TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING TEAMS (THE TATTs PROGRAM)

INSTITUTIONALIZING DISASTER PREPAREDNESS AND MANAGEMENT CAPACITY OF BPBDs IN INDONESIA THROUGH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING TEAMS

BASELINE STUDY REPORT

SUBMITTED TO:
MERCY CORPS INDONESIA

2nd of MARCH 2015
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## ABBREVIATIONS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

### 2. METHODOLOGY

#### 2.1. OVERVIEW

#### 2.2. CAPACITY THEMES

#### 2.3. CAPACITY LEVELS

### 3. BASELINE STUDY RESULTS

#### 3.1. RISK AND VULNERABILITY OF THE TATTs TARGET PROVINCES

**CENTRAL JAVA PROVINCE**

**SOUTHEAST SULAWESI PROVINCE**

**MALUKU PROVINCE**

**NORTH MALUKU PROVINCE**

**PAPUA PROVINCE**

**WEST PAPUA PROVINCE**

#### 3.2. DESCRIPTION OF THE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT THEMES

#### 3.2.1. THEME 1: PROVINCIAL BPBD ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY

#### 3.2.2. THEME 2: PROVINCIAL BPBD PAST, CURRENT AND FUTURE GENERAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

#### 3.2.3. THEME 3: PROVINCIAL BPBD PAST, CURRENT AND FUTURE DISASTER PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM AND ACTIVITIES

#### 3.2.4. THEME 4: TRAINING MODULES AND TRAINING DELIVERY CAPACITY OF PROVINCIAL AND DISTRICT BPBDS

#### 3.2.5. THEME 5: LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND DISTRICT BPBDS

#### 3.2.6. THEME 6: PERCEPTIONS OF DISTRICT BPBD ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY

#### 3.2.7. THEME 7: OTHER ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN DRM/DRR

#### 3.2.8. THEME 8: INCLUSIVE DRR

#### 3.2.9. THEME 9: TRAINING MODULES AND TRAINING DELIVERY CAPACITY OF PUSDIKLAT BNPB

#### 3.2.10. THEME 10: KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING MECHANISMS

### 4. CONCLUSION

### REFERENCE

### APPENDIX
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The USAID-funded Technical Assistance and Training Teams (TATTs) program represents a comprehensive approach to disaster management capacity development in Indonesia. The TATTs program provides support for sub-national disaster management agencies (BPBD) in six (6) target provinces – Central Java, Southeast Sulawesi, Maluku, North Maluku, West Papua and Papua. The goal of the TATTs program is that BPBDs in the 6 provinces are professionally coordinating disaster management activities before, during and after natural disasters and are promoting disaster management best practice among their respective districts. The aim of the TATTs baseline study is to develop understanding and measure current organizational and technical performance of provincial BPBD in disaster risk management (DRM) and their engagement with the national disaster management agency (BNPB), district BPBDs, and other key disaster management stakeholders.

The results of the study are presented in this overview report through analysis of 10 key capacity themes focusing on DRM and disaster risk reduction (DRR) policy and implementation as well as basic organizational capacity. The 10 capacity development themes are derived from the key performance indicators outlined in the TATTs Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The results have been analyzed across the 6 target provinces and ranked based on a five-step Capacity Level measure. The Capacity Level measure defines the extent to which organizational and technical capacity has been achieved, as indicated through an analysis of secondary data such as BPBD plans and reports, as well as primary quantitative and qualitative data from surveys, interviews and focus group discussions with key government and non-government personnel. Under the ranking system, Level 1 relates to minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy in DRM. Level 2 relates to some progress in implementing DRM programs and activities, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment. Level 3 relates to institutional commitment to support BPBDs and implement DRM policies, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial. Level 4 relates to substantial achievement attained, but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources, and finally Level 5 relates to comprehensive achievements with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

For the TATTs program, the study found that 4 capacity development themes had achieved a Level 3 ranking, another 5 themes had achieved a Level 2 ranking, while 1 theme had only
achieved a Level 1 ranking. Overall, the cumulative capacity score achieved by the BPBDs across the 6 TATTs target provinces was an average of 2.1 out of 5, placing this sample group in the low-to-medium capacity level. It should be noted, however, that results varied considerably across the 6 target provinces with identified strengths in different capacity development themes. For this reason, the cumulative baseline study is supported by individual baseline studies for each target province. These documents, produced in Bahasa Indonesia, are important planning tools for the TATTs teams embedded within the provincial BPBDs. Surveying and qualitative interviews were also conducted at the national level with a focus on the BNPB Education and Training Unit (Pusdiklat). In terms of the production of training material and training delivery, the Pusdiklat recorded an average capacity score of 3 out of 5, placing the Pusdiklat in the medium-to-high capacity level.

The highest Capacity Level recorded in the TATTs study was Level 3, indicating a medium-to-high capacity. This shows sufficient evidence of institutional commitment for DRM at the provincial level, however tangible achievements are not yet considered substantial or comprehensive. Overall, Level 3 was achieved in Theme 1 (Organizational Capacity of Provincial BPBDs), Theme 3 (Provincial BPBD Disaster Preparedness Programming), Theme 7 (Involvement of Various Organizations), and Theme 9 (Training Modules and Training Delivery by BNPB Pusdiklat). In terms of Theme 1, all 6 provinces have established their provincial BPBDs and commitment for funding from provincial (APBD) budgets has increased annually, in addition to national support through BNPB. There was, however, variation in progress with respect to DRM skills and knowledge of BPBD staff; the availability and maintenance of equipment and offices; as well as the number of trainings undertaken or provided by BPBD staff. For Theme 7, all of the provincial BPBDs have worked with universities, non-government organizations (NGOs), disaster risk reduction (DRR) Forum, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Forum, universities, or international organizations to varying degrees. For Theme 9, the Pusdiklat BNPB has developed 22 training curricula, and has started the process of developing training modules based on the curricula. The Pusdiklat also has plans to develop interactive materials, either on-line or formatted onto compact disc, to enable long distance learning and wider distribution of the teaching materials. The study shows that while the Pusdiklat has started to develop monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to measure quality of content and delivery, it was still unclear how the collected results and learnings were incorporated back into the curriculum development process.
Capacity Level 2 was achieved by Theme 2 (Provincial BPBD General DRM Programming), Theme 4 (Training Modules and Training Delivery Capacity of Provincial BPBDs), Theme 5 (Engagement Between Provincial and District BPBDs), Theme 6 (Perceptions on the Capacity of District BPBDs) and Theme 10 (Knowledge and Learning Mechanisms). This capacity level indicates a low-to-medium capacity. In these thematic areas the study found some progress in implementing DRM programs and activities but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment. This generally indicates an ad-hoc approach to DRM programming, a need for improved training regimes and systems between provinces and districts, and a need for the development of more robust DRR Forum and inter-governmental coordination mechanisms at the province level.

Findings on Theme 2 suggest the need for better policy and planning to support BPBD programs – a simple example of this is basing disaster preparedness and risk reduction programs on good quality risk assessments and analysis. There are, however, gaps in local policy and planning that hinder strong overall institutional commitment to DRM programming. Findings on Theme 4 suggest that while most respondents from the 6 provinces have conducted trainings involving district BPBDs, NGOs and universities in the past, these trainings were not systematically planned or regularly implemented by the provincial BPBDs. Important issues relating to training challenges included the need to develop local trainers or facilitators, improved use of training materials, and assessment methodology to determine how the trainings were conducted and how the trainees had understood the materials. On Theme 5, the study showed that, in general, the provincial and district BPBDs engaged in terms of coordination, the implementation of activities, and most specifically during emergencies when provinces provided equipment and emergency assistance. But there was not sufficient evidence across all 6 provinces of regular, formalized and systematic engagement. On Theme 6, most respondents identified continuing low organizational capacity and a lack of staff technical capacity within district BPBDs. While for Theme 10, while the national BNPB had begun investing in knowledge management mechanisms, this was not being mirrored at the provincial level resulting in a lack of feedback of learning from the field to national policy makers.
The lowest Capacity Level (Level 1) was assigned to Theme 8 (Inclusive DRR) indicating low capacity. Findings on Theme 8 suggested that all 6 provinces did not yet have guidelines on the involvement of, and capacity building for, at-risk groups, nor a special unit for at-risk groups within the BPBDs.

Overall, the TATTs baseline study results were positive. They showed clear foundations for continued capacity development initiatives across key thematic areas and helped to reinforce the TATTs Program Logic and strategies to bridge national training products with the sub-national level, while simultaneously building the capacity of provincial BPBD to provide better and more inclusive DRM services to the district level. The baseline showed the need to invest in institutional and organizational support, as well as technical training. In a short time period, BNPB has become a leading agency for DRM training and is engaging more effectively with provinces and districts. Provincial BPBD are showing signs of progress in terms of organizational strength, disaster preparedness programming and engagement with multi-stakeholders. But these agencies need to create more systematic strategies in order to most effectively support district capacity.
# ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APBD</td>
<td><em>Anggaran Pembangunan dan Belanja Daerah</em> (Local Development Budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBN</td>
<td><em>Anggaran Pembangunan dan Belanja Negara</em> (National Development Budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basarnas</td>
<td><em>Badan Search dan Rescue Nasional</em> (National Search and Rescue Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNPB</td>
<td><em>Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana</em> (National Disaster Management Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMKG</td>
<td><em>Badan Meteorologi, Klimatologi dan Geofisika</em> (National Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysics Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBD</td>
<td><em>Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah</em> (Local Disaster Management Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRV</td>
<td>Disaster Resilient Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP</td>
<td><em>Dana Siap Pakai</em> (On-call budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusdatin</td>
<td><em>Pusat data dan informasi</em> (Data and Information System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKPD</td>
<td><em>Satuan Kerja Pembangunan Daerah</em> (Local Government Departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATTs</td>
<td>Institutionalizing Disaster Preparedness and Management Capacity of BPBDs in Indonesia through Technical Assistance and Training Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC</td>
<td><em>Tim Reaksi Cepat</em> (Rapid Response Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTX</td>
<td>Table Top Exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

The USAID-funded Technical Assistance and Training Teams (TATTs) Program represents a comprehensive approach to disaster management capacity development in Indonesia. The TATTs program provides support for sub-national disaster management agencies (BPBD) in six target provinces – Central Java, Southeast Sulawesi, Maluku, North Maluku, West Papua and Papua (Figure 1). These provincial BPBDs are located in some of the country's most isolated areas and therefore require strong institutional and technical capacity support to enable effective, credible and professional disaster management coordination and service delivery before, during and after disasters. The TATTs program has the following goal: ‘BPBDs in six target provinces are professionally coordinating DRM activities before, during and after natural disasters and are promoting DRM best practice among their respective districts”. Achievement of the program goal will be supported by two interlinked strategic objectives, namely: 1) BPBDs in target provinces are delivering inclusive DRM services; and 2) DRM technical training delivery has been institutionalized at target sub-national and national levels.

The aim of the TATTs baseline study is to develop an understanding and measure the current organizational and technical performance of target provincial BPBD in disaster risk management (DRM) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) and their current level of engagement with the national level (BNPB), the district level (BPBDs), and other key government and non-government stakeholders at the provincial level. The specific objective of the evaluation is:

To serve as the first measure of all main program indicators as per the TATTs Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Results Framework

To achieve this, the following key areas were covered:

- Analysis of past and current organizational performance of provincial BPBDs;
- Analysis of past, current, and future programming of provincial BPBDs;
- Determine the level of preparedness to disasters of the general community, through activities facilitated by provincial BPBDs;
- Examine how learning and training engagement has taken place between Pusdiklat BNPB and provincial and district BPBDs;
- Identify and analyze programs and activities that facilitate engagement between provincial and district BPBDs;
Identify current stakeholders involved and their respective roles in DRM (government, non-government organizations, community forums, DRR forum, universities);

Identify the extent to which the DRM and DRR programs and activities being implemented by the provincial BPBD consider inclusion of at-risk groups namely women, men, children, youth, elderly, and people with disability;

Examine Pusdiklat BNPB training modules and systems that are relevant to BPBD capacity development;

Examine whether there is a system established for knowledge sharing and learning.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Overview

The following process was utilized in the development of the TATTs Baseline Study:

1) Development of survey tools, instruments and FDG questions by an external consultant with review by the TATTs management team;
2) Training of TATTs provincial teams to conduct the data collection;
3) Data collection conducted at national, provincial and district levels. Up to 2 districts were chosen per province to assist in understanding the engagement between the province and the district in DRM/DRR and also to better understand the districts' perception of the role of the provincial BPBD and associated stakeholders in delivering inclusive DRM services and technical training;
4) Data analysis and report writing.

The study team consisted of 17 members including newly recruited TATTs field staff. Data collected included primary and secondary data sourced from deskwork and field based research. The major tools used during the fieldwork were meetings with Mercy Corps Indonesia staff and other TATTs consortium members, survey questionnaires with key staff within the different organizations and focus group discussions for staff at the provincial and district BPBDs. Secondary data collection included local information from the Bureau of Statistics, BPBD documents, and reports and information from the Department of Social Affairs, the Land Administration, the Bureau of Meteorology, Climatology and Geophysics (BMKG) and others. A total 212 respondents took part in the study, comprising 168 male, 44 female and 0 person recorded with disability. The study was conducted over 30 days including development of methodology, field training, data collection, data
analysis and reporting. The data was interpreted and analyzed before the development of the final report.

The main study report, presented here, combines the results of the 6 provinces to provide an overall cumulative capacity level analysis. This report provides a state of the sector overview for the 6 TATTs target provinces based on the 10 capacity development themes.

However, due to the variation in DRM capacity across the 6 target provinces and to avoid comparisons, the TATTs program will also commission the development of in-depth, individual provincial reports. These reports, to be produced in Indonesian, will provide a specific planning and reference tool for the province-based teams to enable a review of existing capacity levels against highlighted BPBD priorities and needs.

2.2. Capacity Themes
The TATTs program is measured using a range of indicators for its strategic objectives and outputs (Appendix 2 and 3) and these indicators have been utilized in this study for the development of key capacity themes. The 10 capacity development themes are:

Theme 1: Provincial BPBDs organizational capacity;
Theme 2: Provincial BPBDs past, current and future DRM and DRR programs and activities;
Theme 3: Provincial BPBDs past, current and future disaster preparedness programs and activities;
Theme 4: Training modules and training delivery capacity of Provincial BPBDs;
Theme 5: Level of engagement between Provincial and District BPBDs;
Theme 6: Perception of District BPBDs’ organizational capacity;
Theme 7: Other organizations involved in DRM/DRR;
Theme 8: Inclusive DRR;
Theme 9: Training modules and training delivery capacity of Pusdiklat BNPB;
Theme 10: Knowledge and learning mechanisms.

2.3. Capacity Levels
In order to provide a cumulative capacity ranking for each capacity development theme across all 6 provinces, a five-stage Capacity Level measurement was used with Level 1 relating to the lowest level of progress through to Level 5 relating to the highest achievements. The Capacity Level ranking
defines the conditions that have been achieved as indicated through the analysis of primary and secondary data; local DRM systems established; as well as ways of working, culture and perceptions gathered interviews and focus group discussions with key personnel from Pusdiklat BNPB, BPBDs at provincial and district level, and other organizations working on DRM and DRR.

Table 1. Classification of Level of Capacity (color code and description) 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Code</th>
<th>Level of Capacity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Minor progress in implementing DRR programs and activities with few signs of forward action in plans or policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Some progress in implementing DRR programs and activities but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Institutional commitment in implementing DRR programs and activities attained but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Substantial achievement in implementing DRR programs and activities attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Comprehensive achievement in implementing DRR programs and activities with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. BASELINE STUDY RESULTS

This section outlines the results of the baseline study in more detail per capacity development theme and provides risk and vulnerability information on the target provinces. It should be noted that there was considerable variation in performance and capacity across the 6 target provinces. In general, Central Java performed better across most capacity development themes than the five eastern Indonesia provincial BPBD. Central Java, one of Indonesia’s largest provinces, has a very different socio-economic profile, with 35 districts/cities and a population of more than 33 million people. It was evident that the Central Java BPBD had received a higher level of external support than other provincial agencies, and a number of community-based DRM and climate change adaptation programs have been implemented in the province by international and national NGOs. To assist TATTs teams embedded in the 6 different provinces, individual provincial baseline study reports will be developed based on analysis of the provincial data. The present combined report provides the

---

1 The Level of Capacity used in the BS is based on concept of Level of Progress outlined in the Hyogo Framework for Action, the internationally agreed framework for measuring progress in building nation and community resilience to disasters, as outlined by the United Nation Strategy for Disaster Reduction. The level of progress in implementing the HFA is measured at the level from 1(lowest) to 5 (highest). The 2013 Global Assessment Report shows that Indonesia has achieved a 3.5, and internationally the current progress is level 3.0 (GAR, 2013).
overall baseline, or current state of the sector, against which the TATTs program will measure future achievement, impact and change.

Figure 1 below shows the cumulative Capacity Level achieved by the 6 provinces for each capacity development theme. The results range from Level 1 to Level 3 which indicates a low-to-medium capacity level across the specific themes. TATTs program activities and capacity development strategies will aim to improve these capacity levels.

![Figure 1. The Capacity Level across the 6 target provinces and Pusdiklat BNPB toward the 10 capacity themes](image)

Overall, the cumulative capacity score achieved by the BPBDs across the 6 TATTs' target provinces was an average of **2.1 out of 5**, while the BNPB Education and Training Unit (Pusdiklat) recorded an average capacity score of **3 out of 5** for training modules and training delivery, placing the Pusdiklat in the medium-to-high capacity level range.

![Figure 2. The Capacity Level ranges from Very Low to Very High](image)
3.1. Risk and Vulnerability of the TATTs target provinces

Each TATTs target province faces its own disaster hazards, disaster risk and vulnerability. Central Java is the only province in the TATTs program located outside the eastern region of Indonesia. The other 5 provinces are Southeast Sulawesi, Maluku, North Maluku, Papua and West Papua.

Figure 3. Administrative map of Indonesia showing the location of the six target provinces

Four of the 6 targeted provinces under the TATTs program are categorized as high risk and two are at medium risk (BNPB, 2011). The national disaster management plan 2015-2019 has prioritized DRM activities based on the exposure of these provinces:

Table 2: Risk and vulnerability by province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>Central Java</th>
<th>Southeast Sulawesi</th>
<th>Maluku</th>
<th>North Maluku</th>
<th>Papua</th>
<th>West Papua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Risk Index Score (IRBI 2011) &lt;br&gt; Class</td>
<td>203 &lt;br&gt; High</td>
<td>116 &lt;br&gt; High</td>
<td>128 &lt;br&gt; High</td>
<td>89 &lt;br&gt; Medium</td>
<td>120 &lt;br&gt; High</td>
<td>67 &lt;br&gt; Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL DM PRIORITY &lt;br&gt; Earthquakes (people)</td>
<td>24,214,132</td>
<td>772,704</td>
<td>66,846</td>
<td>585,900</td>
<td>8,043,832</td>
<td>9,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami (people)</td>
<td>89,580</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcano (people)</td>
<td>46,760</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslides (people)</td>
<td>422,614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Java Province

- Central Java is one of the most populated areas in Indonesia. More than 33 million people are living on about 3.25 million hectares of land (approximately 1.7% of the total area of Indonesia) and are administered through 8,579 villages and 35 regencies/cities.
- It is ranked the highest risk (index score 203) in the Indonesian Disaster Risk Index\(^2\). Of the 35 regencies/cities in this province, 34 of them are at high risk and 1 city is at medium risk. As of early 2015, 31 regency/city level BPBDs have been established. The population is exposed to almost all natural disaster hazards. The most frequent hazards include earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, land movement / landslides, floods, drought, extreme waves and coastal abrasion. The province has experienced some disastrous events in recent times, including the Java Earthquake in 2005 and regular Mt. Merapi volcanic eruptions.
- With its high population, high economic growth and frequent hazardous events, a challenge for the provincial government is protection of its population as well as protection of development and prosperity gains from the adverse impacts of disasters.

Southeast Sulawesi Province

- BNPB (2011) categorizes Southeast Sulawesi as high risk (with an index score of 116) and all of its 12 regencies/cities are considered at high risk.
- Almost 75% of Southeast Sulawesi is water/sea, while land, covering the southeast peninsula of Sulawesi Island and several smaller islands, is little more than 38,140 km\(^2\) (25%).
- Administered through 12 regencies and 2 cities\(^3\), the population of about 2.4 million is

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Drought (people) & 30,468,131 & & \\
Extreme weather (people) & 3,192,350 & & \\
High tides and abrasion & yes & & \\
Forest fires (ha) & 112,220 & & \\
Epidemic & & & \\
Techno. accidents (ha) & 14,520,246 & 2,806,239 & 712,230 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Baseline Study Report}
\end{table}

Source: Rencana Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana 2015-2019 (draft, figures represent exposures in term of population or areas) and the Indeks Rawan Bencana Indonesia (BNPB, 2011)

\(^2\) Indeks Rawan Bencana Indonesia (2011). It is an official disaster risk measurement by the Indonesian Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) based on the following parameters: (1) number of hazard events; (2) number of deaths; (3) number of injuries; (4) population density; (5) number of damaged houses; and (6) number of damaged public facilities and infrastructures.

\(^3\) There have been 2 additional regencies since the development of the IRBI
exposed to various hazards including floods, landslides, windstorms (*puting beliung*), earthquakes, and drought. The 2013 flood event affected 10 districts and was the largest event experienced in its recent history.

**Maluku Province**

- The archipelago province consists of 559 islands and is administratively divided into 11 regencies/cities. Ninety percent of its 600,000 km² area is sea, which poses a challenge for the delivery of public services including disaster management.
- Maluku Province is among the high risk provinces with a risk index score of 128. Six of its 10 regencies are at high risk, 1 medium and 3 are low risk (BNPB, 2011).
- The most frequent hazards include floods, landslides, flash floods due to natural dam burst, volcanoes (Banda Islands), earthquakes and tsunamis (41 earthquakes during 2013-2014), sea transportation accidents, and social conflicts. A 2013 flood in the city of Ambon affected 5 sub-districts, killed 11 people and displaced almost 4500 people. The 2013 flash flood due to the failure of a natural dam destroyed almost the entire village of Way Ela, home to more than 5200 people. A recorded and well-remembered tsunami was experienced on September 29, 1899, for which a memorial was elected in Masohi (Central Maluku District).
- Maluku is a wide spread archipelago and the biggest challenge is access for rapid delivery of relief services as well as delivery of DRM services.

**North Maluku Province**

- North Maluku Province is ranked medium risk in Indonesian Disaster Risk Index (BNPB, 2011). However, 4 of its 9 regencies are considered at high risk.
- Located north of Maluku province, it has a similar archipelago profile as its former host province and some of its volcanic islands are heavily populated, such as the former capital Ternate. This new province with a population of 1.1 million is administered through 8 regencies and 1 municipality.
- North Maluku is being prioritized under the National Disaster Management Plan 2015-2019 (draft) for its exposure to Tsunami (46,760 people are exposed) and volcanic risk (exposure: 3,049 people).
- Similar to Maluku, North Maluku’s wide spread archipelago area presents the biggest challenge for the delivery of emergency relief and risk management services.
Papua Province

- Overall, Papua is ranked high risk by the Indonesian Disaster Risk Index (BNPB 2011) with a score of 120. Seven of its 29 regencies/cities are considered at high risk, 12 are medium and 10 are low risk.

- With an area of almost 320,000 km², it is the largest province in Indonesia making up 17% of the country. Although its population is considered low (3,032,488 people in 2013), population growth is very high due to continued migration from other provinces. With its low population density (about 10 people / km²), the province is governed by extensive local governments with 28 regencies and 1 city.

- The province is intensively exposed to local and distance earthquakes. Other hazards include floods, landslides, tsunami, sea storms, strong wind and social conflict.

- The province is being prioritized under the National Disaster Management Plan 2015-2019 for its exposure to landslides (422,614 people), flash floods (92,136 people), forest fires, epidemic and technological accidents (Renstra PB 2015-2019, draft).

- Its mountainous and remote profile and low human resource capacity are the biggest challenge in delivering public and disaster management services.

West Papua Province

- West Papua is categorized as medium risk, with 2 of its 11 regencies at high risk, 4 at medium risk and 5 regencies at low risk (BNPB, 2011).

- The most frequent disasters include flood, earthquake, drought, forest fire, landslide and tsunami. One of its high risk regencies, Teluk Wondama, has experienced at least 3 large-scale disasters over the last decade: flash floods in Wasior in 2008, 2010, and 2013, of which one was declared a national disaster with heavy intervention from the national government (BNPB).

3.2. Description of the Capacity Development Themes

This section describes the results for each capacity development theme derived from analysis of primary qualitative and quantitative data collected through interviews, focus group discussions and survey questionnaires. As outlined previously, the capacity development themes were developed based on the key performance indicators of the TATTs strategic objectives and program outputs (see Appendix 2 and3). The analysis findings were ranked against the five Capacity Levels by combining comparative analysis and expert professional judgment.
3.2.1. Theme 1: Provincial BPBD Organizational Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Institutional commitment attained but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>There are signs of good institutional commitment across the 6 provinces providing the foundations for building stronger, more engaged DM agencies. Challenges include maintaining good levels of leadership; improving strategic planning; advocating for program budget; and finding ways to incentivize staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, organizational capacity is measured against three important areas: 1) **enabling environment** such as the existence of national laws, local regulations and support from local leaders; 2) **work culture** which includes the public service culture, the provision of incentives to staff, and the existence of feedback and learning mechanisms; and 3) **BPBD operational capacity** which is measured in terms of availability and reliability of hazard and risk maps, disaster management plans, early warning systems, community-based activities, skilled human resources, finance and funding, and infrastructure and equipment.

Despite challenges, including routine rotation of staff among different local government departments, and limited quality planning, overall the provincial BPBD showed promising signs of institutional commitment such as strong leadership and increasing funding commitments.

**Enabling Environment**

There is general understanding of national Law 24/2007 on Disaster Management and the changes that the law has brought in terms of the disaster management mandate for BPBD at the provincial/district/city level. All 6 provinces have established their provincial BPBDs based on Law 24/2007, and supported by the Head of BNPB Regulations and Ministry of Home Affairs decrees, as well as Governor and/or provincial government regulations legalizing the formation and operations of the BPBD. Each provincial BPBD had a solid organizational structure, with the Provincial Secretary holding the position of ex-officio head of BPBD, while disaster management implementation is managed by a daily operational head (Kepala Pelaksana) with support from heads of divisions and sub-divisions, and operational and administrative staff. Commonly, provincial BPBD had 3 key divisions: 1) disaster preparedness and mitigation; 2) emergency management and logistics; 3) rehabilitation and reconstruction, and each division is supported by 2 sub-divisions. While BPBD had been successfully formed at the provincial level, there were districts without BPBD or new district
organizations with poor and limited regulatory frameworks. In terms of staffing profile for provincial BPBDs, the number of staff varied from 28 (Maluku Province) to 85 (Papua Province).

Work Culture
The view of BPBD as a new organization with limited staff capacity is changing and many interviewed were proud to work in the disaster management sector and equated their role to humanitarianism (helping people and saving lives). However, the study showed there were limited incentives relating to career advancement and the routine movement of staff between different departments meant that skills were often lost to the institution. There were also extremely limited systems or mechanisms for learning and feedback within the agencies.

BPBD Operational Capacity
There was evidence of increased funding commitments, particularly from the local provincial government budgets (APBD), with support from the national level (BPBD) through equipment and national programs (such as the Resilient Villages Program) or through injection of national emergency response funding. For example, in Papua the BPBD budget increased from Rp. 6.5 billion ($650,000) in 2011 to Rp. 8 billion ($800,000) in 2015, while the budget for BPBD Maluku increased from Rp. 1.2 billion ($120,000) to Rp. 1.8 billion ($180,000) rupiah in 2014. However, despite the increases, overall BPBD funding remains very small in comparison to other government departments; often less than 1% of the local budget.

Funding received from BNPB could reach the order of tens of billions of rupiah, and was mostly dispersed for disaster relief. Central Java received on-call budget (Dana Siap Pakai/DSP) from BNPB for drought relief in 2014 to a total of Rp. 10.1 billion to assist 16 districts, and also received BNPB funds for flood relief, landslide emergency management and preparedness for volcano eruptions, as well as funding for organizational strengthening.

The study found that local on-call budget was generally under the direct management of the Provincial Secretariat Office and not the local BPBD. According to respondents, in practice this funding was difficult to obtain and slow to be disbursed.

Throughout the 6 provinces, education levels of BPBD staff varied from high school, to Bachelors Degree, to Masters Degree with the majority of staff holding Bachelor Degrees. There was varied
progress across the 6 provinces with respect to staff capacity development and the number of trainings that had been undertaken or provided by the BPBD. While Central Java had achieved some substantial progress, the other 5 provinces in eastern Indonesia had not yet achieved any form of comprehensive progress. The staff in Central Java had cumulatively received around 300 trainings, while others had received less than 10 trainings. In eastern Indonesia staff capacity was felt to be limited, and while disaster management equipment might be available, resources for training, maintenance and operations was equally limited. In a majority of eastern provinces the number of disaster management related trainings had been minimal and training opportunities were not spread equally among staff.

3.2.2. Theme 2: Provincial BPBD Past, Current and Future General Programs and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellow Level 2</th>
<th>Some progress in implementing DRR programs and activities but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>DRM programming is not being implemented systematically, though there are signs of increased capacity to link better planning to DRM and DRR program initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges include the need for awareness of better systems approaches; the need for better hazard and risk assessments and analysis; and improving the overall knowledge and technical skills base of BPBD staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a strong correlation between provincial BPBD organizational capacity (as outlined in Theme 1) and the progress obtained in BPBD planning, program and activity implementation. However, the study found that BPBD were still struggling with systematic DRM programming, for example DRM programs informed by hazard and risk analysis that targeted the most at-risk areas and vulnerable populations. This rank therefore indicates a more ad-hoc approach to DRM and DRR programming.

**Priority DRM Activities**

Central Java has conducted the biggest variety of activities, while the 5 provinces in eastern Indonesia registered some progress in DRM planning and activity implementation, largely without systematic policy or the requisite institutional commitment to support planning, programs and activities. The study found that the main priorities across the provinces focussed on issues of staff capacity building and training, while there was less priority on the development of contingency and operational plans, hazard and risk maps and analysis, as well as multi-stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation processes. Most of the programs and activities described in the study related to disaster preparedness (see Theme 3), indicating a lack of broader disaster risk reduction initiatives at the provincial level. The challenges of implementing activities included a lack of
committed leadership, frequent movement of staff between local government departments, as well as a lack of skilled personnel.

**Supporting the District BPBDs and Communities**

The study showed that provincial BPBD wanted to increase the capacity of district BPBDs and advocate and provide disaster management information and programs to communities. Some of the identified future priority activities include socialization on disaster risk reduction (DRR), strengthening the capacity of provincial and district BPBD staff and disaster awareness of communities, development of DRR plans at the district level, the formation of the multi-stakeholder DRR Forum, along with a range of disaster preparedness activities (see Theme 3).

### 3.2.3. Theme 3: Provincial BPBD Past, Current and Future Disaster Preparedness Program and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Level 3</th>
<th>Institutional commitment attained but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>There is a greater focus on preparedness-for-response activities at the provincial level, supported by BNPB programs and the provision of response equipment. Challenges include the need for a systematic emergency management and preparedness framework to help link trainings and skills; to build upon existing programs and create more skilled facilitators both within and external to government; concentrate more on coordination skills and consider budget lines for coordination activities; consider budgeting for operational skills training and maintenance of emergency response equipment; and lead more disaster training simulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 3 was developed to gather information on the kinds of disaster preparedness activities conducted by the provincial BPBD. It was clear that disaster preparedness is a key focus of the 6 provinces, analysis also indicated a tendency to focus on infrastructure and equipment rather than systems and skills training. While a commitment to improved disaster preparedness was evident, the lack of a systems approach meant that achievements by the BPBD were not yet deemed comprehensive or substantial.

**Current Disaster Preparedness Activities**

In all target provinces, there has been progress in terms of disaster preparedness capacity development for specific staff through education and training, the early development of emergency operation centers and systems (Pusdalops), and the development of various disaster planning documents relating to contingency planning and operational planning. There was progress in terms of
developing disaster resilient villages (Desa Tangguh) and local early warning systems. However, despite these achievements the progress across the provinces varies. To date the majority of disaster planning documents (contingency plans) were developed for flood hazard, and not yet for other hazards such as tsunami, landslide or extreme weather events. The Desa Tangguh program has only been initiated in less than 5% of villages, while early warning systems tended to focus on tsunami but not yet on landslide, flood or extreme weather events. This indicates gaps between the planning processes and operational systems for preparedness and response. According to respondents, the challenges in implementing disaster preparedness activities included a lack of trained staff or facilitators to provide the necessary skills for successful disaster preparedness programs.

**Future Disaster Preparedness Programs**

Some of the key disaster preparedness activities planned for the future include contingency planning, hazard and risk analysis for flood and landslide, surveying and mapping of high-risk areas, procurement of logistics and emergency response equipment, trainings on rapid response, table-top exercises (TTX), and field simulations. Expected development expressed by BPBDs in the eastern part of Indonesia included increased capacity of staff, improved local government budget for disaster preparedness activities, and better coordination with other government departments and stakeholders.

### 3.2.4. Theme 4: Training Modules and Training Delivery Capacity of Provincial and District BPBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some progress in implementing DRR programs and activities but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification for rank**

Systematic local DRM training delivery has not progressed adequately, however there are signs of willingness to build capacity to better coordinate and implement training. The focus is currently on improving the overall capacity of staff at the provincial BPBD level.

Challenges include the need for better facilitation skills or access to good quality external facilitators; identifying key trainings for best outcomes and monitoring effectiveness; focusing on institutional as well as technical capacity development needs at the district level.

One of the two key goals for the TATTs program is to institutionalize DRM technical training delivery at the provincial level and at the same time help to strengthen national training curricula and training modules through a dedicated review and feedback process. The study explored the type of DRM trainings provided by provincial BPBDs in the past, the number of BPBD staff trained in specific
disaster management skills and capacities, and whether the trainings were implemented in accordance with BNPB-approved training modules. The results indicate a lack of systemized training regimes, the delivery of ad-hoc trainings without necessary foundational basic training, and a need to improve targeting of training to BPBD staff members in order to achieve the most efficient and effective outcomes. Training for government was further impacted by routine movement of staff between local government departments resulting in a loss of skills and the need to retrain new staff. There was little evidence among the 6 provinces of skilled local facilitators or trainers – including government and non-government facilitators – who could be utilized by the provincial BPBD to assist in training and program delivery to the districts.

**Training Achievements**

Most respondents from the 6 provinces reported that they had received various types of training directly from BNPB in the past. This training included development of DRM and contingency plans, training to use equipment, trainings on post-disaster needs assessment and damage and loss assessment methodology, and basic disaster management. In general, the BPBDs across the 6 provinces, with the exception of West Papua, stated that there had been some training through which basic disaster risk management was advocated.

In Central Java, simulations and exercises have become routine activities of the BPBD. However, in all other provinces there is a need for training of trainers or facilitators so staff can then conduct subsequent trainings to the district BPBD and/or communities. Most respondents from the 6 provinces had conducted training involving district BPBDs, NGOs and universities, however the study found that there was not yet a mechanism through which training activities were systematically planned and implemented.

**Future Priorities**

Through FDGs, respondents identified the need for the provincial BPBDs to improve their internal training capacity in order that they could more effectively assist district BPBDs and other stakeholders. The majority of provincial BPBD respondents stated that the provincial BPBDs were responsible for building the capacity of the districts – however there was little evidence of strategy for this, with the exception of Central Java which had engaged considerably with district BPBD. Many of the eastern provinces were still focused on socialization activities concerning DRM and advocating for all districts to form BPBD agencies.
Important issues relating to improved capacity for training included the need for training of trainers and facilitators, quality training materials and training assessment systems. In this case, the study showed that trainers or facilitators had not been systematically recruited and trained by any agency; access to training materials was identified as a challenge; and there was generally no understanding on how to assess the effectiveness of trainings delivered.

3.2.5. Theme 5: Level of engagement between Provincial and District BPBDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Some progress but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Justification for rank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>This links to the Theme 4. More strategic engagement required outside of ad-hoc support during emergency response.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Challenges include the lack of a strategic province-wide coordination framework; establishing regular coordination meetings by utilizing alternative technologies in isolated regions; ensuring follow-up activities and incentives for district BPBD performance.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaster management coordination is the major mandated role of BNPB and BPBDs, before, during and after disaster. As well as the need for inter-agency coordination, there is a national push to develop DRR Forum in all provinces and districts (see Theme 7). As the TATTs program logic seeks to build the capacity of provincial BPBD to then support district disaster management agencies, it is important to understand the existing level of engagement between the agencies at both government levels. Based on an analysis of surveys and qualitative data, it was evident that engagement between provinces and districts was still relatively low. Specific program-related engagement was largely ad-hoc, while coordination mechanisms relied on annual, biannual or quarterly meetings that rarely involved follow-up activities. Engagement between provinces and districts increased during local emergency responses.

**Level of Engagement**

Generally across the 6 target provinces, engagement with districts was highlighted by respondents in terms of general coordination, implementation of activities, the development of risk and hazard maps and plans, as well as the provision of equipment and emergency assistance. The frequency of engagement varied from around 30 times annually to monthly or quarterly meetings. There were always annual coordination meetings hosted by the provincial BPBD which invited all the district/city BPBDs. However, annual coordination meetings for district BPBD were the only coordination meetings officially listed in the provincial BPBD annual plans. There was no evident mechanism from
among the 6 provinces which outlined the types of meetings required to increase coordination among
the district BPBD. For example, there was no evidence of hazard-based coordination led by the
provincial government for specific cross-border disaster events such as flood, earthquake or tsunami.

The provincial BPBDs were frequently invited by the districts to provide training and socialization, as
well as distribute emergency response equipment or logistic materials. This indicates a demand for
greater engagement. However, such engagement usually only intensified during an emergency
management phase or during recovery and rehabilitation, particularly if the provincial BPBD was
involved due to the scale of disasters. Examples include the 2015 landslide in Banjarnegara District
in Central Java, the 2013 flood in Southeast Sulawesi, and the 2013 Way Ela dam burst / landslide in
Maluku.

Despite varying levels of engagement, there was little evidence in the study of a systematic approach
to the engagement. While annual and regular coordination meetings indicated a degree of
institutional commitment on behalf of the provincial BPBD, the lack of focussed themes and follow-up
to the meetings meant that the coordination potential was not being sufficiently fulfilled. Moreover,
there had been no peer-learning initiatives between any of the eastern Indonesia BPBD, with the
exception of Papua who have visited BPBD in Yogyakarta, while some progress was recorded in
Central Java where external BPBDs had visited the province for comparative learning.

### 3.2.6. Theme 6: Perceptions of District BPBD Organizational Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellow Level 2</th>
<th>Some progress in implementing DRR programs and activities but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>Many district BPBD have been newly formed and lack effective leadership and staff capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges include the need for high level support (District Head); support for better planning, budgeting and technical skills; on-the-job practical training; and limiting the rotation of trained staff to other government departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study instruments captured provincial perceptions of district BPBD organizational capacity,
triangulated through surveying and interviews with staff from up to 2 sample districts per target
province. Under Indonesian regional autonomy, the district BPBD are considered autonomous
agencies governed by district regulations. However, both the national BNPB and the provincial BPBD
believe one of their key roles and responsibilities is to increase the institutional and technical capacity
of district BPBD as they are closest to at-risk communities. BPBD at the district level are
comparatively new, with most formed over the past two years, and many provinces, particularly those in eastern Indonesia, reported that districts had not yet formed independent disaster management agencies. Despite a wide variation in the capacity of district BPBD, overall the perception of capacity was quite low.

**Capacity Perceptions**

District BPBD organizational capacity, as with the province level, was measured through three key issues: 1) **enabling environment**; 2) **work culture**; and 3) **BPBD technical capacity**. Most provincial BPBD respondents perceived low organizational capacity of the district BPBD.

The respondents from the district level stated that factors influencing the quality of BPBDs included the capacity of the BPBD head; commitment of the District Head (Bupati); the average level of skills and education of staff; and the provision of budget. There was uniform agreement, from both provincial and district respondents, for the need to develop the human resource capacity and skills of district BPBD staff. Furthermore, while these district BPBDs had received equipment from BNPB, there was a need for training and funding for the operation and maintenance of the equipment. It was identified that human resource capacity building needed to be achieved through formal and practical on-the-job training, better engagement and collaboration with other government and non-government stakeholders, and less staff movement after training in order to maintain skills within the agency.

### 3.2.7. Theme 7: Other Organizations Involved in DRM/DRR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Institutional commitment attained but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>There are good signs of multi-stakeholder engagement in DRM at the provincial level. Challenges include the lack of strategic interest in the DRR Forum; more support required for the local DRR Forum; creating fruitful partnerships with local universities; benefiting from external inputs to policy and planning processes; a lack of funding and support to local civil society to engage as an effective partner in disaster risk reduction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One important issue assessed in the study was the level of involvement of other organizations in the planning and implementation of disaster management activities. In general, BPBDs at the provincial and district levels have worked with a variety of organizations including universities, NGOs, DRR Forum, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Forum, and local and international organizations. The formal multi-stakeholder mechanism through which this engagement takes place is through a local
DRR Forum. The formation of DRR Forum relates to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and recognition of the need to involve all stakeholders in disaster risk reduction, including government, civil society, academia, the media and the private sector. DRR Forum can play a key role in advocacy, socialization of DRR and DRM to multiple stakeholders, and provides a structure that enables easier access to key stakeholders for the development, review and implementation of local disaster management policy, planning and programming.

The study, however, found varying levels of formal DRR Forum operating in the target provinces. Central Java had an active DRR Forum, while provinces in eastern Indonesia were looking for strategies to formalize existing multi-stakeholder engagement.

**Levels of Engagement**

Engagement between provincial BPBD and other organizations involved in DRM and DRR takes place in terms of conducting activities, external organizations providing expert resources when required, and the BPBD providing budget support for organizations to conduct specific types of activities such as hazard mapping or vulnerability assessments, as well as cost-sharing agreements/arrangements through which each party contributes to an activity. The collaborations were viewed positively. The provincial BPBDs felt they gained external knowledge and additional activities while other stakeholders felt they benefited in terms of access to BPBDs as well as to knowledge and networks with BPBDs and others.

In terms of inter-government collaboration, the study found that key DRM stakeholders engaged through both formal and informal meetings, as well as during emergency management activities. This could be initiated by BPBDs or by the other organizations. Inter-agency collaboration occurred most often between the BPBD and the Bureau of Meteorology, Climatology and Geography (BMKG), the Search and Rescue Agency (Basarnas), the Police and Armed Forces (TNI). From Central Java it was reported that the BPBD had collaborated with universities in developing a Disaster Risk Index especially for flood, landslide and windstorms. While in Southeast Sulawesi, most respondents stated that the risk and hazard mapping process was important and that the BPBD had collaborated with BMKG or utilized maps produced by the BPBD districts. The study found that across all provinces there had been limited collaboration with NGOs focussing on at-risk and vulnerable groups. However, collaboration between BPBDs and universities had progressed. In Central Java, Gadjah Mada University (UGM), Diponegoro University (UNDIP) and Pembangunan Nasional University (UPN)
were the most frequent collaborators with BPBD, while in Maluku collaboration occurred with Pattimura University (UNPATTI), Kristen Indonesia Maluku University (UKIM) and UGM. In Southeast Sulawesi, the Halu Oleo University (UHO) had supported the BPBD.

### 3.2.8. Theme 8: Inclusive DRR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Minor progress in implementing DRR programs and activities with few signs of forward action in plans or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>This was the worst scoring theme. Inclusion is only now emerging as a key issue at the national level through new policy and remains a challenging issue for most of the target provinces. Challenges include the need to establish inclusion-sensitive reporting and data collection regimes; and using this information effectively for planning and programming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The delivery of inclusive services is an important strategic objective of the TATTs program. Inclusion in DRM service delivery has become an important indicator at the national level, with the recent launch of the BNPB Disability in DRR regulation (Perka no 14/2014). However, this new regulation has not yet been socialized at the sub-national level and the study recorded only very minor progress in terms of knowledge and implementation of inclusion issues within local planning, local policy and local DRM program implementation.

**Inclusive DRR at the Province Level**

The study found that no provinces effectively collected and utilized data disaggregated on sex, age and types and level of disability. Almost all provinces stated there were no specific regulations outlining the involvement of at-risk community groups within DRM planning. While data related to disabilities is available from different organizations such as the Bureau of Statistics (BPS) and Department of Social Affairs, there was generally little consideration nor inclusion of this disability data within DRR planning by BPBDs, and the agencies were largely unaware of the need to access this data.

In Central Java gender-based disaster management programmes have been initiated and the BPBD has also begun to acknowledge other at-risk groups in its planning and programming. However, there was no evidence of this being institutionalized within any other provincial BPBD. Across all provinces, the existing hazard and risk maps and analysis was unable to identify at-risk groups (women, men children, youth, people with disability) indicating that decisions based on such assessments did not include the specific needs of at-risk groups.
In Central Java, representatives of at-risk groups have provided input to local regulations (Perda) and the 2013-2018 Disaster Risk Reduction Strategic Plan. But in the other provinces it was generally agreed that at-risk groups had not been consulted during the development process. Uniformly across all 6 provinces, at-risk communities had not been adequately considered in the socialization of early warning systems. And all 6 provinces did not yet have guidelines on the involvement of and capacity building for at-risk groups, nor a special unit for at-risk groups within the BPBDs.

However, all BPBDs did recognize the importance for the inclusion of at-risk groups within the planning and implementation of disaster management activities. The challenges for improved inclusion include the need for skilled staff and better knowledge on how to engage with specific needs. Factors that can increase the engagement process include commitment from leadership, greater advocacy, more focussed work at the community level and increased funding, including from the private sector.

**3.2.9. Theme 9: Training Modules and Training Delivery Capacity of Pusdiklat BNPB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Institutional commitment attained but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development of training curricula, training modules and the national training center has resulted in a high level of institutional commitment to improve DRM skills throughout Indonesia. The foundations have been set for future comprehensive and substantial achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges include meeting future demand; ensuring feedback mechanisms and routine review and update of curricula and modules; and reaching the hundreds of BPBD throughout the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 9 is related to the training delivery of the Pusdiklat BNPB. Through the study, this theme covered issues such as the support required by the Pusdiklat BNPB to develop a training certification program, the development of DRM trainers in target provinces linked to a Pusdiklat facilitator database, and the assessment, adaptation and testing of existing Pusdiklat training modules, as well as potential development of new training modules. This theme also explored how to develop mechanisms through which feedback on DRM training curricula or modules, from users and trainees from the 6 target provinces and 12 districts in the TATTs program, could assist a routine review regime for Pusdiklat. The study found an existing strong level of BNPB institutional commitment, laying the foundations for more robust mechanisms as the Pusdiklat followed its capacity development roadmap to become a national, regional and finally international standard DRM training.
The questions in this theme were presented to key personnel in Pusdiklat BNPB and the provincial and district BPBDs. The BNPB Education and Training Centre / Pusat Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Penanggulangan Bencana (Pusdiklat PB) BNPB was created in 2008. Pusdiklat PB is mandated to coordinate and implement tasks related to the provision of trainings on the structure, function and technicalities related to disaster management. The vision of the Pusdiklat PB is to be: “The world center of excellence on the education and training, human resource assessment, and knowledge management related to disasters”, while the mission is to: “Educate civil servants working for BPBDs, the community, and private sectors on issues related to disaster management, through its three streams of activities namely: education and training, skills assessments, and knowledge management”, within the principles of Humanity, Integrity, Synergy, and Quality.

**Training Curricula and Module Development**

The Pusdiklat vision is translated into 6 types of activities: 1) the development of curricula and competency-based modules; 2) training of trainers / facilitators / instructors; 3) developing and supporting pools of facilitators; 4) providing supporting infrastructure for training and accreditation; 6) education and training; and 7) training evaluation. Training curricula is developed in several ways. First, curricula is developed by Pusdiklat, together with the technical staff from BNPB and supported by external experts or organizations formed in a working group, such as from national and international NGOs, universities, practitioners and professionals. Alternatively, curricula is developed based on the identified needs of BPBDs, or sometimes taken from existing international tools and materials and adapted for Indonesia. There are also plans to develop interactive materials through on-line or CDs to enable long distance learning. There are presently 22 training curricula or teaching module documents, produced between 2009 and 2014, however the level of development of each of these curriculum varies.

Pusdiklat BNPB has existing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to measure quality of content and training delivery, but it was not clear from the analysis how the results from the training evaluations were incorporated back to the curriculum development process. Qualitative interviews with Pusdiklat staff identified a knowledge management strategy, through which Pusdiklat intended to start systematically identifying key lessons and experiences from training implementation, especially by BPBDs, in order to improve the quality of training material and delivery. However, while this
indicated good institutional commitment, the results of this new process will need to be monitored into the future.

The head of Pusdiklat explained the vision for the organization to achieve accreditation at national, regional and international standard. Despite the plan for Pusdiklat, through the national training facility (Ina-DRTG), to lead as an international center of excellence within 8 years, there were yet no clear plans or strategies on how international expertise and experts would be recruited, the development of material into English or other international languages, nor strengthening the capacity within the Pusdiklat to be able to deliver training according to identified international standards.

**Perceptions of BNPB Training Capacity**

The study was designed to test external perceptions of the role and function of Pusdiklat BNPB by seeking the views of provincial and district BPBD respondents. Almost all respondents from the provinces and districts were aware of the existence and function of the Pusdiklat, but had not heard of national certification mechanisms. Attendance at Pusdiklat-supported trainings varied across the 6 provinces. Respondents recommended improving training through the involvement of more international experts, more on-the-ground training, as well as providing more basic disaster management planning and techniques.

In terms of trainings already received, the majority of respondents from provincial and district BPBDs stated they had received trainings related to basic disaster management, damage and loss assessment (DALA), or contingency planning. Respondents from Central Java stated that the modules needed to be supplemented with practical guidelines for facilitators in order that trainings could be more easily replicated by provincial BPBD staff at the district level. Respondents in Southeast Sulawesi stated the existing modules needed to be further simplified and to be less technical. In North Maluku, it was suggested that staff already trained by Pusdiklat BNPB needed to receive further courses on facilitation skills.

### 3.2.10. Theme 10: Knowledge and learning mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Some progress in implementing DRR programs and activities but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justification for rank</td>
<td>There has been progress and institutional commitment at the national level, but the provinces and districts are lagging behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges include the development of mechanisms to capture and utilize feedback and experience; and improvement of inter-province and inter-district learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While steps have been taken nationally to develop a knowledge management system within BNPB, at the provincial and district level the use of knowledge and learning for improved local DRM policy or improved training outcomes is still particularly limited. As a result, study analysis identified some progress but the need to further develop this space, particularly by linking lessons from the provinces and districts back into BNPB. One of the strategies of the TATTs program is to trial Pusdiklat training curricula at the provincial level and identify key lessons in terms of content and facilitation skills. Sharing of data, knowledge and experience is critical to informing improved policy and program implementation.

**Current Knowledge and Learning Mechanisms**

At the national level, the study identified a clear policy push for improved knowledge management including a knowledge management initiative supported by the World Bank. The study found that the Pusdiklat BNPB utilized a feedback and evaluation mechanism by distributing forms and surveys to participants at the completion of each training. However, it was unclear how this feedback was converted to lessons learned that could improve future training curricula nor how this information contributed to a routine curricula and training module review process. At the provincial level, there was limited evidence of knowledge management and effective monitoring and evaluation of training, including follow-up activities to simulate the training. This was an identified gap for which BNPB could lead.

**Peer Learning**

At the provincial and district level, peer learning opportunities were extremely limited. There was an opportunity to meet representatives from other provinces and districts during BNPB national coordination meetings and trainings, but there was little in the way of cross-coordination between provinces and districts. The study found that there were only two provinces that had taken part in study visits or shared learning. The Central Java BPBD had received representatives from other BPBDs in the past to learn about their organization and programs, while the Papua BPBD had visited the Yogyakarta BPBD.

4. **CONCLUSION**

This study was conducted systematically by developing key capacity development themes based on the TATTs program performance indicators. Analysis of data collected around the 10 themes enabled
qualitative levels of capacity, based on relative progress, to be assigned to each theme. Further in-depth reports have been developed for each target province based on the raw data to assist TATTs teams to work in partnership with the BPBD on priority activities and trainings.

The Capacity Levels assigned to the 10 themes ranged from from low capacity (Level 1) to medium-to-high capacity indicating institutional commitment and evidence of achievements (Level 3). This indicates that across the themes there are key areas where the foundations for progress have been put into place; while other areas are only now emerging. Analysis of the study data indicates that the assumptions and relevance of the TATTs program logic and performance indicators is sound. In terms of the TATTs strategic objectives, there is strong relevance for the need to develop capacity around training delivery and inclusive DRR at the provincial level. There are also great opportunities to link provincial BPBDs with the national Pusdiklat BNPB through more systematic training provision and improved training quality and delivery through feedback and shared learning amongst the BPBDs.
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## APPENDIX

### 1. Capacity Themes, TATTs Indicators and Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Summary of Baseline Study Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Theme 1: Provincial BPBD Organizational Capacity** | **Indicator 1.1.1:** Organizational and technical capacity of provincial BPBD have improved against qualitative and quantitative baseline | • Achieved a Capacity Level 3;  
• Considerable variation of organizational capacity across the 6 provinces;  
• Functioning organizational and administrative structure based on national and local laws and regulations;  
• Increased funding commitments for BPBD;  
• Limited incentive for career advancement.                                                                                                                              |
| **Theme 2: Provincial BPBD Past, Current and Future General Programs and Activities** | **Indicator 1.1.2:** At least 3 objectives identified in each Provincial BPBD self-assessment/planning priorities completed (eg: strategic plans, hazard maps, specific trainings, etc.)  
**Indicator 1.3.1:** At least 18 enabling plans, strategies or regulations (disaster risk reduction plans, strategies, policies, disaster preparedness, and contingency plans) developed and in place | • Achieved a Capacity Level 2;  
• Strong correlation between the provincial BPBD organizational capacity and progress in the planning and implementation of program and activities;  
• Evidence-base for programming decisions required;  
• Main priorities are internal staff capacity building and training;  
• Lack of broader DRR programming – focus on preparedness for response.                                                                                                        |
| **Theme 3: Provincial BPBD Past, Current and Future Disaster Preparedness Program and Activities** | **Indicator 1.4.1:** Up to 48 training simulations conducted in target Provinces and Districts (tabletop exercises and field simulations etc.)  
**Indicator 1.4.2:** Up to 48 simulation reviews conducted, with changes made to policies and procedures based on lessons learned  
**Indicator 1.4.3:** | • Achieved a Capacity Level 3;  
• There has been progress across the 6 provinces in terms of capacity development for staff through education and training, development of emergency operation centers and systems, and development of various disaster planning documents related to contingency and operational plans;  
• Development of disaster resilient villages (DRV) and local early warning systems;  
• Contingency planning documents largely limited to single hazards – predominantly flood;  
• Early warning systems largely limited to single hazards – predominantly tsunami.  
• The challenge in implementing activities was mostly a lack of staff capacity to deliver trainings.                                                                 |
### Theme 4: Training Modules and Training Delivery Capacity of Provincial and District BPBDs

**Indicator 2.2:** Target Provincial BPBD are able to deliver trainings to the district level

**Indicator 2.3:** Up to 10 certified trainers identified and mobilized (disaggregated by gender, age and disability) in each target Province

**Indicator 2.5.2:** Number of trainers used by local government for DRM training

- Achieved a Capacity Level 2;
- Progress here limited, though most respondents identified receiving some training opportunities through the national BNPB Pusdiklat.
- No evidence of systematic training planning or implementation;
- Lack of systematically trained facilitators or recruitment of trained facilitators;
- Limited understanding or knowledge of how training effectiveness is assessed.

### Theme 5: Level of engagement between Provincial and District BPBDs

**Indicator 1.2:** An increase in the satisfaction level of selected district BPBD in the services provided by Provincial BPBD

**Indicator 2.2.1:** 70% of target BPBD staff, disaggregated by gender, are trained according to BNPB-approved modules

**Indicator 2.2.2:** 50% of trained staff maintain knowledge after 2 months

- Achieved a Capacity Level 2;
- Provincial and district BPBDs engage for coordination, implementation of activities, provision of equipment and emergency assistance etc but not systematically;
- Frequency of engagement varies greatly from around 30 times annually to monthly and quarterly meeting;
- No peer-learning activities most provinces.

### Theme 6: Perceptions of District BPBD Organizational Capacity

**Indicator 2.3.1:** At least 3 trainings are conducted in the pilot Districts

- Achieved a Capacity Level 2;
- Factors influencing the quality of district BPBD organizational capacity includes the capacity of the BPBD head; commitment of district leadership, level of skills and education, and provision of budget;
- Perceived lack of human resource capacity within the district BPBDs, but the average capacity varied greatly among BPBDs;
• Capacity building required through formal training, practical and on-the-job training, better engagement and collaboration, and less staff movement to other government departments after training.
### Theme 7: Other Organizations Involved in DRR

**Indicator 2.6.1:** The university DRR network is established in 6 provinces

- Achieved a Capacity Level 3;
- Provincial and district levels have worked with various organizations such as universities, non-government organizations (NGOs), DRR Forum, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Forum, and other local and international organizations;
- The level of engagement varied mostly based on the existence of DRR Forum.

### Theme 8: Inclusive DRR

Mainstreamed throughout program indicators

- Achieved a Capacity Level 1;
- Limited consideration of vulnerable or at-risk groups in DRR planning and implementation;
- Limited collection of disaggregated data on sex, age and types and level of disability;
- All BPBD considered the inclusion of at-risk groups within planning and implementation to be important.

### Theme 9: Training Modules and Training Delivery Capacity of Pusdiklat BNPB

**Indicator 2.1:** The existing national DRM training system is delivered in 6 target provinces.

- Achieved a Capacity Level 3;
- All respondents at the provincial and district BPBDs were aware of the existence and function of the Pusdiklat BNPB;
- Existing DRM training curricula and teaching modules;
- The curricula developed by working groups including BNPB technical staff and external experts (national and international NGOs, universities, practitioners, and professionals) or adapted from international tools and materials;
- Training often provided to BPBDs from BNPB on request;
- Intention to develop interactive materials through on-line or CDs to enable long distance learning.

**Indicator 2.1.1:** At least 10 training curriculum adapted or developed

**Indicator 2.4:** National certification mechanism is in place

**Indicator 2.4.1:** Support provided for implementing a certification program.

**Indicator 2.5.1:** At least 70 certified and specialized trainers/facilitators identified and mobilized

### Theme 10: Knowledge and learning

**Indicator 2.1.2:** The Users/trainees from 6 Provinces & 12 Districts provide feedback on the module or curriculum

- Achieved a Capacity Level 2;
- There is a need for mechanisms to link learning from the provinces and districts back to the national level;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mechanisms</th>
<th>Indicator 2.6.2: Number of Lesson learned presented to national and sub-national policy makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.7.1:</td>
<td>At least 12 key learning issues have been identified and peer learning visits facilitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.7.2:</td>
<td>At least 24 meetings held between Provincial and District BPBDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.7.3:</td>
<td>Number of sub-national lessons learned shared with national policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.7.4:</td>
<td>3 Inter-provincial twinning arrangements have been facilitated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Clear policy push for knowledge management within BNPB, but not yet a strong concept and the province level;
- Peer Learning has been extremely limited.
### 2. Key performance indicators of the strategic objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result Level</th>
<th>Strategic Objectives Indicators</th>
<th>Key issues to be considered in the baseline survey</th>
<th>Category of information in the baseline survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> BPBDs in six target provinces are professionally coordinating DRM activities before, during and after natural disasters and promoting DRM best practice among their respective districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 1:</strong> BPBDs in target provinces are delivering inclusive DRM services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1: Organizational and technical capacity of provincial BPBD have improved against qualitative and quantitative baseline</td>
<td>The baseline survey needs to specify how organizational and technical capacities are defined.</td>
<td>Theme 1: BPBD (Prov and Districts) Organizational Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2: An increase in the satisfaction level of selected district BPBD in the services provided by Provincial BPBD</td>
<td>The baseline survey needs to formulate questions that can capture the satisfaction level. / or otherwise the level of engagement between BPBDs</td>
<td>Theme 5: Level Of Engagement Between BPBD at Prov and District Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 2:</strong> DRM technical training delivery has been institutionalized at target sub-national and national levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1: The existing national DRM training system is delivered in 6 target provinces.</td>
<td>The baseline survey needs to determine themes of training that are available / currently prepared by Pusdiklat BNPB. The baseline survey needs to determine different trainings that have been received by BPBD from Pusdiklat BNPB.</td>
<td>Theme 9: Training modules and delivery capacity by BNPB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2: Target Provincial BPBD are able to deliver trainings to the district level</td>
<td>The baseline need to determine training collaboration between BNPB, Provincial and district BPBDs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.3: Up to 10 certified trainers identified and mobilized (disaggregated by gender, age and disability) in each target Province</td>
<td>The baseline survey needs to identify potential trainers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.4: National certification mechanism is in place</td>
<td>The baseline survey needs to determine national certification mechanisms that is in place or currently prepared by BNPB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### i. Key performance indicators of the project outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Strategic Objective Outputs</th>
<th>Outputs Indicators</th>
<th>Key issues to be considered in the baseline survey</th>
<th>Category of questions in the baseline survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 1:</strong> BPBDs in target provinces are delivering inclusive DRM services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1: Target BPBDs have addressed priority institutional needs</td>
<td>Indicator 1.1.1: 6 partnership agreements signed with TATTs and target Provincial BPBD</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1.2: At least 3 objectives identified in each Provincial BPBD self-assessment/planning priorities completed (ex: strategic plans, hazard maps, specific trainings, etc.)</td>
<td>The study need to identify different activities in the last 5 years that BPBD Prov have completed, and give relevance and importance of each activity. The study need to identify activities in RENSTRA, and give relevance and importance of each activity.</td>
<td>Theme 2: Provincial BPBDs Past And Current Programming And Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 2:</strong> Provincial BPBDs are engaging and coordinating with government and non-government DRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: Provincial BPBDs are engaging and coordinating with government and non-government DRM</td>
<td>Indicator 1.2.1: Stakeholder forum/committees are active and supported in each target Province</td>
<td>The study need to identify other stakeholders, who their current members are, with they activities and program related to DRM, level of engagement with BPBD Prov.</td>
<td>Theme 7: Other Organizations Involved in DRR Idem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Strategic Objective Outputs</th>
<th>Outputs Indicators</th>
<th>Key issues to be considered in the baseline survey</th>
<th>Category of questions in the baseline survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3:</strong> Provincial BPBDs have improved DRM frameworks in place (including disaster risk reduction plans, DRM plans, strategies, policies, and disaster preparedness and contingency plans)</td>
<td>Indicator 1.3.1: At least 18 enabling plans, strategies or regulations (disaster risk reduction plans, strategies, policies, disaster preparedness, and contingency plans) developed and in place</td>
<td>The study need to find information on different plans, strategies and regulations that exists, developed, in place,</td>
<td>Theme 2: Provincial BPBDs Past And Current Programming And Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.3.2: Number of coordination or support mechanisms developed and in use by BPBD</td>
<td>Idem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.4:</strong> Disaster preparedness at the target province and pilot district levels has been successfully tested</td>
<td>Indicator 1.4.1: Up to 48 training simulations conducted in target Provinces and Districts (tabletop exercises and field simulations etc.)</td>
<td>The study need to find information on different training and simulation conducted, by who, who attended, and how it was organized</td>
<td>Theme 3: Provincial BPBDs Past, Current And Future Disaster Preparedness Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.4.2: Up to 48 simulation reviews conducted, with changes made to policies and procedures based on lessons learned</td>
<td>The study need to find information on different training and simulation conducted, by who, who attended, and how it was organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.4.3: At least 3,600 people involved in simulations, disaggregated by gender, age, and disability</td>
<td>The study need to find information on different training and simulation conducted, by who, who attended, and how it was organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Strategic Objective Outputs</th>
<th>Outputs Indicators</th>
<th>Key issues to be considered in the baseline survey</th>
<th>Category of questions in the baseline survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1:</strong> Existing BNPB PUSDIKLAT training modules assessed, adapted, and tested and new training modules developed</td>
<td>Indicator 2.1.1: At least 10 training curriculum adapted or developed</td>
<td>The study need to find information on different training modules that the prov BNPB are aware</td>
<td>Theme 9: Training modules and delivery capacity by Pusdiklat BNPB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2.1.2: The Users/trainees from 6 Provinces &amp; 12 Districts provide feedback on the module or curriculum</td>
<td>The study need to find information on whether any BPBD prov has received any training from BPNB, in what field, when, who attended, how they think it was delivered</td>
<td>Theme 10: Training modules and delivery capacity by Pusdiklat BNPB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.2:</strong> BPBDs staff trained in specific disaster management skills and capacities in 6 provinces and 12 pilot districts</td>
<td>Indicator 2.2.1: 70% of target BPBD staff, disaggregated by gender, are trained according to BNPB-approved modules</td>
<td>The study need to find information on who can be included in the training program</td>
<td>Theme 5: Training modules and delivery capacity of Provincial BPBDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2.2.2: 50% of trained staff maintain knowledge after 2 months</td>
<td>The study need to find information on what the staff know on HFA, LGS-SAT, The study need to find information on what kind of skills they need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TATTs BASELINE STUDY REPORT

#### Output 2.3: District BPBD staff are trained by Provincial BPBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.3.1: At least 3 trainings are conducted in the pilot Districts</th>
<th>The study need to find information on whether trainings have been conducted, in what topic, who conducted, who attended by BPBD district</th>
<th>Theme 6: District BPBDs Past, Current and future Programming And Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Output 2.4: Support the Development of Certification Program at BNPB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.4.1: Support provided for implementing a certification program.</th>
<th>The study need to find information on proposed trainers</th>
<th>Theme 9: Training modules and delivery capacity by Pusdiklat BNPB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Output 2.5: A network of DRM trainers has been developed in target provinces and linked through BNPB database

| Indicator 2.5.1: At least 70 certified and specialized trainers/facilitators identified and mobilized | The study need to find information on proposed trainers | Theme 4: Training modules and delivery capacity of Provincial BPBDs |
| Indicator 2.5.2: Number of trainers used by local government for DRM training | The study need to find information on proposed trainers | |

#### Output 2.6 Knowledge management mechanisms developed and in use

| Indicator 2.6.1: The university DRR network is established in 6 provinces | The study need to find information on which university, program, research center, key persons to be involved | Theme 7: Other Organizations Involved In DRR |
| Indicator 2.6.2: Number of Lesson learned presented to national and sub-national policy makers | The study need to find information on which universities, programs, research centers, key persons to be involved | |

#### Output 2.7: Peer learning has been facilitated between provincial, district and national stakeholders

| Indicator 2.7.1: At least 12 key learning issues have been identified and peer learning visits facilitated | The study need to find information on key learning issues needed | Theme 10: Knowledge And Learning Mechanisms within Pusdiklat BNPB |
| Indicator 2.7.2: At least 24 meetings held between Provincial and District BPBDs | The study need to find information on different themes and quantity of engagement held in the past | |
| Indicator 2.7.3: Number of sub-national lessons learned shared with national policy makers | The study need to find information on frequency and different themes of information shared to each other | |
| Indicator 2.7.4: 3 Inter-provincial twinning arrangements have been facilitated | The study need to find information on how they view their progresses with respect to other provinces and how they benchmark their progress | |
### 3. List of curricula/training modules developed by Pusdiklat BNPB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Coordination and Rapid Assessment for Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Logistic and equipment management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PUSDALOPS management and DM operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2009/2011</td>
<td>Basic Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Radio Communication System for DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Emergency Management Command System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Basic training on DM volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Rapid Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Design of education and technical training on DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Contingency planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Facilitator guidelines on Disaster Resilient Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Shelter management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Logistic management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Navigation and mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Integration of DRR and CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Post Disaster Needs Assessments (JITUPASNA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>DM for people with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>DM for journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Lessons learned on monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Disaster Risk analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Geospatial for DM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>