EARLY RECOVERY AND RISK REDUCTION

Lessons Learned by PMI-IFRC

Yogyakarta & Central Java Earthquake
• Earthquake on 26 May 2006
• Two provinces of Java seriously impacted
• At least 6,200 dead
• Over 2 million people affected
• Over 327,000 homes destroyed or seriously damaged
  – Man made disaster
• Reached nearly 120,000 families by Nov 2006

• This included:
  – 11,877 tents
  – 110,944 tarpaulins
  - 100,000 hygiene kits, sarongs & food parcels
  - Extensive public health, water and sanitation & psycho social support programs
ER NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- Mapped poverty with damage & loss
- Assessed impact on community coping strategies and vulnerabilities
- Participatory processes used
- Also participated in GOI – World Bank led damage & loss assessment mission
FINDINGS

- Analysis pinpointed 2 vulnerable sub-districts not well covered by other agencies
- Communities identified shelter as most pressing need - closely linked to livelihoods issues
- GOI owner self build program likely to take time to get started – rainy season coming
PILOT ER PROGRAM

Small Cash Grants Via Traditional Mutual Support Mechanism

- To neighborhood groups to buy tools & basic materials and build temporary shelters (17,000 over 6-8 months)
- Funds delivered through group bank account in tranches
- Community contributes labour and materials recovered from rubble
BUILDING BACK BETTER

• Cooperation with local universities
  – Technical inputs to design and messages
  – Posters, pamphlets, t-shirts, etc
  – Students trained to deliver “build back better” messages under staff supervision

• Involvement of local media
  – Radio, TV, print reinforced the messages
COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

- Live-in teams – one team per village
- All documentation, especially financial information, on a public notice board
- Audio visual materials and training
- Regular formal community consultation
INFORMASI PROGRAM
OMAH ing MANGSA RENDHEN
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IMPLEMENTATION

- 2 months to reach agreement on approach
- 1 month for community preparation
- 1 week to build 740 “model” houses through public competition
- Then the take off point was reached ....
RESULTS (+)

- Thousands of shelters built
- Communities empowered
- Trust/friendship with our local partners
- People able to return to work
- Vulnerable people reached – no conflict
- Financial skills learned
- “Has turned tragedy into opportunity”
RESULTS (-)

- Targets/expectations too high

- A deeper outreach strategy needed to ensure women’s full participation

- “Competition” from other programs
NEXT STEPS

- PMI capacity increased to build upon this work
- Continue to work with communities, building on trust established through shelter provision
- PMI volunteer teams doing multi-sector mapping
- Further recovery, disaster preparedness and risk reduction activities with communities
LESSONS LEARNED

- Empowering communities to lead their own recovery does work but takes time & resources
- Meaningful risk reduction at community level requires this, along with good local partnerships
- Simplicity and good, clear communications key
- Shelter can be an effective lead-in activity but should not be done in isolation from livelihoods
- Cash-based approaches can build ownership, give flexibility & support local business recovery
ACHIEVING GOOD RECOVERY & RISK REDUCTION OUTCOMES IN SHELTER/HOUSING:

IT IS NOT ABOUT BUILDING STRUCTURES

IT IS ABOUT BUILDING TRUST WITH COMMUNITIES