## **Terms of Reference**

### **Strengthening Disaster Risk Governance Framework in India:** Learnings from global best practices

#### 1. Background and rationale

Emergency response and disaster risk management (DRM) systems worldwide have been challenged in 2020 given the contingencies created by COVID-19. This has not only included management of the pandemic itself (for which, the role of DRM institutions has been varied across different country contexts) but also towards managing the fall-out of the pandemic management policies as well as the onslaught of dual disasters such as cyclones, floods, heat waves, landslides and earthquakes occurring in the COVID-19 context. Countries have continued to adapt to the evolving scenario, often learning from the experiences of other countries. Even as the pandemic continues to be a formidable threat, the experience gathered thus far has revealed both strengths and gaps in the existing DRM systems as well as the need for learning from different country contexts.

In the 15 years since the Disaster Management Act (2005) was passed India, the disaster risk governance framework has evolved significantly at the national and sub-national levels with India often taking leadership positions on advancing regional and international action on DRM. At the same time, many envisioned outcomes are yet to be achieved fully, for example, localisation of action, integration of disaster resilience concerns into development planning, regulation of risk creation, systemic capacity building, and adequate risk perception in & action by citizenry. Climate change impact and now COVID-19 have further affirmed the need for ongoing improvements in risk governance as the risk context continues to evolve.

With the recognition that this process of learning will need to be continuous and involve iterative explorations of different aspects of DRM systems, an initial small-scale study is planned to understand lessons that can be learnt from existing good practices in select countries such as USA, Canada, Germany, Japan, Australia, Turkey, Indonesia and Philippines.

#### 2. Objective of the Study

To undertake an analysis of the DRM systems and processes in select countries and highlight good practices that could be adopted for the Indian context.

#### 3. Scope of Services

It is expected that the selection of country examples and ensuing analysis is towards developing a better understanding of the following DRM aspects:

- Structure of the concerned Department/Agency/Institutions;
- Functions of the concerned Department/Agency/Institutions;
- Capture important features of core risk governance process and organization capacity;
- Measures undertaken for disaster risk reduction;

- Integration of resilience into development planning and growth;
- Interface between Government and private sector;
- Role of education institutions;
- Role of voluntary sector;
- Some case studies indicating how lessons are drawn from disasters.

Some indicative questions the study should explore through country examples are given in Annex 1. The study is envisioned as a broad system-level review, rather than exhaustive review of any one institution. In light of the COVID-19 related travel restrictions, this study is expected to be based largely on review of existing secondary literature, with web-based consultations with key stakeholders if needed. The duration of the study will be 3 months from the start of the contract, with fortnightly review meetings (web-based) with the commissioning agency i.e. NDMA, GoI.

**4. Final Deliverables and time schedule for completion of task:** The time period for the assignment is 03 months form the date of signing the contract.

S. No.	Deliverable	Timeline	
1.	Inception Report outlining the study design - including framework of analysis/ areas of enquiry and analysis, methods, and tools	Within 10 days of signing the contract	
2.	Draft Report	Within 60 days of signing the contract	
3.	Final Report	Within 90 days of signing the contract	

#### 5. Data, Services and Facilities to be provided by the client:

i. Relevant/ available data from the Govt. Agencies/ Depts. will be provided to the Consultant on request. For this purpose, the Consultant will have to co-ordinate with the concerned Govt. agency/ Depts. for obtaining data in the required format. PMU, NDMA will facilitate acquisition of data from Govt. agencies.

# 6. Procedure for review of progress reports, inception, status, final draft and final reports along with the composition of review committee to monitor consultants work.

i. Consultant will submit deliverables to PMU (NCRMP), NDMA as per the time schedule. PMU will get the deliverable reviewed by a Review Committee, duly constituted for the assignment and confirm the acceptance/ non-acceptance to the Consultant. Invoice will be initiated by the Consultant only after the acceptance of the deliverable.

S. No.	Key Position	Number	Area of Specific ExpertiseMinimum Qualification anddesiredProfessionalExperienceDesiredDesiredDesired
1	Team Leader	01	<ul> <li>Significant (minimum 15 years) global experience in disaster risk governance, disaster risk management (DRM) policy and institutional mechanisms;</li> <li>Multi-country experience in the DRM sector will be an asset;</li> <li>Previous experience of working with/ research on national and sub-national DRM agencies, including conducting consultative processes with senior government officials and</li> <li>Qualifications: PhD and Post graduate in Disaster Studies/ Planning/ Development Studies/ Engineering/ Management / Economics.</li> <li>Multi-country experience of working with/ research on national and sub-national DRM agencies, including conducting consultative processes with senior government officials and</li> </ul>
2	Expert	02	<ul> <li>drafting policy notes, white papers;</li> <li>Solid analytical, research and policy review skills;</li> <li>Experience of working in complex projects and ability to deliver in strict timelines with good quality;</li> <li>Sound writing, report-writing and articulating skills in English in the DRM sector;</li> <li>Minimum 10 years of experience mainly in disaster research studies, analytical skills and report writing, capacity assessments and stakeholder</li> </ul>

## 7. List of key professional positions whose CV and experience would be evaluated.

#### Annex 1: Indicative questions to be explored through country-examples

- (i) How are the lead disaster management agencies in these 8 countries (USA, Canada, Germany, Japan, Australia, Turkey, Indonesia and Philippines) organized? What are different parts / constituents of these agencies?
- (ii) What are the strengths of agencies in these countries, in terms of professional competence, staff, management practices, linkages, training capacities, etc.
- (iii) What are the disaster management functions carried out by these agencies? How is their standing within the overall DRM structure?
- (iv) How do these agencies work laterally with other ministries / agencies and horizontally with lower jurisdictions?
- (v) How are these agencies funded?
- (vi) Are there good examples of structure and functions of DRM institutions (Agencies/ Authorities) in these countries that have demonstrated effective delivery of risk mitigation, emergency response functions, risk informed development planning and can be adapted for the Indian context?
- (vii) What can be learnt from good practices for disaster risk reduction (primarily **mitigation and prevention/avoidance**) measures in these countries, that can be adapted for the Indian context?
- (viii) What are some good examples of policies, institutional arrangements or practices for integrating **resilience concerns** into development and sectoral planning (including interface between DRM agencies and other departments)?
- (ix) What are good practices (including policies) for institutionalising and encouraging **private sector's** role in DRM (including business continuity planning and procurement practices) and governing collaborative action with the government?
- (x) What are some good examples regarding how countries have **conceptualized overarching risk governance frameworks**, for example the principle of 'risk- sharing' in Japan underpins the design and functioning of institutions?
- (xi) What are good practices for empowering **civil society** for civil society contributions in DRM and driving collaborative action with the government?
- (xii) What are some good examples of policies, institutional arrangements, financing arrangements, or practices for better governance of **emerging risks**, such as those from climate change and pandemics like COVID-19?

- (xiii) What are good examples of policies, institutional arrangements, or practices that have enabled large-scale citizen participation, sustained volunteerism, and mainstreaming of DRM into **culture and society**?
- (xiv) What are some good examples of policies and institutions that enable **regulation** of risk creation in a political economy context like India's?
- (xv) What are good practices for **risk financing** that can be integrated into/adapted for the Indian context?
- (xvi) What are the existing good practices for institutionalising **DRM capacity building** and fostering leadership for risk governance, especially amongst those who are underrepresented such as women, LGBTQ, persons with disability, and other marginalised social groups?
- (xvii) Are there good practices for **urban disaster risk management/ urban resilience**, that can be adopted?

\*\*\*\*\*\*