

PROMOTING THE INCLUSION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN INDONESIA



**CENTRE FOR
DISABILITY
RESEARCH
AND POLICY**



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

TECHNICAL REPORT 2

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR DISABILITY INCLUSIVE DISASTER RISK REDUCTION IN INDONESIA

Technical Report 2, 2015

Capacity Building for Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia

University of Sydney, NSW, 2006
June, 2015

ISSN: 2203-7381

This research was funded by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade through the Australian Development Research Awards Scheme under an award titled "Promoting the inclusion of people with disabilities in disaster management in Indonesia".

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade or the Australian Government. The Commonwealth of Australia accepts no responsibility for any loss, damage or injury resulting from reliance on any of the information or views contained in this publication.

Project Directors

Professor Gwynnyth Llewellyn, Director, Centre for Disability Research and Policy and Professor of Family and Disability Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney
Dr Alex Robinson, Country Director Indonesia, Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Germany

Project Team

Centre for Disability Research and Policy, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney

Sarina Kilham, Research Associate
Dr Michelle Villeneuve, Senior Lecturer
Dr Filippo Dall'Osso, Research Associate
Dr Wing Young Man, Research Associate
Ms Alexandra Lewis-Gargett, Research Associate

Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Germany, Indonesia Office

Ms Pradytia Pertiwi, Project Manager
Ms Cahya Wulandari, Senior Trainer/Facilitator
Ms Fahrunnisaa Kadir, Project Officer
Ms Citra Safitri, Project Officer
Ms Wulan Wiyat Wuri, Project Research Assistant
Mr Regisda Machdy Fuadhy, Project Research Assistant

Suggested Citation: Centre for Disability Research and Policy, University of Sydney and Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Indonesia (2015). *Technical Report 2. Capacity Building for Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia*. University of Sydney, NSW 2006. University of Sydney

Cover Artwork: Courtesy of Sunshine's Community Access Program Art Studio

Further information: <http://sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/cdrp/projects/pipddmi.shtml>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
Part A: Reports of Work Packages.....	3
Work Package 1: Basic Disaster Risk Reduction	4
Aims.....	4
Expected output.....	4
Session content	4
Summary of training strategy	4
Participants	4
Materials and accessibility consideration	5
Key training activities and notes on output achieved	6
Participants' learning.....	6
Participants' reflections	7
Work Package 2: Disaster Risk Reduction Policy Framework.....	10
Aims.....	10
Expected output.....	10
Session content	10
Summary of training strategy	10
Participants	10
Materials and accessibility consideration	10
Key training activities and notes on output achieved	10

Participants' reflections	11
Case Study: Lobbying for the inclusion of disability in the new international framework for DRR	11
Work Package 3: The use of Disability-Inclusive Disaster Resilience (DiDR) Tool	13
Aims	13
Expected output	13
Session content	13
Summary of training strategy	13
Participants	14
Materials and accessibility consideration	15
Key training activities and notes on output achieved	15
Participants' reflections	17
Work Package 4: Washington Group Questions and application in DRR.....	19
Aims	19
Expected output	19
Session content	19
Summary of training strategy	19
Participants	20
Materials and accessibility consideration	21
Key training activities and notes on output achieved	21
Lesson Learnt from training participants to identify people with disability by using Washington Group Questions	22
Participants' reflections	23
Work Package 5: Field research findings and application for DRR lobbying	26
Aims	26
Expected output	26

Session content	26
Summary of training strategy	26
Participants	26
Materials and accessibility consideration	27
Key training activities and notes on output achieved	27
Participants' reflections	28
Part B: Lessons Learnt: ASB Staff Reflections.....	30
Lessons Learnt on Work Package Component of Capacity Building	30
Achievements	30
What strategy worked?	31
What needs to be improved?	32
What was unexpected? (successes and difficulties)	32
Recommendations on what could be done differently in future.....	33
Part C: Notes from Interviews with Officials.....	34
REFERENCES.....	37
ANNEX: Photographs from capacity building activities	38

ACRONYMS

ASB Indonesia	Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Germany, Indonesia Office
BNPB	National Disaster Management Agency (Indonesian acronym)
BPBD	Local Disaster Management Agency (Indonesian acronym)
DIDR Tool	Disability Inclusive Disaster Resilience Tool
DiDRR	Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction
DiDRRN	Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction Network for Asia and the Pacific
DPO	Disabled People's Organisation
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GERKATIN	Movement for Deaf Welfare (Indonesian acronym)
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
ICF	The <i>International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health</i>
INGO	International Non-government Organisations
NGO	Non-government Organisations
PPCK	The Association for People with Disability in Klaten District (Indonesian Acronym)
SFDRR	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNCRPD	United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Participants, Work Packages 1 and 2.....	5
Table 2 Participants, Work Package 3, Stage 1 Yogyakarta, January 2015	14
Table 3 Participants, Work Package 3, Stage 2, March to April 2015	14
Table 4 Participants, Work Package 4.....	21
Table 5 Dates of field practice, Work Package 4.....	23
Table 6 Participants, Work Package 5.....	27
Table 7 District, name and title of government officials	34
Table 8 Barriers and enablers of DiDRR	34

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Process for implementation of Work Packages.....	2
Figure 2 Work Package 4 Implementation Model.....	20
Figure 3 Pantomime performances for earthquake safety procedure (Work Package 1)	38
Figure 4 Discussion with government on basic DRR (Work Package 1).....	38
Figure 5 Participant discussion on DRR policy framework (Work Package 2)	38
Figure 6 Practising drop-cover hold-on together (Work Package 1).....	38
Figure 7 Practising protection for volcano eruption (Work Package 1).....	39
Figure 8 Participants with visual impairment practising how to make a safe-room setting (Work Package 1)	39
Figure 9 Presentation on group discussion on definition of disability (Work Package 4)	39
Figure 10 Stephanie Rahardja (a Deaf DPO member) in a high-level discussion on DIDRR in UN HQ New York with Ms Margaretha Walshtrom and ASB Country Director.....	39
Figure 11 Practising interview with Washington Group Questions (Work Package 4) .	40
Figure 12 Field research identification of DRR and disability using DIDR tool	40
Figure 13 Field research identification of DRR and disability using DIDR tool	40
Figure 14 Bejo Riyanto (right) and team mates	40
Figure 15 ASB ADRA team discussion on lessons learned on capacity building activities.....	41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Technical Report details the Capacity Building component of the *Promoting the Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Disaster Management in Indonesia* project. This project was funded by the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Australian Development and Research Awards Scheme 2013-2015. This award scheme promotes research and development programs through collaboration between researchers in Australia and elsewhere and INGOs and NGOs in country.

Relevant to capacity building, two aims of the *Promoting the Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Disaster Management in Indonesia* project were:

1. To increase the understanding of people with disabilities of Disaster Risk Reduction and their capacity to engage with Disaster Risk Reduction policy; and,
2. To understand and subsequently inform the knowledge base of village volunteers (*Kaders* subsequently referred to as cadres) and DRR administrators about DiDRR at local and national levels in Indonesia

The specific needs of people with disabilities in relation to disasters and their aftermath were recognised in the Hyogo Framework for Action (UNDISR, 2005). Over the past decade, including people with disabilities in disaster preparedness, planning, response and recovery has become increasingly recognised as an important component of community resilience. Now titled disability inclusive disaster risk reduction (DiDRR), this concept has received international recognition in the outcome of the recent 3rd World Conference, the *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030* (UNDISR, 2015). Central to disability inclusive disaster risk reduction is people with disabilities themselves and their capacities to participate in and contribute to disaster risk reduction policies, practices and programs.

The capacity building component of the project commenced in the first months of the project (May 2013) with project orientation meetings with DRR administrators, government officials, DPOs and community stakeholders. The Workshop Package component focused on building capacity with people with disabilities and was undertaken from July 2013 to April 2015 with 241 representatives (M:158; F:83) from 59 Disabled People Organisations (DPOs) in 5 districts in Indonesia and including the national level in Jakarta.

The building capacity with people with disabilities component involved 5 work packages covering knowledge, attitudes and skills in relation to DiDRR and each with a different thematic focus. Each work package involved presentations, workshops and skills building for the DPO representatives, with pre and post tests and workshop evaluations. DPO representatives were encouraged and supported to extend their

learning in their own communities and with other DPO members outside of the formal capacity building activities.

The organisation for delivery of the Workshop Packages component was as follows:



Figure 1 Process for implementation of Work Packages

The process of capacity building was mainly targeted for people with disabilities and their DPOs; however the process also involved participation of village volunteers/ cadres and DRR-related government officials in line with Aim 2. It is considered essential to build working linkages between DPOs with government and the community to enable DIDRR to be implemented at the community level with a whole-of-community approach. 28 government representatives and 53 village volunteers participated in the capacity building activities.

This report is organised as follows. Part A covers the contents of each Work Package and includes case studies which highlight the learning of individual participants. Part B includes the reflections of the INGO team who delivered the Work Packages and ‘Lessons Learnt’ from the facilitators’ point of view. Part C includes analysis of interviews undertaken with the government officials responsible for DRR in each of the 6 working areas for this capacity building component of the overall research and development project. Annex 1 contains references and Annex II includes photos from the trainings on the Work Packages. Throughout this Technical Report quotes from participants are included with their consent obtained by ASB, following the University of Sydney Human Ethics Committee Approval No. 2014/658.

There is an accompanying supplement which provides facilitator guidelines. This is titled *Supplement to Technical Report 2. Capacity Building for Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia. Practitioner Guidelines for Capacity Building for Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia*. The entire materials for each of the 5 work packages is available on request from ASB Indonesia, however all the presentation materials, daily schedules and portfolio materials are in Bahasa Indonesia.

PART A: REPORTS OF WORK PACKAGES

WORK PACKAGE 1: BASIC DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

Aims

- To raise awareness of Disabled-People Organisations (DPOs) on the importance of DRR for people with disability.
- To increase knowledge and practice on basic safety procedure for natural hazards.

Expected output

- Participants aware of the DRR and its significance for people with disability.
- Participants able to demonstrate basic safety procedures for natural hazards.

Session content

- What is DRR? And current government-led DRR activities in each local area.
- Risk, participation and inclusion.
- Practical safety and evacuation procedures for people with disabilities; earthquake, tsunami, volcanic eruptions, landslides and tornadoes (module is according to potential hazard risk in each area).
- Introduction to hazards, capacities and vulnerabilities.
- House risk mapping and safe room setting.

Summary of training strategy

Training on Work Package 1 about basic DRR was combined with Work Package 2 on DRR policy framework to deliver an introduction to inclusive DRR and the relevant policy context in Indonesia. Initially, this was delivered in 4 hours duration of training. However, based on evaluation in several locations the workshops were repeated as it was felt that the training duration was not sufficient and participants did not understand the training topics very well, given a low base of initial knowledge. Therefore, the training duration was changed to 2 full-day workshops. Also, DPOs mentioned that they wanted to engage with key government stakeholders for DRR. Work Packages 1 and 2 then served as key instruments to build relations both with DPOs and local government officials and increase participants confidence in engaging in inclusive-DRR.

Participants

Table 1 Participants, Work Packages 1 and 2

No	Working areas	Number of DPO participants		Number of government officials/ key stakeholders		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	Klaten	27	9	4	2	42
2	Sleman	15	10	4	2	31
3	Bantul	27	16	1	0	44
4	Ciamis	17	8	3	0	28
5	Jakarta	9	12	2	1	24
6	Padang	11	7	1	0	19
	Total	106	62	15	5	188

Materials and accessibility consideration

- In order to make the training more accesible, we made a portofolio (participants' workbook) both in printed media and in Braille. In the portofolio there were a compilation of the training materials to help participants understand the training content. The compilation allows the participants to read any matter they missed during the training.
- To gain more qualitative and thorough evaluation, inside the portfolio we captured information on participants' previous knowledge and practice on basic DRR and policy framework, and their personal learning reflection, as well as their personal resume to assess how well they understood our material.
- To accomodate participants with visual impairment, we provided Braille books both for the portofolio and the project brief. We also modified the pre post test method in order that participants with visual impairments could complete them independently.
- To accomodate participants with hearing impairment, we provided 2 sign language interpreters and a touch typist for those participants who were less comfortable using sign language.
- Accessibility for training venue was addressed by providing wooden ramp to access to hotel ballroom (if the hotel entrance was not accessible); coffee break snack and meals provided in boneless form (fish/chicken fillet); and participants with mobility and visual impairments were assisted by the hotel's staff for coffee break and lunch break.

Key training activities and notes on output achieved

- Some areas had received some prior training and instruction on DRR. Bantul, Sleman and Klaten were quite familiar with safety procedures for hazards. Not all areas had benefited from DRR programming before however. In Ciamis, Padang and Jakarta, DPOs expressed the training was the first DRR training involving people with disabilities and DPOs. Further, they said that DRR is critical considering that their areas were prone to disaster.
- To trigger a dialogue between DPOs and government, we invited government representatives to the training. This activity also aimed to build working linkages between DPOs and local government. Government, in this case the National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) or Local Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) took a role in trainings and introduced basic DRR such as hazards, capacity and vulnerability topics. During the training, DPOs and government shared each other's perception on DIDRR and learned from one another on how to initiate inclusive DRR. This was an extremely important initiative as BNPB/BPBD expressed that they had never engaged with DPOs before and currently no programme was being implemented for people with disabilities.
- The training used several methods such as presentation, group discussion and also direct practice. The attractive training model along with colourful presentation, such as the diorama for safe room-setting was useful in increasing participants' enthusiasm and made the material easy to understand. Participants also mixed during group discussions to encourage inclusion and team work across people with different disabilities. There were two trainers who took turns in facilitating the sessions; this created a back-up system which worked well for the training flow.
- Although some areas have participated in DRR programming before, DPOs' knowledge relating to safety procedure especially earthquake procedure drop, cover, hold was relatively low. Participants' knowledge and practice on safety procedure increased during the training workshop as shown during earthquake simulations. However, the topic on international policy framework was considered difficult to understand by the DPOs given that there was various information that was not always considered of direct relevance to DPOs, particularly at the sub-national level.

Participants' learning

In the portfolio, we asked whether participants had received or participated in DRR training before. Approximately 95% of participants from Padang, Ciamis and Jakarta had not engaged in any DRR activities, whereas in Klaten, Sleman and Bantul, around 50% had participated in past DRR training.

Furthermore, in the portfolio, participants were asked to make a summary of what they learned from each session. From participants' summaries, they noted they learnt about

basic DRR very well, feeling most confident with the basic DRR materials and particularly because as they had practiced how to do this, that is for example practising drop, cover, hold technique. Participants mentioned that they wanted to learn more about DRR policy framework in Indonesia.

Participants' reflections

"...I hope person with disability could be an active resources for DRR, and I hope there will be a regulation that is accesible for person with disability in DRR context"—**Nila Krisnawati, DPO member in Bantul**

"I want to learn about any DRR regulation especially for person with disability"—**Yustisia Arief, DPO member in Jakarta**

"I want to be an independent person who can help other disability person. Therefore, the solidarity among person with disability could be built"—**Menik, DPO member Klaten**

"Before today, I have never been involved in activities for DRR and disability. I am interested because as a member of disabled-people organisation (DPOs) this activity improves our knowledge and benefit the development of our organisation." – **Antoni Tsaputra, DPO member in Padang**

Case Study: Person with disabilities as a resource person for DRR

Suparman, 38-years old was not born disabled. It was the 2006 earthquake that permanently damaged his spinal cord and caused him to be a paraplegic. Afterwards, he had to use a wheelchair and withdrew himself from social activities for a number of years.

Initially, when Suparman participated in an earlier ASB earthquake safety procedure training in 2010, he displayed a lack of confidence, was passive and unwilling to be involved in further projects.

In 2014, Suparman participated in ASB basic Disaster Risk Reduction training. At first, again he was silent and unwilling to participate actively. In almost every meeting he was reluctant to come inside the meeting room and rather stayed outside the venue while listening to the resource person giving the training. ASB approached him and discussed what could be done to make him more comfortable in joining the training with other people. He was then willing to participate in a big class. He was trained to be able to deliver disaster safety procedure as well as basic skill to be a facilitator. During this Training of Trainers process Suparman showed great improvement both in mastering the content and delivering key messages.

Later on, ASB invited Suparman to participate in the “Disability data collection using Washington Group Question” training. We noticed his hesitation and, therefore, we tried to personally encourage him while also adapting the training method to better improve active participation and enthusiasm of trainees.

For the training, we refocused on small group-based activities with 5-7 people in each group. These small groups consisted of members with different disabilities. This gave the shy participants greater opportunity to voice their opinions. Each group was accompanied by an ASB staff member who functioned as an observer and facilitator. During small group work Suparman’s ideas and participation were considerably better expressed contributed greatly to the success of the training.

On the last day of training, Suparman was selected to become a member of a surveyor team by considering his improvement in presenting opinions and presentations during the training. Suparman had previously he mentioned in his portfolio that he had no prior research or data collection experience.

As a surveyor, Suparman had to meet new people and was in a position where he had to become more accustomed to interacting with both people with disabilities and people without disabilities. Suparman greatly improved in confidence and in how to ask questions and how to communicate with people from different backgrounds. Initially, when conducting the surveys Suparman was not very confident; however, his confidence improved when assisted by Endang, one of the village cadres.

I was able to meet many people with different characteristics. I feel that I can do things that I thought I was never capable of doing.

Suparman said that by participating in the training and then conducting a survey, he realized that many people with disabilities are excluded and, therefore, restricted from various activities, especially DRR. As a person who became disabled during an earthquake, he knew that it was important to involve people with disability as they are the most at risk group within society.

The training was considered critical in improving Suparman’s ability to speak in public, and to prepare a training lesson plan, as well as to communicate with other people with disabilities. Suparman was also exposed to opportunities to better understand the needs of people with hearing impairments, visual impairments, and intellectual impairments in terms of DRR training, something that he said he had not thought about before as he said he had only thought about people with disabilities like himself.

Currently, Suparman is active in socializing DRR and safety procedures in the Tlogo sub-village, in Kebon Agung village as part of the village disaster management team and also as a member of the village DRR forum. Suparman is now also frequently invited by local non-governmental organizations to speak about inclusive DRR.

“DRR is conducted to save lives. Becoming engaged in DRR activities means that we are helping save the lives of others”. This was the reason Suparman gave

when asked why he participated in DRR activities. Suparman said he hopes that people with disabilities will continue to be involved as active actors in DRR activities in Indonesia.

Supaman provides an excellent example of the capacity and potential capabilities of people with disabilities to understand, from first-hand experience, and to learn from technical training how to best build individual (people with disabilities) and community resilience (cadres and village heads, village disaster management team, DRR village forum) in the face of natural hazards and emergency situations.

WORK PACKAGE 2: DISASTER RISK REDUCTION POLICY FRAMEWORK

Aims

- To raise awareness of the existing DRR policy frameworks at international, regional and local level and the extent of the inclusion of disability in these policy frameworks.
- To equip disabled-people organisation (DPOs) to better influence current policy frameworks to be more disability-inclusive.

Expected output

- Participants are aware of the existing DRR policy frameworks at international, regional and local level and the extent of the inclusion of disability and people with disabilities in the policy frameworks.

Session content

- DRR policy and frameworks; International, regional, national, and local level and to what extent disability and people with disabilities are accommodated.
- Disability policy frameworks and how DRR is included.

Summary of training strategy

Work package 2: DRR policy framework delivery was combined with Work Package 1: Basic DRR module and data has been presented already. (See above section Work Package 1)

Participants

(See above section Work Package 1)

Materials and accessibility consideration

(See above section Work Package 1)

Key training activities and notes on output achieved

- Some areas such as Klaten, Bantul and Sleman were quite familiar with DRR safety procedures; however DRR policy frameworks were a new topic even for these areas. Policy frameworks were also seen as a difficult topic as this topic

was full of new and foreign terms. Typically people with disabilities are not included in any design, discussion or implementation of policy frameworks.

- In response to feedback the process of capacity building was adjusted for the 'DRR Policy framework' topics to include more groups work and visual materials.

Participants' reflections

(See above section Work Package 1)

<p>Case Study: Lobbying for the inclusion of disability in the new international framework for DRR</p>

Stephanie Kusuma is the leader of GERKATIN Yogyakarta office, a national organisation for Deaf people's welfare. She is also active in awareness raising activities for Deaf culture through advocacy and art performance. She has also graduated as a certified sign language teacher for hearing people in Indonesia. Based on her previous experience, she was chosen to participate in the project's capacity building component.

Stephanie has a passion to change the life of people with disabilities; therefore she is very active in lobbying and advocacy for the fulfilment of the rights of people with disabilities and especially Deaf people. Within the project, Stephanie has been active in lobbying on disability-inclusive DRR. Her first experience was at the 4th session of Global Platform in Geneva (2013), where she performed a simple way to teach DRR for Deaf people through pantomime performance. This performance received positive feedback from United Nations Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) who then sent her a special invitation to speak in the High-Level panel discussion in UN Headquarters in New York during International Day for Disaster Reduction the same year.

In her speech at an event (10th October, 2013) immediately preceding the International Day for Disaster Reduction, October 17th, 2013, she reflected on the absence of information for persons with disabilities to protect and save themselves. Stephanie highlighted her work with different forms of media to raise awareness and disseminate knowledge on managing disaster risks. She underscored that participation in disaster risk reduction was every person's right. She drew attention to the Hyogo framework which presents opportunities to governments and civil society to look at how to increase the potential of persons with disabilities to engage and contribute to DRR. Stephanie noted that much more needed to be done by governments and civil society to involve people with disabilities in DRR. Clear data and targeted education is needed, both for persons with disabilities, but also for the wider community. Stephanie spoke about how persons with disabilities can play an important role in increasing a community's resilience.

Stephanie also participated in the 3rd UN World Conference in DRR in Sendai in March 2015, where she and other DPO colleagues from Indonesia, joined the Disability Caucus to lobby on the inclusion of disability. Stephanie was also invited by the UN Major Group for Children and Youth as a speaker to talk about access & communication of DRR information for all. Stephanie has raised awareness of youth from various countries about the barriers faced by Deaf youth and the capacities that Deaf youth have to contribute to overcoming these barriers and working to include all people with disabilities in DRR.

Stephanie's involvement in the lobbying process for the new international framework for DRR contributed to the strong references to inclusion in the Sendai Framework for DRR (SFDRR) 2015-2030. Through the project Stephanie also had the opportunity to provide ideas and solutions of how people with disabilities, particularly Deaf people, can better take part in all DRR processes. Stephanie's work provides an excellent example of how a young person with a disability can speak out and influence others on the international stage. There is untapped potential among young people with disabilities to act as ambassadors for influencing governments to become disability inclusive and in ensuring that DRR frameworks reflect the needs of, and contributions from, this important group in any community – around 15% of people worldwide as documented in the *World Report on Disability* (World Health Organisation and World Bank, 2011).

WORK PACKAGE 3: THE USE OF DISABILITY-INCLUSIVE DISASTER RESILIENCE (DiDR) TOOL

Aims

To equip disabled people organisations (DPOs) with knowledge and practice on using the Disability Inclusive Disaster Resilience (DiDR) tool. The purpose of the DiDR tool (questionnaire) is to identify the resilience and capabilities of people with disabilities in their family and community setting to natural disasters. The tool is designed to be used by people with disabilities, their families or carers and thereby promotes the inclusion of people with disabilities in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategies. In this project the DiDR tool was used by 2 person interview survey teams of a person with disabilities and a cadre.

Expected output

- Participants understand the conceptual framework of DiDR Tool.
- Participants understand the importance of each section of DiDR tool, and the rationale for each of the questions.
- Participants are familiar with the format of DiDR tool and able to use this tool to self-assess, and to interview people with disabilities or their carer.

Session content

- Conceptual framework of DiDR tool
- Content of DiDR tool by section, and question by question.
- Practice in using DiDR tool, role play, interviewing as survey team under observation, field pilot, review and reflection.
- Practice working as an survey interview team for people with disabilities and their cadre partner

Summary of training strategy

Workshop on Work Package 3 on the use of DiDR tool was delivered in 2 stages. The first stage involved a workshop for selected DPOs representatives and cadres in survey teams from the research areas to equip them with knowledge and practice to be able to do field research within the project. Stage 1 workshop was delivered directly by staff from the Centre for Disability Research and Policy (hereafter CDRP) at the

University of Sydney. Stage 1 workshop was 5-day comprehensive workshop combining classroom sessions, role play, in-situ practice, field pilot, review and reflection.

Stage 2 of the workshop involved teaching the remaining DPOs representatives in research areas on how to use DiDR tool. The workshop involved 1.5-day classroom session and in-situ practice. The workshop was delivered by data collectors (DPO representatives and cadres) trained in Stage 1 workshop under supervision of ASB staff. The workshop for Work Package 3 (Stage 2) was combined with the workshop for Work Package 5 on the use of research findings to allow comprehensive delivery of the use of and practice with the DiDR tool and its application to gather data at the local level to inform DRR policy and practice.

Participants

Table 2 Participants, Work Package 3, Stage 1 Yogyakarta, January 2015

No	Working areas	Number of DPO participants		Number of village volunteers		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	Klaten	4	1	4	1	10
2	Bantul	3	2	0	5	10
3	Ciamis	1	2	0	3	6
4	Padang	1	1	1	0	3
	Total	9	6	5	9	29

Table 3 Participants, Work Package 3, Stage 2, March to April 2015

No	Working areas	Number of DPO participants		Number of government officials/ key stakeholders		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	Klaten	22	10	10	1	44
2	Bantul	10	8	3	0	21
3	Ciamis	20	22	8	0	50
4	Padang	10	10	4	1	25

5	Jakarta	5	4	7	5	21
	Total	67	54	32	7	161

Materials and accessibility consideration

Good practices and accessibility considerations from the previous Work Packages 1 and 2 were maintained in Work Package 3 and 5 training. This included provision of DiDR tool in braille and large print, providing sign language interpretation and touch typing for participants with hearing impairment. The DiDR tool was also explained section by section and question by question using PowerPoint presentations (also available for the participants in Bahasa Indonesia). Implementing the DiDR tool in an interview was also explained with participants practising using the Participant Information Sheet and the Participant Consent Form.

English-Indonesia interpretation was provided in the Stage 1 to ensure information was delivered correctly and accurately. Accessibility considerations also including selection of workshop venue and vehicle for field practice were consulted with participants with mobility difficulty.

Key training activities and notes on output achieved

Stage 1 workshop

- Full and detailed preparation facilitated teaching about the DiDR tool with some sections easier to understand than others.
- During the week long workshop training, question formats were simplified in response to feedback from participants and questions requiring coding of respondents' answers significantly reduced.
- Consultation with Deaf participant resulted in adding additional visual materials to assist in explaining concepts which were considered quite difficult and particularly given restricted schooling of many people with disabilities
- Braille reading proved to be rather slow in relation to keeping a reasonable length (under one and a half hours) for interview time.
- The session practising in the workshop training rooms under supervision proved to be essential to identifying remaining difficulties; and particularly the survey teams remaining consistent with the questions. Team work was greatly facilitated by this practice with one person being interviewer, the other recording the answers on the form
- On the reflection day, questions that had caused difficulty in the field pilot were again reviewed and the decision taken to create two forms; one for person with a disability, the other for a carer to ensure exact wording for each situation.

- ASB provided monitoring teams for the survey teams in each area to ensure reliable data collection, monitoring of form completion, and to deal with difficulties as they arose in the field.

Stage 2 workshop

- DPO representatives and cadres trained as data collectors trained in Stage 1 five day training workshop delivered materials for their colleagues in the respective area very well. They were not only teaching about how to use the DiDR tool but also sharing relevant context about the tool based on their experiences in the field research component.
- DPO training participants were interested in DiDR tool and asked many questions. Questions raised included:
 - Why Section 4 of the DiDR Tool used observation because it discriminated people with visual impairments. This is the section on Housing Vulnerability and requires the survey team to assess aspects of the building structure
 - In the participation scale, who is the respondent comparing themselves to, other people with disabilities or other people without disabilities in their community?
 - When the emergency kit equipment is not complete, should the response be considered yes or no? An emergency kit requires several items of equipment to be regarded as complete
- DPO trainers were able to respond questions correctly according to their training from the CDRP team in the Stage 1 Workshop. ASB staff also supported in responding to questions whenever needed.
- DPO participants in this Stage 2 training had the chance to practice using DiDR tool to interview people with disabilities or their carer in their own environment. In the discussion talking about their experience in using DiDR tool, they shared:
 - As the interview duration was quite long; do we consider giving a small gift to respondent for their participation?
 - Communication challenge for interviewing respondent with hearing impairment.
 - Difficulty in interviewing respondent with intellectual impairment as the person did not understand the questions.

DPO trainers when asked these questions responded according to what they had been taught by the CDRP team and also based on their experience in the field. ASB staff also supported DPO trainers responding to the questions whenever needed.

ASB monitored the performances of the DPO and cadre trainers in this Stage 2 Workshop. Overall the DPO trainers' performance was strong in the knowledge of DiDR tool because they had received comprehensive training from CDRP and had field experience. They were also able to respond to questions very well. In terms of delivery, there were mixed performances. Not all DPO trainers were able to convey information clearly; however, this was mitigated through the support of the village cadre partner.

This model shows that collaboration between DPOs and village cadres being trained together as field research teams is an effective method of including people with disabilities and engaging at the community level. Working as a team, each team member could support each other as needed. There were also some DPO trainers who were outstanding in their performance and they were selected to become trainers for DPOs at the national level in Jakarta.

No pre and post-test were conducted for Work Package 3. However according to reflection in the portfolio most DPO participants had no experience with using a tool built on scientific research before. They were also very interested in the DiDR tool and using the findings for advocacy and lobbying. However, they mentioned that 1.5 day plus independent field practice outside the classroom to learn about DIDR tool was too short.

Participants' reflections

"Honestly, this is the first time for me visiting Jakarta and even becoming a trainer to teach DPOs at National level about DIDR tool. I am very proud, that what I have done by participating in this project and what we have done is useful and can be shared to many people" – **Bejo Riyanto, DPO trainer**

"I am very proud and happy that I can share my experiences in the field research to other DPOs especially Deaf DPOs. But because the time is very short and there are communication issues that we faced, I think we need follow up or more time for teaching Deaf DPOs about the tool. And I am willing to give more support!" – **Stephanie Rahardja, DPO trainer**

"I am happy that this tool (DIDR) exists. Now, we really consider DRR as part of our priority of programming" – **Abi, a DPO member from Jakarta**

Case Study: Collaboration with a person with a disability for conducting field research: A village volunteer's perspective

My involvement in the field research conducted by Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund (ASB) Indonesia and the Centre for Disability Research and Policy (CDRP) at the University of Sydney has brought great learning experiences for me. Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and disability were new topics for me, and especially doing research about those themes in collaboration with Disabled-People Organisation (DPOs) was a thing that I never imagined before. It was the first time I ever encountered with and worked together with people with disabilities.

I participated in several training events and learned many new things such as definition of disability, problem in disability statistics and Washington Group Questions. I was

also further involved in the field practice of using Washington Group Questions to identify people with disability. I visited people with disability in their house one by one and interviewed directly with them and their carer. I was then also involved in the training on the use of Disability-Inclusive Disaster Resilience (DiDR) tool from University of Sydney. It was a very comprehensive training where I learned about interview technique, how to interact with interviewees, research ethics, and how to use the tool itself. I felt confident about my knowledge and that I could use it to do interview with people with disabilities. However, during field interview it was more challenging because people's capacity to comprehend and understand information was different (to the training situation) and I needed to maintain the standard of field research while at the same time trying the best to make sure the interviewee understood the questions. Luckily, I have Supriyati as my partner.

Supriyati is a very nice lady. She has difficulty seeing. I really respect her and am proud of her. Despite her limitation, she has such a great passion in living her life meaningfully. In the field research, although she lived far from the village where we did the field research, it did not discourage her from participating as a data collector. She helped me with building rapport and interacting with interviewees. Collaboration with Supriyati has taught me that an impairment or limitation does not prevent you from participating meaningfully in life. I admire her, and how she can live and balance between work/organisation and family.

These experiences have improved my knowledge and capacity about doing research on disability and DRR. Most importantly, it changed my way of thinking about people with disability. Before, I always felt pity for them and always think about how people with disabilities can survive in life with all the limitations they have. But all of that was changed when I met and interacted with them directly. I learned how to fight for my dream as good as what they do.

[Rian Armita was one of the village volunteers who was involved in the field research as a data collector. She finished her undergraduate study in Geography at the Yogyakarta State University in 2013, and now she is in process of finishing her final master thesis for Master of Tourism at the University of Gadjah Mada].

Rian's reflections here are an excellent example of the opportunity for a cadre to not only learn new skills but to change their attitudes from direct experience learning and working with people with disabilities. The technical training in conducting field research with a scientifically sound tool in interview-questionnaire format is very important too. However, as the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2008) requires, it is the involvement of people with disabilities in all decision making processes that affects their lives that is critical. When people such as Rian work with people with disabilities and come to understand their capabilities and strengths (and 'see' past the impairment and their attitude of pity) it is much more likely that people with disabilities will be included and participate actively in policy making and programming at all levels in the community.

WORK PACKAGE 4: WASHINGTON GROUP QUESTIONS AND APPLICATION IN DRR

Aims

To provide direct practical experience for disabled-people organisations (DPOs) and local cadres/social workers on the application of Washington Group Short Set of questions on disability to identify at-risk communities in relation to disaster, including people with disability.

Expected output

- Participants understand about problems in disability statistics particularly when census and surveys use only medical terminology to determine impairment and functioning
- Participants understand and demonstrate ability to use Washington Group Short Set of questions on disability as a standardised approach in disability data collection which focuses on functioning and difficulty with functioning in key areas.
- Participants understand the application of Washington Group Short Set questions in DRR.

Session content

- Disability definition according to International Classification of Functioning, Health and Disability (ICF)
- Disability data comparison and Washington Group Short Set questions
- Information-action model in DRR

Summary of training strategy

Work Package 4 on Washington Group Short Set questions and its application in DRR strategy for delivery also utilised a combined-approach of in-class session and field practice activity. The two-day in-class session and one-day field trial was used to introduce the concept of disability according to the ICF and problems in disability statistics when only medical terminology is used and it is not possible to understand the capabilities or limitations of the person with disability. The workshops were followed by 10-day of field practice allowing selected participants to apply their learning in the field. The field practice included village cadres from the field practice area to be paired up

with DPOs in order to facilitate interaction between DPOs, community and people with disabilities in the community. The training strategy is outlined below:

ACTIVITY IMPLEMENTATION MODEL



Figure 2 Work Package 4 Implementation Model

Participants

Table 4 Participants, Work Package 4

No	Working areas	Number of participants						Total
		DPO		Village volunteer		Government officials/ key stakeholders		
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	Klaten	26	9	10	4	3	3	54
2	Sleman	15	6	2	5	0	0	28
3	Bantul	15	7	2	11	5	1	41
4	Ciamis	22	10	0	19	5	1	57
5	Jakarta*)	6	5	0	0	6	1	18
6	Padang/Mentawai **)	8	9	1	0	3	0	18
	Total	92	46	15	38	22	6	216

*) No field practice conducted in Jakarta

**) Field practice in Mentawai supported by 1 ASB local staff

Materials and accessibility consideration

Good practices and accessibility considerations from the previous Work Packages 1 and 2 were maintained. This included provision of DIDR tool in braille and large print, providing sign language interpretation and touch typing for participants with hearing impairment.

During field practice, participants with visual impairments were paired with 2 partners including a cadre and another DPO colleague to assist with mobility.

Key training activities and notes on output achieved

Participants of the training were DPOs and local village cadres to support DPOs in conducting field practice in the field. In terms of disability definition, DPOs mostly have good understanding of what is disability. They referred to what has been explained in the UNCRPD which is in line with definition of disability according to ICF. However, for village cadres learning about disability was new to them.

It was found that at the beginning of the training cadres and DPOs were not interacting with each other. However, through group discussion and group work, they learned to

work together and interact. This was useful to help both DPOs and village volunteer to understand each other better.

Although DPOs had good understanding about disability, they were not aware of the problem in disability statistics. Only in the Jakarta area with national level DPOs was there a better understanding about the problem in disability data. However, none of the participants had heard about Washington Group Short Set questions. But participants once they had learnt about these questions saw the Washington Group Short Set questions as a simple, concise and easy tool to identify people with disabilities and understand their capabilities as well as their limitations in functioning.

Participants in the class practiced using the Washington Group Short Set questions to interview each other. Participants with visual impairment used a braille version of the questionnaire. Participants reported that the Washington Group Short Set questions were easy to understand and use.

Training participants mentioned that during the trial interview, that some found difficulty in using the questionnaire with elderly people who have functioning limitations. Respondents who were elderly could not use Bahasa Indonesia, therefore it was discussed whether later in field practice they might use Javanese language. This Work Package and its implementation in the field also included elderly people who may or may not have a functioning difficulty (as determined by the Washington Group Short Set questions).

Lesson Learnt from training participants to identify people with disability by using Washington Group Questions

Using the Washington Group Short Set questions

DPOs and village volunteers were able to use Washington Group question to improve data regarding disability and apply this information to DRR. In the field practice, DPOs and village volunteers used government data as a base to do identification, re-check, verify and update. Below in the table are the comparisons between initial (government) data on people with disability and data collected by DPOs and village volunteer during the field practice schedule which began in July in Klaten and finished with the Mentawai Islands in October.

Table 5 Dates of field practice, Work Package 4

Area	Dates of field practice	Number of People with a Disability	
		Initial data	Data collected by DPOs and village volunteer
Klaten District	21 st -24 th July, 2014 & 11 th -14 th August, 2014	239	640
Bantul District	23 rd August - 3 rd September, 2014	480	502
Ciamis District	11 th – 20 th September, 2014	483	696
Mentawai Islands District	26 th of September- 3 rd October 2014	41	80
Total		1,288	1,918

Effective collaboration between DPOs and village volunteers

Although village volunteers and DPOs in the beginning seemed quite reluctant to work together, through the process of field practice they began to work together effectively and very well because the two could complement each other's strengths and weaknesses in terms of team cooperation, knowing the location of the survey, and understanding how to interact with people with disabilities. This collaboration is still continuing after the field practice and beyond DRR, for example: village volunteers in Kemalang helped to approach some young people with disabilities to participate in a mechanics' training conducted by a DPO in Klaten. Another example is in Ciamis district, where Siti, a DPO member leads a *pengajian* (Muslim praying activities) in Panawangan village weekly for members of the community in the village. Siti lives in a different sub-district, but during field research she stayed over in Panawangan in a village cadre's house. She lived and interacted with villagers and they asked Siti who has good knowledge on Islam to lead the Wednesday prayers in the village. Now, even after the field research, the activity is still going on.

Participants' reflections

"Before the survey, I had a negative thought on how difficult it would be to interact with people with different disabilities. But after I received training and discussed with DPOs,

it turned out it was so much easier than I thought” - Mujiyono, village volunteer from Klaten

“Before the survey, I was not confident with myself and my ability. But after the survey, I feel glad because I can do it and I can help to improve data on disability” –Heni, village volunteer from Ciamis District.

“I was not confident because I use wheelchair, and I face so many barriers because I use a wheelchair. But during the survey, I felt grateful that I have my wheelchair because I heard many stories of people with disabilities who were less fortunate than me. Now, for me my wheelchair is a blessing from God” – Suparman, DPO member from Bantul

“I was very nervous when I started the interview. After it has finished, I was surprised that I could do it. I am so proud of myself” – Fitra, DPO member from Ciamis

Case Study: Going the Extra Mile: Involvement of DPO representative in disability data collection

Discussing Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in the absence of people with disabilities is equal to disregarding their existence as community members vulnerable to disaster risk. This means that participation of people with disabilities is essential, if not mandatory in disaster risk reduction activities. Through this participation, we will be able to discover detailed nuances pivotal to identification of the need and the capacity of people with disabilities in disaster risk reduction in a certain region. The detail is once again very important compared to general information. Hence, the engagement of people with disabilities in disaster risk reduction activities is crucial.

I appreciate the partnership project between ASB and the University of Sydney as one initiative of engaging people with disabilities in DRR activities. This means that this project is fully committed to provide accurate information related to DRR needed by people with disabilities. As one of the surveyors, I learnt new lessons that are quite different from what I had known before. In addition, the Washington Group questions have also been assisting me on how to collect information in a simpler manner that is necessary for the DRR activities.

The questionnaire (DiDR tool) provided is very beneficial to help us collect information related to disaster risk reduction. For the respondents, the questionnaire acts as tool to measure their vulnerability and capacity in the context of disaster risk reduction and to assess their contribution in reducing disaster risk in order to ensure that they will always be aware of and prepared against natural hazard emergencies that might strike them.

My experience during the capacity building activity includes exhaustion from learning the detail of the questionnaire considering the abundance of new lessons from the questionnaire that I had to absorb. However, it has been very interesting for me and I am very pleased to be able to participate in the training on disaster risk reduction conducted by ASB.

The field research using the DiDR tool was another interesting experience since as I was exposed to completely different situation compare to the training. I had to go the extra mile in applying the technique of the interview taught during the training. Capacity, cognition, and language barriers were my best friends during the field survey, not to mention the hilly road that at one point caused me to loose balance as my motorcycle fell. The situation made me ponder about the accessibility of the road that would most probably serve as significant hindrance in disaster risk reduction.

I once asked my friend to share the ride in order to maintain balance of this customized motorcycle that I used and I was very lucky to have a friend with me to take the ride over the steep hills. I was so relieved and thrilled that I immediately wrote in my social network feed “I have conquered Sub Village Srunggo.” There was one other area in Nawungan that alarmed me as the road was steep and hilly. Throughout the way, I remember myself praying more than enjoying the trip. The car had to stop in the middle of our trip and we had to walk up the hill for about 3 kilometres. I was exhausted and my leg hurt. It was a tiring yet memorable trip for me.

As the chairperson of Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) Working Group in Bantul District Indonesia, I believe that it is important for me to participate in disaster risk reduction activities including training, sharing or film screening. I hope that related government offices will immediately follow up on the result of the field research conducted by the survey team and I hope that the survey team will also receive information on the actions taken by the government.

People in the survey location are not yet familiar with disaster risk reduction activities, thus, I feel that we need to continue increasing the participation of people with disabilities in DRR both in terms of number of people with disabilities participating and the quality of their participation.

[A story from Mr Bejo Riyanto, a DPO member from Bantul District on his involvement in the training and field practice]

Mr Riyanto’s story illustrates– through his practical experience of reaching villages where people with disabilities live – of the risks and likely consequences for people with disabilities in natural hazard emergencies. His honesty in discussing the hazards he encountered and the exhaustion from learning all the new knowledge and skills of interviewing are a very good reminder that taking disability inclusive programs seriously involves hard work and commitment on all sides. However as each of the case studies demonstrate, being involved in disability inclusive learning and applying this learning is life changing for both people with disabilities and their non-disabled peers – cadres and friends – with whom they worked.

WORK PACKAGE 5: FIELD RESEARCH FINDINGS AND APPLICATION FOR DRR LOBBYING

Aims

- Increase knowledge of disabled-people organisation (DPOs) on the results of research on DRR and disability
- Improve capacity of DPOs on strategy and advocacy for disability inclusive disaster risk reduction.

Expected output

- Participants understand current situation of people with disability from the findings of DRR and disability research in the field.
- Participants able to formulate advocacy strategy for DRR for people with disability.

Session content

- Sharing data/field research findings on DRR and Disability conducted by University of Sydney and ASB Indonesia.
- Advocacy strategy by using research data.
- Role play for advocacy for DRR and Disability.

Summary of training strategy

Workshop on Work Package 5: Field research findings and its application for DRR lobby is combined with Work Package 3: The use of Disability Inclusive Disaster Resilience (DiDR) tool to deliver a comprehensive introduction of the tool, the process of conducting the field research, the findings and how to use the findings for advocacy and lobbying.

Participants

Table 6 Participants, Work Package 5

No	Working areas	Number of DPO participants		Total
		Male	Female	
1	Klaten	24	10	34
3	Bantul	10	8	18
4	Ciamis	20	23	43
5	Jakarta	6	4	10
6	Padang	11	6	17
	Total	71	51	122

Materials and accessibility consideration

Good practices and accessibility considerations from the previous Work Packages 1 and 2 were maintained. This included provision of DIDR tool in Braille and large print, providing sign language interpretation and touch typing for participants with hearing impairment.

Key training activities and notes on output achieved

DRR and disability research findings were shared with DPOs. They reported that the data was very relevant and useful for their work. However, although the presentation of data was using mostly visual and graph with PowerPoint presentation and infographic, there were suggestions from Deaf participants to add brief description for each graph, to help them understand better. They also said this would help them more whenever they will be communicating the findings to policy makers as not all DPOs were familiar with graphs. Therefore, in addition during the training a session on learning how to read graphs was introduced.

All DPOs had experience in doing advocacy and lobbying before, but not for DRR. Mostly they had used informal, one-to-one approach with key government stakeholders. ASB provided some tips on how to plan an effective advocacy strategy. After that, each group of DPOs practiced formulating their strategy for advocacy and performed communicating this in a role-play.

During role-playing of advocacy, DPOs performed their advocacy strategy very well, as they have extensive experience in conducting advocacy and lobbying. DPOs from Padang and Jakarta appeared the best among the DPOs. However, as many of the DPOs were still struggling with interpreting graphs, participants only used general

information during the role-playing. This is one of the recommendations for the future in terms of building capacity on how to use field research findings is to allow more time and training to learn about interpreting graphs of findings. The infographic primarily used pie graphs and bar graphs; a further recommendation is to work with DPOs to understand what the best representation of field research findings is for them to use successfully in lobbying and advocacy.

Participants' reflections

"I am really happy that ASB shared the data from research they are doing with University of Sydney about DRR and disability. Data is crucial, especially in relation to making changes for people with disability's welfare" – **Sika, a DPO member from Jakarta**

Case Study: New networks: Local collaboration with government for inclusive DRR programmes

The Association for People with Disability in Klaten District (PPCK) has good experience conducting DRR for people with disability in Klaten District as a local partner of ASB. However, in their work in DRR they had not engaged with government yet, because the Klaten district disaster management agency was just established in 2012.

In this project, representatives of PPCK participated in the work package trainings and approached Klaten disaster management agency who was invited to the workshop WP 1 and 2 as a speaker. In the workshops there was dialogue on what challenges and barriers faced by people with disabilities in the event of disaster. The Klaten disaster management agency realised then that they had not engaged with people with disabilities before.

After the workshops, PPCK continuously engaged with the disaster management agency by inviting them as a speaker for International Disability Day celebrations, 2014 to talk about DRR. That was the moment where BPBD realised that people with disability are at high-risk in disasters and need to be involved in all DRR stages.

In a recent interview with Klaten disaster management agency, they mentioned that they have planned and budgeted for a DRR training session for 100 people with disabilities in 1 sub-district prone to earthquakes in Klaten District. Also, Klaten disaster management agency also mentioned that they would like to collaborate with DPOs in the delivery of the programme.

The above shows that both PPCK and Klaten disaster management agency have taken important initiatives to work together and do something for better inclusive DRR programming in the district. Both parties are committed to support each other during implementation.

This case study illustrates the critical importance of involving people at all levels in advocacy and lobbying activities and doing this in very practical ways. Including government officials in training workshops with people with disabilities and village volunteers provide each with insights from people 'on the ground' who have lived experiences of disability in village communities and in contributing to DRR. This gives the officials a chance to learn knowledge and also to positively influence their attitudes towards people with disabilities. It also provides an experiential way for the officials to understand what the policy language about including vulnerable groups in DRR actually means in practice. Importantly, it also provides government officials with the experience of meeting people with disabilities and DPOs and learning about their capabilities and their commitment and motivation to be actively involved in sharing their experiences and participating in disability inclusive disaster risk reduction activities.

PART B: LESSONS LEARNT: ASB STAFF REFLECTIONS

Lessons Learnt on Work Package Component of Capacity Building

On 29th of April 2015, ASB ADRA project team composed of 1 Project Manager; 1 Senior Trainer/Facilitator; 2 Project Officers; 2 Project Research Assistants; and 1 Communication and Engagement Officer sat together to reflect on the overall quality and delivery of capacity building activities in this project.

In a 2-hour discussion, each person wrote their thoughts and reflections on the achievements; which strategies worked; unexpected difficulties and outcomes; what should be improved; and recommendations on a different page for each of the 5 work package topics and implementation. Each person presented their reflections and others asked questions. The discussion was facilitated by the Project Manager and the results are summarised below:

Achievements

1. New international framework on DRR is inclusive and DPOs from Indonesia who were involved in the project's capacity building workshops were engaged in the process of advocacy and lobbying for the inclusion of disability in Sendai Framework for DRR. The project directly contributed to success in recognition of disability inclusive DRR post 2015.
2. Capacity building process has succeeded in raising awareness on disability-inclusive DRR for both DRR and disability actors. This is important as often it is only one side – that is DPO actors or DRR actors – working independently. The project brought together DPOs, community level (cadres) and government officials to learn new knowledge and skills and contributed to changing attitudes. Growing demand for information on the 'how-to' of DiDRR at the moment was noted.
3. Some members of DPOs actively involved in the project have engaged in DRR activities as trainers or resource persons not only for people with disabilities, but also for the broader community.
4. The capacity building process has succeeded in building working linkages between DPOs and related government stakeholders for DRR. Important initiatives from government include:
 - 4.1. BNPB has issued head of BNPB regulation on DRR and disability. The regulation is *Peraturan Kepala (PerKa) BNPB No. 14 Year 2014 on Assistance, Protection and Participation of People with Disability in Disaster Management in Indonesia*.
 - 4.2. BPBD in Ciamis included 2 members of DPOs officially inaugurated in the DRR forum on February 26, 2014. These individuals are active in conducting

activities on socialisation of DRR for people with disability at the community level.

- 4.3. BPBD in Klaten district has planned and budgeted for a training programme for 100 people with disabilities this calendar year (2015).
- 4.4. BPBD Mentawai has advocated budget for activities for people with disabilities this calendar year (2015).
- 4.5. BPBD in Sleman district has integrated data for people with disabilities in their household database for communities living in the surrounding of Mount Merapi. Data about people with disabilities gathered during WP 4 field practice is in process of being inputted into the BPBD database. Link to the database as follows: <http://bpbd.slemankab.go.id/?p=1886>

What strategy worked?

5. The organisation of staged delivery for work packages worked very well in building capacity from knowledge to practice.
6. Accessibility provided for training participants such as Braille materials, sign language interpreter, captioning, accessible venue, etc. really supported enabling participants to be more engaged in the training process.
7. Portfolio is a great way of understanding the process of learning from participants. ASB staff learned how to adjust or improve the delivery of each work package in each working area based on what participants' wrote in their portfolios.
8. Continuous engagement and discussion with both DPOs and government regarding what information they need and how this project and others going forward can continue to learn from and accommodate the information and training that government and DPOs need.
9. Field practice was found as the best method in teaching skills on the use of Washington Group Short Set questions and also DiDR tool. It is important to always include as much field practice as possible, where interview survey teams can come back and discuss concerns and issues together and new practices and processes can be formulated and standardised.
10. Pairing DPOs with village volunteers was a great way to facilitate DPOs to work in communities. It opens the door to inclusion, because DPOs and village volunteers not only worked together to collect data, but they also learned to understand each other via conversation and interaction. Both DPOs and village volunteers have strong points in relation to working in disability-inclusive DRR in the community; learning together and working together in this way meant they came to understand each other's strong points.
11. Regular ASB project team reflection and evaluation helped to improve the quality and delivery of capacity building.

What needs to be improved?

12. Need better strategy to accommodate participants with hearing difficulty in an inclusive class. Most of the time, it depends on the quality of Sign language interpreter (SLI). And in Padang, Ciamis and Jakarta the level of understanding from SLI on DRR is low. Evaluation from ASB to SLIs had been conducted, however no significant improvement made. Therefore, until the project ends only a few Deaf DPOs have standout performance.
13. Involvement of government in the training process was considered not optimal. Government, in this case BNPB and BPBD had a great role in introducing basic DRR to DPO participants during work package 1, but afterwards their involvement became restricted largely to giving opening speeches. Consider better strategy for involvement of government in ongoing capacity building in the future, to encourage more active involvement at all stages of the training and capacity building process.
14. Consider making training duration for Work Package 3 and Work Package 5 longer to allow more practice and better understanding, and with more opportunities for field practice as noted above.
15. Consider making research findings document more user-friendly with more description, therefore all DPOs, including those who are not familiar in reading graphs can better understand the findings.

What was unexpected? (successes and difficulties)

16. There were too many working areas with only a small number of personnel. This meant that sometimes it was difficult to follow up and engage with DPOs and government to discuss the quality of capacity building and what needs to be improved. Consider in future having a local staff member for each working area for follow up engagement.
17. Too many participants? This sometimes made it difficult for ASB staff to accommodate all the participants' needs and ensure that all participants had the same level of understanding. Consider to limit number of participants in each class in the future.
18. Deaf participants could not keep up with big inclusive class with other people with different disabilities. Consider having preparatory class and follow up class after capacity building in big inclusive class to provide more opportunity for Deaf participants to engage with and understand the materials. Also appointing the same SLI for each working area would be helpful and with sufficient briefing prior to delivery of each work package so that they are more familiar with the materials before they do sign language interpreting for the Deaf participants.
19. The slogan which was always used in the training "Disabilitas, tangguh bencana" (Disability, resilient to disasters) really boosted participants motivation and mood during the long sessions in the training workshops.

20. In order to provide sufficient and proper accessibility, we just need to simply ask DPOs well beforehand what they need to support them in the training and make sure we can provide that.
21. There were unexpected DPO members who had a standout performance by the end of capacity building which really shows how the process of capacity building can change people (see case studies).
22. Remote support and follow up via SMS to all stakeholders engaged in this project has improved visibility of the project and the issue of DIDRR across the working areas.

Recommendations on what could be done differently in future

In addition to what has been mentioned above:

23. In the capacity building component and particularly the workshops, consider quality vs quantity. Too many participants will not be efficient in the process of capacity building, but from having more in these workshops we then learned which participants had standout performances, and who did not.
24. Better initial assessment on the knowledge of DPOs for each particular topic in each working area so that the workshops are better targeted to their learning needs and also more prior discussion with the DPOs about what strategies are needed to support the delivery of each work package in their area.
25. Regular follow up after each work package is not enough when done only via remote support (from Yogyakarta). Consider having a local staff member posted in each region to follow up with engagement. Better strategy for engagement with government. Prepare well and provide a clear and active role for government in the delivery of each work package. This is important so that it further encourages interaction and engagement between government and DPOs.

PART C: NOTES FROM INTERVIEWS WITH OFFICIALS

From February 20, 2015 to March 5, 2015, ASB interviewed officials from District Disaster Management Agencies (BPBD) in 4 field research areas about disability-inclusive DRR.

Table 7 District, name and title of government officials

No	Name of district	Name of interviewee
1	Bantul district	Mr Dwi Daryanto (Head of Bantul BPBD)
2	Ciamis district	Mr Dicky E Juliady (Head of Ciamis BPBD)
3	Mentawai Islands district	Mr Elisa Siriparang (Head of Mentawai BPBD)
4	Klaten district	Mr Nur Tjahjono, M Eng (Head of Preparedness Section, Klaten BPBD)

The objective of the interview was to understand the knowledge and capacity of local (district) disaster management agencies to include people with disability in DRR activities. Key questions included:

- a. Awareness and knowledge on disability
- b. Knowledge on disability-inclusive policy, legislation and planning
- c. Disability-inclusive DRR practices by local BPBD

Below is the analysis of the interviews focused on the barriers and enablers for disability inclusive disaster risk reduction. The framework for this analysis included 3 focus topics: (i) personal (knowledge, skills, attitudes of BPBD interviewee); (ii) systemic (organisational, resources available and not available that influence BPBD); and (iii) legislation and policy that influences BPBD.

Table 8 Barriers and enablers of DiDRR

Topics	Barriers	Enablers
Personal (knowledge, skills, attitudes of BPBD interviewee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low awareness and knowledge regarding disability among all interviewees. People with disability are still seen as vulnerable group of people who are in need of help and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness on the importance of people with disability being included in DRR activities. • Positive attitude towards potential capacity of

	<p>sympathy. Concept about disability is still limited to physical impairment (defect).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From interviewee disaster management agency Mentawai, there is a concern that people with disabilities will create a burden for the agency to conduct field activities. People with disabilities can work as civil servants only in relation to administrative work in the office. • All interviewees had never attended formal training about disability. Their experiences learning about disability was mainly by collaboration with NGOs. One interviewee from Klaten learned about disability from reading booklets about disability-inclusive DRR from ASB. 	<p>people with disabilities in DRR. All interviewees mentioned that if people with disability are given sufficient knowledge on DRR, they can protect and save themselves independently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed socialisation on disability and participation in drafting of national regulation on disability-inclusive disaster risk management • Interested in planning activities for people with disabilities about DRR. • All interviewees have experiences interaction with people with disabilities whether having family member with disability. • Interviewees think that stigma in community prevents people with disabilities to act optimally in their life
<p>Systemic (organisational, resources available and not available that influence BPBD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived lack of budget as primary obstacles for implementation of DIDRR. • Shortage of human resource personnel and low capacity in DIDRR. • BPBD have no data specifically on people with disabilities but mention that they can have access of data managed by social affairs agency. • One interviewee from disaster management agency Ciamis mentioned their concern about potential overlapping with Social Affairs Department at district level if they conducted DIDRR activities. While others such as Klaten seen it as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having high interest on data of people with disabilities to make good quality and tangible DIDRR programmes. • Have interest to participate in training on disability. All interviewees expressed that they do not have sufficient knowledge and capacity to plan, implement and monitor DIDRR activities; therefore they need capacity building and technical assistance. • Have interest to collaborate with NGO and DPOs to work on DIDRR.

	potential collaboration across agencies on DIDRR.	
Legislative (laws that influence BPBD) and policy (that influences BPBD).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to all interviewees, national regulation cannot directly be applied at district level. Adoption at local level needs time. Also requiring constant advocacy to follow up the regulation and budgeting for DIDRR issue. • No local regulation (district) on DIDRR reported for all areas (However, a related provincial regulation exists in Yogyakarta and also Central Java). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all BPBDs have internal policy of BPBD regarding priority groups. Only Mentawai Islands does not have such policy in place. • Good motivation in follow up implementing the national regulation for DIDRR and have ideas on following up DIDRR regulation. • District disaster management plan and contingency plan for tsunami are available and can be reviewed to integrate inclusion component.

It is interesting that the needs of capacity building and technical assistance were also raised during interview with local disaster management agency (BPBD) officials. This draws a recommendation for capacity building activities regarding disability-inclusive DRR to provide intensive capacity building of government with regard to DIDRR.

BPBD officials also expressed their wish to collaborate with CSOs, NGOs and DPOs to implement disability-inclusive DRR activities. This also reflects messages of the Sendai Framework for DRR regarding partnerships at all levels to realise disability-inclusive DRR.

REFERENCES

UNISDR (2015). *The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*.
http://www.wcdrr.org/uploads/Sendai_Framework_for_Disaster_Risk_Reduction_2015-2030.pdf

UNISDR (2005). *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*.
<http://www.unisdr.org/2005/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf> Access date 11/11/2014.

ANNEX: PHOTOGRAPHS FROM CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES



Figure 3 Pantomime performances for earthquake safety procedure (Work Package 1)



Figure 4 Discussion with government on basic DRR (Work Package 1)



Figure 5 Participant discussion on DRR policy framework (Work Package 2)



Figure 6 Practising drop-cover hold-on together (Work Package 1)



Figure 7 Practising protection for volcano eruption (Work Package 1)



Figure 8 Participants with visual impairment practising how to make a safe-room setting (Work Package 1)



Figure 9 Presentation on group discussion on definit disability (Work Package 4)



Figure 10 Stephanie Rahardja (a Deaf DPO member) in a high-level discussion on DIDRR in UN HQ New York with Ms Margaretha Walshstrom and ASB Country Director



Figure 11 Practising interview with Washington Group Questions (Work Package 4)



Figure 12 Field research identification of DRR and disability using DIDR tool



Figure 13 Field research identification of DRR and disability using DIDR tool



Figure 14 Bejo Riyanto (right) and team mates



Figure 15 ASB ADRA team discussion on lessons learned on capacity building activities

BLANK PAGE

END OF REPORT