

Children on the Frontline

Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction



Children on the Frontline

A child-centred complement to the report of the Global Network of NGOs

Views from the Frontline

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Plan International and World Vision International would like to acknowledge the children and young people involved in the surveys discussed herein, and all those children and young people engaged in DRR work around the world. Over 1,000 respondents took part in the surveys, from the 17 countries, 854 of whom were children and young people. Of these, 44% were girls and 56% were boys.

Plan country offices that participated in the research include: Bangladesh, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Indonesia, Malawi, Nepal, Nicaragua, Philippines, and Sierra Leone.

World Vision offices that participated in the research include: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Pakistan, and Swaziland. Mali, Uzbekistan, Romania and Myanmar expressed intent to engage in two years time.

We would also like to acknowledge the support of our partner organisations for the forthcoming side event at the 2009 Global Platform on DRR, UNICEF and Save the Children Alliance.

For the photographs, acknowledgement are due to Plan International's photographers and ImageBank.

Finally, many thanks are due to the authors, contributors, and reviewers of this report. At Plan UK: Daniel Walden, Nick Hall, Kelly Hawrylyshyn, and Phoebe Farag Mikhail; at World Vision: Melisa Bodenhamer; at UNICEF: Antony Spalton; and at Save the Children: Lydia Baker. This project would not have been possible without the dedication in particular of Plan UK staff in London, who undertook a coordinating function throughout.

About Plan

Founded over 70 years ago, Plan International is one of the largest child centred community development organisations, working in 62 countries on projects and initiatives that address the causes of poverty and its consequences for children's lives. Plan works with children, their families and communities to build a world where children are safe, healthy and capable of realising their full potential.



Plan's approach to sustainable development takes place through our child centred community development programme framework, based on a rights-based approach, guided by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Our programme interventions are focused on: health; education; habitat; livelihoods; disaster risk reduction and emergency response; and building relationships between the developing and developed countries through development education and advocacy.

<http://www.plan-uk.org/>

About World Vision

World Vision is a Christian humanitarian organisation dedicated to working with children, families and communities to overcome poverty and injustice. Motivated by our Christian faith, World Vision is dedicated to working with the world's most vulnerable people. World Vision serves all people regardless of religion, race, ethnicity or gender.



<http://www.worldvision.org>

CHILDREN ON THE FRONTLINE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOXES AND TABLES	2
LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
I. INTRODUCTION and PROJECT BACKGROUND	7
II. AN OVERVIEW: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S INCLUSION AND ACTIVITIES IN DRR	10
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA	13
Quick Reference	13
1. Priority for Action 1 – GOVERNANCE	14
1.1 Discussion	14
1.2 Recommendations and Good Practices	15
1.3 Conclusion	16
2. Priority for Action 2 – RISK ASSESSMENT, MONITORING & WARNING	17
2.1 Discussion	17
2.2 Recommendations and Good Practices	18
2.3 Conclusion	18
3. Priority for Action 3 – KNOWLEDGE AND EDUCATION	19
3.1 Discussion	19
3.2 Recommendations and Good Practices	20
3.3 Conclusion	20
4. Priority for Action 4 – UNDERLYING RISK FACTORS	22
4.1 Discussion	22
4.2 Recommendations and Good Practices	23
4.3 Conclusion	24
5. Priority for Action 5 – DISASTER PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE	25
5.1 Discussion	25
5.2 Recommendations and Good Practices	26
5.3 Conclusion	27
6. CROSSCUTTING ISSUES	28
6.1 Discussion	28
6.3 Recommendations and Good Practices	30
6.4 Conclusion	30
IV. OVERALL: HIGHS & LOWS	31
V. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAYS FORWARD	33
APPENDIX 1	36
APPENDIX 2	37
APPENDIX 3	38
REFERENCES	39

BOXES AND TABLES

Box 1	HFA Priorities for Action: Overall scores according to child focus groups	Table 1	Average scores by country: Governance
Box 2	Slow Progress: Scores of respondent countries by Priority for Action	Table 2	Average scores by country: Risk Assessment, Monitoring & Warning
Box 3	Overall scores by region	Table 3	Average scores by country: Knowledge and Education
Box 4	Changing traditional approaches to DRR in the Philippines	Table 4	Average scores by country: Underlying Risk Factors
Box 5	Bangladesh: Promoting children's action in Disaster Management Governance	Table 5	Average scores by country: Preparedness and Response
Box 6	Children monitoring and warning in El Salvador	Table 6	Average scores by country: Cross-cutting issues
Box 7	Work with schools/Ministry of Education		
Box 8	Indonesia and the Philippines: Raising awareness through theatre		
Box 9	Saving stones and staving of flood in El Salvador		
Box 10	Seed grant initiatives for reducing risk in the Philippines		
Box 11	Philippines: Playing an active role in disaster response helps children recover and feel part of their community		
Box 12	Total Participation graph, girls boys		
Box 13	Average focus group responses, gender disaggregated		

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCC	Children in a Changing Climate
CFG	Child Focus Group
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CYP	Children and Young People
DIPECHO	European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office's Disaster Preparedness Programme
DM	Disaster Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GN	Global Network of NGOs for Disaster Risk Reduction
GPDRR	Global Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction
IDS	Institute for Development Studies
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LG	Local Government
LGU	Local Government Unit
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PFA	HFA Priority for Action
UNCRC	United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The experience of NGOs, including Plan International and World Vision International, confirms that children, who represent 50% of the world's population, can and do play invaluable roles in planning and implementing disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation activities. In spite of this evidence, children are, by and large, excluded from the activities that contribute to building the resilience of their local communities. Children must be engaged as a vital part of the civil society mechanism that monitors HFA progress, which the *Views from the Frontline* survey has sought to establish. This report describes key findings from a global survey which was designed to validate this argument.

The survey asked children and young people, local government officials, civil society organisations (CSOs) and community representatives what they thought about the inclusion of marginalised groups such as children in the five DRR areas of action deemed essential by governments when they signed up to the Hyogo Framework for Action, and what impact this may have on the resilience of the community. The mixed-method survey determined to create a snapshot of the 'state of affairs' with regards to children's resilience to disasters at the local level, setting a ground-breaking baseline against which future progress in implementing the HFA in this specific area could be measured.

The key findings of the survey provide four primary conclusions:


1. Children and young people are not satisfied with what is being done to prevent or mitigate disaster risks. They are convinced that including them, as young citizens, would be helpful, both in building their own resilience and improving DRR governance and resilience of the community as a whole.
2. Adults are not satisfied either. Respondents from local government, from civil society organisations, and from the wider community believe that while some progress is being made to include children in DRR, this is only happening to a very limited extent. Achieving success with the HFA Priorities for Action (PFA) requires concerted efforts on the part of all stakeholders, particularly children, to support and protect the wellbeing of present and future generations. This survey shows that there is still a very long way to go with the HFA. These conclusions highlight and support the findings of the GN *Views from the Frontline* Survey.
3. Although an enabling environment for children's inclusion is lacking in many cases, the survey indicates that attention to PFA 3 is a top priority. For children and young people, *education and knowledge is the foundation for more effective achievement of all remaining HFA goals*. The survey also found that education alone is not enough. If 50% or more of the world's population – the cohort of children and young people – are to actively contribute to DRR, they need encouragement and technical support: Once children develop new knowledge and skills, this survey shows that they are not being helped to apply that knowledge or to put those skills into action particularly to deliver on PFA 2, 4 and 5.
4. The survey found that in countries *where the contribution that children can make to DRR is embraced, HFA progress is more likely than in countries where cultural attitudes prevent children and young people from speaking out*. It is not surprising that this survey also confirms that opinions and attitudes about children vary considerably according to local, cultural, social and political circumstances. In societies where children and young people are not granted access to quality education and pertinent information, nor encouraged to become responsible young citizens, HFA goals will remain unmet.

Good governance – the first of the HFA Priorities for Action – is the foundation of DRR. It establishes the necessary principles and structures for ensuring inclusive participation, ownership and accountability in implementing the HFA. This includes the ownership and participation of children and young people – those most affected by disasters but the least responsible for their occurrence¹. Better governance will also prioritise universal and appropriate education and effective awareness raising. Evidence supports the argument that *good governance and education (both formal and informal) are mutually reinforcing*. An informed and motivated citizenry will ensure good governance on DRR, and good governance will thrive on the input of proactive citizens.


¹ See, for example, Save the Children (2008)

With the first and third HFA Priorities for Action (governance and education) addressed, the second, fourth and fifth remain for discussion. These three PFA – assessment, mitigation and response – are consistently the lowest scorers, according to different countries’ responses. These also represent the ‘active arenas’ of the HFA Priorities, which substantiates the claim that much greater support is needed for children in applying knowledge and skills, and in particular involvement of children in *collective action* on DRR, through risk assessment and management and preparedness and response interventions.

Box 1
OVERALL SCORES




Box 2
SCORES OF RESPONDENT COUNTRIES BY PRIORITY FOR ACTION



Box 3

OVERALL PFA SCORES BY REGION – NUMBER OF COUNTRIES SURVEYED SPECIFIED



I. INTRODUCTION and PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 2005, 168 governments adopted the ten-year Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) for building the resilience of communities and nations to disasters. The 2009 UNISDR Global Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction will see governments and stakeholders reconvene in Geneva to assess HFA progress to date. Governments and civil society organisations have been actively working on reducing disaster risk for communities around the world. Several CSOs, including Plan International and World Vision International, have focused their work on engaging children and young people in disaster risk reduction. The Global Network (GN) for Disaster Risk Reduction has conducted a survey entitled *Views from the Frontline* with a view to involving local stakeholders from government, civil society and communities, in measuring progress made on the HFA, and in particular the implementation of its five Priorities for Action (PFA). The HFA priority areas cover the following areas:

1. Governance
2. Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning
3. Knowledge and Education
4. Underlying Risk Factors
5. Preparedness and Response

The Children and Young People's Survey

It is an achievement in the sector to date that there is a growing degree of consensus and engagement around the Hyogo Framework as an overarching blueprint for global action in DRR. Further, it has been established that there is progress towards implementation of the HFA priorities, which will be explored in further detail in June 2009 at the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. However, what role do children and young people play in this process, and what is the impact of their exclusion, as the research seems to suggest?

The work of both Plan International and World Vision International with vulnerable communities in many countries confirms that children can play a valuable role in disaster risk reduction (DRR), but that the value of their contribution has been given insufficient attention. Recent reports by the Children in a Changing Climate research programme² note that all too often, children are seen as *victims* in disasters rather than having their potential recognised as *effective agents of change* in DRR. This argument is supported by the 2007 UNISDR report and campaign, 'Disaster Risk Reduction Begins at School'. Programmes engaging children in DRR have shown that children do, in fact, have much to contribute to disaster risk reduction.³

With a view to ensuring children have a voice as key local stakeholders in the *Views from the Frontline* report and in the global DRR governance arena, Plan, supported by World Vision International, UNICEF and Save the Children, designed a complementary survey modelled on the GN survey, but with focus on children's role and views on HFA progress.⁴ The breadth and depth of this child-focused survey is unprecedented, and took the form of a two part process: First, child-centred questions were added to the sections of the GN survey conducted by participating countries supported by Plan and World Vision. Second, and most importantly, participating countries supported by Plan and World Vision, conducted an additional survey with children through focus group discussions (See Appendix 1).⁵

² Mitchell, T. et al (2009)

³ See, for example, Plan (2009), CCC (2009), Save the Children (2008)

⁴ A total of 17 countries participated from Africa & the Middle East (6), Asia (6), Latin America and the Caribbean (5).

⁵ Although not in the scope of this report, much valuable learning was gained through the process of carrying out this work. It is anticipated that a separate report on lessons from the survey, with more focus on the process, will be produced in close consultation with stakeholders in the next few months.

This report presents the findings of these child-focused DRR surveys. It concentrates on findings from the Child Focus Groups (CFGs) where 854 children participated. This survey was divided into five sections, one for each PFA. While the GN survey had a sixth section featuring cross-cutting issues, the child-centred survey endeavoured to integrate issues of gender and extreme vulnerability into the main five sections.

Structure of the Report and Reading the Results

This report presents the findings in terms of each Priority for Action, cross-cutting issues, and respondent types. Section III assesses results for each PFA with discussion on findings as well as offering recommendations and conclusions. For each PFA, we present a table of ‘overall scores’; averaging responses from different stakeholders in each of the 17 participating countries, and providing an overall average for progress on the child friendliness of each PFA.

Responses to the surveys were given numerically on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was equivalent to “no, not at all” and 5 was equivalent to “yes, with satisfactory, sustainable and effective measures in place”. These were responses to questions asked about specific aspects of DRR. For the purpose of reading these results, the score rankings are defined as:

1. No action
2. Some progress, but to a very limited extent
3. Some progress, but with significant scope for improvement
4. Progress made, but with some limitations in capacity and resources
5. Satisfactory progress

The main value of these results comes from the discussions with children and young people, since they took part in detailed focus group discussions. In this report, the results from the questionnaires conducted with local government (LG) officials, civil society organisations (CSOs) and community representatives refer only to a limited number (one or two) of child-focused questions added to the GN questionnaires, so they serve as an indicator rather than offering a comprehensive picture of these actors’ views on children in DRR. The full text of child-focused questions and the child questionnaire questions can be found in the appendices.

The surveys were completed in Asia (Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines), Africa and the Middle East (Egypt, Ghana, Lebanon, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Swaziland) and Latin America and the Caribbean (El Salvador, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua).⁶ There were over 1000 respondents from the 17 countries; 854 of whom were children and young people (44% girls and 56% boys).

Expected Outcomes

The process of conducting the child-centred survey and producing the report had two purposes. First, it was important to ensure the voices and roles of children, who form the majority of the world’s population, were heard and taken into account in the Global Network’s local assessments of HFA and DRR implementation, and in subsequent discussions at the Global Platform and in various DRR arenas. The second purpose was to act as a pilot for incorporation into future Global Network surveys, so that children and their voices would become a regular part of the civil society mechanism that would monitor the HFA and DRR governance structures. In 2011, the Global Network intends to conduct another *Views from the Frontline* survey that we hope will also include the voices of children and young people. Our contribution here will serve to demonstrate the importance of children and young people in DRR – to the extent that child-focused questions and child focus groups are integrated into future surveys, and encouraged among all participants gathering data.

⁶ Data gathered by Plan Nicaragua and World Vision in the Dominican Republic, Ghana and Lebanon were not reported in time for the writing of this report.

The Global Network's *Views from the Frontline* survey has created opportunity for discussion among stakeholders, interest groups and key international actors whose voices are not represented in the ISDR Global Assessment Report. It has facilitated networking and relationship-building, and strengthened national and international ties in disaster risk reduction. Importantly, it has demonstrated commitment among non-governmental actors to ensuring accountability among national governments, as well as the monitoring, evaluating and pursuing progress towards building resilient communities and nations. This children and young people's survey provides a mechanism to ensure the views of the largest cohort of the world's population are given a voice through an independent and cost-effective approach for connecting international policy recommendations with local implementation realities.

Unintended Impacts

The survey surpassed its aims by generating some positive unintended impacts. It was, for instance, the first time a number of Plan and World Vision country offices conducted a systematic enquiry into DRR. This, and the sheer number of child and youth participants – over 800 – in and of itself is significant. In some cases, it was the first activity structured around the entirety of the HFA – particularly at the local level – that country offices had engaged in. Hence, the learning gained on DRR by staff and community members was significant. In some cases, this learning engendered a change process that has begun advancing DRR at local and national levels, bringing about significant unintended long-term changes, including the following:

- Collaboration between civil society and government intensified around DRR;
- In Lebanon, offices began working with national government to form a national DRR governance structure and supporting implementation mechanisms which previously had not existed;
- Awareness has been built in senior agency leadership of the needs of children and local communities regarding DRR;
- Investment and donor commitment was stimulated in DRR activities;
- New levels of interest and skills were built in local communities on how to conduct research and enquiry,
- Lobbying tools to advance interests of vulnerable community members in national and international arenas were developed.⁷

Connections were made and strengthened between the world of children and DRR; and linkages revealed between community resilience and children engagement in DRR activities. This is an instrumental step towards a fully inclusive approach which supports children's participation in the realisation of all five HFA Priorities for Action.

⁷ Further follow-up and capacity building is required so that these tools can be used effectively by children and other community members.

II. AN OVERVIEW: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S INCLUSION AND ACTIVITIES IN DRR

Flood, earthquake, fire, famine, drought, landslide and mudslide, cyclone, tsunami, extreme temperatures, hurricanes and typhoons

For all these disasters, explains a toolkit produced by UNICEF in 2006, “the consequences on children, women, the physically challenged and other marginalised groups, are likely to be more severe”.⁸ In the wake of the December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, only one in every three survivors were women or children under the age of 15; and estimates suggest that by 2010, 50 million of the world’s population will be environmentally displaced, most of them women and children.⁹ Children vulnerable to long-term impacts from disasters have lost family members, been removed from school and from their homes, or forced into conflicts or prostitution.¹⁰ Furthermore, as a result of climate change, disasters are becoming more frequent and extensive, increasing child protection risks and affecting their rights to survival and development.¹¹



Filipino girls identifying and sharing knowledge on risks

Increasingly urgent climate change debates hear calls for developed countries to commit to and implement measures to limit global warming to 2°C. Even at 2°C, the impact of climate related disasters is set to rise, making DRR an imperative. The United Nations has estimated that for every \$1 invested in risk management prior to disasters, \$7 of losses can be prevented. Concerns are voiced by development agencies and stakeholders around the world of increasing poverty, hunger, disease, reduced access to clean water and proper sanitation, and reduced access to education due to increases in weather related disasters. Climate change and its effect on drought, floods, desertification, and sea-level rises will affect hundreds of millions of people and is derailing the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Action in support of climate change adaptation (CCA) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) are becoming increasingly interwoven.

Whereas it is widely acknowledged that effective risk management must involve those most at risk, all too often, a valuable resource in both CCA and DRR is being overlooked, and that is the potential contribution of children. Children are repeatedly portrayed as *victims* of disasters and climate change. However, too often, the discussion ends here.

Children can and should be encouraged to participate in disaster risk reduction activities and decision making. Academics and aid agencies are beginning to realise and argue this, echoing organisations like Plan, UNICEF, Save the Children and World Vision that concentrate on supporting children and promoting their rights and engagement in civil society. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) states that *every child who is capable of forming his or her own views has the right to express those views freely in matters that will affect the child*. Children and young people, therefore, have the **right** to participate in DRR and disaster management decisions, since these decisions greatly affect their lives.

⁸ UNICEF (2006)

⁹ Mitchell, T. et al (2009); Plan (2007)

¹⁰ Plan (2007)

¹¹ See, for example, IPCC (2007)



Children and young people also have a unique contribution to make to DRR – far greater than they are given credit for. The Children in a Changing Climate research programme has argued that climate change adaptation strategies must be context specific to be effective, and that children, with “unadulterated” perspectives, can often offer in-depth information about local vulnerabilities and capacities, and in presenting and acting on this information, they are not constrained by institutional/political mandates or sectoral priorities.

Young people can also play a significant role in DRR communication and information dissemination, from disaster mitigation and preparedness information to early warning systems.¹²

The value of children’s knowledge, creativity, energy, enthusiasm, and social networks should be recognised and encouraged.¹³

The contribution of children can be encouraged, developed and consolidated through formal and informal education. Schools are of fundamental importance for DRR at the community level for a number of reasons: the realisation of universal primary education stands as the second MDG; and it is widely recognised that ensuring greater access for children to schools is fundamental for sustainable development.. Yet, integral to the success of this MDG is that school curriculum and governance support children’s knowledge and participation in DRR.

In addition, it is important that school buildings are safe and resilient to disasters. In Kashmir, the 2005 earthquake killed 17,000 school children, and over 5,000 Chinese students lost their lives during the 2008 Sichuan Earthquake. Many other “near misses”, where buildings have been destroyed outside of school hours, have been witnessed.¹⁴ Schools also serve a key role at the community level for community mobilisation. Yet DRR awareness raising and knowledge sharing must also take place out of school, via youth clubs and a wide range of media designed to reach children and young people who are often excluded from mainstream education.

Young people can offer innovative ideas about managing risks, provided they are encouraged to learn about disasters, vulnerability and hazards. They also have the ability to share and apply this information within their households, families and the wider community. Prevention and mitigation measures, as well as disaster preparedness training, can take place at school and community levels, promoting the engagement of children and their communities. Involving children in disaster management planning can lead to much more effective results, since children have unique perspectives to adults. While adults tend to be more concerned about short term risks, children have a long-term view of risks and are thus less fatalistic and more proactive and creative in support of risk management.¹⁵

The evidence confirming the value of children and young people’s participation in DRR and CCA is getting stronger. While statistics and media reinforce the image of children as victims, there are many examples of children around the world taking action to raise awareness, to prevent and mitigate disaster, and to increase effectiveness of disaster response (see the case studies to follow). Children have demonstrated in-depth

¹² CCC (2009)

¹³ CCC (2009)

¹⁴ Wisner, B (2006)

¹⁵ Mitchell, T. *et al* (2009)

understanding about how local risks may be compounded by global issues, such as the changing climate, and can relate the consequences of climate change to infringements on their rights to participation, protection and safety and to the responsibilities of others to ensure this. Children are capable of making constructive contributions to DRR decision-making at all levels, including the global debate on CC. A group of children who attended the UNFCCC conference in Bali in 2007, for example, contributed effectively to debates about tackling climate change.

Smart and articulate young people can hardly be ignored.¹⁶

Children and young people have a vital role to play in CCA and DRR. Not only are children the next generation of adults, and willing and interested in learning about managing risks, but also they are very receptive to new ways of thinking, creative in approaching obstacles, and enthusiastic to share their knowledge with peers and the wider community in innovative and effective ways.

The achievement of the HFA goals, preventing and reducing disasters in the future, requires a greater number of stakeholders to reach out to today's children and young people, today.



Children in El Salvador plant Vetiver grass to mitigate landslides

¹⁶ Plan (2007)

III. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Quick Reference

What are the five HFA Priorities for Action (PFA)?

Adopting a child-focused perspective

1. Governance
 - Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation ***promoting and supporting children's rights***
2. Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning
 - ***Involve children and young people*** to identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning
3. Knowledge and Education
 - Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels, ***because children are our future***
4. Underlying risk factors
 - ***Involve children and young people*** to reduce the underlying risk factors
5. Preparedness and Response
 - Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels, ***particularly at the community level, concentrating on the wellbeing of children and young people***

Interpretation of numeric scores

Negative (Red)	
1-<2	No action
2-<3	Some progress, but to a very limited extent
3-<4	Some progress, but with significant scope for improvement
4-<5	Progress made, but with some limitations in capacity and resources
5	Satisfactory progress
Positive (Green)	

Abbreviations

LG	Local Government
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CFG	Child Focus Group
Rep.	Representative
Avg.	Average
dp	decimal points

1. Priority for Action 1 – GOVERNANCE

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation – **promoting and supporting children’s rights**

Key Question: To what extent is disaster risk reduction a priority in your community?

1.1 Discussion

Governance is a crucial demonstration of commitment to meeting targets and achieving goals, and where governing institutions do not succeed in delivering their responsibilities and engaging their constituents, other aspects of DRR will also fail to succeed. Responses in this survey to the first PFA, on Governance, set the tone for responses to the rest of the survey. The overall average score for HFA 1 barely exceeds 2, indicating some progress, but to a very limited extent.

PRIORITY FOR ACTION 1: GOVERNANCE					
Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
Egypt	1.33	1.14	1.17	1.64	1.32
Bangladesh	1.44	2.06	2.70	2.83	2.26
Nepal	1.33	2.17	1.50	2.60	1.90
El Salvador	2.46	2.67	2.50	2.75	2.59
Malawi	1.50	2.67	1.33	2.25	1.94
Philippines	3.67			3.55	3.61
Indonesia				2.05	2.05
Haiti				1.87	1.87
Sierra Leone				2.33	2.33
Pakistan	1.67		1.47	1.61	1.58
India				2.93	2.93
Bolivia				1.88	1.88
Swaziland				2.53	2.53
Respondent Avg.	1.92	2.14	1.78	2.37	2.21

On average, overwhelmingly, respondents to our child-centred questions related to governance scored progress at less than 3. By respondent type, the highest average score here comes from the children’s focus groups; and the lowest, from community representatives. This is an interesting revelation, as with the relatively close everyday interaction of children and adult community actors, it might be expected that they would have similar views on the topic. What it does possibly show is a disparity in education and/or awareness raising initiatives between adult and child representatives.

This raises the following questions: *Are adults missing out on awareness raising initiatives? Do more bridge-building and communication initiatives need to be developed?* Some of Plan’s DRR work with children’s groups in El Salvador has shown that if their parents and other adults are not also positively engaged, they feel left out and are not clear about their role. Empowering children may be counterproductive if equal attention is not given to adults. It is not surprising that children and young people are naturally more receptive to new – and often challenging – ideas and problems than their elders. Adults are more set in their ways and may well be juggling with any number of very real and immediate, short term concerns, including maintaining livelihoods, supporting households, and keeping families healthy. Children receptivity to new ideas and problems should be treated as an opportunity for planners responsible for the governance of disasters.

Sierra Leone, the Philippines and El Salvador are the higher scoring countries in this section, with Egypt and Pakistan scoring the lowest. In the other sections as well, the Philippines and El Salvador feature as consistently ‘high scorers’, and Egypt a consistently ‘low scorer’ whilst Pakistan and Sierra Leone tend to fluctuate. It is important to note that Sierra Leone, the Philippines, and El Salvador are also countries where Plan has DRR projects with children and many of those children were included in this research process. They are more aware and confident of their views about disasters than children in the other countries where little or no DRR work has been done with children (see also section IV).



Hezel from Philippines shares her views on children’s rights and DRR at COP13 in Bali, 2007

In their open-ended question responses in the survey, El Salvadorian adults stated that “by law, civil protection commissions can only include adults”. In light of the fact that El Salvador is a higher scorer in this PFA (though still not a *high* scorer), it reveals that including children is a low priority at the government level. This is reflected in the lower response average of the local government officials from El Salvador in regards to children’s engagement in DRR governance.

1.2 Recommendations and Good Practices

A holistic view suggests that attention is needed for improvement on HFA 1 across the board. Yet it is important to recognise that there has been some progress on including children, even in countries where the survey scores are very low. In Bangladesh, for example, Plan has successfully lobbied for the provision in the national Standing Order on Disasters, which now stipulates the formal participation of children in the Union Disaster Management Committees (box 5). In the Philippines, although local government rules allow for children’s participation, it is the positive attitude of elected officials towards children’s participation which turns rules into meaningful action (box 4).

Box 4

CHANGES IN TRADITIONAL APPROACHES TO DRR IN THE PHILIPPINES

In the municipality of St Bernard in which the fatal landslide occurred in the village of Guinsaugon in 2006, Plan has been supporting children to take part in DRR. The children’s activities have served to convince the municipal council of the importance of children’s participation in disaster risk management and there are now children’s representatives on all the village and the municipal disaster management councils.

The municipality sees children’s participation in DRR as important, not only for today, but also to prepare a generation of young people who will be able to confront the increase in disaster risks that will occur as a result of climate change. As the mayor Rico Rentuzan of St Bernard said, ‘It is important that a new generation of leaders evolves who have a vision of thinking about DRR.’ (Plan International DRR Project –MTR 2008)

1.3 Conclusion

With an overall average of 2.21 of a possible 5, on a survey where over 1000 respondents (854 of them children) took part, it is abundantly clear that attention is needed by actors at all levels on DRR governance. Improvements are required in participatory planning structures, strategies and accountability mechanisms. Children and young people have a right to participate and adults have a responsibility to include them.

Box 5**BANGLADESH: PROMOTING CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN DM GOVERNANCE**

Between September 2007 and February 2009, Plan Bangladesh implemented the project *Children's Participation in Disaster Risk Reduction* with funding from DIPECHO, targeting 10 Unions of Hatibandha Upazila, an area that consists of 62 communities and a population of 203,300 people. The 10 unions include 6 flood-prone Unions in which Plan does not have a long-term presence and 4 non-flood prone Unions in which Plan has had a presence since 2001. The project was implemented through a partnership with POPI, a national NGO and in collaboration with local government and national DRR stakeholders. The main project activities were:

- The formation of children's DRR organisations who undertook small-scale, self-initiated DRR activities
- The conduct of risk assessments and the formulation of DRR plans by children
- The participation of children in awareness-raising, risk reduction, preparedness and early warning activities.
- School based DRR activities
- The representation and participation of children in local government
- Promotion of children's participation in national policy and practice

A key achievement of the project was the integration of the children's risk assessments and DRR plans into the Union DRR risk assessments and plans, which were then consolidated at the Upazila level to produce a DRR plan that was inclusive of the children's issues. The project also established a series of linked structures to facilitate children's representation and their participation in DRR at the community, school, Union and Upazila levels. At the national level, Plan successfully lobbied for the inclusion of children in the Union Disaster Management Committees in the national Standing Order on Disasters, and the inclusion of children's participation in the national Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme's (CDMP) Community Risk Assessment (CRA) manual.

2. Priority for Action 2 – RISK ASSESSMENT, MONITORING & WARNING

Involve children and young people to identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Key Question: What progress has been achieved in raising community awareness and in sharing information about hazards?

2.1 Discussion

For HFA 2, adults in civil society organisations (CSOs) and the children’s focus groups (CFGs) were much more positive about the role of children in DRR, compared to the local government respondents. The results, country by country, show that the CSO and community representative scores closely correlate, and are always higher than the local government average. The implication here is that local governments are either less receptive to the participation of children in risk assessment monitoring and warning, or are simply less aware of it when it does take place. If the latter is the case, then what is needed is greater collaboration between CSOs and communities and their local governments. There is ample evidence that local people are traditionally well aware of most of the disasters risks they face and usually have well established ways of warning each other when a disaster seems imminent. Now, in a globalised world facing complex new patterns of risk, governments must work harder to supplement this local indigenous knowledge and capacity. Young people must be a primary focus for these bridge building efforts.

PRIORITY FOR ACTION 2: RISK ASSESSMENT, MONITORING & WARNING					
Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
Egypt	1.40	1.08	1.17	1.72	1.34
Bangladesh	1.83	3.00	2.90	2.42	2.54
Nepal	1.33	2.25	1.50	2.17	1.81
El Salvador	2.33	3.80	2.56	2.86	2.89
Malawi	1.75	1.00	1.00	1.92	1.42
Philippines	3.77			4.00	3.89
Indonesia				2.42	2.42
Haiti				1.69	1.69
Sierra Leone				1.21	1.21
Pakistan	1.50		1.56	1.43	1.50
India				2.39	2.39
Bolivia				2.02	2.02
Swaziland				1.79	1.79
Respondent Avg.	1.99	2.23	1.78	2.16	2.07

The Philippines, Bangladesh and El Salvador are the higher average scoring countries with Egypt and Sierra Leone displaying the lowest averages across all types of respondents. These results are predictable, since people in countries affected by frequent, rapid-onset and high-intensity disasters treat these risks very seriously and tend to make sure their children are taught about risk assessment and early warning. However, as patterns of risk in countries such as Egypt and Sierra Leone change due, for example, to unpredictable weather associated with climate change, governments must take more responsibility to inform and include their populations in developing more sophisticated risk assessment and early warning systems.

2.2 Recommendations and Good Practices

Communication, stronger collaboration and networking between civil society and local government on matters of risk assessment, monitoring and warning, will improve both local government knowledge of and coordination with community activities, as well as local governments' receptiveness to the involvement of children and young people in these activities. This will help achieve cohesion amongst stakeholders in terms of both understanding the contribution of children and the extent to which it is being integrated in their contexts. Yet in order to increase the actual success rates (improve scoring to 5), local government actors must recognise that children have abilities to assess and monitor risks which are overlooked. These abilities should be harnessed and encouraged, and put to good use in vulnerability and risk assessments, monitoring and warning planning and activities.



Children in Quebrada de Alajuela, Ecuador, reported the bridge that crosses the village river as posing a safety risk in the event of floods

2.3 Conclusion

In conversation with elders from Falaba village in the Moyamba district of Sierra Leone, Plan staff observed much receptiveness to children participation. The elders noted that children *see things that adults don't see*, and they *say things that adults won't say*. "Children are aware and take action. They identified the well as a problem, but the adults had just accepted it. Now we work together with them."¹⁷ Awareness raising of the value added of children's participation in HFA 2 will ensure safer communities for children and young people, their parents, community members, schools and local authorities.

Box 6

CHILDREN MONITORING AND WARNING IN EL SALVADOR

In El Salvador, in early 2008, several houses in Cerco de Pedra, La Libertad, were destroyed in a flash flood. The young people's and the adult DRR committee had been trained in the establishment and use of early warning systems utilising pluviometers. Young children (8-12 years old) who were not members of the community's DRR committee were well aware of the early warning systems that had been set up to alert the community in times of heavy rain. When asked what they should do if heavy rain started again, they said:

- First, look at the pluviometer
- Next, help people who live near the river to take things out of the house
- After that, call each other by cell phone
- Then be ready to run to evacuation areas, and
- Pray!

¹⁷ In Falaba, Moyamba District, Sierra Leone, the primary school children's club identified unsafe water as the source of epidemics of diarrhoea and participated in the renovation of a well. Since then, cases of diarrhoea had substantially decreased and loss of life ceased.

3. Priority for Action 3 – KNOWLEDGE AND EDUCATION

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels, because children are our future

Key Question: Are communities well-informed about how to prepare for, avoid, or respond to disasters?

3.1 Discussion

Education about coping with disaster threats is the foundation for more effective DRR. In this survey focusing on children, this is consistently the highest scoring PFA among the survey respondents. This is not surprising given the respondents, but nevertheless, there remain calls from all respondent types for support to increasing awareness of DRR, for integrating DRR into schools and curricula and for better knowledge sharing practices. The overall average was still very far below the optimum at 2.37.

PRIORITY FOR ACTION 3: KNOWLEDGE & EDUCATION					
Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
Egypt	1.39	1.50	1.00	1.57	1.36
Bangladesh	1.56	1.67	2.60	2.95	2.19
Nepal	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.27	2.19
El Salvador	3.50	3.10	2.56	2.93	3.02
Malawi	2.00	1.50	1.33	3.20	2.01
Philippines	3.67			3.90	3.78
Indonesia				2.20	2.20
Haiti				2.33	2.33
Sierra Leone				2.35	2.35
Pakistan	2.33		1.71	1.65	1.90
India				2.62	2.62
Bolivia				2.05	2.05
Swaziland				2.75	2.75
Respondent Avg.	2.35	1.95	1.95	2.52	2.37

The replies of the child focus groups to the survey questions produced the highest average scores of all the respondent types. This suggests that in the target localities, ongoing work towards improving education about preventing and mitigating disasters in schools is effective. That children know about their own education is not surprising. What was unexpected was that people from civil society organisations and representatives of the communities delivered the average lowest score – whereas local government actors are more knowledgeable and more confident about the value public education and children’s knowledge sharing on DRR than CSOs and community representatives. This suggests confidence in educational programmes which others criticise. Across all types of respondents the high average scoring countries for this Priority for Action are the Philippines and El Salvador. The lower average scoring countries are Egypt and Pakistan.

The highest average scoring *questions* in this, the highest scoring PFA, were “Do children and young people learn about ways of preventing and dealing with disasters in local schools or colleges?”, which scored an average of 2.69, closely followed by “Does the community know how safe their school buildings are, and the practical steps to take to ensure that all new and existing schools are strengthened to provide protection from the impact of hazards?” which scored an average of 2.63. These average scores indicate a general perception that progress is being made, but with significant scope for improvement.

3.2 Recommendations and Good Practices

In focusing on the implications of the low-scoring respondents, the numbers suggest that more could be done in terms of knowledge sharing and community awareness – in particular children’s, boys’ and girls’ equal inclusion in these activities. Examples of good practices on this can come from El Salvador, Malawi and the Philippines.

Looking at the results table (above), children have a more positive perception of knowledge and education in DRR compared with CSOs and community representatives, whose confidence is lower. The difference may be in regards to the process of *implementation of HFA 3*. Where children are learning and feel confident, there is relatively little demonstration of that for (adult)

observers to witness and judge for themselves – leading to comparatively less confident adult responses. The *recognition* by adult stakeholders that children and young people are often willing and interested to learn, and subsequently use their new knowledge to contribute to DRR, is crucial. Yet to *demonstrate* new knowledge and strength of children, two actions are needed. First, children must be engaged in active learning, whether formal or informal, or both: In the words of a community representative respondent from Pakistan, “Children learn easily, but need to be taught”. Second, children need support in giving their new understanding practical value. It is important to ensure that local governments, civil society and community representatives are conscious of, and act on, the need to focus on this post-learning support.

In order to clarify why there are significant differences in understanding on the part of each type of respondent, more in-depth examination of the knowledge of local government and civil society is required. Nonetheless, it is obvious that local authorities are more likely than the general public to know exactly what is on the curriculum in schools and as such local government responses to questions on this are likely to be closer to those of the children themselves. If this is the case, then greater awareness of civil society on matters concerning DRR awareness raising would be necessary to keep all stakeholders ‘on the same page’.



Children in the Philippines, developing videos to raise awareness of hazards facing their community

Box 7

WORK WITH SCHOOLS/MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

In El Salvador, Plan is worked with the Ministry of Education and all universities offering a Bachelors Degree in Education for basic education (grades 1 to 6), to include DRR as part of the standard Bachelors’ curricula. This will include mandatory courses for future teachers on risk management, child centred DRR, the school protection plan, SPHERE and INEE minimum standards, and general knowledge about disaster emergency and response in regards to school centres. This work is a major achievement for DRR messaging to reach those that are directly involved with school children in a sustainable way.

3.3 Conclusion

Plan’s experiences have demonstrated that knowledge and education are the foundation of successful grassroots development. Where governance (PFA 1) provides the framework for disaster risk reduction at community level; knowledge and education empowers communities in pushing for better governance – understanding and articulating rights to address vulnerabilities, and pursuing accountability. Good governance, in turn, prioritises knowledge and education for children: while governance scores appear substandard, it is somewhat promising that, in this survey, knowledge and education emerge comparatively strong. In the Global Network’s *Views from*



DRR awareness raising via Qasidahs in Indonesia (see Box 8 below)

the Frontline survey however, this PFA did not emerge as strongly, further demonstrating a disparity between knowledge and education among children and among adult respondents. This will be discussed further in Section IV.

The relatively high scoring questions in this PFA point to the importance of formal education institutions such as schools and colleges in DRR. Bearing these points in mind, and looking at the ISDR tenet 'DRR Begins at School', it is promising that this, though still low, is the area where most progress is being made. Nevertheless, given that many of the most vulnerable children in a society may not be in school, children participation in DRR awareness raising via *informal* educational activities, such as theatre, radio, video and music, is essential.

Box 8

INDONESIA AND THE PHILIPPINES: RAISING AWARENESS THROUGH CREATIVE MEANS

While DRR progress in schools is especially important, in terms of strengthening both curriculum and the buildings/institutions of learning, it should also be remembered that children also learn through a rich variety of informal processes. The value of local wisdom based on local knowledge of daily practices should be given greater credit as a key element to strengthen intergenerational community based resilience to disasters. In both Indonesia and Philippines, art and theatre are common cultural practices for expressing perspectives or criticism, as well as for disseminating informative messages to children, youth and adults, and for children to highlight their concerns to the wider community.

In Southern Leyte in the Philippines, recent child theatre productions have included: landslide disasters, child trafficking, family relationships and birth registration. The scripts are written by the children but facilitated by youth leaders who take the roles of directors and choreographers. The theatre is a mobile street production performed from one village to another with limited props, lighting and music. The theatre play is seen as a form of stress release and recovery, as the children can share their stories and experiences. However, of equal importance is the power of the production to communicate the children's views. After each performance, a discussion is held to allow the audience to express their opinions and reactions to the topic presented. Previous productions, for example following the Punta, San Francisco landslide in 2003, have been shown in Manila and in Europe. These have helped spread the children's message beyond Southern Leyte, aided by press conferences following the performance.

In Indonesia, children's groups have developed Quasidah's with DRR messaging as an awareness raising method to reach community members. Historically, Qasidah is a form of poetry from pre-Islamic Arabia, it typically runs more than 50 lines and sometimes more than 100 and has a single presiding subject logically developed and concluded. Qasidah is a type of art where religious poetry is accompanied by chanting and percussion. As Qasidah music is well known in Rembang district, it has been adopted to be one of the media for campaigning and promoting DRR messages to the community by children. Children create and make an arrangement for a lyric containing DRR messages integrated with Qasidah music to be performed at village gatherings. This kind of method has proven to be effective for delivering DRR message, as the community is familiar with Qasidah music and remember the catchy lyrics afterwards

4. Priority for Action 4 – UNDERLYING RISK FACTORS

Involve children and young people to reduce the underlying risk factors

Key Question: To what extent is progress being made in changing social, economic, environmental conditions and land use in communities, to reduce disaster risk?

4.1 Discussion

While the highest average scores for this PFA once again come from children and young people in the CFG discussions, the disparity between the local government and civil society responses should be noted. Apart from responses from Egypt, where the norm has come in reverse, civil society responses about children's roles in reducing underlying risk factors are all higher than the local government responses. And all of the CSO and LG responses, except those from El Salvador, emerged one notably higher than the other: El Salvador is the only country whose local government and civil society respondents gave similar overall scores. Here the specific content of the questions asked must be considered.

As described above, each survey for local government, civil society and community representative *as circulated by the Global Network* was supplemented with a small number of relevant child-focused questions per PFA.

The questions asked of local government actors for PFA 4 were:

- *Do children and young people participate in the reduction of the risks that they perceive within their schools and communities?*
- *Is the protection of children's rights before, during and after disasters integrated into local development and disaster risk reduction policies and plans?*

The question asked of civil society organisations was:

- *Does your organisation support the children and young people to understand and cope with climate change and adapt to future conditions?*

PRIORITY FOR ACTION 4: UNDERLYING RISK FACTORS					
Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
Egypt	1.52	1.00		1.87	1.46
Bangladesh	1.78	2.33		2.50	2.20
Nepal	1.17	2.00		2.50	1.89
El Salvador	2.79	2.80		2.63	2.74
Malawi	1.50	2.00		2.67	2.06
Philippines	3.78			3.25	3.51
Indonesia				2.22	2.22
Haiti				1.92	1.92
Sierra Leone				1.83	1.83
Pakistan	2.42			2.09	2.25
India				2.92	2.92
Bolivia				2.48	2.48
Swaziland				3.67	3.67
Respondent Avg.	2.14	2.03		2.50	2.40

Box 9**SAVING STONES AND STAVING OFF FLOODS IN EL SALVADOR**

In the community of Petapa in El Salvador, the children of the Petapa Emergency Committee have made a huge difference to their community's safety by identifying and addressing a key underlying risk factor.

Where the river Sumpul runs by Petapa, it forms the border between El Salvador and Honduras. In the wet season, large flows that are generated pose a threat to the community through significant scouring and riverbank erosion. The children of the Emergency Committee identified the unregulated extraction of rocks and stones from the river as a major risk, leading to increased erosion and higher risk of vulnerability to flooding of houses near the river. With agreement of local leaders, signs have since been erected prohibiting extraction for personal use. Children can play – and in many cases are only too enthusiastic to play – an important role both in identifying underlying risk factors, and in subsequently addressing them.

In view of the sets of questions posed to adult respondents, it is understandable that the civil society answers were higher, given the nature of the relationship of CSOs with the facilitating organisations Plan and World Vision, whose organisational missions are the realisation of children's rights. The reflection of this in the CFG responses is that children and young people feel comfortable with what they are learning about climate change and adaptation, but are not yet being encouraged to use that knowledge to any great extent to address underlying risk factors.

The single highest scoring question from the CFGs was, "Are children and young people engaged in environmental protection/resource management (e.g. reforestation, mangrove protection, cleaning campaigns, recycling)?" The unfortunate suggestion of the results, however, is that where children are gaining understanding of reasons and principles behind climate change adaptation, they are not being supported to address these much further than encouragement in planting trees and picking up litter. Nor are they integrated or included in arenas where they might receive that support such as decision-making or community consultations, planning meetings with local government actors or training workshops for CCA. The challenge here, noted by one local government official in El Salvador, is to change the paradigm that "children know nothing and cannot participate".

4.2 Recommendations and Good Practices

El Salvador's consistent scoring across all respondents demonstrates good communication between local government and civil society actors, and furthermore good interaction with children where it exists. Examples of good practices from Plan communities in El Salvador may prove beneficial the world over, in terms of children activities to address underlying risk factors (see box 6), and more broadly in terms of their inclusion in planning processes and decision making.

Yet adaptation to climate change must be sensitive and specific to local context. Children and young people are knowledgeable stakeholders for addressing local context issues – offering "unadulterated"¹⁸, neutral, observant, enthusiastic and interested ability for application to problems (such as climate change) that they realise will affect their future. Existing successful local practices for coping with extreme or adverse weather should be built on and developed promoting scaling-up.

4.3 Conclusion

Overall, this is the highest scoring Priority for Action according to our child-centred survey respondents. While this is a promising sign, the markedly higher score from Swaziland was an outlier that raised the overall average significantly. In all countries, especially Sierra Leone and Egypt, significant improvement is still required.

Children and young people can offer a much greater contribution to climate change adaptation procedures than standard activities such as tree planting, digging channels and monitoring litter. The case studies in box 5 demonstrate this. Governments, civil society actors, community members and institutional donors should recognise the breadth and depth of contribution children can make in climate change adaptation, particularly since today's children will bear the brunt of the effects of climate change in the future.



Boys in Bangladesh manage local risk factors for flood preparedness

Box 10

SEED-GRANT INITIATIVES FOR REDUCING RISK IN THE PHILIPPINES

Part of Plan's support for child centred DRR is a seed-grant scheme to implement risk reduction measures addressing risks identified by children in VCA processes. Children's groups in the Philippines are supported with small grants to initiate their own risk reduction projects. The scheme begins with children groups learning how to identify and classify risks in order to formulate their own plans to reduce risks, then receiving a small grant to implement their plans.

Children's groups have implemented a number of DRR interventions as part of this support for their DRR action plans. These have included: hazardous rocks removal and local drainage system in Alibog, Magsaysay, (Mindoro Occidental); establishment of tree nursery and tree planting in Paraiso (Masbate); Mangrove protection in Boro Boro, ride-a-bike-to-school campaign in Liloan and San Francisco (Southern Leyte); and coastal clean up campaign in San Francisco.

5. Priority for Action 5 – DISASTER PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels, particularly at community levels, concentrating on children and young people

Key Question: What progress has there been towards strengthening preparedness for effective response to disasters by involving young people?

5.1 Discussion

With the sole exception of respondents in Nepal, the responses of children and young people everywhere indicates a greater level of confidence in the value of their own involvement in disaster preparedness and response, compared to responses of adults. The degree to which (if at all) the adult stakeholders provide a supporting environment for children to engage in this PFA should therefore be taken into account.

All too often, DRR activities are “reactive” rather than preventative. Communities and authorities’ focus is more on preparing for disaster to happen rather than attempting to mitigate the effects of disaster or prevent it altogether. If this is the case, then the emergence of this PFA as the lowest scorer of all is cause for concern. It should be noted that this is not *consistently* the lowest scoring PFA for all countries taking part. The lowest scoring priority in Malawi, for example, was PFA 2, *Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning*, and in El Salvador the lowest scoring priority was PFA 1, *Governance*. These variables will be considered in more detail in section IV.

PRIORITY FOR ACTION 5: PREPAREDNESS & RESPONSE					
Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
Egypt	1.07	1.00	1.17	1.43	1.17
Bangladesh	1.67	2.00	2.40	2.18	2.06
Nepal	1.40	2.00	2.00	1.57	1.74
El Salvador	2.50	2.20	2.61	2.82	2.53
Malawi	1.00	2.50	1.00	2.50	1.75
Philippines	4.33			4.07	4.20
Indonesia				1.98	1.98
Haiti				1.55	1.55
Sierra Leone				1.11	1.11
Pakistan	1.86		1.59	1.47	1.64
India				2.66	2.66
Bolivia				1.68	1.68
Swaziland				2.32	2.32
Respondent Avg.	1.98	1.94	1.79	2.10	2.03

The highest and lowest scoring questions from this section substantiate the results about PFA 3 in the section above: that children are gaining DRR knowledge and skills but do not have the supporting environment to put this knowledge to good use by taking action. The highest average scoring question in this section was “Do children and young people feel they have the skills they need to keep themselves safe in disasters?” This is supported by the next high average scoring question which discusses those skills in greater detail. The two lowest average scoring questions were “Are your community’s emergency response plans tested regularly with rehearsal exercises?” and “Does your school have clearly marked, child friendly and accessible evacuation routes and safe havens? (Are child friendly spaces identified? Are temporary school arrangements/boats & transportation identified for reaching school during floods, etc.?)”

¹⁸ CCC (2009)

The two high scorers see children and young people express some satisfaction with new skills and abilities. In some instances (e.g. Bangladesh), community representative responses reflect the children satisfaction. Yet in terms of actively applying those skills and abilities into action, through drills, rehearsals, and actions for preparedness – including the establishment of shelters and accessible evacuation routes – responses are all negative, suggesting progress is not taking place. There is a pattern in this disparity. Learning and being comfortable with one's knowledge and skills for disaster preparedness is an individual consideration. But applying those skills into practice in the community, youth group or school arena requires collective, concerted action. What is required is more support to transform individual *learning into collective action*.

5.2 Recommendations and Good Practices

It should not be forgotten that this is, overall, the lowest scoring PFA, and where 'satisfaction' is mentioned above, it is relative to specific responses given – the average scores are still overwhelmingly less than 3, and mostly less than 2.

These results have nevertheless highlighted that while local resilience is reliant upon the sharing of knowledge, the learning of skills, and the effective dissemination of information as it arises; this is not all there is to preparedness and response. Local resilience also depends upon empowerment of the people through effective support networks and mechanisms. Social networks among children are just one place to begin establishing support.

With a focus on the children and young people, the message generated is that knowledge can only be valuable if it is applied, practiced and focused. Collective action among children, young people and adults, and an enabling environment, are crucial for good practice in preparedness and response.

Box 11

PHILIPPINES: PLAYING AN ACTIVE ROLE IN DISASTER RESPONSE HELPS CHILDREN RECOVER AND FEEL PART OF THEIR COMMUNITY.

In February 2006 a landslide occurred in Catig, Liloan. There were no casualties, but the village was too dangerous for the people to stay. An evacuation site was set up while houses were constructed in a new site with the help of the LGU and donors, including Plan. Discussion with the children revealed how stressful the evacuation had been. They said that it had been difficult to find food as there was stealing of farm produce, the evacuation centre was chaotic, unsanitary and it was difficult to go to school.

There was an active children's association in the village. During the evacuation period children took action and actively helped to keep the centre clean, took care of younger children and lobbied the council to solve the sanitation problem in the centre. They also helped to clear the relocation site.

The children say that now they are able to live peacefully again and they feel proud because they helped to resolve their problems together with the rest of the community. After receiving training on disaster preparedness, they no longer are afraid when it rains and know what to do in case of emergency.

5.3 Conclusion

The low scores of other Priorities for Action are reflected in PFA 5, with the low score of PFA 1, Governance, determining the low progress on HFA's applicability for the rest of the survey. Governance on children's activities in DRR, at 2.19, reflects "Some progress but to a very limited extent". This was echoed by low scores for PFA 2-4, on risk assessment, education, and mitigation. It might be expected, then, that the score for Preparedness and Response, the PFA for *in the event of disaster*, reflects the level of unpreparedness at local level.

Progress in all Priorities for Action in getting children involved in DRR at all stages is influential for progress in disaster preparedness and response. Enthusiasm, creativity, and the neutral approach of children to response endorse children's important role in preparedness and response. This was exemplified by one adult respondent from El Salvador:

The children and youth of the community are so awesome!! For example, last year there was a landslide and we couldn't go out of the area, the municipality never came, so they had the idea that everybody had to do a human chain, and we were able to move all the rocks from one side of the village to the other, like ants... the adults wouldn't have that idea.



First aid practice in Indonesia

6. CROSSCUTTING ISSUES

Key Question: What progress has there been towards addressing important cross-cutting issues that impact overall disaster risk reduction strategies?

6.1 Discussion

For the most part, this report has focused on the responses of children in focus group discussions. The children's survey does not have a section dedicated to cross-cutting issues; it was designed for child focus groups and integrates cross-cutting issues including gender and other dimensions of vulnerability into its main five sections. Here we review local government and civil society responses to the child-focused cross-cutting issues questions in their questionnaires.

The question asked of local government actors was:

- *Are children and young people participating in decision-making and implementation of disaster risk reduction activities?*

The question asked of civil society organisations was:

- *Does your organisation facilitate children and young people actively implementing disaster risk reduction activities with their peers in their communities?*

At first glance it may appear that the question asked of local government officials is broad and unspecific. But, in fact, asking adults whether children participate in DRR decision-making and implementation goes to the heart of wider questions about inclusivity and participation in local governance. Child-centredness is itself a cross-cutting issue and responses to this issue are indicative of adults views on other cross-cutting issues, such as the equal inclusion of men and women, and whether DRR policies and strategies are sensitive to the needs of physically challenged and other vulnerable people. Cultural sensitivity is cross-cutting as it regards diversity as well as local and traditional knowledge. This question asks, *to what extent is the inclusion of children and young people also regarded as an important cross-cutting issue*. The question this survey asked of CSOs also does this, but with a focus on organisations' activities in the community.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES					
Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
Egypt	1.33	1.17			1.25
Bangladesh	1.33	2.67			2.00
Nepal	1.00	2.25			1.63
El Salvador	2.54	3.80			3.17
Malawi	2.00	3.00			2.50
Philippines	3.33				3.33
Indonesia					
Haiti					
Sierra Leone					
Pakistan	1.80				
India					
Bolivia					
Swaziland					
Respondent Avg.	1.91	2.58			2.31


Generally speaking, civil society organisations are more positive than local government about children participation. It is important to remember, however, that with this particular section, the respondents are not assessing the same thing: local governments speak generally of their jurisdiction, whilst CSOs refer to activities within or related to their organisation. It is not surprising then that CSOs, who have more and regular contact with child-centred organisations such as Plan and World Vision, and whose mandates, motivations and staff are similar, are generally more enthusiastic about children and young people’s participation.

The responses of local government staff may reflect a number of possibilities. It is possible that they simply reflect an objective view that, “no, children are not participating very much at all” (with the exception in this case of Philippines and El Salvador respondents). It may be that they reflect the wider opinion in these localities that children simply cannot or should not be expected to contribute to DRR. The opinion of one local government representative in Pakistan is made clear: “this [DRR] is not the job of children.” Similarly, in Bangladesh, there was the view that, “it is difficult to ensure [children’s participation] in a culture where adults dominate. This is unlikely to change”. This sentiment was echoed throughout the survey by all respondents in Nepal. The low score of local government staff here demonstrates this.

In assessing the participation of girls and boys in the Child Focus Groups, more boys took part than girls, with 479 to 375 respectively. The graph in box 8 indicates how many boys and girls took part in the survey from each respondent country. The South Asia region seems to stand out in terms of girls:boys participant ratio, since three countries here showed a much larger number of male participants than female. It is also interesting to note that one of the smallest ratio differences is witnessed in the same region – in Bangladesh: This actually shows a slightly higher number of girls participating to boys. This may be for a technical reason – e.g. simple differences in ways of selecting children to take part in FGDs.


Box 12

GIRLS:BOYS PARTICIPATION (SUM TOTAL GIRLS: 375 / BOYS: 479)



In terms of average response scores, differences can be seen in confidence of boys-only, girls-only and mixed focus groups. Box 9 gives an indication of these. It should be noted that of the total numbers of girls and boys given above, 274 boys and 241 girls took part in mixed focused groups, while the rest of the focus groups were single sex.

Box 13

AVERAGE RESPONSES, GENDER DISAGGREGATED FOCUS GROUPS¹⁹

Average responses for PFA 5, Preparedness and Response, show that mixed groups indicated more confidence in their participation and the present state of play. This is possibly country-specific: the Philippines for example, a high-scoring country, only conducted mixed groups FGDs. Perhaps of greater importance is the difference between boys' confidence and that of other actors regarding PFA 1, DRR governance. While it might have been expected that boys' responses would be generally higher than girls, as a result of generally greater social and political inclusion, here their score is lower. This is a promising indicator that girls are being encouraged to engage in, and gaining access to information about DRR governance and the responsibility local authorities have to protect them.

6.3 Recommendations and Good Practices

The results show the need to address widespread antipathy to children's inclusion in DRR. A further concern is that the views of the local government staff reflect those of the wider population. We have returned to a receptiveness issue such as that noted in PFA 2 above. Similarly, there will not be any one single way to address this aversion to children's participation. Local knowledge – including children's knowledge – will provide insight into reasoning behind this aversion, and provide the entry points for changing people's attitudes about children and young people being accepted as valuable contributors to DRR. While a large number of respondents here seem to be conscious of the need for equal inclusion of girls and boys, it should be remembered that many of these respondents are affiliated with Plan and World Vision – and in other social realities, gender equality and children's participation may not be a priority.

6.4 Conclusion

It is crucial that children and young people are involved in all stages of DRR activities and planning, and in climate change adaptation. Girls should be engaged in disaster management from an early age to overcome and disprove stereotypes that this is not their place. Equal inclusion of children and young people, of boys and of girls, means more than tokenism. It means encouraging creativity and leadership, acknowledging and supporting children and young people's ideas, their engagement in designing and leading projects with appropriate support and guidance, being consulted and kept informed of projects which seek to address their wellbeing, and benefiting equally throughout the disaster management process. (See appendix 3 for levels of children's engagement via Hart's *ladder of participation*)

¹⁹ It should be noted here that, on graphs of scores herein, the y-axis begins at 1 because the score "1" indicates "no action" or "no progress at all".

IV. OVERALL: HIGHS & LOWS

Taking a holistic view at the data, there are variations between countries, by Priority for Action, and by respondent types. These will be examined here – but it should be emphasised that on the whole, all scores were low. Not one of the overall averages achieved 3 (some progress, but with significant scope for improvement) or above.

High Scorers

It can be seen throughout this survey that the Philippines' scores are consistently higher than other countries. Unfortunately, CSO and community representative surveys were not completed in the Philippines, and as such where these high numbers pushed up the average scores, this only applied to responses from the CFG and local government. While CFG responses were generally higher throughout, this high response for the Philippines can account in particular for higher averages among local government respondents. However, it is important to note that the Philippines is also an overall high scorer in the GNDRR's *Views from the Frontline* report, in which case our child-focused survey seems to reflect the broader reality of the Philippines context.

The child-focused surveys were sent out with the request for a balanced pool of respondents, where some would be familiar/ engaged with Plan and World Vision country programmes – i.e. actors we had worked with on disaster risk reduction but also ensuring a pool of actors we hadn't. The main apparent reason for higher scores coming from the Philippines is that constraints that prevented the interviewers reaching all respondent types also prevented them from reaching new actors, with whom we had not worked before. Most of the children who attended the focus group discussions have worked with Plan or World Vision on DRR in the past, either directly or indirectly through schools and community work. Similarly the local government respondents are also engaged in Plan's DRR with communities.

While this nuance in results has swayed some overall averages in the survey, it also serves to demonstrate the value of the DRR work that Plan and World Vision do. In a number of the countries surveyed, including the Philippines and El Salvador, Plan has worked on DRR for some time. In others, including Nepal and Malawi, Plan has not begun DRR work. The Philippines and El Salvador are both high scorers and often drawn on for case studies in DRR. Nepal and Malawi in the meantime have conducted less work on DRR with Plan, and response averages reflect this.

Finally, a pattern is emerging whereby more positive scores are emerging from adult respondents in countries where Plan has conducted DRR work than those where it hasn't. This is a good indication that not only is there generally more progress towards children and young people's involvement in DRR in these countries from the point of view of a range of stakeholders, but also that attitudes are changing, that adult respondents are beginning to realise the benefit of involving children and young people in DRR activities and planning. This also upholds the argument that children have a valuable contribution to make in terms of *communication* for DRR.



"WE SAY NO TO POLLUTION, YES TO LIFE"
Children claiming their spaces in El Salvador

The scores between El Salvadorian respondents were of a more consistent nature than others. For example, PFA 1, Governance, sees the following average scores for El Salvador:

Country	LG	CSO	Community Rep.	CFG	Averages (to 2dp)
El Salvador	2.46	2.67	2.50	2.75	2.59

With a gap of just 0.29 between the highest and lowest average scores, opinions of all respondent actors in El Salvador seem very cohesive. This can be accredited to several factors. First, El Salvador is a small country, making coordination and cohesion much less difficult than larger countries with greatly varying terrain. Second, it is highly vulnerable to hazards – earthquake, hurricanes – and as such is familiar with DRR concepts though day-to-day living and its history. Third, Plan’s work on DRR in El Salvador is long-standing (since Hurricane Mitch, 1998) and widespread and we have been ‘building on what works’ by supporting children to engage with other actors to build resilience to disasters. Replication of efforts to achieve relative progress in El Salvador and Philippines must ensure adaptation to local context including climatic, geographical, social and political factors. .

Respondents to the Global Network survey have, on average, scored PFA 3, Knowledge and Education, lowest of all five PFA, highlighting the view that this is the area where least progress is being made. It is pertinent, therefore, that this child-focused survey has reported it as making the most progress. It is possible that children are being more effectively reached than adults on education around CCA and DRR – adult stakeholders have immediate priorities to address and may not consider ‘extra-curricular’ learning a crucial part of their daily routine. It could also be argued that children are naturally better equipped to absorb new information such as this, and act and report on their findings. Furthermore, support systems for implementing new knowledge, giving it practical value, may be even more lacking among adults than they are with children (see section III.3.2). Investigation into this disparity might begin by exploring propositions, and perhaps relative successes on PFA 3 can then be echoed or adapted for establishing better knowledge and education structures and practices across all stakeholders.

Low scorers

This report has shown, according to local and grassroots respondents judging on a scale of 1 to 5, that all countries are low scorers on the participation of children in DRR. One interesting anomaly is the lowest scorer in the survey, Egypt. As well as their overall average scores being lower than other respondents, in all bar one Priority for Action (Knowledge and Education), the local government average response has been higher than that of civil society. This is the reverse to other countries. This may be due to a failure in communication with civil society and consequently a failure also in the implementation of child-friendly DRR policy at local level. Further investigation into why local governments are scoring higher than civil society might helpfully reveal reasons as to why Egypt is scoring the lowest.

The lowest scoring Priority for Action is Preparedness and Response. The effects of the low scores in governance, risk assessment, knowledge and education, and mitigation have been discussed in section III.5 above. The *in the event of disaster* PFA cannot be expected to excel while all *in advance of disaster* PFAs remain with little progress. Yet Preparedness and Response was only the low scorer when combining all countries responses. At individual country level, for El Salvador PFA 4, Underlying Risk Factors, was the lowest scorer, and for Pakistan and Malawi, PFA 2, Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning was the lowest scorer.

Taking these three PFA (2, 4 and 5) as low scorers goes some way to substantiating a concern raised in sections III.4 and III.5 above, that support for children in applying knowledge and skills, and in particular involvement of children in the *collective action* on DRR, requires much greater attention. Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning; Underlying Risk Factors, and Preparedness and Response all discuss the activities which follow good governance and well-grounded and widespread knowledge of DRR. While governance and education support one another in DRR; so too do activities of assessment, mitigation and response – in particular, the involvement of children in the planning and execution of those activities.

V. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAYS FORWARD

This child-focused DRR survey started out with two objectives. The first was to ensure the inclusion of the views and roles of children and young people as part of the broader survey on DRR being conducted by the Global NGO Network for the 2009 Global Platform. The second objective was to demonstrate the importance of children in DRR and thus to encourage the Global NGO Network to include child-focused questions in the 2011 and future surveys.

On both accounts, the outcome is promising. The child centred survey has been acknowledged by the Global NGO Network and is due to be presented alongside the GN report at the 2009 Global Platform. The results of this child-centred survey suggest that this outcome is not a moment too soon.

The survey results on progress against HFA through a child centred approach, as shown in the graph in section IV, all average out at less than 3, indicating that at best progress is being made “to a very limited extent”. It must be emphasised that on several occasions, individual respondents gave high scores; these may be referred to for examples of good practice.

Some broad recommendations follow on the basis of the data analysis above.

PFA 1 on governance and PFA 5 on response have demonstrated that they are closely correlated with all other priorities. That Governance ‘sets the tone’ for the other results is of no surprise. Good governance that includes children’s participation in DRR leads to widespread support for DRR and sets an example for both attitude and behaviour change. This, however, does not reflect the realities being shared with the lower scores in PFA 2-5 as to be expected.

Preparedness and Response, at the other end of the ‘chronology of DRR’ came out at the bottom, the only Priority for Action with an overall average barely above 2. The few countries where some progress is being made on preparedness and response dragged the average score up; otherwise it would have stood at “1” – meaning progress of “No. Not at all.” Indeed there are qualitative responses to this effect, including CFGs in Haiti reporting “no action yet”, and even El Salvador reporting “nobody does nothing about this here”. Progress in this Priority for Action can be considered to be affected by the rest of the scores. If activities prior to disaster (governance, assessment, education, mitigation) are not making any great progress, then any activity focused upon reducing loss and damages *when disaster strikes* cannot be expected to improve significantly either.

As noted, while PFA 5 is the overall low scorer on average, it is not the lowest scoring Priority for Action in all countries. PFA 2, Risk Assessment Monitoring and Warning, and PFA 4, Underlying Risk Factors, also come out lowest on a number of occasions. This suggests that there are underlying problems with the delivery of the Hyogo Priorities which require much more action. Although both knowledge and education are important (indeed this was the highest scoring Priority for Action), they cannot be effective in mitigating disaster risks unless this knowledge is turned into action. Children need to be encouraged, supported and given the space to take individual and collective action to apply their knowledge and ideas on DRR (PFA 2,4, 5).

These recurring ‘low scorers’ turns us to the discussion about Governance and Knowledge and Education. Bearing in mind the argument that DRR Knowledge and Education are the foundation of successful grassroots development and, in light of the low example set by DRR Governance, it is promising that the highest scoring Priority for Action is number 3, Knowledge and Education. The two areas are mutually reinforcing. An informed and motivated citizenry will demand better DRR governance; and the environment of good governance will tend to prioritise better education for children and young people and the wider community, on DRR as well as other issues.

Good DRR governance will set foundations for the enabling environment which children need in order to use their new and ever-increasing skills and knowledge. In order to generate greater achievements for PFA 2, 4

and 5, PFA 1 must take the lead. Civil society can push for this directly at governance level through lobbying and advocacy, but it can also demonstrate how to realise participatory child inclusive DRR, through sharing good practices based on grassroots programmes with children and communities. These five PFA mutually depend on one another for improvement. As progress is made in one area, effects will be felt in others.

The key reason why progress on one Priority for Action will lead to progress in others is that there is a fundamental constraint experienced at all stages. This is a lack of receptiveness among all actors to the inclusion of 50% of the population of most countries – children – in both planning and implementation of DRR interventions. All kinds of actors are beginning to recognise the value of children in DRR and the contributions they can make, from village elders in Sierra Leone, to government leaders in Bangladesh, and UNFCCC decision makers. As news of the value and success of children’s risk reduction activities spreads, enthusiasm for children’s participation will become more widely acknowledged and supported.

Action needed in disaster risk reduction is now more than ever interwoven with action for climate change adaptation. Academics, NGOs, governments and intergovernmental organisations have recognised this on paper, vocally, and even in actions. Now what is required is to make those actions more widespread, more effective, sustainable and efficient at the local level. The way to achieve this is through specialised local knowledge and the involvement of all stakeholders – especially children. The contributions children can make to CCA and DRR stretch far beyond what we see today, and communities, local and national governments should capitalise on their creativity, energy, interest, enthusiasm, social networks and the relevant, unbiased local knowledge that children and young people have to offer.²⁰

DRR inclusion must be full, equal and comprehensive. This means more than simply consulting or asking children what they think of climate and disaster risks. It means giving them access to information that they need to comprehensively understand the dynamics of climate change, and its impact on their rights and their opportunities. It means encouraging them to use that knowledge in creative and innovative ways to safeguard their future, to design and implement their own actions with the support they need, and to take part fully in interventions initiated by adults. This requires a change in the attitude and commitment of stakeholders now to value what children and young people can do.

We did not inherit the earth from our ancestors; we borrowed it from our children. It’s time to listen to them.



²⁰ More information on this topic can be found at www.childreninachangingclimate.org

Postscript


At the 2009 Global Platform for DRR, Plan International is holding a side event, in partnership with World Vision International, UNICEF and the Save the Children Alliance. The side event will emphasise the importance of including children and young people in DRR and CCA and make some key recommendations based upon our findings of the child-centred Views from the Frontline survey and the wider opinion on children and young people in DRR and CCA. These recommendations will be based on the finding that governments are not taking DRR seriously enough. In order for progress in areas highlighted by the survey findings in this report, governments around the world must involve children in the implementation of the HFA and its Priorities for Action. At present this is not happening. A further recommendation is for governments to devolve responsibility on DRR to wider sectors and basic service ministries (including health, education, planning, environment) – integrating it in programmes supporting sustainable development and the realisation of the MDGs.

Finally, Plan and its partners have seen that when local government take DRR seriously, much more can be done to build resilience in communities. Good governance sets the enabling environment for building resilience of those most at risk. With DRR commitments and resources devolved to local governments, progress can be made in getting the crucial local knowledge into DRR activities, and including children and young people in decision making which affects their wellbeing.

A note on methodology and respondents

Children and Young People: Disaggregated participation

The majority of data from this survey has come from Children and Young People's participation in focus group discussions, answering questions posed in Appendix 1. The total number of child respondents is disaggregated in the diagram below. For numbers by country see box 12 in the main body of this report.



Participating country offices from Plan International and World Vision International were instructed to select where possible (and indicate on responses) groups of children from communities both where they have conducted DRR work *as well as* where they have not. Furthermore, where possible it was requested that they conduct single-sex focus group discussions in order to establish a clear gender-disaggregated element in the data.

In total, the respondent groups were split into three categories: children respondents (via 67 CFGs), Local Government respondents (via 66 interviews), and non-Government respondents (via 59 interviews).

APPENDIX 1

Child Focus Group Survey Questions

Section 1: Governance

- A1: Does your community have well organised groups or committees ready to decide what to do in case of disasters?
- A2: Do these groups or committees include children and young people's participation?
- A3: Do girls and boys participate equally in groups or committees deciding what to do in case of disasters?
- A4: Do children and young people in your community know their rights with regard to protection from disaster risks?
- A5: Do children and young people in your community know the government's responsibility to provide protection from disaster risks?
- A6: Do children in your community receive training, both on how to reduce risks from disasters and on how to respond in case of disaster?
- A7: Does your school conduct drills to prepare and respond to disasters?
- A8: Do children and young people's groups in your community address disaster risk reduction issues through discussions and actions?
- A9: Do you feel that children and young people's voices are heard in your community in decisions about what to do to reduce the risks of disasters?
- A10: Do you feel that the voices of girls and boys are heard equally in your community in decisions about what to do to reduce the risks of disasters?

Section 2: Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning

- B1: Are children and young people invited to community meetings held to assess disaster risks?
- B2: Do children and young people conduct or participate in community disaster risk assessments?
- B3: Do children and young people conduct or participate in school disaster risk assessments?
- B4: Do girls and boys participate equally in community and school disaster risk assessments (such as vulnerability capacity assessments, risk mapping, planning for mitigation activities)?
- B5: Does your community have early warning systems in place to raise awareness of potential risks?
- B6: Do children help establish the early warning systems in your community?

Section 3: Knowledge and Education

- C1: Do children and young people learn about ways of preventing and dealing with disasters in local schools or colleges?
- C2: Does your community know enough about the potential risks of hazards to be able to respond in case of danger?
- C3: Are there public awareness campaigns that teach people

about how they can take practical measures to protect themselves from the impact of hazards?

- C4: Does the community know how safe their school buildings are, and the practical steps to take to ensure that all new and existing schools are strengthened to provide protection from the impact of hazards?
- C5: Do children and young people participate in the communication of disaster risks within your community (formally and informally, such as awareness raising campaigns, theatre, media)?

Section 4: Underlying Risk Factors

- D1: Are children and young people engaged in environmental protection/resource management (eg: reforestation, mangrove protection, cleaning campaigns, recycling)?
- D2: Are children and young people in your community trying to adapt to future changes in climate and weather? (for example, through alternative livelihoods, family support with income generation, microfinance)?
- D3: If yes, do you think climate change adaptation is a priority issue for your community?
- D4: Does your community have access to enough reserve food supplies for use in times of emergency?
- D5: Do vulnerable children and young people (such as girls, the poor, and disabled people) have access to basic social services during and after disasters (such as health, education, and food services)?
- D6: Are vulnerable children being addressed in your community's activities tackling poverty?

Section 5: Preparedness and Response

- E1: Does your community have a clear emergency response plan in case of disasters that address the needs of children?
- E2: Are children trained in first aid, search and rescue, swimming & water rescue, wireless and radio communications, fire suppression, water purification, and similar skills?
- E3: Does your community have clearly marked, child friendly, and accessible evacuation routes and safe havens? Are there plans for evacuating people with limited mobility?
- E4: Does your school have clearly marked, child friendly and accessible evacuation routes and safe havens? (Are child friendly spaces identified? Are temporary school arrangements/boats & transportation identified for reaching school during floods, etc.?)
- E5: Are your community's emergency response plans tested regularly with rehearsal exercises?
- E6: Have children and young people participated in the development of the emergency response plan?
- E7: Do children and young people feel they have the skills they need to keep themselves safe in disasters?

APPENDIX 2

Supplementary Child-focused Questions for Views from the Frontline Survey

Section 1: Governance

Local government

AC1: Are there opportunities for children and young people to express their views on disaster risk reduction and for their representation to be formally recognised on local disaster risk reduction institutional structures?

Civil Society Organisation

AC1: Have national and local Civil Society Organisations in your country supported the participation of children and young people in disaster risk reduction?

AC2: Does your organisation support the participation of children and young people in disaster risk reduction?

Community Representative

AC1: Does your community have children's and young people's groups and organisations that actively address disaster risk reduction issues?

AC2: In your community are the voices of children and young people heard in discussions and decision-making processes on what to do to reduce the risks of disasters?

Section 2: Risk Assessment, Monitoring and Warning

Local government (senior and education officials only)

BC1: Do children and young people participate in local the hazard / risk assessments?

BC2: Are children and young people informed about updates on key risks and do they participate in sharing them within their schools and communities?

Civil Society Organisation

BC1: Does your organisation have adequate skills to facilitate the participation of children and young people in participatory risk assessments on potential hazards and vulnerabilities within disaster-prone communities?

Community Representative

BC1: Do children and young people conduct or participate in school and community disaster risk assessments?

BC2: Do children and young people participate in the establishment of early warning systems?

Section 3: Knowledge and Education

Local Government (education officials only)

CC1: Are there opportunities for children and young people to participate in the dissemination of information on disaster risks and how to reduce them within their schools and communities?

Civil Society Organisation

CC1: Is the facilitation of children's and young people's participation in disaster risk reduction included in staff training?

CC2: Do community training initiatives on disaster risk reduction knowledge and practice focus on children?

Community Representative

CC1: Do children and young people participate in the communication of disaster risks within your community?

Section 4: Underlying Risk Factors

Local Government

DC1: Do children and young people participate in the reduction of the risks that they perceive within their schools and communities?

DC2 (senior and planning officials only): Are the protection of children's rights before, during and after disasters integrated into local development and disaster risk reduction policies and plans?

Civil Society Organisation

DC1: Does your organisation support the children and young people to understand and cope with climate change and adapt to future conditions?

Community Representative

None

Section 5: Preparedness and Response

Local Government (planning and education officials only)

EC1: Do children and young people participate in training drills and evacuation rehearsals done with at-risk schools and communities?

Civil Society Organisation

EC1: Do the disaster management plans of local communities, civil society organisations and local and national government incorporate the protection of children's and young people's rights and their participation before, during and after disasters?

Community Representative

EC1: Have children and young people participated in the development of the emergency response plan?

EC2: Do children and young people have the range of response skills that they need to keep themselves safe in disasters?

Section 6: Cross-cutting issues

Local Government

FC1: Are children and young people participating in the decision-making and implementation of disaster risk reduction activities?

Civil Society Organisation

FC1: Has local government incorporated the protection of children's and young people's rights and their participation before, during and after disasters?

Community Representative

None

APPENDIX 3

Ladder of Participation – Dimensions of Children’s Engagement in Decision Making

8. [Top] Children and young people initiated, shared decision with adults	Children and young people have the ideas, set up the project, and invite adults to join with them in making decisions.
7. Children and young people are directed	Children and young people have the initial idea and decide how the project is carried out. Adults are available but do not take charge.
6. Adult-initiated shared decisions with children	Adults have the initial idea but children and young people are involved in every step of the planning and implementation. Not only are their views considered, but they are also involved in taking the decisions.
5. Consulted but informed	The project is designed and run by adults but children and young people are consulted. They have a full understanding of the process and their opinions are taken seriously.
4. Assigned but informed	Adults decided on the project and children and young people volunteer for it. Adults respect their views.
3. Tokenism	Children and young people are asked to say what they think about an issue but have little or no choice about the way they express those views or the scope of the ideas they can express.
2. Decoration	Children and young people take part in an event, e.g. by signing, dancing or wearing t-shirts with logos on, but they do not really understand the issue.
1. Manipulation	Children and young people do or say what adults suggest they do, but have no real understanding of the issues, or are asked what they think. Adults use some of their ideas but do not tell them what influence they have had on the final decision.

See Hart, R. (1997) Children’s Participation, London: Earthscan/UNICEF

REFERENCES

- CCC (2009) 'A Right to Participate: Securing children's role in climate change adaptation' *Children in a Changing Climate* www.childreninachangingclimate.org
- IDS (2007) 'The Role of Children in Adapting to Climate Change' IDS In Focus *Issue02, Climate Change Adaptation*
- IPCC (2007) 'Climate Change 2007: A Synthesis Report' *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Assessment Report 4*
- ISDR (2007) 'Towards a Culture of Prevention: Disaster risk reduction begins at school' *International Strategy for Disaster Reduction report on good practices and lessons learned*
- Mitchell, T. *et al* (2008) 'The Roles of Children and Youth in Communicating Disaster Risk' *Children, Youth and Environments* (18:1)
- Mitchell, T. *et al* (2009) 'Children as Agents of Change for Disaster Risk Reduction: Lessons from El Salvador and the Philippines' *Children in a Changing Climate Research Programme Working Paper 1*
- Plan International (2007) 'Children and Young People at the Centre of Disaster Risk Reduction' *Briefing Paper*
- Plan International (2009) 'Children's Perspectives: Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction into Climate Change Adaptation – the role that children can play' *Plan UK report, work-in-progress/ unpublished at time of writing*
- Plan International (2009) 'Indonesian Children's View on Disaster Risk Reduction' *Photo Booklet reporting on research of the relationship between risks, gender and religion in child-centred disaster risk reduction, in partnership with RMIT University Australia, Risk Frontiers Australia, IDS and the Children in a Changing Climate Research Programme*
- Save the Children (2008) 'In the Face of Disaster: Children and climate change' *Cambridge: International Save the Children Alliance*
- UNICEF (2006) 'Behaviour Change Communication in Emergencies: A Toolkit' *UNICEF toolkit*
- UNICEF (nd) 'Contingency Planning for Natural Disasters' *UNICEF Briefing*
- WHO Dept. Mental Health and Substance Abuse (2005) 'Mental health and psychosocial care for children affected by natural disasters' *World Health Organisation Draft Version*
- Wisner, B. (2006) 'Let Our Children Teach Us! A Review of the Role of Education and Knowledge in Disaster Risk Reduction' *ISDR System Thematic Cluster/ Platform on Knowledge and Education*

Electronic Resources for Further Information:

- Plan International UK
<http://www.plan-uk.org/action/issues/reducingchildrensvulnerability/>
- World Vision International
www.wvi.org > resources
- Children in a Changing Climate*
<http://www.childreninachangingclimate.org>
- UNICEF
www.unicef.org
- Save the Children UK
www.scuk.org
- Eldis annotated bibliography on children and climate change:
<http://www.eldis.org/go/topics/resource-guides/environment/climate-change>

Text on back cover extracted from Christoplos, Ian *et al.*
(April 2009) *The Human Dimension of Climate Adaptation*

CONTACT US:



Plan International UK
5-6 Underhill Street
London NW1 7HS
UK

www.plan-uk.org
tel: +44 (0)20 7482 9777



World Vision International
800 West Chestnut Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016-3198
USA

www.wvi.org
tel: +1 (0) 626 303 8811

Prioritising the education and the agency of young people is an essential feature of any society's capacity to manage risk and develop sustainably. The threats that climate change bring emphasises the need to recognize the wide range of risks inherent in development. It is not about "mainstreaming risk into" development but rather recognizing that development is risk management. Good development is about unpacking that risk, making it visible and transparent, and ensuring that all households, especially their children, and all societies have sufficient information to take decisions on how much risk they will accept and how they will manage it. An informed and motivated citizenry will ensure good governance of managing risks, and good governance will thrive on the input of proactive citizens.