



Uganda

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

Name of focal point: Ms Pamela Komujuni
Organization: Office of the Prime Minister
Title/Position: Senior Disaster Management Officer
E-mail address: pamgumis@yahoo.com
Telephone: +256782730186

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 9 February 2015
Print date: 09 February 2015
Reporting language: English

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

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

Did not report for the period.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

Did not report for the period.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

Did not report for the period.

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

- Lobby for DRR integration into all government sectors in the National Development Plan 2, and support different Ministries and Local Governments to develop sector specific DRR guidelines and strategies. Local Governments shall also be supported to incorporate DRR into their District Development Plans. Through the National Platform for DRR, all partners (UN, NGOs, Donors, Civil Society) shall be encouraged to share work plans so as to ascertain inclusion of DRR.

Strategic Goal Area 2

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Continue to map the different hazards communities face in different parts of Uganda and train them to develop multi-hazard early warning systems, incorporating indigenous knowledge. To further promote community resilience, communities and local leaders will be empowered and trained with skills for data collection pertaining to hazards.

Strategic Goal Area 3

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Work with sectors to develop sector-specific preparedness plans and business continuity plans, as well as contingency plans. And coordinate development of recovery and reconstruction plans that are risk sensitive.

Priority for Action 1

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	Yes
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	Yes

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk?
No

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

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

In as much as DRR is provided for in the National Development Plan 2010-15, and an approved Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management exists, there are still gaps in funding for sectoral engagements to undertake risk sensitive planning as they develop their sectoral plans. Also a few sectors like Education and Environment have developed sector-specific DRR/M strategies and guidelines but the majority have not yet taken such action.

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

There is still a challenge of convincing the financing institutions to provide additional funding to enable DRR planning and programmes. To overcome this, we are continuously lobbying through the Parliament and our development partners to finance risk sensitive development programmes.

additionally, Uganda although has a Policy on DRR/M, there is no law to enforce the provisions of the policy. To overcome this, the National Disaster Preparedness & Management Bill is currently being drafted.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget	25	75
Decentralised / sub-national budget	10	90

USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)

Not known

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

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

At the moment, most sectors of Government at the National and Local Government level do not adequately factor disaster risk reduction in their planning and budgeting hence limited resources for DRR mainstreaming. Although this situation is expected to improve as more DRR awareness is created.

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

Most budget allocation to government sectors are conditional and non-flexible, yet DRR requires an extra percentage in the usual funds to ensure planned activities are informed by risk assessments and appropriate DRR measures. But this challenge will be overcome with increased advocacy to the Ministry of Finance to allocate extra budgets for DRR for sectoral investments. On the contrary, disaster response and relief always attracts funding because effects are visible and people's lives must be saved.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget

allocations for DRR? No

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	Yes
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	No
Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	N/A

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

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

Uganda's Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management provides for a DRR Institutional Framework that runs from the Central government to the lowest administrative level. At the Lower level government, the District Disaster Management Committees (DDMCs), under leadership of the Chief Administrative Officer, have the overall responsibility to plan and budget for DRR activities at their and lower levels. Although the consequent plans and budgets are not yet being allocated sufficient resources for implementation.

Community participation in DRR is increasing in a sense that both government and partners do involve community leaders and members in conducting risk assessments as well as implementation of DRR activities. Although this is not uniform across the whole country, but very prominent in some of the most disaster prone areas like Karamoja sub-region.

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

- District Local Governments receive conditional grants and budget ceilings from the Central governments that often are not adequate for disaster proofed implementation. To overcome this, the Central government is being lobbied to increase budget ceilings and allow flexibility on spending to incorporate DRR issues.
- So in as much as there exists an DRR institutional structure at the Local Government, it is not supported with necessary resources.
- Most Local governments receive budget support from non-government partners including UN Agencies and this support incorporates DRR activities. This is a positive

step but it is not sustainable in the long run unless central government also provides the much needed financial support to local governments.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

civil society members (specify absolute number)	11
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	1
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	15
private sector (specify absolute number)	5
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	1
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	4
other (please specify)	UN, NGOs.(18)

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

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	Yes
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	Yes
In a civil protection department	No

In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	

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

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

The National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction has been operational since 2007 and has over the years expanded in its membership with over 40 agencies. The Platform is a formally established structure provided for under the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management. Regular meetings are convened at least once every 2 months and sometimes more often when a situation requires. Terms of Reference exists and are revised as needed and Platform meetings discuss various DRR/M matters including preparedness and emergency response issues.

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

There are no major challenges. Different agencies do share their planned DRR activities and work plans and resource maps.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? Yes

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	N/A
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	N/A
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	Yes
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	2

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

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

Hazard mapping and vulnerability profiling has been done for about 40 districts and this has been embraced by the district local governments as a planning tool to help in their decision making. The product is also being embraced by some National level sectors like Ministries of Education and Sports, and Energy and Mineral Development.

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

Comprehensive hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment and mapping is a useful exercise and planning tool but requires enormous resources in form of time, personnel, finances and logistics. Out of 112 districts, only 40 have been mapped and results published and availed for use in planning. But a common methodology is in place to cover all the districts as resources avail.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated	Yes
Reports generated and used in planning by	No

finance, planning and sectoral line ministries
(from the disaster databases/ information
systems)

Hazards are consistently monitored across
localities and territorial boundaries

Yes

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

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

There is a data base for capturing disaster losses (disinventar) although some sectors do not effectively utilize the data.

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

Although efforts for installing early warning systems to monitor hazards are underway with some 2 systems in place, the coverage is still inadequate. this coverage will be improved as resources avail.

Updating the Disinventar regularly also requires regular field data collection and sometimes resources are not available for regular assessments.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Early warnings acted on effectively	Yes
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	No

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

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

Early warning systems for floods have been installed in 2 regions prone to floods.

communities in the regions have been trained on system of usage and reporting mechanisms.

The establishment of the National Emergency Coordination and Operations Centre has improved data analysis and dissemination for early action.

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

Uganda is prone to other hazards besides floods e.g drought, landslides and epidemics. There are currently no early warning systems for other hazards besides floods.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

Uganda through the Conflict Early Warning and Response Unit (CEWERU) monitors Trans-boundary hazards especially in the border with Kenya and South Sudan. Pastoral movements are monitored for potential conflicts and actions put in place to mitigate the same.

CEWERU was established as a way of operationalizing the Conflict Early Warning and Response Network (CEWARN) mechanisms for monitoring the hazard of conflict in the IGAD region.

Uganda is a signatory to trans-border protocols on peace and security under the IGAD and EAC Mechanisms.

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

Although several mechanisms exist for cross-border hazard monitoring there is still

inadequate commitment from Partner states and funding for implementation mainly comes from donors and development partners. There is therefore need for Countries to contribute to resource pools where activities to operationalize cross-border hazard mitigation and early warning can be obtained.

Priority for Action 3

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? No

Information is proactively disseminated	No
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	No
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	Yes

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

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

There are no established protocols yet for disaster information sharing. But a few communities especially in the flood and drought prone areas participate in information collection and dissemination. For example the monthly drought bulletins for Karamoja sub-region are developed with participation of local community members and leaders.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular,

highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Since most disaster information is shared electronically, this limits the number of recipients since most people have no access to email, computers while others cannot read. Radio and Television media are more effective to reach larger audiences but sometimes the media houses can offer free services for prolonged periods. One way of overcoming this is to sign roiling contracts fro disaster information dissemination with media houses.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

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

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

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

The Education Sector has made tremendous strides to intergrate DRR in the education curriculum.

The secdtor has finalized Conflict and Disaster Risk Management Guidelkines for

Education Institutions in Uganda. These are ready for implementation.

DRR/M has already been integrated in the revised curriculum for lower secondary education and Primary education.

Five Universities in Uganda currently offer either full fledged courses on DRR/M or with DRR/M forming a key subject in various courses. Short courses are also being offered on a professional level by several agencies and education institutions.

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

There is need to intergrade DRR/M into the remaining levels of the Education system i.e. Higher secondary education and Early Childhood Development Centres.

Additionally, there is urgent need to lobby for resources from both government and partners to implement the CDRM Guidelines for schools.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Research programmes and projects	No
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	No
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	No

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

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

Partnerships with research and scientific institutions are still in infancy.

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

Not much progress but partnerships are being established with research institutions.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.	Yes
Training of local government	Yes
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes
Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	Yes
Guidance for risk reduction	Yes

Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level Yes

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

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

Government and stakeholders in DRR/M utilize designated days that are relevant to DRR to sensitize the public about DRR issues. Such days include the International day for Disaster Risk Reduction, road Safety Week, International Peace week, among others.

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

There is need for more public awareness especially to emphasize the message of resilience to disaster prone communities.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	No
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

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

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

Environmental risk management policies and practices are well developed through several agencies e.g. the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), ministry of water and environment, Climate Change Unit, Uganda Wildlife Authority, National Forestry Authority, etc.

These Agencies work closely with communities that live within or nearby eco-systems to agree on best management practices.

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

In as much as policies are in place and community cooperation exists in some areas, there are still some challenges with encroachment, deforestation, degradation and population pressure which forces people to settle or farm in protected and fragile eco-systems. these challenges are being addressed through enforcement and continuous negotiation and community sensitization on environmental risk management.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Crop and property insurance	No
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	No

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

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

Social safety nets exists but with limited scope and coverage. More so, most cash transfer programmes are implemented by NGOs without much input from government.

There is a growing sector of Micro-Financing and loans which have enabled people to engage in alternative livelihood strategies.

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

There is a challenge of sustainability especially with cash transfers since there is limited government involvement.

In addition, the insurance sector is not yet very attractive to small business owners and farmers, hence leaving people exposed to risk and losses.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	No
---	----

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

Investments in retrofitting infrastructures	No
--	----

including schools and hospitals

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

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

Not much progress

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

Not much progress

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? No

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
---	-----

Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	Yes
---	-----

Training of masons on safe construction technology	No
---	----

Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	No
---	----

Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and	No
---	----

private real estate development

Regulated provision of land titling

Yes

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

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

Not much progress. Slope stabilization is being done in communities in Mt.Elgon region in Eastern Uganda but these are local farming based measures.

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

A lot still needs to be done.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR

N/A

DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened

Yes

Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-

Yes

Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery Yes

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

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

Some post-disaster recovery programmes have incorporated DRR e.g PRDP, NUSAF and some drought recovery programmes in Karamoja.

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

Much as a lot has improved regarding costing disaster impacts, the same is not for actual recovery interventions. In some cases infrastructure for example is rehabilitated in almost the same status as pre-disaster and this largely due to lack of adequate resources for risk informed reconstruction.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? Yes

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	Yes
By international development actors	Yes

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

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

National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) leads the EIA process and results of such assessments are subjected to public scrutiny and debate before endorsement.

additionally, development projects are subjected to appraisals by different stakeholders to scrutinize several social, economic and environment concerns before approval.

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

Even with the above measures, some challenges still exist especially due to lack of sufficient knowledge by public members on issues to look out for, and hence even when public dialogues are convened, not many people turn up. This can be overcome by increased public awareness to educate the public about their citizen responsibility towards development projects.

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies	Yes
--	-----

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

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? No

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety	No
---	----

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness	Yes
--	-----

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

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections	No
--	----

Preparedness plans are regularly updated	Yes
---	-----

based on future risk scenarios

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

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

The National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management highlights roles and responsibilities for disaster and emergency responsibilities at the different levels.

Preparedness plans have been developed and Contingency plans for some hazards e.g. drought, floods, and landslides also exist and are updated as required by the National DRR Platform members.

Simulation exercises are also planned and conducted including drills.

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

Although responsibilities have been clarified by the Policy, actual implementation differs from district to district and some still have capacity building gaps for conducting needs assessments and response.

Simulation exercises and drills have been initiated but are not yet regular to cater for the different hazard scenarios.

Some sectors e.g. Education have developed sector-specific guidelines for conflict and disaster risk management but these guidelines are not yet fully implemented. The sector is developing an implementation road map that will support resource mobilization for implementation of guidelines.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such

as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

Preparedness plans, Contingency Plans and Business Continuity Plans are in place for all the major hazards and are developed through a multi-stakeholder approach.

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

Preparedness plans do not adequately cater for persons with special needs like the disabled persons and elderly.

Medical facilities do exist in disaster prone regions but are not adequately resourced and secured.

The above constraints are being taken note of and will be considered as continuous improvements are being undertaken.

Core indicator 3

Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

The Ministry of Finance has in place a contingency fund for a range of unforeseen events including disaster response. This fund is accessed through supplementary budget requests.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the

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

Much as there is a contingency fund, it is not exclusively for disaster response but also other unforeseen government expenditures. Therefore sometimes the funds are not enough for emergency response. To overcome this, there is a proposal to set up a disaster fund to be utilised for disaster and emergency activities.

Uganda also still has limited appreciation of insurance and re-insurance especially for disaster and risk reduction. There is need to continue sensitizing the public about the benefits of risk insurance, as well as lobbying the government to participate in insurance schemes for DRR purposes.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator

(not only the means of verification).

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

Uganda uses the World Bank GFDRR Post Disaster Needs Assessment tool to assess the cost of major disasters. Officials have been trained in the DALA methodology from all key sectors and these are usually deployed when there is a need for a PDNA.

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

PDNAs require a lot of resources to conduct i.e logistical, financial, human and time. This makes it difficult to conduct a PDNA for every major disaster in a timely manner.

Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Multi-hazard risk and vulnerability profiling is still on-going and only 40 districts have been covered out of the 112. But the available results are being used to inform development planning for those districts in the National Development Plan 2.

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

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

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

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

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

Although not yet perfect, there are commendable efforts in disaggregating gender

data when planning and implementing disaster recovery activities. For example the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) for Northern Uganda and the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) project for LRA war affected regions all factored in gender differences in project planning and implementation.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Institutions and Agencies at different levels have been trained in risk assessment and disaster, but this capacity is not standardized across the country. Regions which experience frequent disaster incidents have better capacity due to regular practice compared to counterparts which have less occurrences.

Additionally, enforcement capacity exists at different levels although effectiveness is often hampered by political interference.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Government has initiated and is implementing social protection programme for the most vulnerable. This is still on a pilot basis but anticipated to expand coverage to all vulnerability hot spots.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Traditional or Indigenous knowledge is considered during formulation of DRR strategies and this is mainly obtained through consultations with local communities.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

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

DRR is forming an integral component in the up-coming National Development Plan 2 with all sectors required to include and budget for DRR/M issue pertaining to their sectors.

A National DPM Policy is in place and continues to guide sectors on different action points for better mainstreaming. An Disaster Preparedness and Management Bill is also under development to provide the legal framework for DRR.

Uganda boasts of an active Parliamentary Forum for DRR which has been critical in creating awareness amongst Policy Makers and advocating for DRR in Parliament.

Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

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

Overall Challenges

- Lack of adequate mainstreaming and integration of DRR into sectoral plans.
 - Lack of adequate capacities for DRR at national and local levels
 - Limited resources for implementing DRR activities
 - Limited early warning systems for multi-hazards
-

Future Outlook Statement

Overall, efforts are being put into integrating DRR into National Development Plan 2015-2020 since this is the guiding development framework for the country, and to ensure all sectors of the economy have captured and budgeted for DRR activities relevant to their mandates.

Future Outlook Area 2

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

Overall Challenges

- Lack of adequate training in Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches.
- Limited resources for implementing community based DRR projects and programmes.
- Lack of adequate early warning systems.

Future Outlook Statement

The Government will endeavour to finalize hazard, risk and vulnerability mapping of the entire country and use that information for establishing early warning systems for identified hazards. Focus will also be directed to building capacity of local governments and communities in DRR.

Future Outlook Area 3

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

Overall Challenges

Currently, emergency preparedness attracts funds but mostly enough to finish the response phase without factoring the recovery and rehabilitation phase. As a result communities become prone to recurring disasters with much done to mitigate the effects should a particular disaster recur.

Future Outlook Statement

Advocacy and lobbying parliament to task sectors that are affected by disasters to budget for funds to rehabilitate and recover in a more resilient manner to avoid the devastating effects of recurrent disasters.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Office of the Prime Minister	Governments	Pamela Komujuni, Senior Disaster Management Officer
Ministry of Education and Sports	Governments	Mr. Joseph Kajumba, DRR Focal OFFICER.
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	Governments	Mr. Robert Ssekate, Senior Economist.
Ministry of Health	Governments	Dr. Patrick Bwire, DRR Focal Officer.
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Governments	Mrs. Anna Hakuza, Senior Agriculturaal Economist
ADRA Uganda	Non-Governmental Organizations	Booker Ajuoga, DRR Focal Point
Uganda Red Cross Society	Non-Governmental Organizations	Simon Peter Anyanzo, DRR Focal person
CARE Uganda	Non-Governmental Organizations	Monica Anguparu, DRR Focal Person
UNDP	UN & International Organizations	Gilbert Anguyo, DRR Analyst
UNICEF	UN & International Organizations	Juliet Ssekandi
Makerere University Kampala	Academic & Research Institutions	Dr. Yazidhi Bamutaze
Uganda National Metereological Authority	Governments	Charles Faustin Obeke
Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Governments	Benedict Okweda
Ministry of Water and Environment	Governments	Eng. Stanley Watenga
World Food Programme	UN & International	Jeff Mungu

Organizations