modules for corporate sector and media management.
  - Lack of data base on personnel trained and their present deployment as also their availability in case of need.
  - Lack of development of Master Trainers and ensuring their availability to impart training to other stakeholders in the specific fields in which they have been designated as Master Trainers.
- The existing training programmes are quite theoretical; however, practical approach is more important to deal with disaster management training.
- There is a need to contextualize the training modules that have to be developed for the different geographical conditions.
- The capacities of workers need to be enhanced further, especially in the urban development and administration department, to perform under difficult circumstances.
- Apart from the nodal department, the capacity buildings of officials of other departments also need to be developed.
are not aware of the general procedures, safety guidelines, building safety codes to be followed at their level, there is little evidence of state programmes benefitting local communities on disaster risk mitigation.

There are positive exceptions also. For instance, in Bihar, there is abundance of local skills and manpower, such as that of bamboo artisans who are capable and willing to take up construction of safe houses using local materials and traditional skills along with new knowledge on enhanced climate and disaster resilience. The Owner Driven Reconstruction Collaborative (ODRC) has carried out work on these lines using local communities and artisans to construct about 30,000 houses in the Kosi flood affected areas as part of a government held and World Bank supported programme that links the Indira Awas Yojana of the government with post disaster reconstruction using appropriate technologies and community based processes.

In Odisha, the NGOs, INGOs and CBOs are active in the state for functions related to disaster management, especially since the super cyclone of 1999. It was observed that NGOs are more active in the rural areas, and hence they can play a very vital role at the time of disasters. There is an active Inter Agency Group that is upward linked to the Sphere India platform of national humanitarian agencies, and is downward present in all parts of the states through its network partners. The Red Cross movement is very active in the state with not only the state and national societies but also a number of international societies having active programmes. An interesting interface is where community volunteers have been identified, recruited, trained and deployed by the government for disaster management functions. One example is of life guards who have been trained by the police department to save lives of the drowning people in the sea, which has emerged as an ongoing risk. On discussing with them it was found that they all belong to fishermen community and are excellent swimmers. The police department hired them and after joining they were provided intense training on rescue. The district emergency management officials acknowledge that this is an important area of work since the largest ongoing disaster in the area is of frequent loss of lives due to drowning.

In West Bengal, there is a fair number of NGOs working in a mission mode. The handicap they invariably face is the trust deficit between the government and non-government stakeholders, lack of coordination with government agencies, lack of accreditation which will give them a sense of ownership and lack of coordination both with government stakeholders as also within the civil society organisations. Despite these handicaps it was observed that some of the key civil society organisations have been doing excellent work in different facets of disaster management in West Bengal. The Inter Agency Group at Kolkata has been functioning in a dynamic way and providing technical and professional support to several other organisations.

In Sundarbans (S24 Paragnas), Tagore Society for Rural Development has been working in Lahiripur GP on mangrove conservation and livelihood promotion. In Darjeeling district, Save The Hills, an NGO located in Kalimpong has been working for landslide mitigation particularly awareness generation (organised more than 80 community level workshops), dissemination of information related to rainfall data and early warning, new landslide vulnerabilities coming up due to digging at the foot hills making the entire habitation at hill crest unsteady, and applied research by bringing out papers and limited documentation for knowledge sharing as also dissemination of information. The Japaiguri Sewa Sadan is undertaking community preparedness before floods at the family level encouraging constitution of SHGs, formation of task teams for early warning, rescue, coordination, first aid and CBDP. CARITAS India is supporting Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction in Jalpaiguri primarily focused on mitigation including Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment (PDRA) and Community Contingency Plan (CCP).

In Gujarat, INGO like ADPC and NGO like AIDMI are associated with GIDM. However, this association is restricted to solitary programme or project for which they have been engaged. Their presence at district or community level is non-existent. Gujarat has a fairly vibrant system of NGOs at state, district and local level but these organisations are not involved with government and normally function with community in isolated manner. Besides, a major handicap is that NGOs themselves do
not have any coordination mechanism among themselves. It would be desirable if they could come together on one platform and work jointly including organisation of training programmes for their employees. The governments at state and district level could function as facilitators to bring them together and extend support by way of their training and capacity building. Once the organizational set up of NGOs is in place at state and district level, periodic meetings with government will help them to remain focused and optimize their outcomes. At district level, DM or ADM in charge of disaster management may take quarterly meetings with their representatives to ensure convergence of efforts, particularly to address DRR concerns. NGOs working at community level would be a good vehicle to carry forward the common agenda and reach the community. At present, government machinery and NGOs work separately at community level which negates the multi-stakeholder approach; though it is talked about at national and state workshops but in reality is not translated into action at local level.

### Existing Institutional and Organisational Framework: Synergy and Adequacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/Sub-District Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At district or sub-district level, there are no District Training Centres exclusively for disaster management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training Centres of other sectors have not really taken DM on board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training at district and sub-district level can be provided through the chain of Master Trainers and Trainers. However, in the absence of State HR Plans and Training Needs Analysis, almost no state has taken any proactive action to develop a comprehensive plan for training of different stakeholders at district and sub-district level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At sub district level, only a group of people are trained and know-how to tackle disaster situations is very limited. People are yet to be adequately trained on urban risks in almost all states, and specifically on the earthquake risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selected volunteers are trained in First Aid, Search &amp; Rescue etc., however there is a need of an organised and dedicated pool of master trainers, who can sustain the disaster management capacity building agenda on the ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the GP level, villagers usually do not recall having received any training regarding disaster preparedness and there is no group formation in their village for generating awareness or practicing preparedness measures related to disasters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagers are open to trainings against different disasters to which they are vulnerable. Only a very small group of people are trained and know-how to tackle disaster situations is virtually non-existent at the community level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rigorous training has been given to the community pertaining to disasters to which they are vulnerable that could have built long-term capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for special thematic focus in specific areas such as floods and drought, since the areas affected by these disasters have to deal with unique problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members across the board suggested that training needs should be a sustained programme and not one-off events; these should be organised at the village level so that more people and particularly women can participate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location-specific skills be provided and not general theoretical inputs, which are not very helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the schools across the states, no sustained training has been provided to children or school teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the schools in urban areas also it was reported that the information on Disaster Management is provided in theoretical ways but a hands-on training was rarely conducted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The girls studying in Madarsas shared that there should be training in Madarsas and it should reach out to all children. The women expressed the need for conducting First Aid training in the community. They are willing to get trained on other issues as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The women shared about the problem of alcohol consumption amongst the men and domestic violence. These could also be dealt through a multi-purpose group that would address all kinds of local risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In brief, women felt that training programmes should be inclusive covering all social problems besides disaster management, health and hygiene so that they could adopt an integrated approach to take care of all problems affecting the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Uttarakhand, there is a good network of NGOs which is quite active at grass root level. Besides, there are a fairly good number of women SHGs active at village level. These organisations are quite familiar with the community as also the local problems and could function as a good vehicle to reach the community and even impart training at community level, given some orientation training. However, the state and district governments are not associating these key stakeholders. These organisations are not involved with government and normally function with community in segregated way; more so since these NGOs themselves do not have any coordination mechanism.
among themselves. These NGOs have a good relationship with PRIs. However, since PRIs themselves have not been allowed to discharge a key role at local level, the availability of such a good human resource is not being utilised by governments. At district level, DM or ADM in charge of disaster management may take quarterly meetings with their representatives to ensure convergence of efforts, particularly to address DRR concerns. At present, government machinery and NGOs work separately at community level which negates the multi-stakeholder approach; since in reality it is not translated into action at local level. Similarly, private organisations and business concerns can also be of assistance at district level, which resource has again not been tapped so far.

In Andhra Pradesh, volunteers are trained by APARD but for more effective use of volunteers they should be part of an institutional setup with clearly defined duties. However, there is a need for extensive public awareness initiatives since the people lack awareness on ways to deal with disasters and also do not know which department to call for assistance during disasters. The awareness of disaster management issues and concerned agencies is the lowest amongst the poor in the state. Hence a mechanism for linking design of training programs with the needs of the poor is required. They are the worst affected during disasters but have the least interaction with the government and the government programs do not reach them. Hence there is a need to design community managed programs where the plans of the community can be supported by the government. Despite a large number of institutes working on the subject in the state, the cross inter-linkages between them is completely missing. There is need for proper coordination to avoid duplicity and overlapping of effort. There is need of integrating DM into various sectors for better preparedness and response.

### Existing Institutional and Organisational Framework: Synergy and Adequacy

#### District/Sub-District Level (Continued)

- There is a need to build capacities of the hospitals and local health centres to handle any emergency situation.
- The existing education and health modules need to be re-looked from training and capacity building point of view.
- There is need to provide substantial inputs on how to mainstream DRR in the curriculum in a more meaningful manner. PRIs can play a very useful role in this context.
- PRI members felt that they need to be given specific role in disaster management and trained adequately to discharge such role.
- There are no well established institutional systems in place for training of private bodies, corporate sector, volunteers and community members and their training needs have not been assessed.
- A major reason for this gap is that the states have not developed their respective HR and CD Plans for all stakeholders with the result that the number of people to be trained among different stakeholders has not been quantified.
- Besides, specific training modules for training of different stakeholders have not been developed.
- Even in some states where training is imparted to NGOs and volunteers, they are trained in the same modules as for BDOs and other government officials, which training is not very useful for other stakeholders.
- Besides, all trainings still continue to be primarily response-centric and DRR is not receiving the attention it deserves.
- Most of the DM programmes have not reached beyond the block office levels.
- At the grass root level people are not clear even on basic issue as to whom they should contact in an emergency, or how they will be informed to deal with such situations.
- At ground zero, community volunteers/ workers/ RWAs/ Ward/ GP and Village members are still struggling with the disaster management issues. They hardly manage fire fighting; for them disaster risk mitigation is a long way to go.
- There is little evidence of state programmes benefitting local communities on disaster risk mitigation.
- Although NGOs, SHGs, PRIs, Teachers and students and volunteers at community level are somewhat active in different states/ districts, there is no well-defined institutional structure in place to channelize their effort to optimize results.
- Governments at state and district level need to facilitate these initiatives with institutional support and well focused training programmes for different stakeholders so that these organizations and volunteers can really reach the community members in large numbers and generate awareness as also impart training.
- The existing practice of governments and private organizations working in isolated manner, though with the same objectives, needs to be substituted with a unified approach to derive maximum benefits for the community.
- Still, it is true that a beginning has been made.
- Governments at state and district level need to facilitate these initiatives with institutional support and well focused training programmes for different stakeholders so that these organizations and volunteers can really reach the community members in large numbers and generate awareness as also impart training.
- The existing practice of governments and private organizations working in isolated manner, though with the same objectives, needs to be substituted with a unified approach to derive maximum benefits for the community.
There is lack of trust between the NGOs and the Government. The communities have very little understanding of the issue and are completely isolated from the process.

It will therefore be observed that NGOs, SHGs, PRIs, Teachers and students and volunteers at community level are somewhat active in different states/districts, there is no well-defined institutional structure in place to channelize their effort to optimize results. Still, it is true that a beginning has been made. Governments at state and district level need to facilitate these initiatives with institutional support and well focused training programmes for different stakeholders so that these organizations and volunteers can really reach the community members in large numbers and generate awareness as also impart training. The existing practice of governments and private organizations working in isolated manner, though with the same objectives, needs to be substituted with a unified approach to derive maximum benefits for the community.
SECTION 4: NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY/ NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA)

The Disaster Management Act, 2005 was enacted on 23rd December, 2005. Pending enactment of the law, the National Disaster Management Authority (commonly known as ‘National Authority’ or ‘NDMA’) was constituted on 30th May, 2005 and the Vice-Chairperson and 5 Members were notified on 28th September, 2005. The Authority has been entrusted with the following responsibilities:

- Lay down policies on disaster management.
- Approve the National Plan which shall include measures to be taken for prevention and mitigation of disasters, integration of mitigation measures in the development plans, preparedness and capacity building measures and roles and responsibilities of different Ministries or Departments of the Government of India.
- Approve plans prepared by the Ministries or Departments of the Government of India.
- Lay down guidelines to be followed by State Authorities in drawing up the State Plan and different Ministries or Departments of the Government of India and coordinate enforcement and implementation of the policies and plans for disaster management.
- Recommend provision of funds for the purpose of mitigation.
- Provide such support to other countries affected by major disasters as may be determined by the Central Government.
- Take such other measures for the prevention of disaster or mitigation or preparedness or capacity building, as it may consider necessary.
- Lay down policies and guidelines for the functioning of the National Institute of Disaster Management.
- Recommend minimum standards of relief to be provided to persons affected by disasters including minimum requirements to be provided in the relief camps, special provisions for widows and orphans, ex-gratia assistance for loss of life and damage to houses and for restoration of means of livelihood etc.
- Recommend relief in repayment of loans or for grant of fresh loans to the persons affected by disaster on such concessional terms as may be appropriate, in case of disasters of severe magnitude.

The National Vision of NDMA, as enunciated by the Authority is ‘to build a safe and disaster-resilient India by developing a holistic, proactive, multi-disaster and technology-driven strategy for DM”. This will be achieved through a culture of prevention, mitigation and preparedness to generate a prompt and efficient response at the time of disasters. The entire process will centre-stage the community and will be provided momentum and sustenance through the collective efforts of all government agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations.

Over the period of last almost 9 years, the National Authority has taken up several initiatives. These are:

- Formulation of guidelines through a participatory and consultative process involving all stakeholders including government, non-government, academic and scientific institutions, corporate sector and the community.
The draft National Guidelines on Role of NGOs in Disaster Management, Hospital Safety, and School Safety Policy are ready and will be finalized soon after consultations.


Facilitating and equipping of the National Disaster Response Force; it has been constituted by converting and upgrading ten battalions of Central Para Military Forces.

Planning national level mitigation projects related to cyclones, earthquakes, floods, school safety etc.

Conduct of awareness campaign to improve risk perception, preparedness and self reliance

Facilitating mock exercises in vulnerable states on various types of natural and man-made disasters to help the state governments in reviewing the adequacy and efficacy of state and district level disaster management plans and identify gaps in resources and systems

Over-see the progress of post-tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction activities in Andaman & Nicobar Islands.

NDMA has also taken up several projects such as National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project, NCRMP Portal, NDCN, School Safety and other Mitigation Projects.

National Executive Committee

The Act provides for constitution of a National Executive Committee (NEC) to assist NDMA in the performance of its functions. NEC also has the responsibility to ensure compliance of directions issued by the Central Government for the purpose of disaster management in the country. It consists of secretary of the Ministry or Department having administrative control of disaster management as chairperson with secretaries of Ministries/ Departments of agriculture, atomic energy, defence, drinking water supply, environment and forests, finance (expenditure), health, power, rural development, science and technology, space, telecommunications, urban development, water resources and Chief of Integrated Defence Staff of the Chiefs of Staff Committee, as members. The main functions of the NEC are:

- To implement the policies and plans of the National Authority.
- Act as the coordinating and monitoring body for disaster management.
- Prepare the National Plan to be approved by the National Authority and monitor its implementation.
- Coordinate and monitor the implementation of National Policy for disaster management.
- Lay down guidelines for preparing disaster management plans by Ministries and Departments of Government of India and State Authorities.
- Provide technical assistance to State Governments and State Authorities.
- Monitor the implementation of guidelines issued by the National Authority.
- Monitor, coordinate and give directions regarding mitigation and preparedness measures to be taken by Ministries, Departments and agencies of the government.
- Evaluate preparedness at all government levels for responding to any threatening disaster situation or disaster and give directions, where necessary, for enhancing such preparedness.
- Plan and coordinate specialized training programs for different levels of officers, employees and voluntary rescue workers.
- Coordinate response in the event of a threatening disaster situation or disaster.
- Promote general education and awareness related to disaster management.
- Perform such other functions as may be required by the National Authority.

National Plan
The Act provides for preparation of a National Plan for disaster management for the whole country by the National Executive Committee. The Plan has to be prepared in consultation with the state governments and expert bodies or organizations in the field of disaster management, having regard to National Policy. The National Plan has to be approved by National Authority. The National Plan shall include:

- Measures to be taken for prevention of disasters or mitigation of their effects;
- Integration of mitigation measures in the development plans;
- Measures to be taken for preparedness and capacity building to effectively respond to any threatening disaster situation or disaster;
- Roles and responsibilities of different Ministries and Departments of Government of India for disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness, capacity building and response.

Note: The Cabinet Committee on Natural Calamities has recently been discontinued by the new Government.
Some of the major issues relating to functioning of NDMA have been brought out in the report of the Task Force\textsuperscript{13} set up to review the DM Act, 2005, as follows:

- What should be the structure of NDMA?
- Does the Act assign adequate functions to the NDMA as regards the disaster management system of the country? Does the Act confer corresponding powers and authority upon the NDMA to carry out those functions?
- Has the Act resulted in a clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities between the NDMA, the MHA and the state governments with regard to disaster management?
- Have the guidelines issued on various aspects of disaster management as per the Act played the part of enabling factors in strengthening preparedness, mitigation and response capacities?

**Structure of NDMA**

The Task Force has recommended that members of NDMA may be part time with Ministers for Home, Agriculture, Defence, Finance, Urban Development, as ex-officio members with not more than four eminent experts, as full time members. One of the full time members may be designated as Member Secretary. A full-time Member shall hold office for a term of five years from the date s/he enters office; provided that s/he shall not be eligible for re-appointment in the same capacity; provided further that no full-time Member shall hold office as such after s/he has attained the age of sixty-five years.

On the other hand, during field visits to six states, it was observed that wherever all members of SDMAs were part time ex-officio members, the Authority had not been functional. In fact, several state government officials felt that the NDMA pattern of having full time members with the back-up of sufficient administrative and professional personnel may be more useful. Restrictions like only one term as a full time member and a maximum age of 65 years have no real justification except to fall in line with some other bodies. In practice, it may not always be possible to get eminent experts/professionals who could be appointed as members with the age cap of 65 years or restriction of one term only irrespective of the contribution of members which may justify another term. Similarly, if the members are to be nominated by the Prime Minister, there should be no restriction to curtail his powers. He could always appoint a Search Committee to suggest likely candidates to him, if he so desires. It is important that the members appointed enjoy the confidence of the Prime Minister.

The selection of part time ex-officio members by the Task Force is too pedestrian. While Urban Development has been picked up, Rural Development has been ignored whereas it is a well known fact that most vulnerable segments of population are in rural areas and there is a crying need to integrate DRR in Rural Development Flagship Programmes and bring about convergence of these programmes so far as DM aspects are concerned. Similarly, while it is universally accepted that community being the victim as also the first responder should be at centre-stage, Panchayati Raj Minister has not been included. Same rationale would apply to the absence of Health Minister.

It is considered that the existing system of appointment of members may continue; the age limit, if it has to be prescribed, may be 70 years as in case of National Human Rights Commission; and the members may be full time as at present; with the added provision that at least four of the members may be professionals who are persons of ability and standing who have knowledge of and credible accomplishments in disaster management, science or public policy. There is no need to state that these persons should be of integrity since it is quite evident. It assumes that the prime Minister may appoint a person whose integrity is suspect, which is unimaginable. Besides, it will leave a gap for challenging any appointment on the plea that the member so appointed is not of impeccable
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integrity, which again is subjective. There is need to have confidence in Prime Minister, if he has to function as the Chairperson of the NDMA.

The Committee proposed by The Task Force for selection of full time members, consisting of Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Minister-in-charge of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Government of India, Leaders of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha and Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, besides Prime Minister, may be able to select politically acceptable persons but not necessarily eminent subject specialists since most of the above selectors are not likely to have knowledge of subject specialists. Instead, a Search Committee consisting of Cabinet Secretary, Principal or Additional Principal Secretary to Prime Minister and two eminent DM Experts may be more useful for selecting members with government experience in the field as also eminent persons in different facets of disaster management.

**Functions and corresponding powers and authority of NDMA**

It is true that there is some doubt, as per the provision of the Act, about the role of NDMA in response and relief as also implementation of policies, plans and programmes. Initially, the Authority was of the view that the role of NDMA would also include response, relief and rehabilitation, besides mitigation and preparedness for the following reasons:

(i) Section 2(e) inter alia defines disaster management as a continuous and integrated process of planning, organizing, coordinating and implementing measures which are necessary or expedient for prevention and prompt response to any threatening disaster situation or disaster; assessing the severity or magnitude of effects of any disaster and evacuation; rescue and relief. Therefore, the National Disaster Management Authority would be concerned with all aspects of disaster management, as defined in the Act.

(ii) As per Section 6(1), the National Authority shall have the responsibility for laying down policies, plans and guidelines for disaster management for ensuring timely and effective response to disaster.

(iii) Section 6(2) (f) states that the National Authority may coordinate the enforcement and implementation of the policies and plans for disaster management. Therefore, the National Authority has a role in response and the differences in perception on this issue may lead to gaps/confusion in the event of a disaster.

(iv) The NEC is the executive arm of the NDMA and will therefore assist the Authority in the discharge of its functions in terms of the provisions of the Act.

(v) It is neither pragmatic nor desirable for the Authority to be disassociated with any part of the essentially inseparable and inter-dependent components that constitute the DM cycle. The effectiveness of response and immediate relief constitute the acid test for all pre-disaster preparedness and mitigation measures. The exclusion of NDMA when the entire country will be mustering its resources for response will lead to erosion of its credibility.

On the other hand, another view was that all mitigation and reconstruction programmes/projects will be with the Authority and response and relief will continue to be with the Government for which a robust mechanism is already in place.

All these issues were considered in the government at the highest level and the view taken was that the role of the Authority was to lay down policies on disaster management, approve plans, lay down guidelines, and coordinate enforcement and implementation of the policies and plans. The Authority may lay down guidelines for the minimum standards of relief. Actual enforcement and implementation did not fall within the functions of the Authority. There is already a robust response mechanism in place which has been functioning quite well. It would not be appropriate to disturb the existing mechanism which may result in overlapping of functions between the Authority and the
administrative Ministries/Departments. It was felt that, on the pattern of the Planning Commission, planning and putting in place disaster management plans will be the major functions of the Authority. Execution of these plans is the responsibility of the National Executive Committee (NEC).

Based on discussions held in the Chief Secretaries Conference as also several meetings within the Government, the final view taken was:

(i) The role of NDMA and the NEC has already been settled. The decision was that monitoring of all prevention, mitigation and preparedness measures during the pre-disaster phase will be undertaken by the Authority. Response, relief and rehabilitation including mitigation measures for reducing the impact of disasters during the post-disaster phase will be the responsibility of the Central Government, to be discharged through the NEC. However, in the post-disaster phase, monitoring of long-term reconstruction and recovery programmes will again be the responsibility of the Authority.

(ii) During the pre-disaster phase also, the Authority, as an Expert Body, is required to undertake the functions to monitor, coordinate, approve and lay down policies and plans. It cannot function as the implementing agency. The implementation of mitigation and preparedness projects has to be undertaken by the Government in the Ministry of Home Affairs under the overall supervision of NEC.

(iii) Response, relief and rehabilitation are post-disaster mitigation measures to reduce the impact of disasters and are required to be undertaken by NEC.

(iv) There should be only one body within the Government which may be entrusted with the function of response, relief and rehabilitation. We cannot have two tiers in the post-disaster phase – one for the approval of the various actions required to be taken and the other for the implementation of these actions. Besides, this is a function which can be discharged by the Government and not by an expert body. Involvement of both National Authority and NEC in post-disaster phase will result in avoidable delays.

(v) The route to be taken during the post-disaster phase is MHA/NEC/NCMC/EGoM/Cabinet. In fact, this system has been in operation for a long time (except NEC) and has proved to be quite robust. Similarly, a system is already in place for providing financial assistance from NCCF during the post-disaster phase which is that a memorandum to be sent by the State Government/deputation of Central Teams/recommendations by IMG/approval by HLC. For long-term reconstruction programme, the proposals, in any case, have to be submitted to the Cabinet.

(vi) The definition of disaster management is an all inclusive comprehensive definition but the modalities for implementation of various programmes during different phases has to be different so as to ensure that focused attention is paid to all aspects of disaster management. At the same time, the accountability for response has to be with the Government and not with an expert but recommending body.

(vii) The National Authority may lay down policies, plans and guidelines for ensuring timely and effective response. It does not mean that they will undertake the actual functions of emergency response, relief & rehabilitation. If at all any improvement is required to be made in the existing response mechanism, it has to be integrated with the existing system.

It is considered that the role of NDMA should therefore be seen in the context of decisions already taken. The mandate of NDMA may include awareness generation, early warning systems, development of policies, plans and guidelines, mitigation measures, training and capacity building, preparedness including development of NDRF, conduct of mock drills, media campaign and recovery in the post disaster phase. NDMA may also be responsible for implementation and coordination of above measures and also extending professional support directly or through NIDM, to state governments as also bringing together all stakeholders.
Considering that the above issues may be taken as settled, a pertinent question is whether it would necessitate amendments to DM Act, particularly in respect of following sections/ sub-sections:

(i) Section 2(k) needs to be amended since it presently states that NEC means the Executive Committee of the NDMA.

(ii) Section 36(f) would need to be amended since it presently states that Ministries and Departments of Government of India will provide assistance to National Authority for drawing up mitigation, preparedness and response plans. If the National Authority has nothing to do with response, then the response plans should also be prepared by NEC and may be approved by Government.

(iii) Section 45 states that the general superintendence, direction and control of NDRF shall be vested and exercised by the National Authority. While NDMA may raise NDRF Battalions and organise their training and purchase of equipments etc as part of preparedness, the general superintendence, direction and control should appropriately be with the Ministry of Home Affairs through DG, NDRF.

(iv) Section 50 gives powers to National Authority, if it is satisfied that immediate procurement of provisions or materials or immediate application of resources is necessary for rescue and relief, it may authorise the concerned departments or Authority to make such emergency procurement and in such case, standard procedure requiring inviting of tenders shall be deemed to be waived; and a certificate about utilization of provisions or materials by the controlling officer authorised by the National Authority shall be deemed to be a valid document or voucher for the purpose of accounting of emergency procurement of such provisions or materials. If National Authority is not concerned with rescue and relief, these powers should appropriately be vested in the Ministry. There is no reason that National Authority should be saddled with responsibility to give authorizations to concerned controlling officers, who would be operating under the command of Central or state governments, as the case may be.

(v) On the other hand, National Authority should have powers to take such actions as necessary to ensure implementation of policies and programmes by state governments/ State Authorities/ District Government/ District Authorities in respect of functions assigned to it through advocacy and appropriate monitoring mechanism, keeping in view the constraints inherent in a federal structure.

**Impact of guidelines issued by NDMA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Disaster Management Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Interaction with state level officers, where SDMAs have all ex officio members without any secretariat brought out that NDMA pattern of having full time members with the back-up of sufficient administrative and professional personnel may be more useful.
- Restrictions like only one term as a full time member and a maximum age of 65 years have no real justification except to fall in line with some other bodies.
- In practice, it may not always be possible to get eminent experts/professionals who could be appointed as members with the age cap of 65 years or restriction of one term only irrespective of the contribution of members which may justify another term.
- Similarly, if the members are to be nominated by the Prime Minister, there should be no restriction to curtail his powers. He could always appoint a Search Committee to suggest likely candidates to him, if he so desires. It is important that the members appointed enjoy the confidence of the Prime Minister.
- The existing system of appointment of members may continue.
- The age limit, if it has to be prescribed, may be 70 years as in case of National Human Rights Commission; and the members may be full time as at present.
- At least four of the members may be professionals who are persons of ability and standing who have knowledge of and credible accomplishments in disaster management, science or public policy.
- A Search Committee consisting of Cabinet Secretary, Principal or Additional Principal Secretary to Prime Minister and two eminent DM Experts may be more useful than the Committee proposed by the Task Force for selecting members with government experience in the field as also eminent persons in different facets of disaster management.
At present, NDMA can lay down policies, plans and guidelines but the responsibility of its coordination and monitoring implementation has been given to NEC. If NEC is not to be treated as the executing body of NDMA, the responsibility of coordination and implementation of policies, plans and guidelines laid down by it should also be logically with them. In the absence of such a specific provision in the Act, it is invariably blamed for lack of coordination and implementation of these policies, plans and guidelines by central ministries and Departments/ state governments/ state authorities/ district authorities etc. If there has to be a break between NDMA and NEC, it should be a clean break, appropriately incorporated in the DM Act. The corresponding provisions of the Act relating to NDMA, NEC, SDMAs, SECs, DDMAs should be scrutinized and necessary amendments made to give necessary powers to National Authority to ensure compliance with its policies, plans and guidelines by all government agencies at national, state, district and even local level. The Task Force\textsuperscript{14} to review the Disaster management Act has also expressed the view that the role and functions of the NDMA should cover policies, plans, guidelines and regulations relating to prevention, mitigation and preparedness. It should coordinate with the agencies concerned and ensure that all activities relating to prevention, mitigation and preparedness envisaged by the Act are performed. This would include coordinating the implementation of policies and guidelines and preparation of plans. In other words, NDMA should be responsible for coordinating the implementation of the policies, plans and guidelines also.

**National Executive Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of NDMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mandate of NDMA may include awareness generation, early warning systems, development of policies, plans and guidelines, mitigation measures, training and capacity building, preparedness including development of NDRF, conduct of mock drills, media campaign and recovery in the post disaster phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDMA may also be responsible for coordination of implementation of above measures and extending professional support directly or through NIDM, to state governments as also bringing together all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Authority may lay down policies, plans and guidelines for ensuring timely and effective response. It does not mean that they will undertake the actual functions of emergency response, relief &amp; rehabilitation. If at all any improvement is required to be made in the existing response mechanism, it has to be integrated with the existing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response, relief and rehabilitation including mitigation measures for reducing the impact of disasters during the post-disaster phase will be the responsibility of the Central Government, to be discharged through NCMC, NEC and CMG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accountability for response has to be with the Government and not with an expert or advisory body like NDMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to bring out clarity of role of NDMA vis-à-vis NEC, it may be desirable to amend sections 2(k), 36 (f), 45 and 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the other hand, National Authority should have powers to take such actions as necessary to ensure implementation of policies and programmes by state governments/ State Authorities/ District Government/ District Authorities in respect of functions assigned to it through advocacy and appropriate monitoring mechanism, keeping in view the constraints inherent in a federal structure as also the roles of NDMA and NEC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meetings of NEC have been held rarely. The issues to be considered in this context, as brought out by the Task Force are:

- Does the NEC carry out the functions assigned to it by the Act?
- Is there overlap of functions between NDMA and NEC?
- Is there an overlap between the NEC and the NCMC chaired by the Cabinet Secretary?
- Should NEC be discontinued?

It has to be admitted that NEC has not been able to discharge the functions assigned to it under the Act. The Task Force has not gone into the question as to why NEC has failed to discharge its functions. It will be seen that all members of NEC are \textit{ex-officio} members. These members are
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already too busy with the charge of their respective Ministries/Departments/Organisations and cannot be expected to attend to the functions of NEC at their level from initial stages itself. The question arises as to why this institutional mechanism was put in place in the Act? The rationale was that the members represent key departments of the government relevant to disaster management and unless they are brought on board together through an institutional set up, it would be difficult to bring about convergence among various central government Ministries and departments. Besides, they have wealth of experience which would be lost, if not channelized through NEC.

The reason as to why NEC has failed to discharge its functions is primarily that it has no exclusive and dedicated secretariat. The DM division in the Ministry of Home Affairs neither has the manpower nor professional support to function as the secretariat of NEC. NEC was assigned three major functions; (a) to assist the national Authority in the discharge of its functions; (b) be responsible to implement the policies and plans of NDMA; and (c) ensure compliance of directions issued by the Central Government for the purpose of disaster management in the country. These functions have been elaborated further in section 10(2) of the Act. Since the members are Secretaries of different central government departments, the respective Ministries have been ensuring compliance with the directions of the central government, which was the case even before enactment of the Act. The first two functions did not receive adequate attention since Ministries did not have the manpower and NEC did not have an exclusive secretariat, including administrative officers and staff as well as professional support. It has therefore been discharging functions primarily linked to response and relief, as it had been doing since independence.

As for the second issue whether there is overlap of functions between NDMA and NEC, it may be stated that the roles assigned to each institution are quite distinct and separate, even if the functions apparently seem to be overlapping. While NDMA was constituted as an advisory and policy making body, it was not given a role in coordinating implementation which was entrusted to NEC. For instance, if NDMA had to lay down policies, plans and guidelines, NEC was expected to ensure its implementation as it had to act as a “coordinating and implementing body”. Since coordination and implementation has to be overseen with state governments, logically this function had to be assigned to different ministries and Departments through NEC. Secondly, while NEC was required to prepare

---

### National Executive Committee

**Merger of NEC with NCMC**

- If NEC is discontinued and its functions are assigned to NCMC, it may amount to concentrating on response only and prevention, mitigation and preparedness would not receive the attention these components deserve.
- It would only show that the paradigm shift from reactive to pro-active approach, though much talked about, has not really taken place in government.
- NCMC ensures effective coordination and implementation of response and relief measures in the wake of disasters. It also gives direction to the Crisis Management Group as deemed necessary. The functions of both NCMC and CMG relate to response and relief only.
- On the other hand, NEC is responsible for all aspects of disaster management including mitigation, preparedness, response and relief including coordination of implementation of policies, plans and guidelines as also preparation of National Plan.
- It may therefore not be appropriate to merge NEC with NCMC since NCMC would hardly have time to discuss issues relating to pre-disaster aspects. However, CMG can extend support to NEC for response and relief related functions.
- There is no other body looking after pre-disaster aspects including DRR and therefore, except for response and relief, there is no duplication or overlapping of functions entrusted to NEC and NCMC.
- It is therefore considered that NEC may continue to discharge the functions assigned to it under the Act and should have its own dedicated secretariat to assist it.
- It can engage professional consultants to provide technical assistance to enable NEC to extend technical assistance to state governments and state authorities for preparing their Disaster Management Plans in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the National Authority, which is one of the functions assigned to NEC.
the national plan, NDMA was required to approve it and thereafter coordinate and monitor its implementation. Similarly, NEC had to ensure preparation of DM Plans by different Ministries and Departments. It has to be kept in view that these plans are not ‘stand alone’ plans and there has necessarily to be convergence among different Ministries and departments which could and should have been undertaken through the mechanism of NEC. Besides, NEC was expected to monitor implementation of the national plan. NEC was also required to provide necessary technical assistance to state governments and state authorities.

Therefore, the mere fact that same items appear for both NDMA and NEC such as policies, plans, guidelines, national plans, DM Plans etc, does not mean that there is overlapping or duplication of functions. The functions assigned to each, NDMA and NEC, are distinct and separate and in tune with the functioning of the Government. The recommendation of the Task Force that NEC may be disbanded is not in order. It has not examined why NEC failed to discharge its functions. However, since it failed to discharge its functions and therefore may be disbanded would be a hasty conclusion unless it is examined why NEC failed to accomplish its tasks. It would therefore be better to retain NEC with necessary administrative and professional support. We need to strengthen NEC instead of abolishing it or merging it with NCMC. In that case, we would again be concentrating on response only and prevention, mitigation and preparedness would not receive the attention these components deserve. It would only show that the paradigm shift from reactive to pro-active approach, though much talked about, has not really taken place in government. The reason is simple as brought out by an NIDM Professor that “response is visible and mitigation is invisible; if the invisible is made visible, the visible would gradually become close to invisible”. In the long run, social and economic costs can be reduced only if preventive measures are taken and not only through prompt and efficient response alone, which at best, can be considered a damage control exercise resulting in considerable, though inescapable, non-developmental expenditure.

As for the issue whether there is an overlap between the functions assigned to NCMC and NEC, it may be mentioned that the NCMC ensures effective coordination and implementation of response and relief measures in the wake of disasters. It also gives direction to the Crisis Management Group as deemed necessary. The Crisis Management Group is headed by the Central Relief Commissioner in the Ministry of Home Affairs and includes senior officers (called as nodal officers) from various concerned Ministries. The CMG’s functions are to review every year contingency plans formulated by various Ministries/Departments/Organizations in their respective sectors, measures required for dealing with a natural disaster, coordinate the activities of the Central Ministries and the State
Governments in relation to disaster preparedness and relief and to obtain information from the nodal officers on measures relating to above. The CMG, in the event of a natural disaster, meets frequently till the situation is stabilized to review the relief operations and extend all possible assistance required by the affected States to overcome the situation effectively. Therefore, the functions of NCMC relate to response and relief only.

On the other hand, NEC is responsible for all aspects of disaster management including mitigation, preparedness, response and relief including coordination of implementation of policies, plans and guidelines as also preparation of National Plan. It may therefore not be appropriate to merge NEC with NCMC since NCMC would hardly have time to discuss issues relating to pre-disaster aspects. However, CMG can extend support to NEC for response and relief related functions. There is no other body looking after pre-disaster aspects including DRR and therefore, except for response and relief, there is no duplication or overlapping of functions entrusted to NEC and NCMC.

An issue may arise whether there would be too many committees for response and relief, if NEC is also added, as at present, besides NCMC and CMG. In this context, it may be mentioned that the NCMC functions under the chairmanship of Cabinet Secretary whereas CMG functions under the Central Relief Commissioner, who is an officer of the rank of Joint Secretary. Besides, The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs is responsible for ensuring that all developments are brought to the notice of the NCMC promptly. In order to enable the Home Secretary to discharge this function, he would need to coordinate with different Ministries and Departments through NEC and will also be supported by CMG. It will therefore be appropriate to entrust NEC with coordination of response and relief as provided in the DM Act, besides looking after other functions related to pre-disaster aspects, mentioned in section 10 of the Act.

It is therefore considered that NEC may continue to discharge the functions assigned to it under the Act and should have its own dedicated secretariat to assist it. It can engage professional consultants to provide technical assistance to enable NEC to extend technical assistance to state governments and state authorities for preparing their Disaster Management Plans in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the National Authority, which is one of the functions assigned to NEC.
SECTION 5:  STATE DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES / STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES/ DISTRICT DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES / LOCAL AUTHORITIES

State Disaster Management Authorities

The Act provides for the constitution of a State Disaster Management Authority (SDMA) by every State Government with the Chief Minister as Chairperson and other members, not exceeding eight, to be nominated by the Chief Minister and the chairperson of the State Executive Committee, who shall be the Chief Secretary ex-officio, as member and Chief Executive Officer of the State Authority. However, in the case of the Union Territory of Delhi, the Lieutenant Governor shall be the chairperson of the State Authority and the Chief Minister thereof shall be the vice-chairperson.

The powers and functions assigned to the State Authority are to:

- Lay down policies and plans for disaster management in the state;
- Lay down the State Disaster Management Policy;
- Approve the State Plan in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the National Authority;
- Approve the disaster management plans prepared by the departments of the state;
- Lay down guidelines to be followed by the departments of the state government for integration of measures for prevention of disasters and mitigation of their effects, in their development plans and projects and provide necessary technical assistance for this purpose;
- Coordinate the implementation of the state plan;
- Recommend provision of funds for mitigation and preparedness measures;
- Review the development plans of different departments to ensure that prevention and mitigation measures are integrated therein;
- Review the measures being taken for mitigation, capacity building and preparedness by the state departments and issue such guidelines as may be necessary;
- Lay down detailed guidelines for standards of relief to persons affected by disasters in the state provided that such standards shall not be less than the minimum standards laid down in the guidelines of National Authority;
- In case of an emergency, the Chairperson of the State Authority has the powers to exercise all or any of the powers of the State Authority subject to post facto ratification by the State Authority.

Most of the state governments/ union territories have already established their respective State Authorities. While some of them had constituted it before the enactment of the Act and the notification of its provisions in respect of states/union territories with effect from 1st August 2007, few states/ union territories have constituted the Authorities after the enactment of the Act and the notification of the relevant provisions for states, in terms of the constitution indicated in the Disaster Management Act, 2005. Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh are two exceptions since these states have notified the State Authority under their respective state Acts. Most of the other states/ union territories, which have not notified the State Authorities under the Central Act, are in the process of doing so.
Functioning of SDMAs

It has been observed that only few of the SDMAs are functioning effectively such as Bihar, Gujarat, Odisha and Sikkim. These Authorities have few full time members. Almost all other SDMAs, which have ex-officio members, are not able to function effectively, more so since they do not have exclusive secretariats. Normally such Authorities are seen to be active during and in the aftermath of a disaster. In the process, pre-disaster interventions, such as undertaking awareness generation, mitigation measures, training and capacity building and integration of disaster risk reduction with the development process tend to be by and large ignored. Therefore, it may not be presumptuous to state that most of the SDMAs are still in response mode with little attention being paid to preventive measures during normal times.

Structure of SDMAs

The different models adopted by the state governments/union territories for constitution of the State Authorities may broadly be placed in the following categories:

Model I: Chief Minister, Ministers and Chief Secretary (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Manipur, West Bengal, Tripura)

Model II: Chief Minister, a combination of Ministers and Officers and Chief Secretary (Gujarat, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi)

Model III: Chief Minister, a combination of Ministers and non-officials and Chief Secretary (Maharashtra, Kerala)

Model IV: Chief Secretary, Government Officers and non-officials (Odisha)15

In terms of the provisions of the Act, it is the prerogative of the Chief Minister/Lieutenant Governor, who is the Chairperson of the State Authority, to nominate the members of the State Authority, except the Chief Secretary of the state, who is ex officio member and Chief Executive officer of the State Authority. The only limitation is that the number of members nominated by the Chairperson shall not exceed eight. The constitution of the State Authorities has to be amended by the respective state governments/union territories to fall in line with the provisions of the Act unless a special dispensation is obtained in accordance with the law. The different models adopted by different state governments have their relative advantages and disadvantages as brought out below.

Model I

The advantage of having all Ministers as members of the State Authority is that there would be total convergence and coordination between the Authority and the State Government. The decisions taken by the Authority will be at par with the decisions of a Cabinet Committee. However, the disadvantage is that, since all members will be working in ex officio capacity, they may not have adequate time to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to the State Authority. In fact, the purpose of having a separate Authority itself is defeated since this objective could have been achieved by constituting a Cabinet Committee. While adequate attention may be paid to response and relief measures in a post-disaster situation, it would be unrealistic to expect the Authority to devote adequate time to the pre-disaster aspects of prevention, mitigation, preparedness and awareness generation. With this formulation, the Authority cannot reasonably be expected to lay down guidelines to be followed by different state departments for integration of measures for prevention and mitigation in the departments’ development plans and projects and provide necessary assistance for this purpose; coordinate the implementation of the state plan; review the development plans of different departments to ensure that prevention and mitigation measures are

15 Odisha has since constituted SDMA under the provisions of the DM Act, while still continuing with the earlier SDMA. Therefore, in effect, Odisha has two SDMAs.
integrated therein and review the measures being taken by each state department for mitigation, capacity building and preparedness. The Act assigns separate and distinct roles to state governments. In this arrangement, the functions assigned to the State Authority and the State Government will lose their separate identity, which is not desirable. Besides, due to their preoccupations, the Authority is not able to meet regularly, particularly to address the pre-disaster aspects and integrate the disaster risk reduction with the development process or approve the District Plan of each district, keeping in view the vulnerability of different areas of the district to specific disasters.

**Model II**

This model provides for a combination of Ministers and Officers as members, with Chief Minister as the Chairperson and Chief Secretary as the Chief Executive Officer. This model also has the advantage of convergence of responsibilities entrusted to the State Authority and the government departments and effective coordination. However, in this model also, the main disadvantage is that the members will be functioning in their ex officio capacity and may not be able to pay their exclusive attention and devote adequate time for adoption of a pro-active approach encompassing prevention, mitigation, capacity building and awareness generation. The disadvantages brought out in model I will invariably be reflected in this model also.

**Model III**

This model includes Ministers and non officials with Chief Minister or Lieutenant Governor/Administrator, as the case may be, as Chairperson and Chief Secretary as member as well as the Chief Executive Officer. This is apparently a more appropriate model. With key line Ministers in charge of Disaster Management, Home, Finance or Health as members, it will ensure convergence and coordination of functions assigned to the State Authority and the State Government. In addition, inclusion of full time three to four non official members who may be specialists in different aspects of disaster management including prevention, mitigation and preparedness, will ensure that adequate attention is paid to all phases of disaster management, particularly the pre-disaster aspects for integration of disaster risk reduction with the development process. It will also be possible for the State Authority to discharge the functions assigned to it under the Act as distinct and separate from the functions assigned to the state government. The non official members can meet regularly, on day to day basis, for formulation of the state disaster management policy; in-depth examination of the State Disaster Management Plan; laying down guidelines for different departments of the state government for integration of measures for prevention and mitigation in the development plans and projects and provide necessary technical support therefor; coordinate the implementation of the State Plan; recommend provision of funds for mitigation and preparedness measures; undertake review of the development plans and the measures being taken for mitigation, capacity building and preparedness by different state departments as also review the District Disaster Management Plan of each district, keeping in view the vulnerability profile of each district; measures to be adopted for prevention and mitigation of disasters at district level in accordance with the guidelines issued by the National Authority. They would also have adequate time to visit different districts to assess their respective requirements. After the necessary groundwork has been done by the full time non official members, the State Authority can meet from time to time to consider the inputs and accord approval with necessary amendments as may be considered appropriate.

**Model IV**

This is a model of the State Authority adopted by Odisha in December, 1999, well before the decision of the Government of India to enact a central legislation. The Orissa State Disaster Mitigation Authority (OSDMA) has been registered as a society which is an autonomous body. It is
headed by the Chief Secretary with central and state government officers as well as non officials including NGOs as members. This model is not in accordance with the provisions contained in the Disaster Management Act, 2005. It is not headed by the Chief Minister; members are not nominated by the Chief Minister; has more than ten members whereas the Act lays down a ceiling of ten members including the Chairperson (Chief Minister) and the Chief Executive Officer (Chief Secretary). After the enactment of the Act, this model is legally untenable. Besides, it has several disadvantages. The Authority is merely a recommendatory body; there is little, if any, convergence with the state government departments; inadequate coordination with the line departments including the department in charge of disaster management and hardly any powers to enforce the mandate assigned to the State Authority under the Act. It has no authority to approve the district disaster management plans or oversee the functions of other line departments at state and district level. It was set up soon after the Orissa super cyclone with a limited mandate to undertake comprehensive restoration and reconstruction programme for revival of infrastructure and economy and making the state better prepared for handling such disasters in future. Taking note of these inadequacies, the State Government had concurrently designated the Managing Director, OSDMA as Special Secretary (Revenue) as well as Special Relief Commissioner. It is also true that, despite these constraints, the Authority has done commendable work within the mandate given to it. However, the Authority, with its present constitution, may not be in a position to discharge the functions assigned to a State Authority under the Act. Therefore, this model is not a viable option available for adoption keeping in view the provisions contained in the Act. The State Government has now set up an SDMA in accordance with the provisions contained in the Act. However, the earlier SDMA also continues as an implementing agency.

The models discussed above are illustrative and cannot be considered exhaustive. However, for the reasons brought out above, the balance of advantage may be to consider adoption of Model III at state level. Having said that, it may be reiterated that, as per law, it is the sole prerogative of the Lieutenant Governor/ Chief Minister of a state/ union territory to adopt any of the above models or any other model considered appropriate for the State Authority, keeping in view the mandate, role and responsibility, powers and functions assigned to the State Authority under the Act. The only limitation imposed by the Act is that the Authority shall be headed by the Chief Minister/ Lieutenant Governor, as the case may be, and the Chief Secretary shall be a member of the Authority in his capacity of being the Chairperson of the State Executive Committee and he shall also be the Chief Executive Officer of the State Authority on ex officio basis.

It is suggested that, of the eight members, other than the Chairperson and Chief Executive Officer (Chief Secretary), at least four members may be full time members, of whom at least two members may be subject specialists in different facets of disaster management who have knowledge of and accomplishments in the subject, particularly, disaster prevention and mitigation, training and capacity building. The remaining two full time members could be senior retired officers who have the experience of dealing with response and relief, mobilization and movement of resources.

NDMA may issue suggested guidelines for the constitution of the SDMAs for consideration of the state governments. The Disaster Management Act, 2005 need not be amended since, considering the federal structure, the final decision about constitution of the State Authority may be left to the State Governments through the respective Chief Ministers as already prescribed in the Act.

Secretariat of SDMAs

A major handicap in efficient functioning of the SDMAs has been lack of an exclusive secretariat. The Revenue or Disaster Management Department, which have to perform this function also, are mostly over-burdened with the result normal prevention and mitigation initiatives and training and capacity building efforts do not receive the attention these aspects deserve. SDMAs become active only when there is a major disaster. On the other hand, SDMAs which have set up their own secretariat are
functioning quite efficiently. Section 16 of the Act states that the state government shall provide the State Authority with such officers, consultants and employees, as it considers necessary, for carrying out the functions of the State Authority. It is therefore necessary that a small but compact secretariat is provided by the State Governments to their State Authorities with the support of professionals on regular or contract basis.

**State Disaster Management Authorities**

- Few of the SDMAs only are functioning effectively which have some full time members.
- Almost all other SDMAs, which have all ex-officio members, are not able to function effectively, more so since they do not have exclusive secretariats.
- Normally such Authorities are seen to be active during and in the aftermath of a disaster.
- In the process, pre-disaster interventions, such as undertaking awareness generation, mitigation measures, training and capacity building and integration of disaster risk reduction with the development process tend to be by and large ignored.
- Most of the SDMAs are still in response mode with little attention being paid to preventive measures during normal times.
- Of the eight members, other than the Chairperson and Chief Executive Officer (Chief Secretary), at least four members may be full time members, of whom at least two members may be subject specialists in different facets of disaster management and the remaining two full time members could be senior retired officers who have the experience of dealing with response and relief, mobilization and movement of resources and recovery.
- NDMA may issue suggested guidelines for the constitution of the SDMAs for consideration of the state governments. The DM Act, 2005 need not be amended since, considering the federal structure, the final decision about constitution of the State Authority may be left to the respective Chief Ministers as already prescribed in the Act.
- It is necessary that a small but compact secretariat is provided by the State Governments to their State Authorities with the support of professionals on regular or contract basis.

**State Executive Committee**

Similar to the national level, where the National Executive Committee is constituted by the Central Government, the State government shall constitute a State Executive Committee (SEC) to assist the State Authority in the performance of its functions and to coordinate action in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the State Authority. The State Executive Committee shall also ensure compliance of directives issued by the State government under the Act. The SEC shall consist of the Chief Secretary of the State government, who shall be the ex officio chairperson, and four secretaries to the government of the state, ex officio, of such departments as the state government may think fit. The functions entrusted to the SEC are to:

- Coordinate and monitor the implementation of the National Policy, National Plan and the State Plan;
- Examine vulnerability of different parts of the state to different disasters and specify measures to be taken for their prevention or mitigation;
- Lay down guidelines for preparation of disaster management plans by the state departments and District Authorities and monitor their implementation;
- Monitor implementation of guidelines laid down by State Authority for integrating measures for prevention and mitigation of disasters by the departments in their development plans and projects;
- Evaluate preparedness at all governmental and non-governmental levels to respond to any threatening disaster situation or disaster and give directions, where necessary, for enhancing such preparedness;
- Coordinate response to a threatening disaster situation or disaster;
- Give directions to any state department or any other authority or body in the state regarding actions to be taken in response to any threatening disaster situation or disaster;
Promote general education, awareness and community training for different disasters to which different parts of the state are vulnerable and measures that may be taken by such community to prevent, mitigate and respond to such disaster;

Provide necessary technical assistance or give advice to district and local authorities for carrying out their functions effectively;

Advise the state government regarding all financial matters related to disaster management;

Examine the constructions in any local area to ensure compliance of prescribed standards, by giving directions to district and local authorities, where necessary;

Provide information to National Authority relating to different aspects of disaster management;

Lay down, update and review the state level response plans and guidelines and ensure that district level response plans are prepared, reviewed and updated;

Ensure that communication systems are in order and the disaster management drills are carried out periodically; and

Perform such other functions as may be assigned to it by the state authority or as it may consider necessary.

**Functioning of SECs**

It was observed during field visits that SECs have become almost virtual bodies and have failed to discharge their functions adequately. The main reason for this disability is that the Chairperson and all secretaries who are members of SEC are functioning in ex-officio capacity and have little time to devote to the functions of SEC. It will be seen from the functions of SEC given above that these are widespread and it would indeed be almost too difficult for the secretaries to perform these functions, in addition to their respective duties of the departments they are heading, particularly since SEC also does not have any exclusive secretariat. Besides assisting the State Authority in the performance of its functions and to coordinate action in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the State Authority, SEC has to ensure compliance with the directions issued by the State Government under the Act. Most of the SECs have therefore become non-functional and get activated only when there is a disaster or threatening disaster situation.

The Task Force on the review of Disaster Management Act, 2005 has therefore proposed that SECs may be discontinued and its functions primarily related to pre-disaster aspects may be entrusted to SDMA and those related to response and coordination may be entrusted to State Crises Management Committee, which may be made a statutory body by including it in the Disaster Management Act, 2005. It is somewhat strange that without examining the reasons as to why SECs have become non-functional, the recommendation made is that these may be discontinued. SECs have Chief Secretary as the Chairperson with Secretaries of key departments of the state as members. SCMC mainly meets when there is a crisis situation primarily for response, relief and coordinating actions by different state departments. The rationale of Task Force is apparently to ensure that the Governments look after response and relief whereas mitigation and preparedness, training and capacity building and integration of disaster risk reduction with development process may be left to SDMA. This would clearly show that the Task Force has perceived the Government’s functions as post disaster response and relief and disaster risk reduction for preventive action, mitigation measures as also integrating DRR in the development plans and projects of different departments may be left to SDMA, ignoring the fact that most of the SDMAs are also non-functional and if the support of SECs is also withdrawn, it in effect would amount to converting them into Authorities existing only in statute.

If the intention is to ensure convergence of various facets of disaster management with due attention to pre-disaster aspects, the only way out is to retain SECs and make them really functional by providing an exclusive secretariat with the support of administrative and professional staff so that SECs may function on regular basis under the guidance and wisdom of experienced secretaries of...
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key departments, which will also ensure coordination and convergence among various relevant departments of state governments for taking up mitigation and preparedness measures as also integrating DRR by the departments in their development plan, programmes and projects. A vertical split between the pre-disaster measures required to be taken and post-disaster functions of response and relief will be counter-productive and would effectively negate the paradigm shift from post disaster reactive approach to pre-disaster pro-active approach of which the governments have been talking about for last two decades and which has emerged as the international strategy as brought out in Hyogo Framework of Action, the Millennium Development Goals and the national priorities outlined by the High Powered Committee on Disaster Management.

It is therefore necessary to provide a small but compact secretariat including professional support to both SDMAs and SECs in each state and to ensure that these institutional systems created through the Disaster Management Act, 2005 function effectively.

**Constitution of SECs**

Section 20 of the Act provides for constitution of SEC with Chief Secretary as Chairperson and four secretaries to the Government of the State of such departments as the state government may think fit. This number is too restrictive, unlike National Executive Committee which has 16 secretaries as members including the Chairperson. It is necessary that key departments like Disaster Management, Home, Health, Agriculture, Power, water resources including Drinking Water Supply, if it is a separate department, Urban Development, Rural Development, Local Self Government, Communications should all be represented on SEC for coordinated action. While the selection of relevant departments may be left to the State Governments, the constitution of SEC may be amended to provide, besides Chief Secretary as Chairperson, not more than 10 secretaries to the Government of the State of such departments as the State Government may think fit, *ex-officio*. If a State Government feels they need not have as many secretaries as members of SEC, they may have lesser number of secretaries but the statutory provision in the Act should not be too restrictive as at present, which limits the State Government to not more than four secretaries to be made members of SEC. Besides, a larger SEC will encourage greater participation of all relevant departments and facilitate coordination and participatory action for undertaking mitigation and preparedness measures, training and capacity building of all key departments and integration of disaster risk reduction with the development process of all relevant departments.

**State Plan**

The Act provides for a State Disaster Management Plan for each State. The State Plan shall be prepared by the SEC having regard to the guidelines laid down by the National Authority and after such consultation with the local authorities, district authorities and the people’s representative, as the SEC may deem fit. The State Plan is required to be approved by the State Authority. It shall include:

- The vulnerability of different parts of the state to different forms of disasters;
- Measures to be adopted for prevention and mitigation of disasters;
- Manner in which the mitigation measures shall be integrated with development plans and projects;
- Capacity building and preparedness measures to be taken;
- Roles and responsibilities to be discharged by each State Department for disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness, capacity building and responding to any threatening disaster situation or disaster;

The Act further provides that appropriate provisions shall be made by the state government for financing the measures to be carried out under the State Plan. The State Plan shall be reviewed and
updated every year. Based on the State Plan, each Department of the State shall draw up its own disaster management plan.

Based on the guidelines issued by the National Authority for preparation of State Disaster Management Plans, almost all State Governments have finalized the State Plans and few others are in the process of doing so. The NDMA guidelines cover the approach, objectives, key responsibilities of different agencies, guiding principles and basic features of the State Plan, and also suggest the outline of the State Plan. It particularly emphasizes the participatory approach to be adopted by keeping focus on the community.

Mostly, the State Governments have outsourced the preparation of State Disaster Management Plans to outside agencies. While this has made the State Plans quite comprehensive with adequate stress on mitigation and preparedness measures as also recovery, the disadvantage has been the lack of ownership of State Plans by the respective State Governments with the result that the gaps identified therein have not been paid adequate attention during implementation phase.

For instance, the West Bengal State Plan developed by the Jadavpur University is an excellent document. It encompasses most of the salient features required to be included in the State Plan and also includes a State Disaster Management Action Plan related to mitigation and preparedness. A lot of time and efforts has gone in compiling and tabulating relevant demographic, socio-economic and disaster specific data, which has enriched it. In particular, the State Plan contains and analyses data up to block level, which would have greatly facilitated the task of preparation of district, block and

---

**State Executive Committees**

- SECs have become almost virtual bodies and have failed to discharge their functions adequately.
- The main reason for this disability is that the Chairperson and all secretaries who are members of SEC are functioning in ex-officio capacity and have little time to devote to the functions of SEC.
- SECs also do not have any exclusive secretariat.
- Most of the SECs have therefore become non-functional and get activated only when there is a disaster or threatening disaster situation.
- In order to ensure convergence of various facets of disaster management with due attention to pre-disaster aspects, the only way out is to retain SECs and make them really functional by providing an exclusive secretariat with the support of administrative and professional staff.
- This will enable SECs to function on regular basis under the guidance and wisdom of experienced secretaries of key departments, which will also ensure coordination and convergence among various relevant departments.
- A vertical split between the pre-disaster measures required to be taken and post-disaster functions of response and relief will be counter-productive and would effectively negate the paradigm shift from post disaster reactive approach to pre-disaster pro-active approach.
- At present SECs can have only four Secretaries, besides Chief Secretary as Chairperson.
- It is necessary that key departments like Disaster Management, Home, Health, Agriculture, Power, water resources including Drinking Water Supply, if it is a separate department, Urban Development, Rural Development, Local Self Government, Communications should all be represented on SEC for coordinated action.
- While the selection of relevant departments may be left to the State Governments, the constitution of SEC may be amended to provide, besides Chief Secretary as Chairperson, not more than 10 secretaries to the Government of the State of such departments as the State Government may think fit, ex-officio.

**State Plans**

- Mostly, the State Governments have outsourced the preparation of State Disaster Management Plans to outside agencies. While this has made the State Plans quite comprehensive with adequate stress on mitigation and preparedness measures as also recovery, the disadvantage has been the lack of ownership of State Plans by the respective State Governments with the result that the gaps identified therein have not been paid adequate attention during implementation phase.
- Most of the states have still a long way to go to cover the gaps through mitigation and preparedness measures, training and capacity building of different stakeholders and particularly the capacity building of communities.
- This is a function to be discharged by the State Executive Committees which are responsible to monitor the implementation of the state plans. Since the SECs are mostly non-functional in majority of the states; the progress of implementation of State Plans also leaves much to be desired, which has to be undertaken in a time bound manner.
municipal level disaster management plans. However, during field survey, it was observed that the Action Plan laid down in the State Plan has not really been activated.

The Andhra Pradesh State Disaster Management Plan, prepared by the Centre for Good Governance, Hyderabad is a comprehensive and qualitatively excellent document. It by and large covers all aspects of disaster management. A lot of factual information has been included in Tables as also annexes, which has been analyzed to draw cogent and logical conclusions. Although a separate Action Plan has not been included, various gaps have been identified and analyzed in different chapters with recommendations about the future course of action. On the other hand, the State Plan tends to be somewhat an academic exercise since the basic concepts have been discussed at length. This has made the plan too lengthy. Besides ‘Recovery’ has not received due attention. Programmes to cover the gaps identified in the State Plan have either not been taken up or are in infancy.

The Uttarakhand State Plan is basically a resource inventory at state and district level. It is also not clear whether this resource inventory is being updated at periodic intervals. It has not covered the various objectives laid down in the Disaster Management Act, 2005 for State Plan or the format and contents suggested in the guidelines released by NDMA in July, 2007 for preparation of state plans. The Plan needs to be totally recast based on provisions contained in the DM Act and the guidelines issued by the National Authority.

The Odisha State Disaster Management Plan is qualitatively a very good document which by and large covers all aspects of disaster management exhaustively. It contains an Action Plan showing the activities to be undertaken with time line as well as the level at which each activity is to be undertaken. The State Plan was apparently attempted some time in 2003 since the figures given are up to 2002 only. Odisha was probably the second state, after Maharashtra, to formulate its State Plan. The State Plan is based on three major pillars—Prevention, Response and Recovery. Within these parameters, all phases of disaster management have been covered adequately. The State Government has also initiated several measures to cover the gaps identified therein and its impact was visible recently when a cyclone struck some coastal parts of Odisha recently.

The Bihar State Plan is a comprehensive and well written plan. There are, however, several gaps which have not been identified and analyzed. It needs to be updated keeping in view the provisions contained in the Disaster Management Act, 2005 and the guidelines issued by the National Authority. The objectives of the plan primarily are to ensure that prevention, response and recovery components of disaster management are organized to facilitate planning, preparedness, operational coordination and community participation. The entire plan basically revolves around these components. There is no reference to the objectives of state plan legally mandated in the DM Act which are much more broad based and inclusive. The plan therefore does not adequately address several factors such as the manner in which the mitigation measures shall be integrated with the development plans and projects. Mitigation itself has been taken as a sub-component of prevention, whereas prevention and mitigation have separate connotations. Similarly, the definition of disaster has not been evolved except in terms of classification of disasters, based on L0, L1, L2, L3 concept. In the process, manmade disasters find little, if any, coverage. It has been stated in chapter I that “though the focus of attention has been on the more frequent disasters like floods, earthquake, fire, droughts and transport accidents, the same disaster management arrangements and resources could be used for a wider range of hazards for which there has been little or no experience in Bihar, such as Industrial, Chemical and nuclear hazards.” This assumption itself could be a grave hazard. The state plan primarily concentrates on natural hazards.

Gujarat State Disaster Management Plan again is a comprehensive document with a vision to making Gujarat, where communities react to disasters with sense of urgency but in a planned way, to minimize human, property and environmental loss, with highest priority being given to saving
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human lives. It comprises risk and vulnerability assessment of disasters in the State. It provides planning for prevention and mitigation, mainstreaming disaster in development plans/programmes/projects, capacity building and preparedness measures, the role and responsibilities of each of the government departments and other stakeholders, risk transfer mechanism and effective programme management for future disasters. This is probably the only State Plan which has been referred to NDMA, though it is not a statutory requirement, and changes proposed by the National Authority have been incorporated therein. However, the field survey brought out a lot has yet to be done to activate the plan at ground level although there has been significant progress in awareness generation. However, the same cannot be said for undertaking training and capacity building at community level.

There is no doubt that the State Governments have made a beginning by developing their respective State Plans to put in place an instrument for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in the development process and identifying gaps in different facets of disaster management. However, most of the states have still a long way to go to cover the gaps through mitigation and preparedness measures, training and capacity building of different stakeholders and particularly the capacity building of communities. This is a function to be discharged by the State Executive Committees which are responsible to monitor the implementation of the state plans. Since the SECs are mostly non-functional in majority of the states; the progress of implementation of State Plans also leaves much to be desired, which has to be undertaken in a time bound manner.

District Disaster Management Authority

The Act mandates that every state government shall establish a District Disaster Management Authority (DDMA) for each district in the state. The District Authority shall consist of the chairperson and such other members, not exceeding seven, as may be prescribed by the state government by making appropriate rules. The District Authority, shall consist of, unless otherwise provided by rules, the Collector or District Magistrate or Deputy Commissioner of the district as chairperson, elected representative of local authority as co-chairperson and the Chief Executive Officer of the District Authority, Superintendent of Police, Chief Medical Officer of the district and not exceeding two district level officers to be appointed by the state government, as members. As for elected representative, in any district where Zilla Parishad exists, the chairperson thereof shall be the co-chairperson of DDMA. In the tribal areas, the Chief Executive Member of the district council of autonomous district shall be the co-chairperson, since there is no zilla parishad in tribal districts. The Chief Executive Officer of the DDMA shall be appointed by the state government and shall not be less than the rank of Additional Collector or Additional District Magistrate or Additional District Commissioner, as the case may be. The main function of the District Authority is to act as the district planning, coordinating and implementing body for disaster management. Some of the salient actions that DDMA may undertake are:

- Prepare a disaster management plan including district response plan;
- Coordinate and monitor the implementation of National Policy, State policy, National, State and District Plans;
- Ensure that areas in the districts vulnerable to disasters are identified and measures for prevention and mitigation are undertaken by the concerned district level departments;
- Ensure that guidelines for prevention, mitigation, preparedness and response measures, as laid down by National Authority and State Authority are followed by all district level departments;
- Give directions to different authorities at district level and local authorities to take such other measures for prevention and mitigation of disasters as may be necessary;
- Lay down guidelines for preparation of disaster management plans by the district level departments and local authorities and monitor the implementation of disaster management plans of departments at district level;
• Review the state of capabilities for responding to disasters in the district and give directions to relevant departments or authorities at district level for their up-gradation as may be necessary;
• Review the preparedness measures and give directions to concerned district level departments and other concerned authorities for bringing the preparedness measures to the level required, where necessary;
• Organize and coordinate specialized training programs for district level officers, employees and voluntary rescue workers;
• Facilitate community training and awareness programs with the support of local authorities, governmental and non-governmental organizations;
• Set up, maintain, review and upgrade the mechanisms for early warning systems;
• Provide technical assistance or advise the local authorities for carrying out their functions.

It will be observed that the model adopted at district level is somewhat different than the model adopted at national and state level. While there are three major players at the national level, namely the Central Government, National Disaster Management Authority and the National Executive Committee as well as at the state level, namely the State Government, State Disaster Management Authority and the State Executive Committee, at the district level, there is only one agency, namely the District Disaster Management Authority, which is responsible to discharge all functions entrusted to three agencies each at national and state level. The rationale is that all functions required to be discharged in all the phases of disaster management converge at district level, to be discharged by the District Authority. The District Authority is therefore the focal point and the operational hub in respect of all aspects of disaster management. It has therefore been given additional powers and functions in the event of a threatening disaster situation or disaster for the purpose of assisting, protecting or providing relief to the community, as indicated below:
• Give directions for release and use of resources available with any government department and the local authority in the district;
• Control and restrict any vehicular traffic and entry or movement of any person to, from and within the vulnerable or affected area;
• Remove debris, conduct search and rescue operations;
• Provide shelter, food, drinking water and essential provisions, healthcare and services;
• Establish emergency communication systems in the affected area;
• Make arrangements for the disposal of unclaimed dead bodies;
• Require consultants and experts to advise and assist;
• Procure exclusive or preferential use of amenities from any authority or person;
• Construct temporary bridges or other necessary structures and demolish structures which may be hazardous to public or aggravate effects of the disaster;
• Ensure that non-governmental organizations carry out their activities in an equitable and non-discriminatory manner.

In all these efforts, it is obligatory for any office of the Central and State Governments located in the district and the local authority to render full support to the District Authority and function under the supervision of the District Authority. The district authority is, however, empowered to constitute advisory committees, as and when necessary, for the efficient discharge of its functions.

Functioning of DDMAs

It is well known that the Central and State Governments normally perform supervisory and coordination roles including logistic and financial support, mobilization and movement of resources, making available National and State Disaster Response Forces, medical and public health support etc. However, actual actions for prompt and efficient response, awareness generation, training and capacity building particularly at community level as also of the stakeholders working at grass root level have to be undertaken at district and sub-district level. Despite the fact that DDMAs have been
assigned key role at district level, combining the roles assigned to SDMAs and SECs at state level, it was brought out during field surveys and interactions with district level officers that DDMAs, though constituted in most of the districts, are virtually defunct. This was frankly admitted by District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers in most of the districts. It was invariably stressed in the districts that the District Magistrates hold regular meetings of their respective departments and Block Development Officers when disaster management is normally one of the agenda items and therefore separate meetings of DDMAs are generally not held. However, it was observed that due attention to disaster management issues is paid in the context of a disaster or threatening disaster situation. Mitigation measures, mainstreaming DRR in development programmes, training and capacity building and other similar pre-disaster aspects do not receive any worthwhile attention. The district officers could not bring out actions taken on functions assigned to DDMAs under section 30 of the Act.

The main bottlenecks brought out for not holding the meetings of DDMAs regularly and ensuring that the functions assigned to it are carried out diligently briefly were:

- District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers were too pre-occupied with the regular work assigned to them and, barring disaster situations, had no time to perform the functions assigned to DDMAs.
- Most of the district level officers, including District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers had not been imparted any training for disaster mitigation, training and capacity building, mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in development process.
- DDMAs had not been provided any secretarial assistance. It was difficult, in the absence of a dedicated secretariat for DDMAs, to ensure that the statutory responsibilities entrusted to DDMAs are carried out.
- There was need to provide professional support to DDMAs.
- There was a felt need to provide Mitigation Fund at district level to enable them to implement mitigation measures including training and capacity building of different stakeholders.
- It was observed that there was trust deficit between district officers and NGOs; district officers were reluctant to involve NGOs for community training and undertaking mitigation measures unless the list of NGOs which could be associated was provided to them by the state governments.
- NGOs invariably expected to be provided financial support to enable them to take up disaster management related functions at grass root level. There were no discretionary funds with district magistrates to extend assistance to them; besides, the mandate to extend such assistance to NGOs had not been given to them by state governments.
- There were no policy guidelines or government orders to involve NGOs or private sector in DM related functions.

It is therefore considered that there should be clear cut instructions from state governments to district officers to involve NGOs and other non-governmental stakeholders in specific DM related functions with monitoring, evaluation and coordination mechanisms clearly spelt out. If financial assistance had to be provided to non-governmental stakeholders, the modalities should be clearly laid down by state governments. DDMAs should have a small but compact secretariat which should function throughout the year to ensure that the functions entrusted to DDMAs in the Act are carried out. There should also be a Mitigation Fund at district level to enable the District Magistrates to take up limited intervention programmes in normal times. Besides, the number of members of DDMAs may be increased by amending the Act to enable the District Magistrates to include 2-3 professionals as members. It is also desirable to impart training to selected officers at district level, including District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers, in DM related functions, particularly mitigation measures to be undertaken, training and capacity building of stakeholders, awareness generation, community and local self government’s involvement and media management for DM related activities. District Magistrates should also have powers to recruit consultants for limited periods to
provide professional support and facilitate organisation of training programmes for stakeholders at district and sub-district level in specially designed training modules, keeping in view the

**District Disaster Management Authorities**

- The model adopted at district level is somewhat different than the model adopted at national and state level.
- While there are three major players at the national level, namely the Central Government, NDMA and NEC as well as at the state level, namely the State Government, SDMA and SEC, at the district level, there is only one agency, namely the DDMA, which is responsible to discharge all functions entrusted to three agencies each at national and state level.
- The rationale is that all functions required to be discharged in all the phases of disaster management converge at district level, to be discharged by the District Authority.
- The District Authority is therefore the focal point and the operational hub in respect of all aspects of disaster management.
- The DDMA, though constituted in most of the districts, are virtually defunct
- The main bottlenecks brought out for not holding the meetings of DDMA regularly and ensuring that the functions assigned to it are carried out diligently briefly were:
  - District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers were too pre-occupied with the regular work assigned to them and, barring disaster situations, had no time to perform the functions assigned to DDMA.
  - Most of the district level officers, including District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers had not been imparted any training for disaster mitigation, training and capacity building, mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in development process.
  - DDMA had not been provided any secretarial assistance. It was difficult, in the absence of a dedicated secretariat for DDMA, to ensure that the statutory responsibilities entrusted to DDMA are carried out.
  - There was need to provide professional support to DDMA.
  - There was a felt need to provide Mitigation Fund at district level to enable them to implement mitigation measures including training and capacity building of different stakeholders.
  - It was observed that there was trust deficit between district officers and NGOs.
  - NGOs invariably expected to be provided financial support to enable them to take up disaster management related functions at grass root level.
  - There were no policy guidelines or government orders to involve NGOs or private sector in DM related functions.
  - It is therefore considered that there should be clear cut instructions from state governments to district officers to involve NGOs and other non-governmental stakeholders in specific DM related functions with monitoring, evaluation and coordination mechanisms clearly spelt out. If financial assistance had to be provided to non-governmental stakeholders, the modalities should be clearly laid down by state governments.
  - DDMA should have a small but compact secretariat which should function throughout the year to ensure that the functions assigned to DDMA are performed diligently.
  - There should be a Mitigation Fund at district level to enable the District Magistrates to take up limited intervention programmes in normal times.
  - The number of members of DDMA may be increased by amending the Act to enable the District Magistrates to include 2-3 professionals as members.
  - It is also desirable to impart training to selected officers at district level, including District Magistrates and Chief Development Officers, in DM related functions, particularly mitigation measures to be undertaken, training and capacity building of stakeholders, awareness generation, community and local self government’s involvement and media management for DM related activities.
  - District Magistrates should also have powers to recruit consultants for limited periods to provide professional support and facilitate organisation of training programmes for stakeholders at district and sub-district level in specially desined training modules. keeone in view the vulnerabilities of each district.

**District Plan**

The Act provides for a district plan to be prepared by the district authority after consultation with local authorities and in alignment with the National and State Plans. The district plan shall be approved by the State Authority. It shall include:

- Areas in the district vulnerable to different forms of disasters;
- Measures to be taken for prevention and mitigation of disasters by the district level departments and local authorities;
- Capacity building and preparedness measures to be taken by district level departments and local authorities to respond to any threatening disaster situation or disaster;
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- Response plans and procedures, in the event of a disaster, providing for allocation of responsibilities to district level departments and local authorities, prompt response to disaster and relief thereof, procurement of essential resources, establishment of communication links, and dissemination of information to public;
- Such other matters as may be required by the State Authority.

The District Plan shall be reviewed and updated annually. Copies of the district plan shall be made available to district-level departments and the State Authority which shall forward it to the state government. The district authority shall review the implementation of the plan from time to time and issue such instructions to different district level departments as it may deem necessary for its implementation.

It was noted that District Plans had either not been prepared and, in few cases, where these had been prepared, were not comprehensive with identified gaps and Action Plans. At present, the District Plan, where prepared looked more like a telephone directory rather than a district plan which could be taken up for implementation. The NDMA is at present in the process of developing a template for District Disaster Management Plan. However, even when the template is ready, there would be need to train Chief Development Officers and few selected district level officers in the preparation of district plan. Besides, they might also need professional support to assist them in preparing the District Plan.

**Local Authorities**

As per the definition of the ‘local authority’ in the Disaster Management Act, 2005, it includes “panchayati raj institutions, municipalities, a district board, cantonment board, town planning authority or Zila Parishad or any other body or authority, by whatever name called, for the time being invested by law, for rendering essential services or, with the control and management of civic services, within a specified local area”. Section 41 of the Act states that subject to the direction of the district authority, a local authority shall ensure that its officers and employees are trained for disaster management, resources relating to disaster management are so maintained as to be readily available.

**District Plan**

- District Plans had either not been prepared and, in few cases, where these had been prepared, were not comprehensive with identified gaps and Action Plans, which could be taken up for implementation.
- The NDMA is at present in the process of developing a template for District Disaster Management Plan. However, even when the template is ready, there would be need to train Chief Development Officers and few selected district level officers in the preparation of district plan.
- Besides, they might also need professional support to assist them in preparing the District Plan.

**Local Authorities**

- Despite statutory provisions in section 41 of the Act, the Gram Panchayats are not being proactively involved in disaster management. The main limitations, as brought out during interaction with the GPs, are:
  - Elected members of GPs are not provided any training in disaster management. The induction training programmes include a capsule ranging from one hour to half a day on disaster management, which is inadequate.
  - All DM related functions are generally performed by Revenue Officials with the support of school teachers and/or Anganwadi workers. Members of GPs are not even consulted.
  - The officials of GPs are not given any training in DM related aspects.
  - If training is imparted to GP Members, they can play and are willing to play a key role in generating awareness, undertake advocacy with district officials for mitigation measures to be taken in their respective villages, assist in distribution of relief materials equitably on need based basis etc.
  - Ensure that DRR is integrated in the development programmes being undertaken in the villages.
  - Given adequate training, they can make sincere efforts to ensure that the responsibilities entrusted to GPs under the Act are discharged diligently. At present, almost all GP members across six states were not found to be even aware of the DM Act or the duties and responsibilities assigned to them under the Act.
- It is therefore necessary to involve GPs in all facets of disaster management. This institutional mechanism, though available at village level with statutorily mandated responsibilities is by and large being ignored.
available in the event of a disaster, all construction projects under it or within its jurisdiction conform to the standards and specifications laid down for prevention and mitigation of disasters by the National, State and District Authorities; and carry out relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction activities in the affected area in accordance with the State and District Plans. There is also a general provision stating that the local authority may take such other measures as may be necessary for disaster management.

However, despite these statutory provisions, the Gram Panchayats are not being proactively involved in disaster management. The main limitations, as brought out during interaction with the GPs, are:

- Elected members of GPs are not provided any training in disaster management. The induction training programmes include a capsule ranging from one hour to half a day on disaster management, which is inadequate.
- All DM related functions are generally performed by Revenue Officials with the support of school teachers and/or Anganwadi workers. Members of GPs are not even consulted.
- GP Members have no say in damage and loss assessment.
- The officials of GPs are not given any training in DM related aspects.
- If training is imparted to GP Members, they can play and are willing to play a key role in generating awareness, undertake advocacy with district officials for mitigation measures to be taken in their respective villages, assist in distribution of relief materials equitably on need based basis etc.
- Ensure that DRR is integrated in the development programmes being undertaken in the villages
- Given adequate training, they can make sincere efforts to ensure that the responsibilities entrusted to GPs under the Act are discharged diligently. At present, almost all GP members across six states were not found to be even aware of the DM Act or the duties and responsibilities assigned to them under the Act.

It is therefore necessary to involve GPs in all facets of disaster management. This institutional mechanism, though available at village level with statutorily mandated responsibilities is by and large being ignored.
SECTION 6: NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT

The National Center of Disaster Management (NCDM) was set up in 1995 at the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The functions assigned to NCDM were as follows:

- Organizing training programmes for policy planners, decision makers, disaster managers, as well as trainers for regional/state training institutes;
- Research and development of case studies relating to disaster management activities;
- Development of database and dissemination of information in the field of natural disasters.

The NCDM was subsequently assigned the function of providing secretarial assistance to the HPC which was set up in August 1999 and submitted its report in October 2001. After the Bhuj Earthquake, a National Committee on Disaster Management was also set up under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister and the HPC was converted into a Working Group to provide requisite support to the National Committee on Disaster Management. The NCDM was also entrusted with the responsibility of providing secretarial assistance and other support to the Working Group.

Initially, the proposal under consideration in 1995 was to have a full-fledged National Center of Disaster Management. However, since there was hardly any time to develop the necessary infrastructure and the need to set up NCDM was very urgent in the wake of international calls for action to reduce the occurrence and minimize the adverse impact of natural calamities during the 1990s, it was decided that instead of establishing a separate Institute for Disaster Management, the task may be entrusted to an existing leading National Institute. It was in this context, that the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) was selected for this purpose. An Advisory Committee was constituted in June 1995 under the Chairmanship of the Central Relief Commissioner, Department of Agriculture. The Advisory Committee was entrusted with the following responsibilities:

- To identify and recommend programs on disaster mitigation and preparedness to be taken up by the Center;
- To review the impact of the programs conducted by the Center from time to time;
- To review the performance of the Center;
- To consider and recommend suitable candidate for selection as Head of the Center.

The HPC considered the role of NCDM and recommended the following functions for NCDM, with a further recommendation that it may be developed as a full-fledged National Institute of Disaster Management:

- Human resource development covering multiple aspects of disaster management, and to play a lead role in national level policy formulation;
- Coordinate the actions of various role players within the field of disaster management: government, non-governmental organizations, public and private sector and international organizations;
- Establish an exhaustive national-level information base on disaster policies, prevention mechanisms, mitigation measures, and region-wise preparedness and response plans, as well as resources spent on mitigation and response for various types of disasters;
- Forge, promote & sustain international & regional partnerships for launching joint, synergistic projects & programmes;
- Assist various states in strengthening their disaster management systems and capacities, and in the preparation of their plans and strategies for hazard mitigation and disaster response;
- Set up linkages with other international institutions in the region for mutual benefits and sharing of experiences;
Accordingly, the National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM) was established on 16th October 2003. The objective in making the NIDM a separate entity was to develop it as an Institute of Excellence and make it an autonomous organization, registered as a society, to enable it to have requisite flexibility. When the process for the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 commenced, it was considered that NIDM may be made a statutory body under the proposed legislation.

Accordingly, NIDM was re-constituted with a Governing Body. It shall function within the broad policies and guidelines lay down by NDMA and be responsible for planning and promoting training and research in the area of disaster management, documentation and development of national-level information base relating to disaster management policies, prevention mechanisms and mitigation measures. In accordance with the above tasks, NIDM, as prescribed by the law, may:

- Develop training modules, undertake research and documentation in disaster management and organise training programmes;
- Formulate and implement a comprehensive human resource development plan covering all aspects of disaster management;
- Provide assistance in national level policy formulation;
- Provide required assistance to the training and research institutes for development of training and research programmes for stakeholders including government functionaries and undertake training of faculty members of the state level training institutes;
- Provide assistance to the State Governments and State Training Institutes in the formulation of state level policies, strategies, disaster management framework and any other assistance as may be required by the State Governments and State Training Institutes for capacity-building of stakeholders, Government including its functionaries, civil society members, corporate sector and people’s elected representatives;
- Develop educational materials for disaster management including academic and professional courses;
- Promote awareness among stakeholders including college and school teachers and students, technical personnel and others associated with multi-hazard mitigation, preparedness and response measures;
- Provide assistance to State Governments and state training institutes in the formulation of state level policies, strategies, disaster management framework and assist these institutions for the capacity building of stakeholders, governments including its functionaries, civil society members, corporate sector and people’s elected representatives;
- Undertake, organise and facilitate study courses, conferences, lectures, seminars within and outside the country to promote the aforesaid objects;
- Undertake and provide for publication of journals, research papers and books and establish and maintain libraries in furtherance of above objects;
- Do all such other lawful things as are conducive or incidental to the attainment of the above objects; and
- Undertake any other function as may be assigned to it by the Central Government.

Initially when it was considered to register NIDM as a Society, the intention was to allow it requisite autonomy. However, when it was made a statutory body under the Disaster Management Act, 2005, it could not be made a society. However, in order to give NIDM requisite autonomy, it has been empowered to make regulations with the approval of the Central Government. Initially the Regulations were made by the Central Government on 30th October, 2006 covering composition of the institute and it's Governing Body, conduct of meetings, transaction of business, powers and functions of Governing Body, quorum and powers and functions of Executive Director. However, over a period of about 8 years, NIDM has not made its own regulations with the result that it continues to be governed under the regulations made by the Central Government.
Initial Vision Document for NIDM

Soon after the NCDM was set up as a National Institute of Disaster Management in October, 2003, a vision document was prepared in 2004 to evolve the future roadmap for the Institute. The Tenth Five-Year Plan signaled the start of a new era by concluding, “The development process needs to be sensitive towards disaster prevention and mitigation.” The key sectoral issues identified were

- Put in place multi-stakeholders’ institutional arrangements
- Improve emergency response capacities
- Promote risk sharing and transfer mechanisms for disaster reconstruction through contributions from the private sector
- Develop Human Resource and Capacity Development Plan and ensure its implementation
- Organise cross-sectoral, cross-country and cross-regional support
- Develop policy guidelines at local, state, national, regional, sectoral and sub-sectoral levels and streamline and synergize all interventions for disaster risk reduction
- Involve coherent risk reduction communities by taking professionals from different disciplines - medicine, disaster management specialists, and activists in the mitigation process
- Build partnerships with the community, private sector, research, education and training institutions at the national and international level

The National Institute of Disaster Management was expected to facilitate the efforts of various agencies in addressing the key sectoral issues for disaster management at all levels.

The vision of NIDM was stated to be “To develop as an international center of excellence in the field of disaster management” and the mission statement was “Planning and promoting education, research, training and awareness in the area of disaster management including documentation and development of national and international level information systems for providing inputs in policy formulation and implementation leading to sustainable development and act as a nodal agency for government and inter-governmental organizations”. The objectives of the NIDM were proposed as follows:

- To provide education, research, and training in the field of disaster management
- Provide inputs in formulation of disaster management policy and plan and strategy for their implementation at national and state level
- Formulate and implement a comprehensive human resource development plan covering all aspects of disaster management
- Establish information management system for collection, collation, retrieval and dissemination of information
- Develop a national database network and decision support systems on natural and manmade disasters using GIS and remote sensing tools
- To promote collaboration, networking and synergy between Governments, Universities, Academic Institutions, professionals, Corporate Bodies, NGOs and communities at National and International levels
- Document research outputs and case studies and publish journals, books, reports, newsletters, and awareness material
- Organize seminars, symposia, conferences, workshops and media campaigns at national and international level for creation of awareness
- Promote awareness among stakeholders including college and school teachers and students, technical personnel and others associated with multi-hazard risk reduction
- To provide Consultancy services in disaster management at national and international level

---

16 The vision document was developed by Prof. Santosh Kumar of NIDM with the in-principle approval of Shri RK Singh, the then Joint Secretary (DM), holding additional charge of ED, NIDM at that time.
It was proposed to create NIDM as an autonomous organization equivalent to an institution of higher learning in India, mandated under an Act of Parliament with specific policy framework, constitution, mandate, powers and functions, organizational structure and financial mechanism commensurate with its vision, mission and objectives. The Institute was envisaged to have the following six divisions:

1. Policy, Planning & Coordination Division
2. Mitigation Division
3. Reconstruction and Recovery Division
4. Emergency Preparedness and Response Division
5. Knowledge Management, IT and Publication Division
6. Administration Division

All the above-mentioned divisions would be addressing natural and human-induced disasters. Each division will have different centers, which would be addressing different disasters such as earthquake, flood, cyclone, drought, and human-induced disasters, so that a multi-hazard approach could be adopted. All the divisions would work in close coordination with each other. Each division would undertake training, research, networking, and documentation activities as part of its mandate.

**Organisational Structure**

It was proposed that there would be a Governing Council and an Executive Committee of the Institute, which will take all decisions related to the Institute. It may be headed by a Director General with the following administrative staff:

- **Registrar** 1
- **Administrative Officer** 1
- **Finance, Accounts and Audit Officer** 1
- **Jr. Administrative Officer** 2
- **Maintenance Officer / Junior Engineer (Civil)** 1
- **Junior Engineer (Electrical / Electronic / Computer)** 1

**Faculty**
- **Dean / Sr. Professor** 1
- **Professors** 7
- **Associate Professors** 14
- **Assistant Professors** 14

**Project/Academic (Term Appointments)**
- **Advisors / Consultants** 4
- **Research, Teaching, and Documentation Associates** 14

It was proposed that services such as cars, drivers, maintenance, cleanliness, electrical, computer, equipment, security, secretarial assistance, reception, telephone operator, protocol, data entry operators, and other field staff may be outsourced.

**Infrastructure Plan**

The NIDM may be a purpose-built facility designed to cover its range of activities. A consultant would be hired to develop the blueprint of the institute. The consultant will provide plans and technical details (including detailed specifications and estimates) for all the items of work (construction activities, equipment, etc.) of the Institute and other related activities. It will also include:

- Preparation of a Master Plan including landscape design for the Institute campus.
- The size and physical requirements of buildings, including residential facilities, hostels for staff, students, and trainees.
• Preparation of architectural design and engineering drawings/plans etc for the proposed buildings and facilities in the campus including the provision of utilities and other services.
• To provide with details of equipment, utilities and facilities needed within the Institute buildings and outside the buildings for practical training activities.
• To provide for a phase-wise planned development of the Institute campus.
• Provide with complete set of bid documents including tender drawings, bill of quantities and specifications.

**Financing Plan**
The funding of NIDM will primarily be done from government sources for initial 10 years, as at present. It was proposed that, after 10 years, Institute may gradually convert into self-sustaining mode. Additional resources may be generated through:

1) Fee based Training Programmes  
2) International Programmes  
3) Consultancy bids  
4) International Bidding.  
5) Projects  
6) Publications  
7) Service Charges from outside agencies for using facilities of NIDM.

However, with the JS demitting charge of the post of ED, NIDM and appointment of full time ED, apparently the proposal was not carried forward and was shelved.

**Report of the Sub Committee under Shri B. S. Baswan, Director IIPA to consider Expansion Plan of NIDM**
The Governing Body of NIDM, in its first meeting held on 20th June, 2007 decided to constitute a Sub Committee under Mr. BS Baswan, the then Director, IIPA to recommend an overall expansion plan for NIDM. The terms of reference included recommendations on:

• Perspective Plan for overall expansion of NIDM  
• Staffing Pattern  
• Organisational Structure  
• Mode of recruitment of faculty  
• Financial systems as prevalent in other premier institutes  
• Recommendations to help evolve NIDM as a National Centre of Excellence in the field of disaster management.

The Sub Committee gave its report in October, 2007. The main recommendations made by it were briefly as follows:

• While NIDM may draw continuously from research and knowledge from specialized institutes, its core competence shall be on the following:
  ✓ Emergency Management  
  ✓ Training of trainers  
  ✓ Training Modules and Materials  
  ✓ Research and documentation of disasters  
  ✓ Outreach  
  ✓ Knowledge Integration  
  ✓ Consultancy services  
  ✓ Disaster Management Education

• The operational framework for NIDM shall have following five parameters:
  ✓ Organizational Structure
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- Staffing Pattern
- Mode of recruitment
- Financial system
- Infrastructure Development

As for organisational structure, the Sub Committee recommended that the existing three divisions may be restructured into five divisions as follows:
- Division of Geological Disasters
- Division of Hydro-Meteorological Disasters
- Division of Human Induced Disasters
- Division of Cross Cutting Issues
- Division of Knowledge Management

Each division may have one Professor, one Associate Professor/ Consultant, two Assistant Professors, two Research Associates/ Research Assistants (total 6). Besides, some of the academic divisions may require more Associate/ Assistant Professors, according to the requirement of domain experts. The Administration-cum-Finance Division may be reorganized to have five sections, namely, Establishment, Training, Purchase, Finance and Accounts and Library and Publication. Besides, there may be few inter-divisional/ inter-institutional Research Centres for carrying out specific activities on project basis which may be supported by dedicated project staff and funds. Some of the proposed Research Centres may be on:
- Seismic Microzonation
- Building Technology and Retrofitting Clinic
- Environment, Climate Change and Disasters
- Hazard Risk Vulnerability Mapping
- Public Private Partnership
- Forecasting, Early Warning and Communication
- Urban Risk Mitigation
- Chemical and Industrial Safety

The Sub Committee recommended creation of following 8 posts of professionals:
- One Professor for Remote Sensing and Geospatial Applications.
- Five Associate Professors, one each for Public Health Emergency/ Bio-disasters; Nuclear and Radiation Hazards; Seismic Engineering/retrofitting; designing simulation based training and exercises; and Rail and Road Accidents.
- Two Assistant Professors, one each for Industrial Engineering with specialization in Chemical Hazards and Mass Communication with expertise in designing communication materials.

It was further proposed that concerned Ministries may create “Chairs” for these professionals in NIDM to ensure that the Institute does not remain an organisation of MHA alone and it develops as a national institute which is owned by all concerned Ministries/ Departments of Government of India. The Sub Committee also stated that it would not like to speculate on the long term requirement of professional and general staff of the institute which can be assessed on a bi-annual basis by an expert body that the Governing Body may like to constitute.

As for mode of recruitment, it was suggested that:
- The Institute may be a lean and performing organisation and should not be tied by a rigid recruitment system
- The recruitment rules should be flexible enough to attract best professionals in the field
- RRs should be a combination of different modes of recruitment such as deputation, contractual services and regular appointments
- Profile of faculty should be a combination of youth and experience
- It should have its own recruitment system and should not be bound by UPSC system
UGC guidelines on pay scales, qualification, constitution of Selection Committees, mode of recruitment etc may be adopted

For Group “A” and Group “B” posts, Governing Body may be the Appointing and Disciplinary Authority; while for Group “C” posts ED, NIDM may be the Appointing and Disciplinary Authority

The Career Advancement and Faculty Development Programme should be made an integral part of recruitment and service rules.

As for financial system, it was recommended that NIDM may maintain an “Institute Fund” to which shall be credited all financial support provided by Central Government, all fees and other charges received by Institute, all grants, donations gifts etc received by institute and all financial support received from any other source or in any other manner.

So far as infrastructure development is concerned, the Sub Committee recommended that:

- NIDM should have its own state of the art Campus in NCR of Delhi in a suitable institutional area with adequate land of about 20-30 acres with good transport facility;
- Main Institute Building, classrooms, Library and Publication Centre;
- Special facilities including EOC, Remote Sensing and GIS Lab, Computer Centre, Simulation and Multi-Media Lab, video Conference Lab, Earthquake Engineering Lab, Instrumentation Lab, Exhibition and Museum, Auditorium Complex, Hostel Complex, Residential Complex and Sports Complex.

It was proposed that these facilities may be developed in three phases from 2008-10; 2010-15; and 2015-20.

There is, however, no indication as to what, if any, action was taken on the report of the Sub-Committee. Apparently, this report was also shelved or remained under consideration like the initial Vision Document.

A Strategic Plan for NIDM was developed in September, 2010 which broadly outlined actions to be taken in three phases over a period of 10 years, as below:

Phase I: during years 1 to 3 called “Finishing the Foundation covered Curriculum Planning, Course Development, Distance Learning Programme, and Applied Research;

Phase II: during years 3 to 7 called “Becoming a Change Agent” covered construction of building for the institute, Curriculum Planning, Courseware, Distant Learning, Partnerships and development of organisation;

Phase III: during years 8 to 10 called “Becoming a Regional Centre of Excellence” would stress on developing NIDM as a “deemed university”

The fate of this report is also not known. Faculty members were not aware whether any action was taken on this report.

It will therefore be seen that, though some efforts were made through these reports to develop the Institute as a state of the art facility, equivalent to a deemed university, these were not followed by cogent actions and the reports were eventually shelved. The Governing Body needs to give a second look to all the three reports, particularly the Vision Document, and evolve a Roadmap for the development of the Institute as an autonomous institute and a Regional Centre of Excellence.
**Activities performed by NIDM**

The main objective of separating NIDM from IIPA and making it an independent Institute was that it was felt that the growth of NCDM was stunted in IIPA and it was not able to keep pace with the growing requirements of training and capacity building, research and education, documentation, development of case studies, extending policy and professional support to Central and State Governments and Institutes. The Disaster Management Act, 2005 envisaged a much broader role for NIDM to function as the apex level institute at national level, provide professional support to state level training institutes and develop as a Regional Centre of Excellence in South and South East Asia. However, since its constitution as an institute about a decade back and a statutory institute for last seven years, it is still functioning in a pedestrian fashion and concentrating mostly on organizing training programmes without any larger capacity development perspective or framework. The other functions covered in the statute have been relegated to the background.

**Training Programmes**

During 2005 to 2012, NIDM has conducted around 471 classroom training programs, 17 online training programs and 2 satellites based training programs. A total of around 14,940 people have been trained in these 483 programs. On an average NIDM has trained around 2000 people each year. There has been gradual increase in the number of training programmes being conducted by NIDM, which rose from 36 in 2005-06 to 89 in 2011-12, as indicated below:

![Trend in the number of training programmes during 2005-2012](image)

**Source:** nidm.nic.in
Out of the total 464 classroom training programs around 230 have been conducted in-house and rest in other institutions like ATIs, SIRDs of various state, research institutes etc. There has been a steady rise in the number of in-house training programmes over the years 2005 to 2012.

Rising trend in the number of in-house training programmes

Source: nidm.nic.in

NIDM has trained a range of participants with a wide variety of profile. Following are the broad categories of participants:

- Officials from coastal states and UTs
- Police and CPO Officers
- All sections of the society
- Officers from state banking and finance sectors
- NSS Volunteers
- Officials from state from women and child development department
- Senior and middle level officials from State & UTs, Central Ministries
- District Nodal Officers
- Media Personnel
- Faculty from Fisheries Institute of state and DM experts
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- NGO representatives
- NIC, IGNOU, NCERT, IT professionals etc.
- Head ATI/Faculty DMCs & Training Institutes
- Deputy Commissioners, Addl. Dy. Commissioners, Sub Divisional Magistrates, Asst Commissioners etc
- NYKS

From the year 2005-2006 these participants represented 36 states and UTs; state wise distribution of the number of participants, who attended these training programmes are as follows:

State wise distribution of participants

Source: nidm.nic.in
With the increase in the number of training programmes, it is obvious that the other activities which NIDM had to undertake in terms of the mandate given by the DM Act could not be taken on board.

It has to be realized that NIDM is not merely a training institute. It has to perform several other functions also such as research and education, documentation, development of national level information base, extending professional and policy support to Central and State Government and State Training Institutes etc. Given several other constraints discussed below, NIDM has to be selective in undertaking training programmes such as for policy makers at Central and State level, training of trainers, development of training modules and test check of such modules etc, besides development of National Human Resource and Capacity Development Plan and assisting the State Training Institutes to develop similar plans for the states.

Quotes from different Faculty Members about functions of NIDM

- “Functions primarily confined to training activities. Other activities, though performed, are receiving less than adequate attention”
- “Training programmes are mainly supply driven and not demand driven based on needs assessment”
- “Programme development process is not based on needs assessment but is based on individuals’ perceptions and comfort level”
- “About 20-25% of programmes conducted are based on needs assessment but trainees are not deputed by state governments/central departments on that basis with the result optimum benefits could not be achieved”
- “It does not result in capacity building of state training institutes”
- “The objective apparently is to achieve numbers in terms of programmes organised and trainees trained”
- “Need to improve quality to develop replicable programmes”
- “Minimal use of in-house faculty at present and greater dependence on guest faculty; results in lack of ownership within NIDM; need to develop in-house capacity”
- “There are many training programs which are being delivered without adequate design briefs and training modules”

It has been observed from above that Faculty Members are not satisfied with the manner in which training programmes are being organised at NIDM or their real usefulness. However, there is lack of interaction among faculty members or indifference to remedy the situation. Certain targets are imposed on each faculty member and everyone tries to complete the target assigned to him/her in terms of number of training programmes and the usefulness or otherwise of the training programmes are not taken into consideration.

Besides, NIDM has no control over the participants being nominated to attend the training programmes by Central Government Departments or State Governments. There is no system to check whether participants are making use of training imparted to them or have been posted to positions where the training imparted is not of much use.

Normally, a professional training institute has to undertake some exercise before organizing training programmes. The salient steps of this exercise may be:

- Carry out Training Needs Analysis and ascertain, in participatory manner, demand for specific training programmes.
- Develop Training Design Briefs and discuss it among faculty members and other concerned stakeholders before finalizing it.
- Develop training modules based on finalized design briefs.
- Develop training materials, handouts, presentations and include practical training components such as visits, demonstrations, case studies, group discussion modalities etc
- Finalize training modules after intensive discussion in-house as well as with the concerned Ministries/Departments/State Governments to ensure the module will achieve the desired objective.
- Get nominations for training programme clearly spelling out the objective and the categories of participants who may be nominated.
- Organise training programme and get feed-back from participants about any changes which they feel may be made in the module for optimizing the benefits.
- Make necessary changes in the module, if necessary, in the design brief and develop training materials to meet the requirements of revised training module.
- The process should be a continuous exercise to ensure training briefs, modules and materials are dynamic and vibrant to meet changing needs and take into account new experience, lessons learned etc.

The process of developing training programmes and its modules has been dealt with at length in the Strategic Framework for Improvement of Training (SFIT).

Another limitation is that NIDM is not focused on the activities to be performed by it for training and capacity building. The institute should concentrate on training of policy makers and Master Resource Persons/ Trainers. It is not necessary for them to organise a large number of training programme. Its function is to build capacity in the country for imparting training. It should extend support to State level training institutes/centres by developing trainers and training modules. As the apex level institute, it should focus on quality and not quantity of training programmes in terms of numbers.

Despite the statutory mandate, NIDM has been able to develop a draft National Human Resource and Capacity Development Plan in 2013 only. Even this Plan does not work out number of people to be trained in different disciplines in the country. It is true that it would be very difficult for a National Institute to work out numbers on its own unless such an exercise has been undertaken by different state governments/ UT Administrations. NIDM could provide professional support to enable the state governments or state level training institutes to develop their respective Human Resource and Capacity Building Plans. Based on this, minimum benchmarks for personnel to be trained in different disciplines in government, public and private sector as also non-government organisations and volunteers could be worked out and a training plan finalized in consultation with the state level training institutes. It can then extend professional support to facilitate implementation of training plans of each state, undertake its monitoring and evaluation to ensure that quality of training programmes is maintained.

*Training and Capacity Development Policy*

While NIDM is organizing training programmes based on certain norms including requests from different stakeholders as also keeping in view their limitations at present, a formal well articulated policy for training and capacity development is not in place so far. It is necessary for NIDM to develop a comprehensive policy encompassing the entire country with the approval of government so that capacity building may be undertaken in all training institutes within the overall parameters of such a policy. Capacity development includes but is not restricted to training alone. Various non-training factors such as policy, strategy, work-culture, enabling environment, infrastructure and adequate finance have a major bearing on capacity to perform and produce results. Training in order to be truly effective has to be conceived and implemented as part of a larger capacity development vision and agenda for effective disaster risk reduction with a safe and sustainable development perspective. The Training Framework includes Capacity Development Vision (CDV), Capacity Development Goals (CDGs), Bench Marks including challenges, Strategy, Training Goals and Objectives, Perspective Planning, Training Methods and Approaches and Training Outputs. These aspects have been discussed at length in the White Paper which suggests a draft Training Policy. Once such a policy is in place, its implementation under the aegis of NIDM would ensure that training is imparted in a comprehensive manner by national and state training institutions in a holistic manner to achieve optimum benefits.
Training Infrastructure

The basic infrastructure at DM Cells located in ATIs/ SIRDs is available due to overall infrastructure of ATIs which is shared by DM Cells. However, in some cases, there are bottlenecks such as inadequate hostel facilities, adequate number of lecture halls, computer and GIS Labs etc. It would be desirable to undertake a study of infrastructural facilities available in different DM Cells, identify gaps which need to be filled up and draw a time bound plan in tune with availability of funds to put in place such facilities which are presently not available or are inadequate for each DM Cell.

Training modules for all stakeholders

At present, most of the DM training institutes/ Cells do not have the capacity to develop training modules for different stakeholders supported with training materials, case studies, documentation, practical components of training etc. The training modules are presently developed based on knowledge and experience of faculty members, which is unfortunately not adequate. Since training programmes at present are supply driven and not demand driven, their usefulness is also less than the desired levels. In most of the institutes, different stakeholders are being imparted training in same module which is not based on training needs analysis of different stakeholders. For instance, DM Centre at ATI, West Bengal is using the same training module for BDOs/ BDMOs and NGOs. Even in an institute like GIDM, there are no separate training modules for different stakeholders and therefore training is being imparted through guest faculty or out-sourced. However, in the case of Gujarat, the problem may be temporary as they are still in the process of recruiting faculty members. NIDM can extend technical assistance to state level training institutes to facilitate the task of developing different training modules and imparting training to faculty members in the modalities for development of such modules.

Documentation of past disasters and development of case studies

Documentation of past disasters and its analysis to develop lessons learned is a recent process. Prior to Gujarat earthquake, it was virtually unknown in the country, except, to a limited extent about drought and flood management. This practice is gradually picking up but it still is in infancy. There is also no study of traditional practices being followed, which need to be identified, analysed and certified and mainstreamed. Similarly, development of case studies has also not been taken up on a large scale. The training institutes still rely on case studies developed in other countries, which may not be totally relevant or difficult to comprehend by trainees. All training institutes therefore need to develop this competence and the stress may be more on local case studies in similar environment which can be easily comprehended by trainees and replicated in local conditions.

Process for selection of participants

In Indian context, this is almost a universally weak area. Firstly, while inviting nominations, institutes do not specifically indicate the level and duties being performed by the trainees so that it is really useful to them in discharging their responsibilities. Secondly, the training modules are not too focused for different levels of stakeholders. Thirdly, trainees are nominated by the concerned departments as per their convenience with the result that employees who need to be trained are not deputed due to so called ‘exigencies of work’. People who can be easily spared are generally deputed for training. Fourthly, training institutes have no control over selection or rejection of employees deputed. Fifthly, the nominations are received so late that the institutes are not able to select/ reject the candidates at that late stage, and sixthly, there is no system of feedback from trainees about the duties assigned to them, post-training, to enable the institutes to assess whether the training imparted is being gainfully utilized. The entire process need to be streamlined and it has to be ensured, with the cooperation of nominating departments, that training is imparted to the employees who really need it in the discharge of their duties and responsibilities; that the training is need-based and not imparted as a matter of course.
**Organizational structure of NIDM**

When the erstwhile NCDM was established in IIPA in 1995 by the Ministry of Agriculture, which was the nodal Ministry for disaster management at that point of time, the Ministry sanctioned 19 posts. This was done on an ad hoc basis since there was no perception at that point of time about the need for faculty and other support staff. Over the next few years, IIPA created additional posts as per their own rules. By the time the NIDM was established in October, 2003, there were in all 46 sanctioned posts in NIDM. However, there were some issues whether these posts had been created by IIPA as per government procedure and the entire matter is now under consideration of Ministry of Home Affairs.

At present, there are 15 faculty members including one post of Professor diverted to SAARC Disaster Management Centre and one post of Professor is presently vacant, as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Executive Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professor</td>
<td>3 (one post diverted to SDMC and one post is vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research Associate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Posts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accounts Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Computer Programmer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Junior Assistant cum Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accounts Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stenographer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Junior Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data Entry Operators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Machine Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Messengers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Driver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Library Attendant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we exclude two posts of professors who are presently not available and the post of Executive Director who is the head of the Institute, the actual faculty posts in position are 12 only, with support staff of 20. Even these posts are yet to be regularized and the matter has not been settled since October, 2003, when the Institute was established.

Considering the functions assigned to NIDM under the Disaster Management Act, 2005, the faculty size is too insignificant to take care of the duties and responsibilities of NIDM. The faculty is, therefore, primarily engaged in organizing training programmes. There are no cohesive teams or groups and each faculty member is required to organise a specific number of training programmes. In effect, there is no difference between the activities being performed by faculty members from Professors to Research Associates. Besides, the recruitment of these personnel was not made based on institute’s need analysis, it is difficult to say that all faculty members have the required capacity to discharge the duties assigned to them. There has also been no worthwhile effort to improve the
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capacity of faculty members with the result that trainings being organised are supply driven and all other functions get relegated.

Keeping in view the Vision Document, it is considered that there should be at least six operational divisions, besides Administration Division which should also provide logistic support to operational divisions. These divisions, to begin with, may be:

1. Policy, Planning & Coordination Division
2. Mitigation Division
3. Reconstruction and Recovery Division
4. Emergency Preparedness and Response Division
5. Knowledge Management, IT and publication Division
6. Climate Change Adaptation Division
7. Administration Division

Each of the six operational divisions may consist of following faculty support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each division may be assigned not more than 12 training programmes to be organised in a year. This would include Training Needs Analysis, development of design briefs, training modules and training materials, case studies, presentations, selection of trainees, feedback from trainees etc. Besides, each division may undertake research and documentation; extend support to state governments and state level training institutes and also to Central Ministries and Departments. Each division may also undertake consultancy assignments to generate internal resources. The training programmes may cover policy makers from Central and State Governments and training of Master Resource Persons.

The broad distribution of time, for the entire team taken together, may be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of training programmes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Papers</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Education</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and policy level support to Central/ State Governments and training institutes</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of workshops/seminars/conferences</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy Assignments</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other miscellaneous items of work including Support to NDMA/ MHA, Public Awareness, Media Interaction etc</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each faculty member may have his/her own area of specialization, linked to overall work of the division. The specialization could be function-specific/ disaster-specific. Such areas of specialization may be decided well in advance, before the recruitment. The entire team should work as a cohesive and well-knit unit. The Data Entry Operator may provide clerical support and Administrative Assistant may extend logistic support to the team.

The Administration Division may have a strength not exceeding 20 personnel with two Data Entry Operators only.
ED, NIDM may be supported by a Personal Assistant, a Stenographer, an Administrative Assistant and a Peon/Messenger. (Total including ED 5)

It will be desirable to have a Senior Professor or Dean to coordinate the functions of all operational divisions, if ED, NIDM is an Administrator. If ED, NIDM is a professional, then the post of Dean may not be needed and this function may be performed by him. If a Dean is in position, he may be supported by a Data Entry Operator and a Research Associate. (Total 3)

The total strength of NIDM, at the barest minimum, to begin with, may be:

1. ED, NIDM with support staff 5
2. Dean with support staff 3
3. Six operational divisions with strength of 8 each 48
4. Administration Division 20
Total 76

Additional support for services and hostels may be outsourced or engaged on contract basis, which may not exceed 10 persons.

NIDM Infrastructure

Lack of adequate infrastructure for NIDM is at present a major handicap. It should have separate spacious premises with provision for adequate number of Lecture Halls, Hostel Accommodation, Quarters for faculty members and staff with at least 50% satisfaction level, Mess Hall for trainees, computer and GIS Laboratories. While NIDM need not have separate Emergency Operations Centre for training purpose, it should have access to EOCs of MHA/NDMA for hands on training. In order to develop the infrastructure, the premises and the facilities put in place by the Gujarat Institute of Disaster Management at Gandhi Nagar could be an example worth emulating.

Need for motivation of Faculty members and other staff

During interaction with the faculty members and staff, it was noted that, by and large, they are trying to give their best output, keeping in view their respective areas of specialization and the constraints of the institute. However, it was also observed that many of them are de-motivated and frustrated and there were also under-currents of mistrust among themselves. The reasons for de-motivation and frustration eventually came out and may be summarized as follows:

- The faculty feels they should have more flexibility to do the job as they would like to do.
- They are by and large not satisfied with the manner in which they were performing the job which, according to some of them, was in a mechanical way.
- Need for autonomy and collective decision.
- There is no element of research in their functions which, according to them, is necessary for their learning and improving their performance, which in turn will result in better job satisfaction.
- The emphasis in the performance of their duties should be more broad-based and, besides training, there should be more emphasis on academic efforts were need to be encouraged.
- There was also discontentment due to lack of sanctioned permanent posts with the result that they were not certain of their future; as of now they were not even eligible for pension.
- Need to improve promotion prospects to motivate the faculties, who have more than 12-15 years of experience.
- There is need to reduce the number of training programmes; and have more emphasis on the quality of training programmes. At present, the faculty members do not have much time to properly develop design briefs, focused training module, training materials and pre-testing of training modules and further revising it on that basis.
- There is need to promote team work.
View of Faculty

- There must be pension provision for the family.
- I have put in more than 15 years of service and I am still temporary.
- The system should give adequate autonomy to faculty members to work, as per our perception.
- Allow some flexibility to work for job satisfaction which will bring credit to NIDM.

Need for trust building

- The working environment is stressful. There is need for confidence building among faculty members.
- Even for attending to our work, we do not get necessary facilities since the institute does not have adequate autonomy.
- The quality of work performed, including manner of organizing training programmes, should get more attention.

- Faculty members need to meet frequently to discuss professional issues. There is need for brainstorming sessions.
- They hardly have time for doing Training Needs Analysis and developing training modules in a methodical manner. If they did these jobs, they would not be able to complete the targets set for them. It was obvious that the targets of training programmes to be organised, according to most of the faculty members, were too ambitious.

Coordination

There should be a better coordination mechanism in force. Normally, if one or two faculty members develop a design brief or training module or even training material, it is discussed in the meeting of all faculty members and problem areas are thrashed out before finalizing it. These practices need to be restored and, if not in existence earlier, need to be introduced.

NIDM needs to instill confidence among the faculty members and encourage them to bring forward their own ideas as also allow some flexibility in the manner of working. It should also be a priority task for the Institute and MHA to take care of the administrative issues agitating the faculty and staff and share with them the efforts being made to find early solutions to their problems. There is also need to initiate efforts to develop team spirit among faculty members which may go a long way in putting the institute on a positive track and the faculty members in a better frame of mind. For this purpose, regular interaction/meetings with the entire faculty together in a friendly and informal way may yield encouraging results.

Financial Support

The NIDM has to be financed primarily from government sources. However, over a period of years, it would be advisable that NIDM generate their internal resources to reduce the burden on Government. This could be achieved through:

1. Fee based Training Programmes
2. International Programmes
3. Consultancy assignments
5. Projects
6. Publications
7. Service Charges for the outside agencies for using facility of NIDM.
It would be desirable for NIDM’s Divisions to take up consultancy assignments such as preparation of Disaster Management Plans for private sector including industries or take up projects on behalf of World Bank/UN Organisations as implementing agency or charge fee for imparting training to corporate sector nominees. To begin with, say after about an year, if each of the six operational divisions of NIDM take up assignments worth Rs. 50 lakh each every year, which is a modest target, resources can be raised up to Rs. 300 lakh. Assuming that 33% of the amount is paid to Institute as “fee” and the rest of the amount is distributed to the team undertaking the consultancy assignment, the internal resources of NIDM would be about Rs 100 lakh every year and, to this extent, the budgetary support needed by NIDM would get reduced. Gradually, NIDM may endeavour to further increase the amount of consultancy assignments. Besides helping in generation of internal resources for the institute, it will also give monetary incentive to the teams working as Consultants. The faculty members, however, should not be allowed to spend more than 10% of their time on consultancy assignments to ensure that their normal functions do not suffer in the process. An added advantage of this arrangement is that the experience gained as consultants would also help the faculty to discharge its functions in a more gainful manner. At present, faculties of IITs are allowed to take up consultancy assignments and similar arrangements may be put in place for NIDM also.

National Institute of Disaster Management
- NIDM is at present focused on organizing training programmes only and its other functions as laid down in the Act are getting relegated.
- NIDM has to be selective in undertaking training programmes such as for policy makers at Central and State level, training of trainers, development of training modules and test check of such modules etc.
- NIDM is not merely a training institute. It has to perform several other functions also such as research and education, documentation, development of national level information base, extending professional and policy support to Central and State Government and State Training Institutes etc.
- The institute should concentrate on training of policy makers and Master Resource Persons/Trainers. It is not necessary for them to organise a large number of training programmes.
- It should extend support to State level training institutes/centres by developing trainers and training modules. As the apex level institute, it should focus on quality and not quantity of training programmes in terms of numbers.
- It should also extend support to State level training institutes to develop State Training and Capacity Development Policy, Training Infrastructure, training modules for all stakeholders, Documentation of past disasters and development of case studies and process for selection of participants

Organizational Structure of NIDM
- NIDM should have seven divisions such as Policy, Planning & Coordination Division, Mitigation Division, Reconstruction and Recovery Division, Emergency Preparedness and Response Division, Knowledge Management, IT and publication Division, Climate Change Adaptation Division, and Administration Division.
- Each of the six operational divisions may consist of one professor, one Associate Professor, two Assistant Professors, two Research Associates, one Data Entry Operator and one Administrative Assistant, making a total of 8 for each operational division. The strength of Administration Division may be restricted to 20. ED, NIDM may be supported by a Personal Assistant, a Stenographer, an Administrative Assistant and a Peon/Messenger. (Total including ED 5)
- It will be desirable to have a Senior Professor or Dean to coordinate the functions of all operational divisions, if ED, NIDM is an Administrator. If ED, NIDM is a professional, then the post of Dean may not be needed and this function may be performed by him. If a Dean is in position, he may be supported by a Data Entry Operator and a Research Associate. (Total 3)
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- NIDM infrastructure is at present poor. It should have separate spacious premises with provision for adequate number of Lecture Halls, Hostel Accommodation, Quarters for faculty members and staff with at least 50% satisfaction level, Mess Hall for trainees, computer and GIS Laboratories.
- The broad distribution of time, for the entire team taken together may be as follows:
  1. Organisation of training programmes 25%
  2. Publication of Papers 10%
  3. Research and Education 15%
  4. Documentation 10%
  5. Professional and policy level support to Central/ State Governments and training institutes 10%
  6. Organisation of workshops/seminars/conferences 10%
  7. Consultancy Assignments 10%
  8. Other miscellaneous items of work including Support to NDMA/ MHA, Public Awareness, Media Interaction etc 10%

Total 100%

- There is need to motivate faculty members and facilitate interaction and coordination among them through regular meetings.
- The NIDM has to be financed primarily from government sources. However, over a period of years, it would be advisable that NIDM generate their internal resources to reduce the burden on Government.
- It would be desirable for NIDM’s Divisions to take up consultancy assignments such as preparation of Disaster Management Plans for private sector including industries or take up projects on behalf of World Bank/ UN Organisations as implementing agency or charge fee for...

Concluding Interaction with ED, NIDM

After having gone through the draft of review and evaluation of institutions, and particularly the section related to NIDM, ED, NIDM made the following observations in his concluding interaction with the Study Team:

(i) Several suggestions made in the report relating to NIDM were good and the effort of institute would be to implement these suggestions.
(ii) While NIDM is not a training institute only, it is also a fact that training is the key activity of the Institute. Besides, training programmes are being organised for different stakeholders.
(iii) Training delivery is quite diverse. Besides, conventional face to face training, NIDM is also organising web-based training, satellite-based training and self-study courses.
(iv) More than 50% of face to face training programmes are being organised off-campus at ATIs etc in different states which facilitates capacity building of DM Cells. Besides training, NIDM is also undertaking capacity building projects, post-disaster investigation and documentation projects, hazard mapping, vulnerability analysis and risk assessment,
developing tools and techniques for DRR training and capacity building, and networking and knowledge collaboration. The details can be perused in the Annual Reports.

(v) Faculty Members are encouraged to write and publish papers in their respective areas of specialization. However, while few faculty members take lot of interest, some others don’t take much interest in this activity.

(vi) Institute has also taken information and communication technology initiatives.

(vii) A number of training modules have been developed and published by NIDM.

(viii) NIDM also organizes and participates in several workshops/seminars/conferences.

(ix) Despite above, it is true that there is potential for further growth of institute, as brought out by the Study Team also. The endeavour of the institute would be tap the additional areas in disaster risk reduction.

(x) As for autonomy, it is a fact that institute has certain limitations. Being a statutory body, it has to function within the overall system of government rules and regulations. However, a system of giving additional facilities to faculty members for discharge of their duties would be put in place through consultations with all faculty members subject to the limitation that it should be within the powers of NIDM.

(xi) ED, NIDM will also hold periodic meetings with faculty members to address any issues which are coming in the way of discharge of their duties.

(xii) There will be an effort to develop team spirit and provide a forum for discussion among faculty members on design briefs, training modules, need assessment and other professional activities.

(xiii) It is true that the officers and staff are frustrated and de-motivated due to lack of regular posts and benefits normally admissible to government employees. However, with persistent effort on the part of ED, NIDM the recruitment rules have been finalized and approved by MHA and the Ministry will notify it very soon. Further, it has been ensured that a saving clause is included in the recruitment rules so that these do not affect adversely the faculty already in position.

(xiv) ED, NIDM expressed his personal anguish on non availability of pensionary and other retirement benefits to NIDM staff, particularly in the background of two unfortunate deaths of institute’s employees and assured that to ensure these benefits are extended to institute’s staff is his top priority.

In conclusion it may be stated that the Institute is still in the process of evolvement. It is however a fact that its development has not been to the extent which should have been expected over 11 years, when the institute was established as a separate body in October, 2003. At the same time, actions have been initiated, both on administrative and professional sides, to further improve its functioning and address faculty members’ and staff’s grievances, if justified and to the extent feasible. Various suggestions/recommendations made in this section of the report need urgent consideration and, after approval of competent authority, implementation on priority basis. Within the Institute also, there is need for confidence building among faculty members and a feeling of mutual trust and participation.
ANNEX 1: NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

I. Institutional Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outputs</th>
<th>Areas of intervention</th>
<th>Agencies/sectors to be involved and resource linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Roles and responsibilities of the NDMA</td>
<td>2. All kinds of disasters (except drought)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Policies for disaster reduction and Mitigation</td>
<td>3. Amendment of existing laws, procedures, instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparedness at all levels</td>
<td>4. Differentiate pre, during and post-disaster roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Response Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relief and rehab coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Enactment and amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of state departments of disaster management and Authority, if necessary</td>
<td>Same as above With state specific provisions and needs</td>
<td>Same as above With other state level institutions - capacity building of such departments/authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution of Disaster Management Committees under District Magistrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Disaster Prevention/Mitigation

| Risk/Vulnerability assessment and dissemination       | Disaster specific multi-hazard risk zonation at least up to district level on regular basis | Committee of BMTPC, CSIR, IITs, NIC, CWC, IMD etc. to do it every 5 years                                           |
| Multi-hazard vulnerability mapping on regular basis | Lead sectoral institutions (Planning commission, Ministry of Water Resources, Dept. Of Science & Technology etc.) to do it every 5 years |
| Risk and vulnerability awareness campaign | Universities & Research institutes need to undertake risk and vulnerability studies. |
| Preventive structural measures developed and incorporated in all public and private development initiatives | DAVP-mass communication- print and electronic media, department of education-curriculum of schools and colleges |
| | Development of IEC resource materials and dissemination by MHA through all line ministries at state levels-local self bodies, National and State NGOs |
| | Network of national and state NGOs to be involved |
| | Development of IEC resource materials and dissemination by MHA through all line ministries, State Govts, local self-bodies. |

- Multi-hazard vulnerability mapping on regular basis
- Lead sectoral institutions (Planning commission, Ministry of Water Resources, Dept. Of Science & Technology etc.) to do it every 5 years
- Universities & Research institutes need to undertake risk and vulnerability studies.
- DAVP-mass communication- print and electronic media, department of education-curriculum of schools and colleges
- Development of IEC resource materials and dissemination by MHA through all line ministries at state levels-local self bodies, National and State NGOs
- Network of national and state NGOs to be involved
- Development of IEC resource materials and dissemination by MHA through all line Ministries, State Govts, local self-bodies.
### III. Early Warning System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Level</th>
<th>Advanced hazard-tracking systems for climatological and geological hazards</th>
<th>Multi-disaster intelligence/ surveillance system in the country using existing network of NICs, CWC stations, IMD stations. NDMA to take up multi-disaster surveillance thru existing network of agencies. Wherever necessary to get these upgraded. Dedicated MetSAT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community/village/Panchayat/Block/district, State and national disaster mitigation/reduction strategy and plans.</td>
<td>Strong social mobilization and awareness campaigns</td>
<td>Ongoing central schemes to have “disaster mitigation project” component-MORD, MOTA, MOWR, MOA MOHFW etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased participation in decentralized planning</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster appraisal to be one of the integral components of the development plan</td>
<td>Support from donor agencies and Banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and prepare mitigation projects for inclusion in the development plans and implementation with earmarked allocation.</td>
<td>Encourage foreign direct investments and third party financing in mitigation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Hazard warning-vulnerability modeling for each state/district on GIS platform</td>
<td>Larger number of parameters taken into the modeling techniques used to minimize uncertainty element and to determine areas likely to be affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State-of-the-art Emergency Operations Centre (MHA) with full-time professionals</td>
<td>The existing institutional infrastructure of National Informatics centres can form a backbone of system of building disaster inventories (Cataloguing past disasters-parameters and lesions learnt).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stand bye EOC at another location in the country</td>
<td>Better anticipation of Impending disaster and its impact as an integral part of “decision support system”-anticipation impact levels to act as trigger for preventive action at different levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mobile EOCs</td>
<td>Train multi-disciplinary team in EOC operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing disaster inventories for analysis of trends and tendencies.</td>
<td>All equipment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computers with VSAT communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SATPHONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large video screens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maps/bulletin boards/charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk and vulnerability assessment maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-day stockpile of essential commodities/consumables in the EOC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department of Irrigation, Agriculture, IMD
### IV. Disaster Preparedness, Mitigation and Response

| Community based village preparedness mitigation and response plans | Enhance community capacity in all multi-hazard prone states and districts to respond effectively to disasters in future. | Setting up DMCs and DMTs in each village in hazard prone areas.  
Train them to develop their preparedness and response plans:  
- village inventory  
- safe shelters  
- stock piling of relief material  
- evacuation plan  
Mainstream these plans with annual development plans of all Panchayats and local bodies  
Train DMTs in all response functions such as early warning dissemination, search and rescue, first aid, trauma management, shelter and livelihood loss prevention techniques etc.  
Mainstream capacity building of the teams with programme extension of all line departments  
Mock drills of the community and Panchayats at regular intervals. |

| District disaster preparedness and response plans | Enhance capacity of the district team to respond to disasters:  
- District preparedness and response | Specialized training of the members of the DMT at district and sub-district levels  
Mock drills at regular intervals |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preparation Long Term Training and Capacity Building Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction in India, under NCRMP:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Review of Institutions, Strategy for Standardisation &amp; Mechanism for setting up of DRR Institute along with its Capacity Building Strategy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State preparedness and response plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>National level preparedness and response plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance capacity of the state administration to respond to disaster</td>
<td>Specialised and self-contained Search and Rescue Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- state preparedness and response plans</td>
<td>Hydrological disasters (cyclones and floods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State inventory of resources and gaps</td>
<td>Nuclear/Radiological/Chemical/Biological disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Const of State DMT and training</td>
<td>Geological disasters (eq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State response teams for evacuation, search and rescue, road and debris clearance, health, trauma management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level preparedness and response plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Web-enabled and easy-to-access inventory of resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution of State Disaster Rapid Action Force with one company of the Armed Reserve Police of all Battalion to be trained as rapid response teams with other members drawn from health, PWD, Forest, Fire</td>
<td>Link all Inventories at all levels thru a web-link-to be designated as National Inventory of Disaster Equipments (NIDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water rescue</td>
<td>Nic connectivity to be used for the purpose-or-a dedicated link between national and state DMAs could be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collapsed structure rescue</td>
<td>Periodical census of NIDEs including using secondary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fire rescue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One company of the Armed Reserve Police to be trained as rapid response teams with other members drawn from Health, PWD, Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V. Human resource development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National capacity building as a national agenda</th>
<th>Development of capacity building plans including national trg plan (NTP)---need assessment of the skill sets and quantity and their availability</th>
<th>Bring all national trg institutions including corporate sector trg facilities together in a network. Mainstreaming disaster management trg with all induction courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialised training facilities set up</td>
<td>---- do ----</td>
<td>Identify existing specialised trg institutes--NISA, NCDC, NFSC etc.- include corporate sector trg facilities as well. Teleconferencing facility to be made available in all training institutions at national/state levels like NCDM, ATIs, NIRD and SIRDs so that large number of officials can be trained in a short period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional human resource available in the country for all DM operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professionals</td>
<td>Include crisis prevention response and recovery, and trauma management in MBBS curriculum</td>
<td>Working with AICME and ICMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers, Planners and Architects</td>
<td>Include hazard mitigation technologies including knowledge of all techno-legal provisions in degree and PG courses</td>
<td>Working with AICTE and CSIR to achieve safer habitat and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture universities</td>
<td>Include crisis prevention response and recovery in Agricultural sector in degree and PG course</td>
<td>Working with ICAR for risk reduction in livelihood sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Govt. functionaries at all levels receive basic training in basic preparedness and response functions</td>
<td>(1) Create centres for training of trainees (2) Create facilities in all post recruitment training institutions for categories of staff</td>
<td>NCDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All India Services</td>
<td>All IAS, IPS and IFS officers undergo basic trg in DM after recruitment</td>
<td>Set up DM Cells in LBSNAA, SBPNPA, IGNFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central services</td>
<td>Services such as IRTS, IDES, ICCES also could be provided exposure to special orientation programs</td>
<td>Rail tragedy airport and seaport tragedy, defence ammunition storage hazard response etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State administrative services</td>
<td>Initial rectt trg to include modules on DM in all ATIs, PTCs and other state</td>
<td>Include the same in refresher and promotion course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trg institutes (SIRD, SLI, SiHFW etc.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District cadres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All district cadre staff-village extension officers, health workers, agriculture extension workers, revenue functionaries etc. have to undergo trg in DM functions at the time of their induction trg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Training Institutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local self-govt. representatives and staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All elected representatives and staff of LSGs to be provided trg in DM at the time of their assumption of office along with basic trg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for refresher trg programmes especially in high-risk zones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs/CBOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The representatives of national/state/district/local level NGO/CBOs to be provided training on disaster management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to be provided by the National and state level training institutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College students i.e. NCC/NSS/Scout &amp; Guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of youth organisations and the students should be provided training in the emergency response and public awareness generation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and colleges need to prepare a volunteer force by orienting students in emergency response and public awareness generation through various co-curricular activities like drawing, essay, poster and debate competitions and skill training in emergency response i.e. drills, simulation exercises etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public awareness and community training.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness generation of the local community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of the community at local level to impart skill training like mock drills, rehearsals etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among various alternatives, visual media like television and film can be utilised in Social preparation and public awareness generation. Specific programmes on disaster management be telecasted in various TV channels like Gyan Darshan, Discovery Channels etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media professionals of Doordarshan and private TV Channels and Film producers can be sensitised and encouraged to integrate DM components in different programmes for public awareness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>