

1 Linking Relief-Rehabilitation-Development Against Disaster

2 Col PK Chaturvedi

3 *Received: 16 December 2015 Accepted: 1 January 2016 Published: 15 January 2016*

4 **Abstract**

5 Introduction-A disaster means that appalling disturbance / change which brings with it great
6 damage, misery and death when it occurs and leaves a legacy of destruction that has to be
7 overcome. Although disasters have enormous damaging capacity, there exist considerable
8 evidence of the efforts made by human beings to survive in extreme events such as earthquakes
9 or hurricanes or fires and these evidences are observed throughout ancient to modern history
10 of human civilization. In contemporary societies, warnings and repercussions of disasters has
11 been superintended by various organizations in various forms. International aid-agencies such
12 as the World Bank (WB), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Canadian
13 International Development Agency (CIDA), and United States Agency for International
14 Development (USAID) etc. emphasize through their Disaster Relief Program (DRM) on the
15 involvement of community for development purposes and long term sustainability
16 (UNDP-DRM, 2002-09).However, disasters could be reduced if not prevented. With today's
17 advancements in science and technology, including early warning and forecasting of natural
18 phenomena together with innovative approaches and strategies for enhancing local capacities,
19 the impact of natural hazards somehow be predicted and mitigated. Also, its detrimental
20 effects on populations can also be reduced and the communities can be protected adequately.

22

23 Index terms—

24 **1 Introduction**

25 However, disasters could be reduced if not prevented. With today's advancements in science and technology,
26 including early warning and forecasting of natural phenomena together with innovative approaches and strategies
27 for enhancing local capacities, the impact of natural hazards somehow be predicted and mitigated. Also, its
28 detrimental effects on populations can also be reduced and the communities can be protected adequately.

29 Disaster recovery and rehabilitation efforts require enormous funds that, amidst insufficient contingency
30 funds, are taken out from other development programmes that are planned or are underway, thereby impeding
31 development efforts ??Building Material and Technology Promotion Council, 1996). Therefore, it is important
32 that disaster mitigation programmes are made an integral part of developmental programmes. At the same
33 time, efforts to enhance the capacities of communities and coping systems at various levels towards self-reliance
34 and selfsufficiency must be sustained. The tools for assessing relief requirements and analyzing capacities and
35 vulnerabilities have to be further developed, fine-tuned and promulgated among aid providers and disaster
36 management practitioners (Centre for Science and Environment (CSE)-Case Study, Nov 2013).

37 **2 II.**

38 **3 Impact of Disaster**

39 Disasters leave harm and damage to people, infrastructure, economies and the environment hence the goals
40 of sustainable development get hindered. The disaster management framework has promoted a comprehensive
41 approach that embraces disaster response and also prevention, preparedness and recovery activities. However,
42 much of the focus has been concentrated upon disaster response planning relatively lesser activities have been

6 LINKING RELIEF, REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT (LRRD)

43 undertaken on disaster prevention, including the examination of the underlying causes of disasters. As the
44 potential of the occurrence of a disaster increases, the coping mechanisms of many societies tend to become less
45 effective. Moreover, vulnerability to such risks tends to increase due to the mismatch between faster speeds of
46 urbanization compared to that of building infrastructures to cope with the urbanization. It results from the
47 coupling of independent risk sources, i.e. interaction of natural hazards with technological, lifestyle, and social
48 risks and transition of people from rural to urban areas; increase of mobility and cultural de-rooting i.e. loss of
49 traditional management capabilities; increase of social pressure and conflicts and insufficient management capacity
50 for mitigation and contingency management (UNDP-Project Management Board (PMB), 2002).. disaster means
51 that appalling disturbance / change which brings with it great damage, misery and death when it occurs and
52 leaves a legacy of destruction that has to be overcome. Although disasters have enormous damaging capacity,
53 there exist considerable evidence of the efforts made by human beings to survive in extreme events such as
54 earthquakes or hurricanes or fires and these evidences are observed throughout ancient to modern history of
55 human civilization. In contemporary societies, warnings and repercussions of disasters has been superintended
56 by various organizations in various forms.

57 4 Disaster Mitigation in India

58 India faces disasters of different types and people have been struggling to overcome the disasters that strike
59 with periodic regularity. During the years 1990-1999, there were 59,846 reported deaths, while 315,125,127
60 people were affected by various disasters in the country. During the years 2000-2009, there were 64,478 people
61 killed and 659,134,721 people were affected by various disasters in India, indicating an increase in both deaths
62 and the impact of disasters (World Disaster Report 2010). The country is more vulnerable to disasters, such
63 as droughts, earthquakes, floods, avalanches, cyclones, landslides, etc, Major natural disasters that India has
64 experienced includes Uttar Kashi Earthquake (1991), Latur Earthquake (1993), Super cyclone in Orissa (1999),
65 Bhuj Earthquake in Gujarat (2001), South Asia Tsunami (2004) (Ch andran 2004), Kosi floods 2008 (NDRF
66 2008).

67 Disaster Management geared to make a paradigm change from response and calamity relief to disaster
68 prevention, preparation and mitigation. Another significant change is to move from largely government instituted
69 disaster management to public private partnership and community based disaster management. In this regard,
70 significant changes have been made. India probably has the world's oldest disaster relief code which started
71 in1880. This relief code provides details of the relief to be given by the government to the affected people.
72 India has been following five year national plans although they are not on a rolling basis. The Tenth Five-Year
73 Plan 2002-2007 for the first time had a detailed chapter entitled Disaster Management-Development Perspective.
74 The plan emphasized the fact that development cannot be sustainable without mitigation being built into the
75 development process. Disaster mitigation and prevention were adopted as essential component of the 2007-2012
76 (Planning Commission, 2008) states:-"The development process needs to be sensitive towards disaster prevention,
77 preparedness and mitigation. Disaster management has therefore emerged as a high priority for the country.
78 Going beyond the historical focus on relief and rehabilitation after the event, there is a need to look ahead and
79 plan for disaster preparedness and mitigation in order to ensure that periodic shocks to our development efforts
80 are minimized."

81 5 Response

82 The Eleventh Five Year Plan (op.cit) aims at consolidating the process by giving impetus to projects and programs
83 that develop and nurture the culture of safety and it also concentrates upon the idea of integration of disaster
84 prevention and mitigation into the development process. The guidance and direction to achieve this paradigm
85 shift will need to flow from National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), and in the true spirit of the
86 Disaster Management Act, 2005 to all stakeholders including State Governments and Union Territories, right up
87 to the Panchyati Raj (Local administration by five locally elected citizens) Institutions. Communities at large
88 will need to be mobilized to achieve this common objective as they are the first responders. Even the best of
89 isolated efforts will not bear fruit unless they are part of an overall, wellconsidered approach. Also responsibilities
90 of all stakeholders need to be clearly spelt out and accountability and sustainability factored in.

91 While participating in these relief operations, it was strongly felt that the resources from external agencies
92 arrive at least 06 to 12 hours later than the occurrence of disasters. Further, the priority is given by local
93 commanders to those casualties that appear to have more chances of survival. While most of the casualties
94 can be saved by local assistance during initial reaction time, lot of efforts are needed to look into the issue and
95 administer local activities in initial stage of the disaster or even preparedness in disaster prone localities. There
96 is a paradigm shift from reactive approach of mitigation and relief to proactive approach of planed rehabilitation
97 and development.

98 IV.

99 6 Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD)

100 Conceptual thinking about LRRD already started in the 1980s. The most broadly associated idea with LRRD
101 is that both humanitarian relief and development assistance should be structured in a way that reduce the

102 need for humanitarian aid and promote developmental objectives before, during and after emergencies. Relief
103 and rehabilitation may be temporary measures necessary for returning to pre-existing levels of development
104 cooperation. Once disaster hostilities cease, moving into recovery and early development type assistance may be
105 hampered by a lack or incapacity of local authorities and the prevailing need for sociopsychological coping with
106 the past. How to apply relief, rehabilitation and development measures simultaneously over an extended period
107 is analysed and placed in this thesis.

108 A number of studies focus on developing risk reduction approaches (Paton, 2003& Camilleri, 2003),
109 vulnerability reduction (Hellstrom, 2005; ??cEntire, 2001), and developing more comprehensive disaster
110 management approaches (McEntire, op.cit). However, very few studies reflect on developing effective monitoring
111 tools in order to understand the vulnerable communities post-disaster, which could form the basis for sustainable
112 reconstruction ??Birkmann & Fernando, 2007). The urban or rural planners and disaster managers need
113 coordination at the operational level and strategic coordination at the policy level (Bennett et al., 2006).
114 Most of the development projects are completed in urgency within the stipulated time frame, without actually
115 investigating the long term benefits of such projects or developing effective monitoring systems for the programs.
116 Time and again it has been stressed that disasters stems from human and societal changes which translates into
117 vulnerability (Blaikie, 1994 VENRO, 2006 working paper on LRRD states that fluid transition from relief to
118 rehabilitation and development co-operation justified to describe the respective phases, methodical approaches
119 and terminologies involved. The immediate goal of relief is to secure survival and provide those affected with
120 the most vital support as quickly as possible. Salvage and rescue, shelter, protection, food aid, water supply
121 and emergency medical care are of top priority. This stage of relief may last for a couple of weeks up to several
122 months, and even longer in the case of what are referred to as chronic crises. As a rule, this is to the detriment
123 of project planning but must not be used as an excuse not to make a need assessment and do the corresponding
124 project planning.

125 Voice Investment in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in development programme is an essential component
126 in rehabilitation and development, and more importantly in reducing the need for emergency responses. At
127 the same time, activities which lay the ground for DRR in development should continue to be supported under
128 the Humanitarian Aid instrument. NGOs have separate humanitarian and development departments. Funding
129 constraints reinforce the gap, as donors may choose to only fund (a part of) one 'phase'. This can lead to projects
130 which are suddenly discontinued because an 'emergency phase' is ending in the donor's view, or to long term
131 programme which no longer make sense because a disaster has completely changed the local situation in the
132 'development phase'. Such trends need to be checked in time (VOICE, op.cit).

133 Conceptual thinking about LRRD started in the 1980s, having idea that both humanitarian relief and
134 development assistance should be structured in ways that reduce the need for humanitarian aid and promote
135 developmental objectives before, during and after emergencies. The implementation of LRRD led to the emergence
136 of two approaches, i.e. continuum and contiguum. In the continuum approach, the succession of relief,
137 rehabilitation, and development, based on the assumption of a linear sequence before-during-after the disaster.
138 In contiguum approach, simultaneous occurrence of humanitarian aid, rehabilitation and development, is carried
139 out in order to respond effectively to all aspects and areas of the disaster. LRRD under the contiguum approach
140 requires both NGOs and the Govt to expand their activities facilitating cooperation, in order to prevent crises,
141 and to contribute to the long term stability and well-being of society (Karlos PA, 2002). LRRD interventions,
142 regardless of the size or character of a disaster (sudden, recurrent or ongoing natural hazards or conflict), is need
143 of time. Effective LRRD can address the poverty that disasters and conflicts generate (or intensify) by laying
144 the groundwork for sustainable development during humanitarian interventions.

145 Long term programmes may be in the best position to respond to forecasts of a crisis, as development NGOs
146 are on the ground, have established links with communities and government bodies and have staff and partner
147 organisations in place. If a crisis is up coming, they can act upon early warning signals and adapt their programme
148 where necessary. Once a crisis reaches a certain threshold, a more substantial humanitarian intervention may
149 become necessary. Moreover, development funding needs to be dispersed quicker in situations where LRRD is
150 needed as the current practice is far too slow for this purpose. Disaster preparedness will save money: "It is
151 much more cost effective to prevent and prepare for a crisis than to wait for it to happen (VOICE, op.cit).

152 Aid agencies and government authorities on the ground have to take context-specific actions in relation to
153 key needs of affected populations. The coordination among all actors: local authorities, donors, Govt agencies,
154 local civil society and NGOs are very difficult. This involves field-level coordination between all actors but also,
155 internal coordination between different departments of aid agencies, governmental authorities and donors.

156 **7 V. Interrelationship between DRR and RRD Approaches**

157 At all level, disasters are now viewed as opportunities for sustainable development. However, recently, post-
158 disaster reconstruction efforts and community based development initiatives were lacking resources. Simultaneous
159 projects are launched by numerous local state and central government organizations for housing and infrastructure
160 construction, repairs, for livelihoods creation and for a range of other social programs. However, affected
161 communities are totally unaware of the long term benefits of such initiatives.

162 Thus, there is possibly a need for a common platform for post-disaster development. Numerous communities
163 were unable to adapt to the new environment after the relocation. They returned to their original homes within

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

164 the few months of after the relocation that lead them to further vulnerability. This shows a failure of the system
165 that targets capacity building and sustainable development for communities. Development initiatives undertaken
166 by either the local government or the aid agencies lack cultural sensitivity. It is also identified that there is a
167 need for coordination at the operational level (who does, what and where) and strategic coordination at the
168 policy level. The indigenous knowledge should be considered in the process of disaster reduction, by educating,
169 preparing and consulting communities before a disaster occurs. A larger investment in Disaster Risk Reduction
170 (DRR) in development programmes is an essential component in LRRD, and more importantly in reducing the
171 need for emergency responses. At the same time, DRR mainstreaming and activities which lay the ground for
172 DRR in development should continue to be supported under the Humanitarian Aid instrument (Voice-Concord,
173 op.cit).LRRD can have six key relationships between aid and disaster (Lindahl, (1996):-Source: Chaturvedi A
174 more recent addition to this list of key relationships is between relief and peace-building activities (Mancino et
175 al, 2001). The 'second generation' of the debate identified by Macrae and Harmer (2004) raises the issue of
176 relationships to a higher and more political level, to do with the links between aid, foreign and security policy.
177 But as far as slum fire is concerned, it does not need such international level aid or security. Slum fire impact is
178 heavily dependent on how slum society is structured and development programme or humanitarian assistance aid
179 funding is made available. According to VOICE (op.cit), the disaster prevention/ risk reduction; rehabilitation
180 measures focuses on restoring the status quo ante and promoting the existing potentials as well as aims to
181 achieve qualitative and sustainable improvements in the living conditions of those affected. Running project
182 phases is not divided. If it is not possible for a single organisation to implement the different phases of a project,
183 coordination with other organisations working on a complementary basis is sought to integrate capabilities aimed
184 at comprehensive improvements in living conditions.

185 Missing coordination between stake holders-With the immensity and complexity of the disaster problem, no
186 stakeholder could effectively address the problem alone. Cooperation in disaster reduction activities among
187 governments at national and local levels, nongovernmental organizations and various sectors of the communities
188 is essential. The broadened participation of relevant sectors, such as environment, finance, industry, transport,
189 construction, agriculture, education, health, and media among others, in disaster reduction activities, allows for
190 greater understanding of local vulnerabilities and risk to disasters and integration of actions of stakeholders.

191 The effectiveness of disaster risk management interventions could be ensured when the community and people
192 at risk are directly involved in the disaster risk management process. It is also critical that any disaster risk
193 management plan is dynamic and remains relevant to the community and the roles and contributions of the
194 members are defined. Through the participative approach, the determination of risks and the intervention
195 measures are not imposed on the community, but rather accomplished by the very people concerned. Moreover,
196 greater emphasis is placed on local knowledge and the indigenous ways of knowing, rather than on expert
197 knowledge and technologies. Also, community based-activities tend to be multi sectoral, thereby reinforcing
198 local organizations, and enhancing consciousness, awareness and critical appraisal of disaster risks and their
199 inter-dependence. Altogether, they increase the community's capacity and people's potential for reducing their
200 vulnerability to disasters. Following measures are missingi. Empowerment to the poor and women, to overcome
201 established boundaries and limitations ii. Funds/subsidies of state-led programs are not seen. iii. New relationship
202 between grassroots groups, social organisations, and the private and public sectors is not seen. iv.

203 8 Recommendations

204 The RRD approach confirms that development can only sustain if disaster mitigation is built into the development
205 process. Further mitigation has to be across all sectors of development. It advocates that investments in
206 mitigation are much more cost effective than expenditure on relief and rehabilitation.

207 Funding Mechanism with development linked mitigation -India's 10 th Five Year Plan noted that the urban
208 slum population is growing despite sharp reductions in poverty and rising incomes. The central and several
209 state governments recognized the need for intervention by initiating, or enlarging existing urban housing and
210 other slum subsidy programs. With this in mind, the Government of India (GOI) has requested a loan from
211 the World Bank to implement a more effective strategy and delivery mechanism for the financing of urban slum
212 improvement and sanitation provision in underserved areas.

213 In order to support the GOI to achieve the goals delineated in 10th Five-year Development Plan concerning
214 slum improvement and poverty alleviation in urban areas, the Bank has agreed to consider a program that will
215 focus on i. Refining the national policy framework for the upgrading of urban slums and sanitation in underserved
216 areas in India; ii. Working with the states and various beneficiaries to establish a methodology which measures
217 program performance of both the GOI and the states, and identifies concrete monitorable steps that can be
218 taken to improve this performance; iii. Developing appropriate monitoring mechanisms to enable the evaluation
219 and modification or redesign of the programs which would improve the transparency, efficiency, administrative
220 simplicity, and targeting of the assistance; iv. Developing funding schemes for slum improvement and sanitation
221 that could provide incentives so that resources are used more effectively and the program reach expanded. In
222 doing so, the program will:

223 a) Contribute to poverty alleviation in the poorest urban areas in India; b) Strengthen human capital in poor
224 neighborhoods by increasing community participation in planning, delivery and maintenance of public works and

225 services; c) Improve the efficacy of the use of more than \$400 million of annual government expenditures on these
programs^{1 2 3 4}



Figure 1:

Figure 2:

226

¹Linking Relief-Rehabilitation-Development Against Disaster

²© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US) Linking Relief-Rehabilitation-Development Against Disaster

³© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US) s

⁴(B)

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

227 [-DG FOR EXTERNAL POLICIES European Union POLICY DEPARTMENT -July 2012 PE 491.435 EN POLICY BRIEFING
228 ‘-DG FOR EXTERNAL POLICIES European Union POLICY DEPARTMENT -July 2012 PE 491.435 EN
229 POLICY BRIEFING Linking relief, rehabilitation and development: Towards more effective aid’. *DGEP*
230 2012.

231 [Hellstrom ()] ‘A decision model for involvement in vulnerability reduction’. T Hellstrom . *Disaster Prevention and Management* 2005. 14 (2) p. .

232 [Blaikie et al. ()] ‘At Risk: Natural Hazards, People’s Vulnerability and Disasters. London, Routledge. 219. 4.
233 BM&TPC: P Blaikie , T Cannon , I Davis , B Wisner . *Report of the expert Group on Natural Disaster*
234 *Prevention, Preparedness & Mitigation having bearing on Housing and Related Infrastructure-Part-I, Techno*
235 *legal aspects of flood and fire hazards and land Zoning*, 1994. 1996.

236 [Bennett et al. ()] J Bennett , W Bertrand , C Harkin , S Samarasinghe , H Wickramatillake . *Coordination of*
237 *international humanitarian assistance in tsunami affected areas*, 2006.

238 [Mohopatra ()] *Community Based Planning in post disaster reconstruction; A case study of Tsunami affected*
239 *fishing community in Tamil Nadu coast of india -Waterloo, ontario, R Mohopatra* . Canada 2009.

240 [Chaturvedi ()] *Community Based Sustainable Responses to emergent Relief at District Level-Col PK Chaturvedi,*
241 *P K Chaturvedi* . BVP/EEE/facebook 2011.

242 [CSE Draft Discussion; Health and Environment Industrial Disasters-A Delhi Case Study (2013)] *CSE Draft*
243 *Discussion; Health and Environment Industrial Disasters-A Delhi Case Study*, Nov 2013.

244 [Dfid-] *Disaster risk reduction: a development concern-A scoping study on links between disaster risk reduction,*
245 *poverty and development Department for International Development*, Dfid- . DFID, United Kingdom.

246 [International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies P.O. Box 303 CH-1211 Geneva 19 Switzerland World Disaster
247 ‘International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies P.O. Box 303 CH-1211 Geneva 19
248 Switzerland’. *World Disaster Report* 2010.

249 [Goi Pc- ()] ‘Jai Singh Road, On behalf of Planning Commission, Government of India, Yojna Bhawan, Sansad
250 Marg, New Delhi 110 001, 12. GOI-UNDP-UNITED Nations Development Programme India’. Goi Pc- .
251 *Disaster Risk Management Programme*, 2007-2012. 2008. 2002-2009. Planning Commission. Published by
252 Oxford University Press YMCA Library Building (Good Practices in Community Based Disaster Risk
253 Management)

254 [Voice Cisp ()] *Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD): Towards a more joined up approach*
255 *enhancing resilience and impact*, Voice & Cisp . 2001. 2012. July 2012. (Linking Relief to Rehabilitation and
256 Development’ (booklet),Voiceconcord)

257 [Karlos ()] *Linking Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development in the Framework of ‘New Humanitarianism’ -A*
258 *Summary of Clara Beetz Slattery on behalf of VOICE asbl (Voluntary Organisations In Cooperation in*
259 *Emergencies) BRUSSELS*, P A Karlos . 2002.

260 [Camilleri and Denis ()] *Maltas risk minimization to earthquake, volcanic and tsunami damage, Disaster*
261 *prevention and management*, H Camilleri , Denis . 2003. 12 p. .

262 [Birkmann ()] *Measuring Vulnerability to Hazards of Natural Origin -Towards Disaster-Resilient Societies*, J
263 Birkmann . 2006. Tokyo and New York: UNU Press.

264 [Paton ()] *Stress in disaster response: a risk management approach*, *Disaster prevention and Management*, D
265 Paton . 2003. 12 p. .

266 [Mc Entire ()] ‘Triggering agents, vulnerabilities and disaster reduction: towards a holistic paradigm’. David A
267 Mc Entire . *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 2001. 10 p. .