



Malawi

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2015)

Name of focal point:	Mr James Chiusiwa
Organization:	Department of Disaster Management Affairs
Title/Position:	Director of Disaster Risk Reduction
E-mail address:	chiusiwaj@yahoo.com
Telephone:	+265 999 937 952

Reporting period:	2013-2015
Report Status:	Final
Last updated on:	2 March 2015
Print date:	23 April 2015
Reporting language:	English

A National HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

DRR has been mainstreamed into the DRM Policy and other policies. The DRM Policy has been approved by Cabinet on 4th February 2014. The review of the 1991 Disaster preparedness and Relief Act is in its final stages, consultations are remaining with Principle Secretaries (i.e. National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee) and Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture. The draft will then be submitted to Ministry of Justice.

Effective coordination aids implementation. To achieve this at all levels requires development of capacity of institutions and staff and appropriate resource allocation. In 14 out of 28 districts the Department has stationed staff to ensure further coordination of DRM activities. This representation of staff at district level also ensures effective mainstreaming and coordination of DRR activities in government and developments partner's projects. This is an important step that ensures projects' outcomes lead to more resilient communities, and reduced disaster risks through more efficient coordinated implementation. In other districts this is achieved through designated DRM District Desk Officers.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

The Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA) has worked with the ministry of Education to ensure DRM principles are captured in the school curricula. DoDMA further worked with consortiums to build and strengthen capacities at community level for effective implementation of disaster risk reduction programmes including disaster response:

Joint Resilience programme with Ministry of Finance, Development and Planning and 4 UN agencies to target communities with various household level tailor made packages.

The Enhancing Community Resilience Program (ECRP) which is comprised of the Concern Universal-led Developing Innovative Solutions with Communities to Overcome Vulnerability through Enhanced Resilience (DISCOVER)) and Christian Aid/ECRP consortia work towards "Increasing resilience of 600,000 vulnerable people to climate variability and change in eleven districts by 2016" through implementation of climate change adaptation and DRR interventions. Through the ECRP, Christian Aid and Concern universal led consortia continue to strengthen district and community institutions and mechanisms through capacity building of district and community structures in Disaster risk reduction in 11 districts in Malawi.

Community based Basic First Aid and shore-based Water Rescue, together with simulation exercises.

CADECOM is working with local vulnerable communities to promote Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) strategies aimed to building their resilience to mitigate the effects of disasters. Currently CADECOM has reached out to 250,000 people and is also mainstreaming an entrepreneurship approach to ensure that there is increased income.

The large Shire River Management Project and related projects promote a strong local culture for DRR, investment and proactive measures needed to support local development structures such as village and area development committees (VDCs and ADCs) and civil protection committees (CPCs) at district and city assembly and below levels for a response orientated DRR.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

A large 4 year regional EWS programme has started this year to:

1. Enhance capacity of the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS) and Department of Water Resources (DWR) to monitor and forecast extreme weather, hydrology and climate change.
2. Efficient and effective use of hydro-meteorological and environmental information for making early warnings and long-term development plans.
3. Documentation and use of traditional early warning signs as a preparedness measure. CADECOM has facilitated the development of these in Karonga, Nsanje, Chikwawa, Nkhatabay reaching out to 6,000 households.

Tools and mechanisms for incorporation of risk reduction preparedness, response and recovery programmes are being adopted, adapted and developed in Government and together with stakeholders.

People and institutions are being made aware and motivated to participate in activities aimed at reducing risks. To develop essential skills and knowledge to integrate and manage disaster risk, government is signing MOUs, e.g. Police and Defense Force.

The ECRP has developed a partnership that links community members to access weather information regularly from the Department of Climate Change Management using mobile technology through the ESOKO platform. The program has also facilitated production of district Hazard maps and installation of rain gauges in schools and other important facilities. River gauges have been installed on rivers that cause annual flooding. More than 60 GVHs have functional EWS. Building on immediate emergency response to affected communities implemented by other organisations, Christian Aid and Concern universal led ECRP consortia build the capacity of local and district decentralized structures in hazard and vulnerability assessments to ensure that such response and recovery initiatives incorporate risk reduction measures for resilience. These include strengthening early warning

systems through provision of weather forecast information.

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

The DRM policy and the 1991 Disaster Preparedness and Relief Act review endorsed in Cabinet for enhanced planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on enhancing resilience of the rural and peri-urban communities.

Strategic Goal Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Strengthened capacities and mechanisms to sustainably reduce disaster losses in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of individuals, communities and the nation. Strengthen coping mechanisms through capacity building to increase community resilience.

Strategic Goal Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

The Government brings stakeholders together prior to, and after, disasters to ensure incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes. Risk reduction approaches are also incorporated in the reconstruction of affected communities

Priority for Action 1

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

Core indicator 1

National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions? Yes

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	No
Poverty reduction strategy papers	Yes
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	No

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk?
Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

DRR is considered in most of strategic documents that guide the implementation development programmes. For instance, disaster risk is incorporated in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy, Common Country Assessment, United Nations Development Assistance Framework and most of climate change programmes and projects. The National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework, the National Disaster Risk Management Policy and the 1991 Disaster Preparedness and Relief Act review were developed in 2010, 2012 and 2014 respectively.

Decentralization is one of the preconditions for DRR mainstreaming in the country. Civil Protection Committees (CPC) have been established at district, area and village. At national level, the National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee (NDPRC) provide policy directions on the implementation of DRM programmes and the Department of Disaster Management Affairs coordinates the implementation of DRM programmes and serves as the secretariat of the NDPRC. The National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical Committee and its eight (8) sub-committees (Agriculture and Food Security; Health and Nutrition; Water and Sanitation; Assessment; Shelter and Camp Management; Transport and Logistics; Early Warning and Search and Rescue) which comprise government line ministries and departments, civil society organisations, the private sector and development partners provide technical support in the implementation of DRM at national level.

These are responsible for planning and coordinating disaster risk management issues at district, area and village levels.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The 1991 Disaster Preparedness and Relief Act review is yet to be approved by the Cabinet. This is expected to be finalised early 2015, belated due to a change in Government.

The civil protection committees do not exist in some districts while in other they exist but are not functional.

Recommendation

The implementation of the National Disaster Risk Management Policy and Act will address the challenges through the mainstreaming of DRM in development planning and policies and will enhance the coordination of DRM activities at all levels.

There is need to establish civil protection committees in districts where they are not existent and develop their capacity to become functional and effective.

Core indicator 2

Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

Level of Progress achieved? 2

Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget	<1%	<1%
Decentralised / sub-national budget	<1%	<1%
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	0	

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The government does not allocate adequate resources to disaster risk reduction activities at national and district level. This hinders the implementation of DRR projects. The government provides funds for disaster response but the resources are inadequate to respond to all disasters that occur in a season and also provided late. There is no budget line for DRM in ministries/departments, city, municipal and district councils which could have been used to channel funds for implementation of DRM activities.

The Department of Disaster Management Affairs has for the past two years been lobbying for DRR funds and the creation of a budget line for DRM and efforts are still being made to that effect, this includes the approval of the Act.

However, in districts where active NGOs are operating, districts civil protection committees have been technically and financially assisted to develop DRM plans. For instance, 9 out of 15 disaster prone districts have these plans.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges

More funds are directed towards response as opposed to DRR (partners prefer supporting response as opposed to DRR).

The DoDMA does not have a separate vote in the national budget and is not directly provided with funds for DRR through central Government. However, funds are provided to ministries and departments for their development activities which turn out to be DRR activities. Data on finances of such activities is not disaggregated to allow for clear analysis of the total amount for DRR activities but a public expenditure review has been conducted on DRM in 2014.

Recommendation

Intensification of advocacy on the significance of investing in DRR.

DoDMA should be supported with adequate DRR funds through creation of a budget line and a vote in the national budget. DoDMA will then be able to provide dedicated funds to allow functionality of the established CPCs especially at District level (DCPC).

Creating a budget line for DRM in ministries and departments and city, municipal and district councils. In Addition to this there should be dedicated funds to support the role of ADDRMO

Improve data management to capture actual cost of DRR and response as it relates to the impact on the ground for planning.

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget

allocations for DRR? No

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)

No

Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government

No

Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR

0%

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

District councils and civil society organisations have gained reasonable experience in implementing community based DRR initiatives such as small scale irrigation schemes, dams and dykes, local capacity building, relocation of people from flood prone areas to safer areas, flood mitigation and flood early warning systems. Most of these initiatives are donor funded but coordinated at the district level through government. Local governments do not make budget allocations for DRR The DRM Draft Devolution plan will help to strengthen the district capacities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

District Councils are the basic planning and implementation units for government at the district level under the decentralization system. This level is the most important level for DRR to be integrated. However, there is no budget line for DRR in the district budgets. Although civil protection committees exist at district, area and village level, lack of resources for implementation of DRR activities makes them non-functional and ineffective.

Core indicator 4

A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? Yes

civil society members (specify absolute number)	20
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	5
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	3
private sector (specify absolute number)	0
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	4
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	1
other (please specify)	9

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	Yes
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	No
In a civil protection department	No
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical Committee which comprises of government, civil society organization, the private sector, the media, academic institutions, and development partners serves as the national platform for DRM. The Department of Disaster Management Affairs serves as the secretariat of the platform. The launch of the national platform was in 2013.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Since the Platform is relatively new we are yet to establish a better coordinating mechanism that will enhance DRM planning, implementation and coordination at both national and district level.

Due to limited funding towards DoDMA, it proves difficult to organize platform meetings.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? No

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	0%
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	n/a
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	Yes
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	Yes
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	n/a

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

No significant multi hazard risk assessments have been undertaken in the country. Most risk assessments have been done by civil society organisations on one or two hazards and the assessments have been localized to their target districts. Hence, there are no agreed national standards for the multi hazard risk assessments and the format for undertaking them varies from one institution to the other. This is mainly due to lack of resources to undertake a comprehensive risk assessment. However, currently we are undertaking very comprehensive spatial district baseline studies that will guide us with damage and loss assessments among others. If NGOs were better coordinated, their spatial baseline data could be consolidated but this is not happening and as a result there is little data and information shared.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Agree on and enforce standards for data collection, storage and the sharing of this information.

Recommendations

Mobilization of resources to undertake the multi hazard risk assessment and continue with the baseline data collection, storage, standards debate and sharing mechanisms.

Sharing of information collected by different NGOs in their areas

Core indicator 2

Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed?
Yes

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated

Yes

Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)

Yes

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Department of Disaster Management Affairs maintains a database of disaster losses which is updated regularly. Districts also keep a database of disaster losses and update them regularly. Reports regarding disasters are generated and circulated to stakeholders for use in planning. Some reports are specific to certain disasters while some, for instance, the Humanitarian Update, are general with the purpose of updating stakeholders on humanitarian situation prevailing at that particular time.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

There is inadequate capacity to quantify disaster losses in monetary terms to inform programming.

Lack of modern equipment for early warning and communication of early warning information.

Flood early warning system covers only major rivers leaving out smaller rivers which equally cause problems.

Inaction by community members to use early warning information

Recommendations:

Speed up current capacity building particularly on the aspect of quantifying disaster losses in monetary terms.

Build capacity on the interpretation of early warning information, sensitization on the use of early warning information and upgrade equipment used for collecting and disseminating early warning information under EWS programme.

Core indicator 3

Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events? Yes

Early warnings acted on effectively	Yes
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Early warning information is provided by the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS) and the Department of Water Services. The DCCMS operates a network of 21 surface observing stations, 27 automatic weather stations, 63 rainfall loggers, and satellite receiving station and over 100 rainfall stations across the country for the purposes of producing early warning information. In addition, the DWS has water gauging stations installed in major rivers across the

country for flood monitoring. The forecasts and warnings are disseminated through radio, television, internet, conference, and bulletins and newsletters. However, early warning information is not widely used by communities due to inability to interpret warning data. Consequently, there are minimal preparedness activities undertaken by community members. Generally, there are challenges with using national early warning system. Recently, some NGOs introduced community based early warning systems and indications are there that warning information generated of this is more used than that generated from the national early warning system. A 4 year multi country programme will greatly improve equipment and coordinating structures.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Lack of modern equipment for early warning systems.

Flood early warning systems cover only major rivers leaving out smaller rivers which equally cause flooding.

Ineffective channels of dissemination to affected communities.

The national early warning system focuses on a few hazards, mostly floods, strong winds and drought.

The way of reporting is also haphazard as some reports are area specific while some are general. This results in the general populace losing trust in the warning information.

Lack of capacity at community level to interpret and use early warning information.

Limited link of early warning information to people's livelihoods

Recommendations:

There is need to acquire modern early warning equipment.

There is need to develop systems for other hazards like civil strife.

Establish user-friendly and sustainable mechanisms for disseminating information to communities.

Flood monitoring systems should be extended to smaller rivers.

Capacity building of community members on the interpretation and use of early warning information.

Develop linkages between EWS to other economic sectors like agriculture to make EWS more relevant.

Core indicator 4

National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? Yes

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	No
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	No
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	No
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Regional early warning information is provided by the Southern Africa Regional Climate Outlook Forum (SARCOF). The outlook provides information on projected rainfall pattern which in turn allows stakeholders to undertake preparedness activities. Neighboring countries share information in regional fora, however there are no clear cut protocols for regular trans-boundary information sharing.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

There are no regional risk assessments done.

Bilateral relations with neighboring countries have not been fully utilized.

Recommendations:

Mechanisms for regional hazard monitoring should be established.

Regional risk assessments should be done.

There is need for maximum utilization of bilateral relations.

Priority for Action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

Core indicator 1

Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? No

Information is proactively disseminated
--

Yes

· [Humanitarian Update](#)

Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)
--

Yes

Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk
--

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A communication Strategy is in final draft and will guide towards standardized information sharing. The Department but disseminates information on disasters and disaster risk reduction activities to stakeholders through a number of ways; workshops, print and electronic media, training sessions, and a newsletter known as Humanitarian Update. Part of the information is provided to stakeholders while most is provided upon request. Over 20 tele-centres have been established across the country, to be extended to all 193 constituencies by 2013. The public are access

information about other countries through internet. However, there are high illiteracy levels in the rural areas such that most of the tele-centres are underutilized. DRM documents like national DRM policy, DRM Act, DRM operational guidelines, DRM framework for action and DRM handbook were developed and disseminated to all DRM stakeholders at all levels. The department also produced and disseminated flyers highlighting DRM concepts including living with floods, drought, earthquakes as well as disaster risk management terms to DRM stakeholders.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Inadequate numbers of tele-centres

High illiteracy levels particularly in rural areas which hinders people's understanding of DRM issues

Recommendations:

There is need to increase the number of tele-centres

There is need for intensification of adult literacy as well as basic education

Core indicator 2

School curricula , education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	Yes
university curriculum	Yes
professional DRR education programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

DRR related concepts have been incorporated in primary and secondary school. The DoDMA assisted in the development of modules for degree programme on DRM and Climate Change to be offered at newly built University of Science and Technology. Short term DRR course for DRM professionals has been Introduced at one of the constituent colleges of the University of Malawi. In addition, a private university is also offering a degree course in DRM. Through the Education in Emergencies programme which is implemented by Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, District Education Managers (DEMs) were trained in education in emergencies to enhance their capacity to respond to emergencies, and to ensure that learning process is not disturbed during emergencies. Training in basic DRM issues was also provided to curriculum developers from Malawi Institute of Education.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

There are no supplementary teaching and learning materials on DRM concepts and practices

Institutions providing DRM courses are not properly regulated

Inadequate knowledge on DRM issues by many stakeholders in the education

Limited human capacity to provide training to all primary and secondary school teaching staff

Recommendations:

Provision of supplementary teaching and learning materials

There is need for regulation of institutions offering DRM courses

Sensitization of stakeholders in the education sector on DRM issues

Capacity building on DRM targeting primary and secondary school teaching staff

Core indicator 3

Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? No

Research programmes and projects	Yes
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	Yes
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Commission for Science and Technology is a government agency mandated to conduct research in various fields in the country. However, not much has been done on DRM.

ECRP recently commissioned aiming at assessment of functionality of DRR structures as it relates to costs incurred. The report is not out but it is hoped to unveil constraints limiting the functionality of these structures. Through a DIPECHO funding there is a planned study on assessment of the efficiency of EW messages delivery pathways.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Research on DRM is overlooked by the National Commission for Science and Technology and many other private institutions but some programmes and studies have been reported on.

Recommendations:

There is need for more research on DRM especially by national institutions.

Core indicator 4

Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.

Yes

Training of local government

Yes

Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)

Yes

Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)

Yes

Guidance for risk reduction

Yes

Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A Communication Strategy on DRM has been developed and is awaiting signing of by the Vice President. However, sensitization campaigns on seasonal rainfall forecast and possible disasters projected to occur in the season are undertaken through public meetings, drama, mobile van broadcasts, jingles and press conferences in both print and electronic media. Due to limited funds, most of these

awareness campaigns have targeted disaster prone districts. District officers have been trained in DRM by both local and international institutions.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges

Most of the awareness campaigns and trainings have been limited to only disaster prone districts and central level officers.

Recommendations

There is need to mobilize resources to widen the target of the awareness campaign.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) Yes

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	Yes
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Progress has been made to strengthen the link between climate change, DRR and the environment at policy planning and implementation levels. It is now being recognised that development projects have to be formulated, monitored and evaluated with regards to DRR and CCA considerations. The Africa Adaptation Programme, a climate change adaptation programme has been developed among

others and is being implemented and DRR stakeholders are part of this process. More often than not social and environmental impact assessment is also done by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA). NGO's are contributing to addressing the underlying causes to community vulnerabilities with the aim of reducing overall community Disaster risk and build resilience. This is done through transferring and enhancing knowledge in CC and its impacts, implementation of adaptation activities which also increase household income and food security in efforts to reduce poverty at household level. In addition NGOs support household and communities in Village Saving and Loans which is a catalyst to accessing other household assets to reduce poverty. Low carbon technologies and afforestation which reduce pressure on the environment and provide for carbon sink.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Existing guidelines on project planning do not provide specific guidance on how to assess and address the potential risk reduction benefits of projects or to explore the potential risks posed by development projects or tourism.

There is laxity in the enforcement of policies.

Recommendation:

Consideration of disaster risks in the project formulation, appraisal and approval process as well as Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Social Impact Assessment (SIA) by the government can help in understanding the benefits and negative consequences of prospective projects.

Strict enforcement of policies.

Core indicator 2

Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? Yes

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	Yes
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Improving disaster risk management” is a sub theme of Theme three of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS).The long-term goal of sub theme three is ‘the reduction in the socio-economic impact of disasters as well as building a strong disaster management mechanism. A number of safety nets programmes are being implemented in the country in a bid to improve the livelihoods of vulnerable populations. Some of these include social cash transfers, farm input subsidy programme, public works programme, targeted food distributions, food for work programme and cash for work programme. The social cash transfer programme is running in 18 districts of the country and is being up-scaled this year with an addition in the number of beneficiaries. The number of beneficiaries under the public works programme has also increased this year. The Social Support (Social Protection) policy is in place. This will ensure the promotion of social support programmes for the most vulnerable.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Lack of adequate financial resources for the implementation of social welfare programmes to target more vulnerable population.

Targeting of the most vulnerable for the different programmes.

Recommendation:

Resource mobilization for the programmes.

Enhanced targeting, create a single register and allow the most vulnerable to be part

of different programmes.

Core indicator 3

Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? No

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.

Yes

Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets

agriculture and food security; irrigation and water development; transport infrastructure development; integrated rural development and energy generation and supply

Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Ministry of Economic Planning and Development developed a Project Planning Manual and guidelines to support the planning process of ministries. As per the

process, projects included in the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) are required to undergo economic appraisal. The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy has a number of key priority areas which will contribute towards the economic development of the country. These include agriculture and food security; irrigation and water development; transport infrastructure development; integrated rural development and energy generation and supply. A lot of development projects under these priority areas are being implemented in the country and they are contributing to reducing vulnerability of economic activities. There are also insurance, trade and finance regulations to protect economic investments. Most of these activities are not classified however, as DRR initiatives.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Requirements indicated in the PSIP are mostly overlooked in development projects. negative impacts need to be analysed, not just the positive impacts development programmes.

DRR is mostly overlooked in public investments.

Recommendations:

Strict enforcement of rules laid out in PSIP in development programmes and M&E should be enhanced.

DRR to be mainstreamed into public investments.

Core indicator 4

Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas

Yes

Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	No
Training of masons on safe construction technology	Yes
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	Yes
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	No
Regulated provision of land titling	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Currently, there is no policy framework for human settlements especially for the rural setting. Building guidelines were developed by the government through the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development. Building codes also exist (in draft form) for buildings in towns, however, they do not exist for houses in the villages where most of the disasters occur.

The new land bill has provisions for making the entire country a Planning Area. The implications of this will be that even rural areas that are not subject to planning control will now be subject to planning control and this will offer the opportunity to introduce statutory land use planning that incorporates reduction of vulnerability to disasters of all communities in Malawi.

A Malawi Land Use Planning and Management Policy is being formulated and should contribute to strengthening the policy framework for promoting human settlements that incorporate disaster risk reduction elements.

For urban areas which have been subject to planning control for a long time, the challenge is that many of them are operating with outdated land use plans and in most of them where such plans exist, they do not adequately address disaster risk reduction as a key principle of planning control. Although these are planning areas, the de facto situation is that up to 60% of urban development takes place outside planning control. This is manifested in the growth of informal settlements some of which are in vulnerable locations such as steep slopes, wetlands and in flood prone areas. This is where most of the urban poor live in substandard housing.

The Building Code in use in many urban centres is also outdated and does not adequately address DRR nor green construction issues. Efforts are being made to address this situation. Construction guidelines addressing safer construction in earthquake and flood prone areas have been developed and a new national building

code is under formulation through the Ministry of Lands and Housing. Masons in selected districts are being trained in the application of these construction guidelines.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Poverty of most people in the rural and some parts of urban areas results in their constructing weak houses which are usually damaged when affected by disasters. There is need for these people to be empowered economically. The development of a settlement policy framework as one of the UNDAF cluster plan will increase the likelihood that DRR will be incorporated in designing human settlements.

The rapid rate of urbanization (5.3%) is placing severe social, economic and environmental pressure on the urban environment. As urbanization cannot be stopped and neither is it desirable to try to do so, it is important to support strengthening of capacity of local governments to manage urbanization and make it sustainable. This includes strengthening capacity for planning, urban management, promoting access to land by the urban poor in safe locations with secure tenure, improving construction, drainage and other engineering solutions to disaster risks. Strengthening capacity of local governments for implementation of land use plans, policies and bylaws.

Disaster risk management attention has tended to focus on rural areas only. It will be important to carry out a national urban risk and vulnerability assessment in order to determine the extent of urban risk and vulnerability and design relevant programmes to address these.

Core indicator 5

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? No

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	Yes
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	No
Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Government plans for recovery activities. However, funds are seldom provided for DRR activities. Provided funds only cover disaster response activities for a specified period. Nevertheless, a number of NGOs and development partners plan for and have implemented disaster recovery activities incorporating DRR.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Lack of advocacy and commitment towards recovery activities by government.
Lack of proper planning during project design.

Recommendations:

There is need for more lobbying for funds for recovery activities.
There is need for capacity building in project design.

Core indicator 6

Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? No

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	No
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	No
By international development actors	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There is a requirement that EIAs be undertaken for all major development projects. This requirement ensures that there is an assessment of the disaster risk impacts of such major projects. Cost/benefits of disaster risk has not yet been conducted.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Laxity in monitoring adherence to findings of the EIAs and its recommendations.

Recommendations:

Conducted cost/benefits analysis of DRR in general and project/program specific.

Strict enforcement and regular monitoring of the major developments to ensure adherence to EIA's recommendations.

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies

Yes

The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support.

Yes

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? Yes

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

No

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

No

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

Yes

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Cabinet has endorsed the National Disaster Risk Management Policy on February 2015 and will soon consider the Act, which address disaster risk reduction issues comprehensively. One of the priority areas in the policy is strengthening preparedness capacity for effective response at all levels. With the efforts of the department at mainstreaming DRR, various institutions are recognizing their role in DRM.

The government also developed the Operational Guidelines for Disaster Risk Management which addresses the need for a comprehensive expression of roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in DRM in Malawi. The main purpose is to identify the lead organization in each phase of every hazard situation, the coordination modes that ensure action without gaps or redundancies.

The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology implements Education in Emergency programme which aims at ensuring that learning sessions are not interrupted in times of disasters.

Training and mock drills on risk reduction are done at small scale in private schools. The Department of Civil Aviation also undertakes air crash drills once every two years.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Key challenges are lack of resources to properly implement DRM activities. Although stakeholders know their roles, most haven't yet started effectively participating due to lack of resources. There is also lack of awareness by stakeholders on their role in DRM.

Recommendations:

Sensitization of stakeholders on their roles in DRM.

Advocate for designated budget lines.

Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	Yes
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	Yes
Operations and communications centre	No
Search and rescue teams	Yes
Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Shelters	Yes
Secure medical facilities	No
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	Yes
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National contingency plan was developed and is reviewed annually. This plan takes into account gender sensitivities. The overall objective of the National Contingency Plan is to help ensure that government, development partners and civil societies mount a timely, consistent and coordinated response in times of disasters to

minimise potential humanitarian consequences and ensure the early recovery of affected communities. 14 districts out of 28 also have contingency plans which are also reviewed annually. Besides government, most NGOs have contingency plans specific to their operations which can be used to supplement government efforts in times of emergencies.

Search and rescue teams are established and ToT course has been conducted for further training in country.

At institutional level, various INGO develop Emergency Preparedness Plans which are reviewed on a yearly basis to take into account recent trends and occurrences. Through the EPPs, response plans are made and other some organisations do preposition items for response. The private sector is a partner in the delivery of response initiatives in times of disaster.

The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology implements Education in Emergency programme which aims at ensuring that learning sessions are not interrupted in times of disasters. Ministry of Health also has mechanisms put in place which ensure continued delivery of health services in times of disaster (Mobile clinics)

The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security is also actively involved in risk management through the crop weather insurance.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

The contingency plan is not resourced which makes its operationalization difficult. Some districts do not have the contingency plans. In addition, there are no contingency plans at community level.

Most district contingency plans have not been operationalised such that they are not reviewed if there are no funds from NGO and other development partners

Recommendations:

There is need to intensify resource mobilization for operationalising the contingency plan.

Contingency plans should be developed for the remaining districts and at community levels.

There is need for institutionalization of district contingency plans to allow funds to be allocated for its review.

Core indicator 3

Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective

response and recovery when required.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	No
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Govt of Malawi provides funds for disaster response every year. Under the coordination of United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office (UNRCO), humanitarian actors established a humanitarian fund which is be accessible for preparedness and initial response to disasters. This fund will also be useful for conducting joint assessments. This fund however does not cover for early recovery activities.

Other NGOs, have emergency funds in their respective headquarters which can be used in emergencies e.g. Oxfam, Save the Children, Malawi Red Cross Society, CADECOM

Micro Insurance and reinsurance are provided by some banks there but not extensively used due to people lack knowledge on it. There is therefore, a need for a review of the mechanisms used in the delivery of these services.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

There are delays in accessing the disaster response funds from government.

Recommendation:

There is need to develop a mechanisms to ensure timely disbursement of disaster response funds.

There is need for sensitization on the role of insurance in providing resources for disaster response.

There is need for government and humanitarian partners to find innovative means of mobilizing resources for preparedness activities.

Core indicator 4

Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? Yes

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available	Yes
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	Yes
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	Yes
Identified and trained human resources	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Damage and loss assessment methodologies are available and staff have been trained on how to use them. Officers from line ministries were trained on how to conduct a post disaster needs assessment. The exercise has been conducted in one of the districts which is frequently affected by floods. Further when a disaster of big magnitude occurs, a joint assessment exercise is undertaken. The joint mission comprises members of the government, CSO and UN agencies.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Challenges:

Training covered only a few stakeholders.

Recommendation:

There is need to train more officers at national and district level.

Drivers of Progress

a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Many studies, Docs, Strategies exist: Flood Risk Management, Economic Vulnerability, Operational Guidelines, DRM Handbook, Communication Strategy, draft operational Guidelines on DRM, DRM Policy has been approved 4th February 2015 and the Act is to be approved early 2015.

Focus should be directed towards Multi-Hazard, Vulnerability and Risk maps as well as on communication, data collection storage and dissemination.

b) Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

DRM Policy has Gender perspectives strongly embedded but the implementation of these broad directions need to be further detailed. The establishment of a gender disaggregated disaster database will be completed next year and more disaggregated data collection is required.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?:
Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Some capacity does exist in the 14 Districts where ADDRMO's have been placed. In areas and villages where CPC are active there is some capacity, too. However the means or resources that these individuals and groups have, almost always needs to come from outside sources as government does not have budget lines for DRR and DRM at those levels.

While the policy environment and framework has been provided at the local level, implementation of policy translated at the local level is the greatest challenge because it lacks a proper financing mechanism. In order to mobilize district level resources and better Coordination of players for a concerted approach, District DRR platforms need to be formed and better coordinated. At the National level, different players meet and discuss DRR related issues affecting policy and implementation frameworks. NGOs and INGOs have formed the Civil Society Network on Climate Change (CISONECC). With the Decentralisation system in place, financial resources need to be channeled to the districts and better managed at that level. District sensitization and human capacities need to be strengthened at that level other than focusing on National level policy discussions. The district platforms require a more focused resource allocation and better coordination of different partners who bring in resources to the district.

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Because there is not an agreed UNISDR definition, let us assume that the term, socio-environmental risks, is used for the circumstances where human activity is increasing the occurrence of certain natural environmental risks.

The Human Rights based approach is adhered to as much as possible and is coordinated through the Humanitarian Response Committee and DoDMA for DM and through DoDMA for DRR.

Well informed and targeted social protect measures are implemented but the scale is inadequate.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels and are more aligned and coordinated through the DRM Platform since 2013.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Institutional framework is a priority together with the implementation of the DRM Policy, the draft Act and Operational Guidelines.

Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Overall Challenges

Enough DRR awareness across sectors to integrate risk reduction measures in daily work when developing policies, acts, strategies and plans at all levels.
Localised risk maps are not of desired resolution to be able to effectively inform the mitigation of disaster risks.

Future Outlook Statement

Government will ensure that DRM is mainstreamed in all sectors and at all levels, based on solid knowledge that is shared with all stakeholders during regular National Platform meetings and other fora.

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges

Enough DRR awareness across sectors to integrate RR measures in daily work.
Many focal points are overwhelmed with subjects, projects, courses, trips etc. due to a general lack of adequate staff (numbers are just too low).

Future Outlook Statement

Coordination and knowledge management needs uplifting and data and information collection analysis and sharing enhanced, with emphasis towards resilience at the local level.

Up-scale the small grants scheme at community level to effectively address resilience at the community level with full community support from design to implementation and ensure ownership.

Development of a devolution plan by DoDMA will help the shift in roles and responsibilities towards District authorities,

Future Outlook Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges

Resilience is difficult to achieve in a vicious circle of poverty and has been hampered by a lack of stakeholder coordination and joint approach and coordination.

Future Outlook Statement

Better Stakeholder coordination to ensure early incorporation of pre-defined measures and approaches to include DRR into all programmes and project dealing with preparedness, response, recovery. Better results and graduation from poverty due to personalized targeting through various programmes for individual households.

Stakeholders

Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA)	Governments	James Chiusiwa, Director for Disaster Risk Reduction
Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA) / United Nations Development Programme	UN & International Organizations	Noud (Arnoldus Gijsbertus) Leenders, DRM Advisor
Catholic Development Commission in Malawi (CADECOM) – Caritas Malawi	Non-Governmental Organizations	Carsterns Mulume, National CADECOM Secretary
Zomba District Council	Governments	Bennet Nkasala, Assistant District Disaster Risk Management Officer
Department of Forestry	Governments	William Mitembe, Chief Forestry Officer
Save the Children International	UN & International Organizations	Chrispin Magombo, Project Manager Livelihoods and Food Security
Concern Universal	UN & International Organizations	Senard Mwale, Project manager
Christian Aid	UN & International Organizations	Sophie Makoloma, Project manager