

LUND UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
TUTOR: LISA STRÖMBOM

SIMV07

# A Reflection on Gender Mainstreaming in Disaster Risk Reduction

---

ZHOU LIANG

Adv10lzh

# Abstract

This thesis attempts to reflect on the current disaster risk reduction policy from a gender perspective, with the example of Hyogo Framework for Action which is the current international framework basis for the disaster risk reduction work. By linking it with the upstream, theoretical discussions in academia, and the downstream, the reports from the member states in terms of implementation, the analysis attempts to find out if the policy is designed in line with the theory, and is reflecting the need in the reality. Through looking at how gender mainstreaming has been described in policy documents and monitor templates under the Hyogo Framework for Action over time, and how women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender as key theoretical concepts are addressed in the policy documents, monitor templates as well as national reports by member states, the thesis argues that the current gender policy in disaster risk reduction is lack of consideration on men engagement and contextualized gender relations.

*Key words:* gender mainstreaming; disaster risk reduction; men engagement; women empowerment; vulnerability by gender

Words: 19,873

# List of Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired immune deficiency syndrome or acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
CSW	Commission on the Status of Women
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
EU	European Union
GAD	Gender and Development
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
INSTRAW	International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PfA	Platform for Action
PTSD	Post Traumatic Stress Disorder
MSB	Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United National Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNIFEM	UN Development Fund for Women
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
USAIDS	U.S. Agency for International Development
WCDR	World Conference on Disaster Reduction
WID	Women in Development

# Table of Content

1.	Introduction: .....	6
2.	Theoretical and Conceptual Framework.....	9
2.1	Theory Review on Women, Gender and Development.....	9
2.1.1	Women in Development in 1970s.....	9
2.1.2	Gender and Development from 1980s, and Gender Mainstreaming.....	11
2.1.2.1	Gender and Development from 1980s.....	11
2.1.2.2	Gender Mainstreaming and Women empowerment.....	12
2.1.3	Men engagement in Gender Mainstreaming from 1990s.....	15
2.2	Theory Review on the Gender Perspective of Disaster Risk Reduction.....	17
2.2.1	Disaster, risk and Vulnerability.....	17
2.2.2	The gender perspectives in Disaster Risk Reduction.....	22
2.2.2.1	Vulnerability by gender.....	22
2.3	Summary on the theoretical framework and operationalisation of theory.....	25
3.	Methodology.....	27
4.	Gender Mainstreaming in DRR documents.....	33
4.1	UNISDR and Hyogo Framework for Action.....	33
4.2	‘Gender’ in the HFA policies and monitor templates by UNISDR.....	34
4.2.1	‘Gender’ in HFA documents by UNISDR is changed over time.....	34
4.2.1.1	‘Gender’ in HFA 2005-2015 policy documents.....	34
4.2.1.2	‘Gender’ in the HFA monitor templates.....	39
4.2.1.3	Summary on the process of change in DRR policies in terms of gender.....	45

---

4.2.2 Analysis on the gender dimensions in DRR policies and monitor templates.....	47
4.2.2.1 Women empowerment.....	47
4.2.2.2 Men engagement .....	49
4.2.2.3 Vulnerability by Gender .....	50
4.2.3 Summary on the analysis in HFA policy documents and monitor templates.....	52
4.3 ‘Gender’ in national periodic reports (2009-2011).....	53
4.3.1 ‘Gender’ in national reports (2009-2011) .....	53
4.3.2 Analysis on the gender dimension in the HFA national report .....	55
4.3.2.1 ‘Gender’ is perceived in different ways.....	55
4.3.2.2 Women empowerment.....	58
4.3.2.3 Men Engagement.....	62
4.3.2.4 Vulnerability by Gender .....	65
4.3.2.5 Summary on the DRR implementation from a gender perspective .....	67
5. Conclusion.....	69
Executive Summary .....	73
Bibliography.....	77
Appendix A: list of documents used for analysis.....	82
Appendix B: chart of gender-related responses in the national reports (2009-2011).....	83

# 1. Introduction:

Disaster risk reduction has been recognized as an important integral part of the development field. It is highly related to several aspects of human security, including food security, water, ecosystem and access to services. The poverty reduction effort on the one hand affects people's capacity of responding to disasters, while the level of capacity and resilience on the other hand also influences the development of the community in a comprehensive way. Therefore disaster risk reduction is not only a sector, but also an approach to development. All stakeholders, including governments, international society, as well as civil society, are seeing disaster risk management as an integral part of poverty reduction and trying to make it more effective.

With gender mainstreaming requiring a gender perspective to be included into all fields of development work, the discussion of taking gender approach in disaster risk reduction has started since 1990s. However, the feminist perspective in development in general has gone through the stages of Women in Development (WID) in the 1970s, to Gender and Development (GAD) in the 1980s and to men engagement discussion in the 1990s, despite that the concept of gender mainstreaming is raised along with GAD only in the 1980s. As a 'late-comer' in gender mainstreaming, disaster risk reduction (DRR) is an interesting aspect in development to look at, because it is expected to be more updated with the theoretical discussion compared to the other development fields. Therefore the thesis aims to find out if gender mainstreaming described in disaster risk reduction policies under the Hyogo Framework for Action, which is the current framework basis of DRR for stakeholders at the international, regional, national and community level, are in parallel with the gender mainstreaming discussions in the academia. Moreover, reports from the member states of the Hyogo Framework for Action will be examined, in attempt to find out if the disaster risk reduction policies are designed reflecting the reality in terms of implementation.

With the example of documents under the Hyogo Framework for Action, the thesis will examine in two dimensions: *1) how is gender mainstreaming described in DRR policy documents and reports with the example of Hyogo Framework for Action? Are there any changes over time? 2) Are women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender addressed in those policies and reports? If yes, how are they addressed?*

In order to answer these two research questions and employing textual analysis as the research method, the analysis will be based on the theoretical framework of the process of gender mainstreaming in development from 1970s till today, to examine how gender perspective is presented and how the description has changed over time in the documents of Hyogo Framework of Action by UNISDR which served as a coordinator of HFA, including the policy document *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*, its follow-up document the *Strategic Directions for the ISDR system to assist the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015*, as well as the biennial monitor templates developed for the member states to track the progress in accordance with HFA goals. Key gender concepts in general like ‘women empowerment’ and ‘men engagement’, together with the gender perspective in DRR ‘vulnerability by gender’, that are highlighted in the theory, will be looked up not only in the aforementioned documents of UNISDR, but also the national reports submitted by the member states based on the biennial monitor templates. The national reports will be served as a comparison to the policy documents, to examine if the gender dimension in the policy documents reflects the reality in the member states. The national reports (2009-2011) will be the main set of reports among other biennial reports, because they are submitted by more member states and there are more gender features in the monitor template (2009-2011). A list of the texts used for the analysis can be found in Appendix A.

There are four parts in the thesis, theory, methodology, analysis and conclusions. The theory part consists of the theoretical review on women, gender and development, as well as the theory review on the gender perspectives of disaster risk reduction, with focus on the most important component of gender mainstreaming ‘women empowerment’, the new trend of gender mainstreaming since 90s ‘men engagement’ and the most important rationale for engendering DRR ‘vulnerability by gender’. It is followed by the methodology section, which elaborates on the concept of textual analysis and its key techniques, the choice of data, source criticism and the difficulties and limitations of using textual analysis will be discussed. In the main analysis part, information on UNISDR and Hyogo Framework for Action is first briefly introduced. Then the policy documents by UNISDR and the reports from the member states are analyzed respectively, by looking for how gender is described in these documents, and how the gender dimensions on women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender are addressed in these documents. In the final conclusion part, the main findings from the analysis will be readdressed, revisiting the research questions. Implications to the gender policies in DRR are given as the output of the research.

## **2. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework**

### **2.1 Theory Review on Women, Gender and Development**

Gender approach to the development field was recognized and has gone through the stages from Women in Development (WID) in the 1970s and to Gender and Development (GAD) since the 1980s. While starting from the 1990s, a large portion of focus has shifted from women to the other counterpart men. This part will be an overview of how the ideas have influenced development policies and how the programs implementation has in turn pushed the theoretical ideas forward, highlighting women empowerment which is the most important component of gender mainstreaming in policy, and men engagement which is the new trend in gender mainstreaming.

#### **2.1.1 Women in Development in 1970s**

With the publish of Ester Boserup's classic thesis, '*Woman's Role in Economic Development*' (1970), the concept of Women in Development (WID) emerged and began to challenge the male-dominance and the long ignorance of female's economic role and contribution to development (Jaquette & Staudt, 2006, p.18). Through empirical studies in Africa and Asia, Boserup discovered that women were taking almost all the domestic work and were highly participating in the agricultural work. In some countries in Africa, women were found responsible for 70%, or even 80% of the agricultural work (Boserup, 1970, p.10). However the productivity of male and female found does not differ much (ibid, p.200). Boserup argued that the cash cropping and technology transfer to men ignored the fact of women's contribution, therefore suggested empower women and allow them to be qualified for modern sectors, and take women into account for development programmes.

Boserup's thesis provided as a solid foundation for recognizing women in development in the 1970s. Along with the dramatic rise of women's movements, and the effort of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), it led to the UN International Year for Women 1975, the UN Decade on Women 1976–1985, four world conferences on women 1975–1995 (Corner, 2008, p. 598). "Full integration of women in the total development effort should be encouraged" was included as the objective in the International Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade 1971-1980 (UN, 1970); in contrast to the First Development Decade 1961-1970 declaration of the UN which did not consider the status of women (Jain & Chacho, 2008, p.7). On the first world conference on women in 1975, three objectives served as the basis for UN work on the advancement of women were identified: (i) full gender equality and the elimination of gender discrimination; (ii) the integration and full participation of women in development; (iii) an increased contribution by women towards strengthening world peace. These changes in policies manifested a change in a way women were perceived, from seeing women as passive development recipients, to recognizing their role as equal participators in development, with equal rights to resources and opportunities (Pillai, Asalatha & Ponnuswamy, 2009, p.8).

It also brought institutional change in the UN system by establishing the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) and the UN Development fund for Women (UNIFEM), enlarging the proportion of female staffs in the UN system to allow more to speak out for women.

In addition, it influenced national governments and foreign aid agencies to put women into consideration in the development programmes. U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), for instance, established an office of Women in Development in 1973, and encouraged other donors to give specific attention to women (Jaquette & Staudt, 2006, p.23).

## 2.1.2 Gender and Development from 1980s, and Gender Mainstreaming

### 2.1.2.1 Gender and Development from 1980s

In the 1980s, the WID model was criticized to be ineffective in practice to improve women's economic conditions, and insensitive to the differences among women (ibid, p.28). Based on both success and failure of WID, Gender and Development (GAD) approach was introduced. The focus from 'women' (or 'sex') to 'gender' is influenced by some feminist scholars such as Rubin (1975) and Oakley (1972), who were concerned about perceiving women in terms of their social relationship in which women are systematically in a subordinate position than men, rather than perceiving women according to their biological difference and in isolation from men (Pillai et al., 2009, p.14). The classic thesis for the establishment of the GAD model are Caroline Moser's *'Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs'* (1989) and Kabeer's *'Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought'* (1994). Moser argued that the WID model was too women-specific, which neglected women's triple-burdens of reproductive, productive and community work. She called for an analysis to focus on gender relations and gender roles, which are not biologically determined, but socially constructed and culturally varied (Jaquette & Staudt, 2006, pp.28-29). She also suggested the development programs to shift from equity approach to anti-poverty approach and efficiency approach, to *'increase the employment and income-generating options of low-income women through better access to productive resources'* (Moser, 1989, p.1812).

GAD in theory brought a more sophisticated view of women's situation (Bannon & Correia, 2006, xviii). Although it has been argued that the shift in vocabulary did not bring substantial change in the development practice on gender (Cornwall, 1997 cited

in Bannon & Correia, 2006, xviii), the GAD model is still believed to have enlarged the scope of women's involvement in practice by the mainstream academia.

### ***2.1.2.2 Gender Mainstreaming and Women empowerment***

The most notable change that GAD brought to the development field is the strategy of 'gender mainstreaming'. WID required the development agencies to support women's projects, which were ghettoized in specific WID offices (Jaquette & Staudt, 2006, p.31). While GAD called for the international organizations like United Nations, Council of Europe, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), as well as governments around the world to adopt 'gender mainstreaming' as the policy and include gender consideration into their development programs, so as to overcome WID's marginalization problem.

Gender mainstreaming was first adopted as an intergovernmental mandate in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (PfA) in 1995, which was identified as the most important mechanism for achieving the goals indicated in PfA (Moser, 2005, p.576). The strategy was later adopted by UN in 1997 as an approach to all policies at all levels in UN system, and the concept was defined in the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) agreed conclusions, 1997/2, as:

*'the process of assessing the implication for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women as well as of men an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic, and societal spheres, so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.'*

One distinctive aspect of the ECOSOC definition that made the definition most widely-practiced is that, it specifies the *goal* of mainstreaming is the equality between women and men (Prugl & Lustgarten, 2006, p.56), though it is widely agreed that mainstreaming is also a process rather than a goal (Moser & Moser, 2005, p.15).

In practice, components of gender mainstreaming shared by most institutions include dual strategy of mainstreaming and targeting gender equality, gender analysis, gender trainings, support to women's decision-making and empowerment and so on (ibid, p.13). According to Moser and Moser (2005), among these components, the most important aspect is *women empowerment*.

In a general sense, empowerment is about increasing capability for the marginalized people and groups who are lack of access to knowledge, decisions, networks and resources (Wang and Burris 1994, cited in Thurairajah & Baldry 2010, p.349). Such stance is echoed by Kabeer (1999), seeing it as 'process of change' by which those who have been denied the ability to make choices acquire such ability. Kabeer further elaborated the empowerment model by introducing three inter-related dimensions, resources, agency and achievements. Resources can be material resources from an economic sense, and also social recourse that "serve to enhance ability to exercise choice" (ibid, p.437). So disempowerment is related with poverty, but not necessarily, because the key measurement of power is 'choices' instead of any economic indicators. Agency is the ability to define one's goals and act upon them. It is often operationalised in the form of 'decision-making', but it can also be other forms like bargaining and negotiation, deception and manipulation, subversion and resistance as well as cognitive processes of reflection and analysis. The combination of resource and agency is what Amartya Sen (1985) called 'capabilities'. Among the three dimensions, resource is the pre-condition for the 'process of change', agency is the process, and achievement is the outcome of the process. The achievement dimension is used in the evaluation, so it will be not employed as a basis for the analysis part,

whereas resource dimension and agency dimension will be looked at in the main analysis.

Criticisms on gender mainstreaming and women empowerment are mainly focused on whether they could be effectively implemented. Moser and Moser (2005) have found that there is huge gap between the adoption of terminology, putting the policy into practice, and implementation. New norms need to 'fight their way into institutional thinking' to compete with those established norms (Elgstrom, 2000, cited in Walby 2005, p.323), even if they are not directly opposed, such as the goal of gender equality and that of economic growth. Perrons (2003) found that the goal of the competitiveness of the economy in at least UK prioritizes over the goal of equality, therefore endorsing rather than helping the low paid work so frequently found among women. Stratigaki (2005) also revealed that the gender mainstreaming policies in EU are hindered by positive actions in political decision-making which has challenged the gender distribution of political power, and human and financial resources. In addition, research by Prugl (2009) showed that EU governments selectively implemented gender responsive policies depending on whether the gender mainstreaming strategy challenges the patriarchal power relations in the state.

Furthermore, the notion of gender mainstreaming and women empowerment have been criticized by scholars such as Mohanty (1988) for being Eurocentric, which insufficiently takes the complex and diverse nature of gender relations into account based on various socio-political contexts (Syed, 2010, p.284). Related to this argument, it has also been criticized for the assumption of the binary of women and men, and taking for granted that all women are universally homogenous and disadvantaged (*ibid*).

### **2.1.3 Men engagement in Gender Mainstreaming from 1990s**

Starting from 1990s, there is an increased focus on ‘men engagement’ as a reflection to the critique of missing men in gender mainstreaming. Critiques argue that the shift from WID to GAD virtually did not change the focus on women (White, 1997, p.15). Although gender involves both men and women, men are usually portrayed as the oppressor and perpetrators of male domination that women struggle with, fear, resist or resent (Cornwall, 2000, p.18).

There are mainly two approaches to make men-engagement valid. One is the increasing concern on men’s issues and the recognition of men’s vulnerabilities. Men’s issues raised academic interest initially in developed countries, particularly in Australia, United States and United Kingdom (Jacobsen, 2006, p.4), with regards to male unemployment, low proportion of men in higher education, high rates of violence with men as victims and so on (Jacobsen, 2006, p.2). Studies stressing ‘the crisis of masculinity’ explored that men’s role of bread-provider to the family has been challenged through economic changes or structural adjustment (Clever, 2002, p.3). Men’s vulnerabilities and men’s issues are sometimes seen as different approaches for men-engagement, but I prefer to combine the two in the same category, because the studies on men’s issues virtually help to acknowledge the fact that gender relations vary from different contexts. Moreover, men’s issues is one aspect of understanding men’s vulnerabilities. Cornwall (2000, p.24) argued that the underlying assumption in GAD is that women-in-general are everywhere oppressed by men-in-general. However, studies have revealed that men are not always the powerful, dominant and superior than women. In some contexts, gender systems are negative for men instead. From the perspective of power relations, not all men are powerful and not all powerful people are men (ibid). Take the example from Sweetman’s (1998, cited in Clever, 2002, p.3) study on the impact of labour migrancy in Lesotho, the idea that young boys being the future labour migrants actually hindered their

opportunity to receive education as the girls in the family. Health is another notable area that men's vulnerabilities are easily visible. Men in general suffer more health problems than women, particularly mental health problems in many societies (ibid). In addition, more men are infected and at risk in the case of HIV/AIDS.

The other approach is generated from the perspective of gender power relations. This is not to say that men-women relationship is a zero-sum game, that women empowerment can never be fulfilled without men's concession and giving up some of their power. However, men engagement is a prerequisite for achieving gender equality. As Cleaver (2002) argued, men's inclusion matters in improving women's well-being, because gender is relational, and gender inequality is closely connected with men's attitudes and practices (Flood, 2004, p.45). Men should be stopped perceiving as 'problems' or obstacles for women empowerment (Cornwall, 2000, p.25), but rather a strategic partner of women in achieving equality (Cleaver, 2003), and have men to change their attitudes and behaviors, and realize that they too will gain from the process of gender equality. Especially in decision-making body, men often play a crucial role as 'gatekeepers' to construct the current gender order, thus men engagement is especially important in terms of women's empowerment in political participation (Flood, 2004, p.45).

The call to include men engagement in the gender mainstreaming in academia has resulted the political shift in development discussions, represented by two United Nations global conferences ----- the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development in 1994 and the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 (UN, 2008) ----- along with the other intergovernmental conferences which raised public awareness of men's role in achieving gender equality, including the World Summit for Social Development in 1995, the 26<sup>th</sup> Special Session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS in 2001, the 23<sup>rd</sup> Special Session of the General Assembly on the five-year review of implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action in 2000 (ibid).

With this focus shift in the global discussion, the United Nations Commissions on the Status of Women (CSW) became the first UN entity to address men engagement and male responsibilities by making it one of the priority themes at its 48<sup>th</sup> session in 2001 (CSW, 2004), and marked a major step forward in the global policy framework by adopting the agreed conclusion on the session that recognized the crucial role of men in empowering women, changing gender stereotypes, enhancing gender awareness and achieving gender equality (CSW, 2004).

So far, the practice of men engagement is focused on several themes in the development field, particularly in HIV/AIDS pandemic, as well as violence against women and girls.

## **2.2 Theory Review on the Gender Perspective of Disaster Risk Reduction**

### **2.2.1 Disaster, risk and Vulnerability**

Although natural disasters appear in natural forms like earthquakes, floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, landslides and so on, over the last six decades, disasters have been seen by sociologists as social phenomenon and have roots in the social system or social structure (Quarantelli, 1994 cited in Fothergill, 1998, p.11). It is a compressed in a short time span that allows the social processes to be more visible. As what Fothergill (1998, p.11) puts, disasters are social and political events that are linked to who we are, how we live, and how we structure and maintain our society. To emphasize on the societal property of disaster, it is distinguished with another term ‘hazard’ by scholars. Hewitt (1997, cited in Beckman, 2006, p.26) stated, “*A hazard turns into a disaster if people are vulnerable.*” It pointed out that disasters are the consequences of hazards and that people facing the same hazard may suffer different levels of disaster

depending on their vulnerability which is highly influenced by the social-economical factors (Beckman, 2006, p.26). Furthermore, it pointed out that the hazards are natural, but not disasters.

In order to grasp the theoretical framework of disaster risk reduction, several key concepts will be discussed here. The definitions of these concepts will mainly adopt the ones in UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) Terminology developed in 2009, supplemented by some in the academia. There are at least two reasons for using UNISDR definitions. For one thing, it serves as a theoretical basis that directly helps the understanding of the UNISDR texts for the analysis part. For another, UNISDR is the leading agency specifically in dealing with disaster risk reduction, so its definitions have been internationally accepted and used in documents of other partner UN agencies and donor countries, for instance UNDP and USAID. It is important to take note that the definitions by UNISDR have constantly changed over time. Therefore, certain definitions from academia are used to further supplement and understand the term more comprehensively.

According to the definition on ‘disaster’ by UNISDR (2009), it is “*a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts which exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources.*” Following the definition above, ‘disasters’ in the broad sense include both natural hazards<sup>1</sup> and man-made catastrophe, including immediate social crisis like terrorist attacks or wars, diffuse events like famines or droughts, as well as abrupt natural hazards like earthquakes, tsunamis, landslides and floods. However in reality, the three categories of disasters are separately managed by different agencies in the UN system and government sectors. Through stating the aim of disaster risk reduction as “*...to reduce*

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Physical hazards’ has recently appeared in UN policy documents to substitute the use of ‘natural hazards’, however discussions on the difference between the terms are limited.

*the damage caused by natural hazards like earthquakes, flood, droughts and cyclones, through an ethic of prevention*”, UNISDR clarifies its territory to deal with only natural hazards, rather than man-made catastrophes, although human activities also contribute to the outbreak of natural hazards. The definition also implies the necessity for agencies outside the community to involve in disaster risk reduction, because disasters occur when the community’s capacity is not sufficient to cope ‘using its own resources’.

‘Risk’ by UNISDR (2009) is defined as “*the combination of the probability of an event and its negative consequences*”, which is a revision to its definition before that emphasized purely on the ‘probability of harmful consequences’ (UNISDR, cited in Beckman, 2006, p.28). ‘Risk’ is more perceived with relation with vulnerability in its definition before 2007, but now risk is explained in a more broad way. It is perhaps resulted from the consideration of weakening the victimization of the people in the community, so as to better engage them in the community-based participatory disaster risk reduction.

‘Disaster risk’ is “*the potential disaster losses, in lives, health status, livelihoods, assets and services, which could occur to a particular community or a society over some specified future time period (UNISDR 2009).*” ‘Risk’ in the popular usage usually involves the meaning of both ‘probability’ and ‘consequences’, but in ‘disaster risk’, risk is usually more focused on the ‘negative consequences’. It has been acknowledged that disaster risk is the result of the combination of two elements, the *physical intensity* of the hazard, and the *vulnerability* and the *coping capacity* of the peoples exposed to the hazard (UN, 2009, pp.34-35). According to De Leon (2006, p.9), various equations are formed to illustrate the correlation among risk, the intensity of hazard, and vulnerability, but one of the frequently employed equations by many agencies is:

*Disaster Risk = Hazard x Vulnerability*

### *Coping Capacity*

In other words, given that the physical intensity of hazard is not controllable, the more vulnerable the people in the community are, the higher disaster risk they face. On the contrary, the greater coping capacity the people in the community possess, the less vulnerable they are, and the lower disaster risk they face.

There are many definitions on vulnerability. For instance Wisner et al (2004, cited in Beckman 2006, p.22) defined it as “*the characteristics of a person or group and their situation that negatively influence their capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impacts of a hazard.*” Few (2007) also put the focus of vulnerability on *people* by identifying the three elements of vulnerability to be internal (health status), personal (perceptions, capabilities, actions) and external (physical / social environment). On the contrary to the definitions in academia which stressed the vulnerability of *people*, the definition by UNISDR on the other hand emphasized the vulnerability of *community*, “*the characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard.*” It can be seen as a supplement to the understanding of vulnerability in academia, but the ignorance of individual characteristics shows that it is not meant to be gender sensitive.

Vulnerability is strongly related with poverty. Poverty is one of the factors that lead to vulnerability, and vulnerability may lead to poverty as well (Beckman, 2006, p.38). People who are poor are more exposed to risks and hazards because of factors like housing location, construction material and access to information (Bolin, 1986 cited in Fothergill, 1998, p.13). Cannon (1994, p.19) argued that vulnerabilities include three components: the degree of resilience, including the capacity of recoverability; the health component that includes the physical condition of individuals and the accessibility to medical treatment; the degree of preparedness of the individual and

the community. He further pointed out that people in the developing countries are more vulnerable both because of the lack of preparedness measures and resilience of the individual, and the governments are unwilling or unable to provide secure assistance to weaken their vulnerability. In developed countries, there are studies that show people who are economically vulnerable are more exposed to hazards because of lack of social protection (ibid). However, same with the concept of disempowerment, poverty is only one dimension of looking at vulnerability, which is a basket of characteristics that also include class, gender, ethnicity or even age. Moreover, poverty may be derived from these characteristics.

Coping capacity, as identified by UNISDR (2009), *“the ability of people, organizations and systems, using available skills and resources, to face and manage adverse conditions, emergencies or disasters.”* It is recognized to be important in both normal times and during the crisis to contribute to the disaster risk reduction. Coping capacity is seen in contrast with vulnerability. People who are vulnerable have limited coping capacity. Improving people’s coping capacity helps them to reduce their level of vulnerability. Revisiting the concept of women empowerment, capacity building is a general sense of women empowerment.

Disaster risk reduction, disaster risk management are the two terms that are commonly used to describe the work engaged in disaster risks. According to the terminology by UNISDR (2009), ‘disaster risk management’ is defined as *“The systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster.”* It describes the actions that targets to reducing risk, both in terms of lessen the possibility of disaster before it happens and lessen the adverse impacts of hazards after it takes place. While ‘disaster risk reduction’ is defined as *“The concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards,*

*lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events,”* that describes the policy objective of risk reduction, with focus on the pre-disaster stage, but both pre-disaster and post-disaster stages are targeted at in practice. It can be seen that the definition on ‘disaster risk reduction’ comes from how ‘disaster’ and ‘disaster risk’ are defined. Comparing to the ‘disaster risk management’, it underscored that the concept of vulnerability is placed at its centre. Although there has been discussion to minimize the victimization to the people in the community as mentioned above, the vulnerability approach is an important rationale for the international disaster risk reduction work in the field, therefore ‘disaster risk reduction’ will be the term used in the thesis instead of ‘disaster risk management’.

## **2.2.2 The gender perspectives in Disaster Risk Reduction**

The importance of gender dimension of disaster was not acknowledged by scholars in the disaster research field until 1990s (Fothergill, 1998, p.12), with the first major conference to raise gender awareness in disaster risk response held in Costa Rica in 1991 (Fulu, 2007, 844). Scrutinizing the past studies on gender and disaster risk management, there are several approaches which illustrate men and women’s different features, perception and reaction to disasters, which in turn affects men and women in different ways.

### **2.2.2.1 Vulnerability by gender**

The most often-used theoretical concept is the vulnerability by gender, which scholars argue that gender perspective is a key lens to understand vulnerability. Women are more vulnerable than men at most times, which is resulted from their low income, gender roles as family caretaker, and relatively lack of power, status and resources (Fothergill, 1998, pp.13-14). With the feminization of poverty, women in developing

countries are at a higher risk of death. Studies revealed that women are largely left out in formal disaster preparedness trainings (Nehnevajsa, 1989 cited in Fothergill 1998, p.16). Discriminatory practices in some cultural context limit women's capacity for disaster survival. For instance in Southeast Asia, women died because of their dresses that restrict their ability to move (Haider et al., 1991 cited in Fothergill 1998, p.18), and women did not dare to leave without husbands' permissions because men are the decision makers in the family (ibid). Because of women's role as family caretakers, they are expected and required to stay with, assist, and protect the other family in disaster situations (River, 1982 cited in Fothergill, 1998, p.14). Fothergill (1999) points out that women's roles and duties 'accumulates' before, during and after disasters, bringing them increasing burden and vulnerabilities. Studies also disclosed that the reported cases of violence against women increase in communities hit by disasters (Enarson, 1999). Despite physical impacts, in some studies women are found more related with emotional problems like stress, depression, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms and anxiety (Fothergill, 1998, p.19). In disaster relief, women are less likely to be involved in the disaster response decision-making process. Studies have disclosed that female relief workers were not trusted by men to carry out the works efficiently due to gender discrimination (Begum, 1993 cited in Fothergill, 1998, p.21). Gender discrimination also affects women survivor's vulnerability in other aspects, for instance the access to financial aid aftermath the disaster and access to microfinance loan to get their life back to normal (Fothergill, 1998, pp.21-23).

The vulnerability approach has been criticized for showing an over-emphasize on women's vulnerability. As Fulu argues (2007, p.845), the over-simplifying of categorizing universal women as vulnerable not only ignores men's vulnerability and that vulnerabilities are dependent on various factors including gender, ethnicity, age and class, but the reinforced gender roles also in turn has a negative impact on the disaster recovery. Everyone has different 'vulnerability bundles' (Blaikie et al. 2003,

cited in Fulu 2007, p.845), which result from the interplay of one's political, economic, social characteristics and vary from different kinds of hazards one faces.

Literature review on gender approach in disaster risk reduction shows that it is an accumulated knowledge based on various contextualized cases. However, not all cases generate the same results that women are more victimized. In certain contexts, women are found to be less vulnerable than men.

Some studies in Southeast Asia found that women are not accessible to the disasters warning. Whereas in some researches in developed countries, women are found more likely to receive the disaster warnings from peers, friends and neighbours because of their social network (Turner et al., 1981 cited in Fothergill 1998, p.16).

Sometimes men are more vulnerable in disasters as well. Men are more likely to be dead in weather related hazards like thunderstorms, lightning etc., because more men are engaged in works and activities outdoor (Fothergill, 1998, p.17). Some research found that men experience greater emotional depression along with the increased consumption of alcohol in the period of disasters (Miller et al., 1981 cited in Fothergill, 1998, p.19). For instance, UNFPA has found that after the Maldives tsunami, men suffer more depression because they felt their male gendered role as bread-feeder cannot be fulfilled, therefore men worried more than women about worsening employment, economic activity and basic needs (UNFPA Maldives, 2006, pp.8-9). In addition, men are more vulnerable in terms of facing long-term psychological issues because it is socially unacceptable for men to express their emotions in front of family and friends (Fordham and Ketteridge 1998, cited in Fulu 2007, p.855), which is an important way for women to get emotional support from.

Gender approach does not only mean the gendered vulnerability analysis, it also looks at how men and women perceive and respond towards disasters differently. Several studies have shown that women feel more fear and concern over danger, human suffering and loss of life (Szalay et al, 1986 cited in Fothergill 1998, p.14), and tend

to believe the predicted disasters, while men are more preoccupied with the technical aspects of protective measures (ibid). In addition, women are more likely than men to respond to the disaster warnings with protective actions, such as evacuation (Drabek, 1969 cited in Fothergill 1998, p.17).

## **2.3 Summary on the theoretical framework and operationalisation of theory**

The theory part attempts to illustrate two things. First, the process framework of how gender mainstreaming has come through, which forms the theoretical basis to see at what stage gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction is. Second, key concepts of gender mainstreaming and disaster risk reduction, including women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability analysis.

According to Moser (2005)'s categorization, the process of gender mainstreaming can be divided into four stages: first, embracing the terminology of gender equality and gender mainstreaming; second, getting a gender mainstreaming policy into place; third, implementing gender mainstreaming in practice; and fourth, evaluating or auditing the practice of gender mainstreaming. The analysis on the gender mainstreaming policies documents under the Hyogo Framework for Action deals with whether or not there are gaps between the first stage 'embracing the terminology of gender mainstreaming', and the second stage 'getting a gender mainstreaming policy into place', and to some extent if the second stage has gaps with the third stage 'implementing gender mainstreaming in practice'.

The analysis will first look at the process of how gender has been mentioned in the DRR policy document and related monitor templates, to see if the process is in line with the process of gender mainstreaming in development field in general, from WID

to GAD and to men engagement. Then the key gender discussion points like women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender will be looked up in the policies documents, monitor templates and national periodic reports submitted by member states under the Hyogo Framework for Action. These three aspects are chosen because women empowerment is the most important component of gender mainstreaming, men engagement is the new trend in gender mainstreaming since 1990s, and vulnerability by gender is the key rationale for the gender approach in disaster risk reduction.

The policies documents and monitor templates will be used to examine if the gap between the first stage and the second stage exists on women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender. While the national periodic reports, which is filled with how gender has implemented in the member states in practice, will be used to examine if there is gap between the second stage and the third stage on women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender.

### 3. Methodology

In order to answer the research question, *1) how is gender mainstreaming described in the disaster risk reduction policy documents under the Hyogo Framework for Action? Are there any changes over time? 2) Are women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender addressed in those policies and reports? If yes, how are they addressed?*, the method employed will be textual analysis.

What is textual analysis, or sometimes paraphrased as content analysis? McKee (2003, p.1) defines it as ‘an educated guess at some of the most likely interpretations that might be made of that text’. A text is something that we make meaning from (ibid). It can be written or oral, can be material which already exists or created by researcher (e.g. interviews), including historical documents, literature, legal verdicts, interviews, TV programs, web pages (Linne, 2011). It can also be single or large numbers of selected texts. The word ‘analysis’ is the opposite of ‘description’, which requires the researcher to look beyond what is manifested in the text, to discover the new things in the already known text, to dissolve and decompose a text, but also to compose what has been decomposed (ibid).

McKee’s definition, among others, recognizes the analysis to be more subjective, pointing out that the interpretations may vary depending on how the text is collected, who the analyst is, which text is selected, and what context the text is linked to. McKee (2003, p.81) further points out that the selection of text has to be determined by the research question, because every interpretation of the text is an attempt to answer the ‘sense-making’. In addition, the chosen texts shall be either representative, or revealing, meaning rich and important in content (P älli et al., p.924).

Based on the above-mentioned guidelines and aiming to answer the research questions, the texts selected are a range of existing disaster risk reduction policies and reports under the Hyogo Framework for Action, which is the current framework for

disaster risk reduction at international, regional, national and community level, with UNISDR as the secretariat coordinating among the stakeholders. The documents chosen to be analyzed include the policy documents and follow-up documents of Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, the monitor templates that UNISDR developed for the member states to track their progress towards the goal of HFA 2005-2015, and the national periodic reports submitted by the member states with the example of report (2009-2011). The policy documents by UNISDR identified the strategies, goals, priorities for actions in a broad and general way, while the monitor templates are more concrete, with guidance on how gender can be implemented in the disaster risk reduction. The biennial periodic report by member states has been so far collected in 2007-2009 and 2009-2011. However, national reports (2009-2011) will be mainly analysed, with national report (2007-2009) only as a supplement. It is because the former has included both gender-related concrete measures and description on the implementation on gender aspects in DRR, while the latter only has the description. In addition, reports (2009-2011) are submitted by a larger sum of countries, therefore offering more comprehensive data for the analysis.

The ‘educated guess’ about the likely interpretation of a text requires the researcher to link the text with its context (McKee, 2003, p.92). From a more linguistic perspective, the context is both social and cultural, which comprises situation, sender, receiver, purpose, place and time of the communication (Albrecht, 2005, p.38). Whereas McKee (2003, p.93) puts it more explicit by dividing the ‘context’ into four categories: other texts in the series; the genre of the text; intertexts about the text itself; and the wider public context in which a text is circulated.

In order to make the likely interpretation of the documents on mainstreaming gender in disaster risk reduction under the Hyogo Framework for Action, the texts have to be linked with the context. First, interpretation is not likely to be understood with a single text, therefore a range of documents within the same field (series) will be analysed so as to produce a more likely educated guess. That is why a range of policy

documents and reports are chosen for the analysis. Although national report (2007-2009) will not be specifically analyzed, they would also be browsed for the purpose of understanding the national reports (2009-2011).

Second, the genre of the text is important to take note because the researcher has to be aware that different texts have different kinds of modality (McKee, 2003, p.97). The term ‘modality’ comes from linguistics, which indicates ‘degrees of certainty’ of texts (Hodge & Tripp, 1986, p.104). For instance, news or documentaries are to be of high modality which has higher ‘degree of certainty’, whereas cartoons or musicals are to be of low modality which has lower ‘degree of certainty’ (ibid). McKee (2003) argues that the higher the modality of the texts is, the more they are expected to offer information that can be applied to other parts of our lives. In this case, the genre of the policy documents and monitor templates are official documents of the largest intergovernmental body with high modality and with formal language. While the genre of the national reports is less formal than the policy documents, especially in the description part where how gender perspective in disaster risk reduction has been addressed, but since the reports are approved and submitted by the government officer at ministerial level, the texts can also be seen as of high modality. Therefore, both the policy documents by UNISDR and reports from member states are expected to offer information that can be applied to the current and future disaster risk reduction field.

Although the official documents are of high modality, it is always necessary to be critical to the source of data, especially the official information which people take for granted to be valid and reliable but ignored the fact that they are constructed and presented to shape the policy landscape (Backlund, 2011). Therefore, the interpretation of the texts attempts to look beyond the bureaucratic language, especially in the national reports by the member states where exaggerated gender status can sometimes be sensed to make the reports look nicer. So the source criticism is always born in mind in the interpretation process.

Third, the intertexts about the text itself refer to the publicly circulated texts that are explicitly linked to the text that the researcher is interested in, including internet posts and reviews. Due to the high modality of the UN documents, there are limited intertexts available from the public. The relevant intertexts, though not necessarily directly related, are the existing academic policy analysis and the fans' comments from the UN new media webpage, twitter and facebook group for instance. These intertexts would not be used for analysis, but they are helpful for the researcher to grasp how people interpret.

Last but not least, the researcher has to be aware of the wider public context in which the text is circulated. Though the documents are available on an online platform, they are mainly circulated among the stakeholders under the Hyogo Framework for Action, including UN agencies, platforms at regional level, governments of member states, NGOs, and private sectors.

Textual analysis is the most suitable method with regards to the research questions, because it is an ad-hoc method which is developed only for the purpose of analyzing the specific text in question (Linne, 2011). Furthermore, as McKee (2003, p.128) argues, textual analysis has its specific advantage in terms of providing an overview of how a particular issue is being represented in a large number of texts, in this case the gender mainstreaming issue being represented in disaster risk reduction policies and reports with the example of Hyogo Framework for Action. In addition, it is suggested by Silverman (2011, p.124) that textual analysis helps to provide 'important insights into institutional talk based on pressing sociological and practical concerns'. Concerning the practical issue, textual analysis is easy for the investigator to conduct, because it is flexible in terms of allocating the research time since it does not engage other people comparing with fieldwork or interviews. On the other hand, the transparency of the research material also makes a big advantage for the implementation, that the access to the UN official policies and reports are not only public to the researcher, but also other audiences. It is especially true compared with

fieldwork notes, which have limited access to the public (Holstein & Gubrium, 2008, p.423).

There are also several limitations of using textual analysis. Quantitative methods, including textual analysis, are often criticized for the lack of objectivity. As discussed above, the interpretation of the text vary from the discourse of the author's intentions (Widdowson, 1995, p.171), therefore McKee (2003) argues that the interpretation cannot be more scientific because the interpretation cannot be replicated. However, some scholars (Krippendorff & Berelson, in Popping 2000, p.11) expressed a contrast view by stating that the analysis can be scientific and objective, if the researcher is aware of the bias produced by his values and beliefs, weaken them and focus more on the content in the text. On this question, Dijk (1985) expressed a view somewhere in between, suggesting that the influence of bias may be different depending on the genre of the texts. Where the discourse structures are closely related with social structure, especially in anthropological and ethnographical literature, such biases are heavily influencing the research process and outcome. Therefore according to his opinion, UN documents belong to the genre with high modality, the influence of personal bias to the interpretation is not heavy and obvious. Another related disadvantage of textual analysis is the tendency of 'over-reading'. Yet it is argued by Jupp (2006, p.76) that the 'true reading' of social realities, by whatever method, is an 'impossibility'. In this sense, there is limited we can do to solve the 'over-reading' problem. From a practical perspective, the immense consumption of labour work for textual analysis is also one of the disadvantages, but the situation has improved with the advancement of computerized text analysis which makes key word search and word count much easier to operate (Popping, 2000).

A difficulty during the textual analysis lies on the language. The texts selected are UN documents, which are mostly drafted in English. However there are several in other languages when it comes to the reports submitted by member states such as French (Haiti, Algeria, Burkina Faso, Madagascar, Côte d'Ivoire, Togo, Monaco, Burundi,

Morocco, Senegal, Comoros), Portuguese (Cape Verde, Brazil) and Spanish (Costa Rica, Argentina, Paraguay, El Salvador, Panama, Nicaragua, Honduras, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Peru, Uruguay, Chile, Cuba, Venezuela). Although online translating tools are used to understand the rough meaning of the texts, inevitably there are mistranslations with the computerized tools that it more or less affects the understanding of the original texts. Since Portuguese, French and Spanish belong to the same language roots with English, so the meaning can be inferred from its spellings, which to some extent can serve as a double-check with the computerized translations.

According to Linne's (2011) lecture notes, after reading the texts thoroughly, textual analysis should start with a sorting of the texts on the basis of themes and/or categories generated from theory or from the empirical in itself. The theoretical themes of gender mainstreaming in the theory part are used as a guide to categorize the policies documents and reports at hand. Therefore based on the theoretical discussions, themes of women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender will be scrutinized and categorized in the documents. Other techniques for textual analysis, including counting elements/units in the material, looking how different categories relate to one another, looking for contradictions, looking for what is absent, and identifying keywords, would also be born in mind and applied during the interpretation.

## **4. Gender Mainstreaming in DRR documents**

### **4.1 UNISDR and Hyogo Framework for Action**

UNISDR is the secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR). It was created in December 1999 as the successor to the UN Secretariat of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR, 1990-1999) with the purpose of ensuring the implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR, 2011). In 2001, it expanded its mandate to serve as the focal point within the UN system, in response to the need to mainstream disaster risk reduction within UN in development and other areas of work (ibid).

With the adoption of the Hyogo Declaration and the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 by 168 countries at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in January 2005, UNISDR served as a supporting sector for the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) (ibid). Hyogo Framework for Action is a ten-year strategy agreed and approved by the 168 countries to integrate disaster risk reduction into the development programmes of individual countries.

Hyogo Framework for Action is an important framework in DRR to be analysed not only because it is the first and the current DRR international framework that are committed by the member states to integrate DRR into development, but also it is the first DRR policy document which appeared 'gender' in it. Whereas in the output document "Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a safer World" of World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction 1994 which is the previous conference before the one in Hyogo, only 'women' was mentioned, for example women empowerment, women's needs and women groups (IDNDR, 1994). It can be understood as a shift from Women in Development to Gender and Development, a gesture to include both men and women, and not only women-specific.

The following analysis will be conducted based on both the DRR policies and monitor templates developed by UNISDR under the framework of Hyogo Framework for Action, as well as the periodic reports submitted by the member states with the example of national reports (2009-2011), to examine how the description of gender in these policies and templates have changed over time, and how women empowerment, men engagement, and vulnerability is addressed in these policy documents and national reports.

## **4.2 ‘Gender<sup>2</sup>’ in the HFA policies and monitor templates by UNISDR**

### **4.2.1 Gender Dimension in HFA documents is changed over time**

Gender dimension in the HFA documents, including the policy documents and the monitor templates that UNISDR developed for the member states will be examined, with the former more general and broad principles, and the latter more related with guidance on the concrete measures in implementation, to illustrate the process of engendering DRR and how the gender dimensions in policies have been changed over time.

#### ***4.2.1.1 ‘Gender’ in HFA 2005-2015 policy documents***

*Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters* (hereinafter referred to as the HFA 2005-2015) was the output document on the World Conference on Disaster Reduction held from 18-22

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘Gender’ is often used to describe gender perspectives in UN documents, though I am aware that the word is used inaccurately, the thesis will follow what has been used in the documents, so as to present the texts in the original format.

January 2005 in Kobe, Hyogo Japan (UNISDR, 2007). It is the first framework document that calls for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable development. Moreover, it is the first document in disaster risk reduction at an international level to include the concept of gender mainstreaming.

It specified that the Hyogo Framework for Action for the 10 years of 2005-2015 is to achieve the expected outcome of ‘*substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries*’. It is further elaborated by defining three ‘strategic goals’ (ibid, pp.3-4):

- (a) *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;*
- (b) *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;*
- (c) *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.*

It can be seen that a strong emphasis on the disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness at the pre-disaster stage, as well as community-based capacity building are highlighted, which correspond to the definition of disaster risk reduction and vulnerability by UNISDR that have the focus on pre-disaster stage and community-centered vulnerability.

The main body of HFA 2005-2015 is the illustration of five ‘Priorities for Action’ which are listed below (ibid, p.6).

- 1) *Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation;*
- 2) *Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning;*

- 3) *Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels;*
- 4) *Reduce the underlying risk factors;*
- 5) *Strengthening disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.*

Gender perspective is explicitly stated to be taken into ‘General Considerations’ under the ‘Priorities for Action’ in the HFA 2005-2015.

*“A gender perspective should be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making processes, including those related to risk assessment, early warning, information management, and education and training.”* (UNISDR, 2007, p.4)

It is listed as the fourth point among the eleven ‘General Considerations’, and listed separately with the other social characteristics (cultural diversity, age and vulnerable groups), which to some extent shows that gender dimension is perceived to be of higher importance than them. Although the term ‘gender mainstreaming’ is not found in the entire document, the gender approach in ‘*all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making*’ expressed the meaning of mainstreaming gender.

Under each priority for action, several ‘key activities’ are specified and suggested sub-points to be taken into consideration under each ‘key activities’ are listed. ‘Gender’ aspect is mentioned in the Priorities for Action 2 & 3 respectively, by pointing out that gender perspective should be taken into account in early warning, *“develop early warning systems that are people centered, ..., which take into account ... gender...”*(ibid, p.7), and disaster preparedness training and education, *“ensure equal access to appropriate training and educational opportunities for women ...; promote gender and cultural sensitivity trainings...”* (ibid, p.10). However, gender in the gender-based risk assessment and information management, which appeared in the ‘General Considerations’, are not mentioned as key activities in the ‘Priorities for Action’.

It is important to note that although examples of DRR areas that gender dimension can be involved are given, only training and education is offering concrete measures on how gender perspective can be introduced. On the contrary in early warning, it only mentioned gender to be taken into account in developing early warning systems, but did not specify the concrete measures on how gender can be taken into account. Therefore, HFA 2005-2015 is a policy document with little touch on implementation.

In the follow-up document to HFA 2005-2015, the *Strategic Directions for the ISDR system to assist the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015* which was reviewed and approved four months after the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, again emphasized the expected outcome from gender perspective, that “*gender perspective integrated in all disaster risk management policies, plans, and decision-making processes*” (UN Inter-Agency Task Force, 2005, p.24). It is developed as a main tool for the actors under the Hyogo Framework for Action to implement the follow-up actions. Comparing with the HFA 2005-2015, where gender mainstreaming appeared as one of the general consideration, “*a gender perspective should be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making processes*” (UNISDR, 2007, p.4), gender mainstreaming here is recognized as an expected outcome from the gender perspective. “Should” is no longer appeared in the phrasing of gender mainstreaming as the expected outcome, to some extent shows that gender mainstreaming is no longer a suggestion, but a commitment by the member states.

Unlike gender perspective is highlighted in early warning and education and training under Priority for Action 2 & 3 in HFA 2005-2015, ‘gender’ in the follow-up document is listed only under Priority for Action 1, “*ensure that DRR is a national priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation*”, by stating ‘gender’ as one of the main elements to achieve this priority for action (UN Inter-Agency Task Force, 2005, p.24). Comparing with how ‘gender’ is mentioned in HFA 2005-2015, ‘gender’ in this document is focused on gender mainstreaming, implying that gender

perspective should be taken into account not limiting to early warning and education trainings.

In this document, gender perspective and cultural diversity is stated as one of the cross-cutting issues, together with multi-hazard approach, community and volunteers participation, and capacity building and technology transfer (ibid). Seeing 'gender' as a cross-cutting issue puts gender dimension at a place of higher importance because it stood out among the other 'General Considerations' stated in the HFA 2005-2015. 'Gender' is not mentioned in the other four priorities for action, because the word 'cross-cutting' implied that 'gender' shall be considered in all activities under the priorities for action.

According to the document, a platform on gender equality and DRR named Disaster and Gender Network was launched in the context of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction to support the implementation of HFA (ibid, pp.31-32), to further realize gender equality.

Gender perspective has been seen of great importance in the HFA 2005-2015 and its follow-up documents. Gender mainstreaming is explicitly illustrated in these policy documents; however the operationalisation of gender perspective in DRR is not clearly indicated. In HFA 2005-2015, 'gender' in early warning and education and training are emphasized, but in the follow-up document, 'gender' again became vague by titling it "cross-cutting". On the one hand, it makes itself in line with other development field to have gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction written in the policy documents. While on the other hand, the practical aspect of incorporating 'gender' is not clearly addressed. The change of focusing 'gender' in early warning and education to 'gender' as 'cross-cutting' issue shows that UNISDR is flip-flopping at whether or not the concrete implementation of 'gender' should be indicated as guidance, and which area gender perspective should be indicated. It is not until the

development of HFA national templates that the concrete gender measures are suggested and indicated as guidance for the implementation.

#### **4.2.1.2 'Gender' in the HFA monitor templates**

Before the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR), member states were requested to submit a baseline report known as the National Report in preparation for WCDR. The structure of the report<sup>3</sup> is required to include the political commitment and institutional aspects, identification and assessment of natural risks, education of the public how to defend from emergency situations, risk management, emergency planning, successful examples of activities on risk management on a regional level, and priority issues to be discussed at the WCDR. However 'gender' is not addressed at all in the template. For the few countries that did not follow the template, for instance China and Egypt, 'gender' is also not mentioned in the entire report.

Periodic progress report at every two years is suggested to be submitted to keep track of how member states are working towards the expected outcome and strategic goals of HFA. Therefore HFA monitor template is produced, not only for UNISDR to monitor and review their progress in the implementation process of DRR at the national level, in accordance with the Hyogo Framework's priorities, but also for the member states to self-track their progress.

The HFA monitor template (2007-2009)<sup>4</sup> is the first template that provided to the member states. In line with the HFA 2005-2015, and the *Strategic Directions for the*

---

<sup>3</sup> The structure of the baseline report is inferred from the baseline reports submitted by member states, that can be found at: <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/?pid:222&pil:1>.

<sup>4</sup> Due to the updates on the biennial monitor templates, the HFA monitor template (2007-2009) is not available online, so the structure of the template is inferred based on the national reports (2007-2009), which can be found at: <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/?pid:222&pil:1>.

*ISDR system to assist the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015*, the template consists of four sections, strategic goals, priorities for action, drivers of progress, and future outlook.

‘Gender’, together with other cross-cutting issues, is listed under drivers of progress. Member states are to self-assess their level of reliance on gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized, whether it is no/little, or partial/some, or significant and ongoing reliance (UNISDR, 2009, p.23).

- 1 *No / little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing / little done to address it.*
- 2 *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.*
- 3 *Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.*

A description section is provided to allow inputs on the evidence of the self-assessment (ibid). ‘Gender’ is not mentioned under the priorities for action, which means that in 2007, concrete guidance on how ‘gender’ can be integrated into DRR is not provided by UNISDR, although ‘gender’ is specified as a ‘cross-cutting’ issue and ‘driver of progress’.

The Hyogo Framework for Action monitor template (2009-2011)<sup>5</sup> is a revised version based on the template (2007-2009). Besides the four sections in the original template, it added two more sections, ‘outcomes’ at the beginning to report on the progress made based on the three strategic goals in 2007-2009, and ‘stakeholders’ at the end to include the stakeholders that contributed to the report (UNISDR, 2009).

---

<sup>5</sup> Due to the updates on the biennial monitor templates, the individual HFA monitor template (2009-2011) is not available online, however it is found as part of a *Practical Guide to HFA monitoring and review through a Multi Stakeholder Engagement Process 2009-2011* (UNISDR, 2009).

The major progress that the monitor template (2009-2011) contributed to the gender dimension is that it specified some concrete measures that gender perspective can be integrated into DRR under the priorities for action. So in the monitor template (2009-2011), 'gender' as a 'driver of progress' remained as a cross-cutting issue to be self-assessed and described, but also 'gender' as a vague concept finally decomposed to tangible concrete measures under the priorities for actions.

The five priorities for action are the same that has been indicated in *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. The difference is that the 'key activities' under each priority for action have changed to 'core indicators' in the monitor template. In addition, the sub-points under each key activity have changed to 'means of verification' (ibid).

Among the five priorities for action, four instead of two included gender dimension in the 'means of verifications' in the HFA national monitor template (2009-2011). Education and training which has been emphasized in the policy document HFA 2005-2015 is absent in this monitor template. Instead, a variety of other gender-related aspects are stated. They are listed as below (ibid):

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

*Means of verification: **Women's** organizations participating in national platform.*

*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 sectors.*

*Means of verification: **Gender** disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments.*

*Priority for action 4: Reduce the underlying risk factors.*

*Core indicator 5: Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes.*

*Means of verification: Measures taken to address **gender** based issues in recovery.*

*Priority for action 5: Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.*

*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.*

*Means of verification: Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans with **gender** sensitivities*

*Core Indicator 4: Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.*

*Means of verification: Post disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on **gender** aspects; dedicated provision for **women** in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities.*

As mentioned above, the biggest progress of the monitor template (2009-2011) is that the implementation side of ‘gender mainstreaming’ is decomposed into concrete measures. Unlike in the HFA 2005-2015 where disaster risk reduction is only focusing on the pre-disaster stage, the concrete gender-related measures in this template expanded the range to both pre-disaster stage including early warning and preparedness, and also post-disaster stage including response and recovery. It demonstrated the integration of ‘gender’ into all stages of disaster risk reduction. It is a reinforcement of the commitment to gender mainstreaming that “*gender perspective to be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making*” (UN Inter-Agency Task Force, 2005, p.24).

‘Gender’ appeared four times in the means of verifications in ways of “gender disaggregated vulnerability assessment”, “measures on gender-based issues in recovery”, “gender sensitivities in disaster preparedness and contingency plans”, and the inclusion of “gender aspects in post-disaster assessments” (UNISDR, 2009). In comparison, ‘women’ was used two times, “women organization” and “dedicated provision for women” (ibid). The language of using ‘gender’ instead of ‘women’ corresponds to the shift in women-centered approach to gendered approach in the general gender mainstreaming strategy, recognizing that both men and women are

affected by disasters in different ways, and are expected to be treated to their needs accordingly.

The gender perspective in education and training is absent in the monitor template (2009-2011), making Priority for Action 3 “*use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels*”, the only priority for action with no gender-related measures. ‘Education and training’ as one of the indicators under Priority for Action 3 is elaborated more specifically in this monitor template: “*school curricula, education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices*” (ibid, p.15). Its focus on ‘gender’ in HFA 2005-2015, “*ensure equal access to appropriate training and educational opportunities for women ...; promote gender and cultural sensitivity training ...*” is no longer in the monitor template. Instead, means of verification under this core indicator are whether DRR is included in the primary / secondary / university curriculum and if there are professional DRR education programmes (ibid). Therefore the original community-based DRR training and education is changed to a formal education system. No specific reasons can be found for the changes of skipping the emphasis on women’s specific needs in training and education. However women empowerment in terms of access to gender-sensitive trainings in the community has been left out because of this change.

‘*Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities*’ as the third indicator in Priority for Action 2 “*identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning*”, was another highlighted key activity to have included gender perspective in the HFA 2005-2015 (UNISDR, 2007). However in the monitor template (2009-2011), the original idea of taking gender characteristics of the target audiences into account in people-centered early warning system is left out, the substituted means of verification are whether early warnings acted on effectively, whether there is preparedness at local level, whether there is communication systems and protocols and whether active involvement of media is

included in early warning dissemination (UNISDR, 2009, p.14). Not only ‘gender’ is missing in this category, but ‘people-centered’ is missing. Rethinking the definition on vulnerability by UNISDR, which is quite different from the academia that the former sees vulnerability based on community while the latter on individuals, or a combination of factors including internal, external and personal. The result of UNISDR’s understanding on vulnerability resulted in the ignorance of individual vulnerabilities in a community. Gender perspective virtually requires vulnerability to include individual characteristics; therefore the definition on vulnerability does not show its gender-sensitivity. On the other hand, the change may be resulted from the reflection on the empirical findings that women and men are found more disadvantaged at different situations with respect to early warning.

Nevertheless, gender perspective is not completely waived off from Priority for Action 2, instead it shifted from the third indicator “early warning” to the first indicator “national and local risk assessment”, by offering “*gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments*” as the mean of verification for the national and local assessment (ibid). Revisiting how gender perspective is described in the general consideration in HFA 2005-2015, “*a gender perspective should be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making processes, including those related to risk assessment, ....*” (UNISDR, 2007, p.4), risk assessment as one of the key areas that were mentioned in HFA 2005-2015 but not highlighted under the priorities for action appeared in this monitor template again.

In sum, HFA national template (2009-2011) is a crucial document from a gender perspective, because besides categorizing ‘gender’ as a ‘cross-cutting’ issue, it specified the areas where ‘gender’ can be integrated into disaster risk reduction, and also provided concrete measures as means of verification, making ‘gender’ from a vague concept to something tangible. However comparing with the areas where gender is suggested to be integrated into in the HFA 2005-2015, the focus on the areas have changed and expanded. Education and training is no longer calling for

gender-sensitive trainings, and early warning is no longer asking to take gender into account. Instead, the focus areas are changed to women's participation in National institutional and legislative frameworks, risk assessment, post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation process, disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans, as well as post-disaster assessment.

It reinforced that gender mainstreaming to be integrated into all stages of disaster risk reduction, both at pre-disaster stage and post-disaster stage, by giving concrete guidance on the gender measures at all stages. However, the gender measures listed in the monitor template limits the scope of how much 'gender' can incorporate into DRR.

The HFA monitor template (2011-2013) is again revised based on monitor template (2009-2011) and the national reports received. The only difference it made is that 'dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities' is changed to 'dedicated provision for disabled and elderly' (UNISDR, 2011, p.33). It can be seen as a gesture to weaken the victimization of women in gender approach, which will be further discussed in the analysis part on vulnerability by gender.

#### ***4.2.1.3 Summary on the process of change in DRR policies in terms of gender***

By reviewing the disaster risk reduction documents under the Hyogo Framework for Action, including the HFA policy document, the follow-up document, the national monitor templates, a change on how 'gender' is integrated into DRR can be seen over time.

At a policy level, 'gender' is first perceived as only a consideration in DRR, but later is put in a higher position as 'cross-cutting' issue and driver of progress that indicated 'gender' is a necessity for disaster risk reduction rather than an alternative. At the

implementation level, the concrete gender sensitive measures are only developed as guidance to the stakeholders until 2009 in the national monitor template (2009-2011). The DRR areas that 'gender' is mentioned to be taken into account expanded from 'risk assessment, early warning, information exchange and education and training' in the HFA 2005-2015, to 'women's participation in National institutional and legislative frameworks, risk assessment, post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation process, disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans, as well as post-disaster assessment' in the monitor template (2009-2011).

Although gender mainstreaming is gradually experiencing putting the policy into place, stating that gender perspective to be integrated into all levels and all stages, there are still many areas where gender can be a dimension to be incorporated and much more can be done are left blank. Perhaps that is the reason why in the UNISDR 2012 document, *Towards a post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*, gender was mentioned to be better addressed in the post-2015 framework (p.6).

Putting the change of gender in the policy documents under the Hyogo Framework for Action under the theoretical framework of how gender mainstreaming in development in general has gone through, it can be seen that the gender mainstreaming status in DRR is far behind the academic discussion. It is only at the stage of gender and development, with no men engagement strategies touched upon at all. It showed that that although gender is used in the policy documents, the focus is still on women.

## **4.2.2 Analysis on the gender dimensions in DRR policies and monitor templates**

This part will look at whether and how the gender theoretical discussion points, women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender, are addressed in the DRR policy documents and monitor templates by UNISDR.

### **4.2.2.1 Women empowerment**

Women empowerment is given of great importance throughout the HFA policies and monitor templates. However the dimensions of women empowerment are highlighted differently over time.

In Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, ‘gender’, together with *“demographic...cultural and livelihood characteristics of the target audiences”*, is mentioned to be taken into account when developing early warning systems, which is one of the ‘*key activities*’ listed under Priority for Action 2, *“identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning”* (UNISDR, 2007, p.7). Under Priority for Action 3, *“use knowledge, innovations and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all level”*, gender perspective is again brought up by suggesting to *“ensure equal access to appropriate training and educational opportunities for women ... and promote gender and cultural sensitivity training as integral components of education and training for disaster risk reduction”* as one of the sub-points under the key activities ‘education and training’ (ibid, p.10). ‘Gender’ in both places is largely related with improving women’s capacity to cope with natural hazard. Revisiting Kabeer(1999)’s women empowerment model of resource, agency and achievement, women empowerment here is focusing on the dimension of “resources”. Giving specific attention to gender aspects when developing early warning systems allows the disadvantaged women / men to obtain access to the resources like disaster early warning information. While ensuring equal access to

training and educational opportunities for women brings resources such as disaster preparedness knowledge and skills.

When monitor template (2009-2011) is developed in 2009, women empowerment as a concrete strategy appeared under the priorities for action again. However this time, women empowerment in early warning as well as education and training are not mentioned at all. Instead, “*Women’s organizations participating in national platform (national platform for disaster risk reduction)*” became a mean of verification under Priority for Action 1 – Core Indicator 4 (UNISDR, 2009, p.13). While “*dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities*” is another mean of verification on women empowerment under Priority for Action 5 – Core Indicator 4 (ibid, p.19). It marked a shift in the women empowerment strategy, from a focus on the dimension of resources to both dimensions of resources and agency. The dedicated provision for women is to increase women’s access to resources on relief, shelter and emergency facilities, while the participation of women’s organizations in the national platform for DRR is a form of access to agency, to strengthen women’s engagement in the decision-making process. It showed the recognition of seeing the basic concept of empowerment is the ‘process of change’ which the dimension of agency contributes to. The policy of women’s political participation in the decision-making process implied that the institutional change in turn will benefit women from obtaining access to ‘resources’.

However women empowerment through increasing access to “agency” is not only about participation in the institutional platform by women civil societies, it can be in other forms such as the involvement of government sectors that dedicated to gender issues, or gender mainstreaming in all government departments, and women’s participation at the community level. These alternative forms are not indicated as means of verification in terms of women empowerment, which actually limits the scope of women’s political participation in DRR. Similarly, women’s access to “resources” is not limited to obtaining relief, shelter and emergency facilities at the

post-disaster stage. Empowering women at the pre-disaster stage is more important than in terms of increasing women's coping capacity upon facing disasters, such as trainings on preparedness skills and knowledge. These alternative dimensions are left out in the concrete measure guidance in the monitor template.

In sum, women empowerment in the Hyogo Framework for Action has experienced a change from focusing on the dimension of resources to the dimension of both resources and agency. Although it is a progress in terms of recognizing women empowerment is 'process of change', seeing both resources and agency constitute capabilities, there is limited choice of measures indicated in the monitor template to address access to both resources and agency.

#### ***4.2.2.2 Men engagement***

As discussed in the theoretical review, men engagement has been recognized as an important strategy in gender mainstreaming since 1990s, and is agreed and adopted by CSW as one of the priority themes in gender equality in 2004.

However, men engagement is not found at all in the policy documents and monitor templates under the Hyogo Framework for Action when it was established in 2005. 'Men' did not appear in these documents, instead when there is either side of gender mentioned, it is always 'women'. Therefore, although Hyogo Framework for Action is an important step in disaster risk reduction that a focus on 'gender' is shifted from merely on 'women' from a gender perspective, the other counterpart men is still far left out.

The relatively conservative process of gender mainstreaming is partially because the masculine nature of disaster risk reduction, which people tend to take for granted that men are already fully engaged in the field, and a specific emphasis on men's

participation is unnecessary. It may also be a concern on men's vulnerability in disasters is not as universal and pandemic as women's.

Seeing how gender perspective has been mainstreamed into development over time since 1970s, disaster risk reduction is clearly at the stage of Gender and Development (GAD). It has made the shift of focusing on women to gender in DRR, men engagement is not yet considered as a strategy in gender mainstreaming. The change only occurs in seeing women in gender relations instead of seeing women independently from men, but it did not change the underlying strong emphasis on women.

#### ***4.2.2.3 Vulnerability by Gender***

Vulnerability is not explicitly addressed in the HFA 2005-2015, but an implication on women's vulnerability can be seen from the text, where "*ensure equal access to appropriate training and educational opportunities for women*" is identified as a key activity under Priority for Action 3 (UNISDR, 2007, p.10), underlying that women are generally disadvantaged in terms of getting access to disaster related knowledge and skills.

In the monitor template (2009-2011), vulnerability is specifically featured as "gender disaggregated vulnerability" (UNISDR, 2009, p.13), indicating that vulnerability varies by gender. Revisiting the theoretical discussion on vulnerability by gender or women-specific, the shift from women's vulnerability to vulnerability by gender showed its neutrality at least formally that vulnerability is not women-specific, recognizing that women's vulnerability and men's vulnerability exist based on different contexts.

However, women's vulnerability is implied to a great extent in the other parts of the monitor template (2009-2011), because women organization and dedicated provision for women are particularly highlighted as means of verifications in Priority for Action 1 and 5 respectively, where 'women' appeared instead of 'gender'. Especially in Priority for Action 5 – Core Indicator 4, where “*dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter, emergency medical facilities*” is indicated as a mean of verification (ibid, p.19), it highlighted that women are generally more disadvantaged and more vulnerable in disaster response and therefore there is the need to establish a dedicated provision for women. Women are generally more at risk than men confronting disasters from most of the findings, but stating the specific division for women as measures of verification for indicators not only shows the assumption that women's vulnerability in disasters is universal, but also ignores men's vulnerability.

This paradox of claiming vulnerability by gender and implying the universal women's vulnerability is revised in the HFA monitor template (2011-2013), where the means of verification for indicator 2 under Priority for Action 5, ‘*dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter, and emergency medical facilities*’ was reformulated to ‘*dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities*’ (UNISDR, 2011, p.33). The gender characteristic was substituted by a focus on disabled and elderly. This change indicated a self-reflection on the paradox, avoiding an over-emphasis on women's vulnerability. It also showed the understanding of vulnerability is not only gendered, but also based on a basket of other individual's characteristics. Vulnerability based on physical health and age is more universal than gender.

In sum, vulnerability by gender in the documents and monitor templates has experienced a shift from merely emphasizing on women's vulnerabilities in the HFA policy document, to vulnerability by gender with particular focus on women's vulnerabilities in the monitor template, and to vulnerability by gender with no

particular focus on women to respond to the criticism of over-emphasis on women's vulnerabilities.

#### **4.2.3 Summary on the analysis in HFA policy documents and monitor templates**

HFA policy and the national monitor templates are analysed in this section, with the former more conceptual and the latter more related to the guidance on implementation. 'Gender mainstreaming' is not mentioned with the exact same phrase in all documents, but it is explicitly expressed in the policy document, the importance of integrating gender perspective into DRR is paid much attention to and gender is recognized as a cross-cutting issue in DRR. Seeing HFA 2005-2015, HFA monitor templates (2007-2009), (2009-2011) and (2011-2013) from a chronological perspective, the overall trend of reinforcing 'gender' into DRR can be seen from these documents.

When looking at the gender dimensions in theory, the focus on women empowerment has changed from 'access to resources' to access to both 'resources' and 'agency'. Men engagement, which is the new trend in the development field in general, is not at all addressed in the policy paper and monitor templates, showing gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction is still at the stage of Gender and Development. Vulnerability by gender, as the most important rationale for gender mainstreaming disaster risk reduction, still poses a strong emphasis on the vulnerability of women. However it is challenged by the academic criticism for an over-emphasis on women, therefore there is a tendency of seeing vulnerability by some more universal characteristics such as age and health conditions rather than gender.

## **4.3 'Gender' in national periodic reports (2009-2011)**

### **4.3.1 'Gender' in national reports (2009-2011)**

The national periodic reports (2009-2011) analysed in this part are submitted by member states using national monitor template (2009-2011) which has more detailed indicators on 'gender' as means of verification under the priorities for actions, as well as an open-ended part for the self-assessment on the reliance on 'gender' in disaster risk reduction under the category of 'driver of progress'. So member states can fill the supplement input in the second part if they want to elaborate more on gender perspective other than the ones in the means of verification. The national periodic report (2007-2009) will not be used as the main analysis because its template does not include the concrete gender measures as means of verification. In addition, the sample size of national report (2007-2009) is far less than the national reports (2009-2011). But the national periodic report (2007-2009) will sometimes be used as a supplement when looking at the gender dimensions, women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender.

There are altogether national periodic reports (2009-2011) of 110 countries collected and used for the data source<sup>6</sup>. 76 national periodic reports (2007-2009) are browsed as supplementary data in analyzing the data in the national periodic reports (2009-2011). It is crucial to point out that the report submission is not obligatory to the member states, therefore the number of reports (2007-2009) and reports (2009-2011) are different. This is to say that, the countries submitted the report (2007-2009) may not necessarily submit the report (2009-2011), and vice versa.

---

<sup>6</sup> All national reports are available on the HFA reports database:  
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/?pid:222&pil:1>.

Generally all the countries have mentioned the acknowledgement of the importance of gender approach in DRR work, and are willing to improve on the implementation of incorporating 'gender' into DRR. Kazakhstan, Guinea-Bissau, Romania and Cayman Islands are the few exceptions that indicated 'no' to each mean of verification for the gender-related indicators, also with no account at all under the description column of the gender situations in the country context. Nevertheless, there is a wide concern on the lack of knowledge on operationalising the gender perspectives into the implementation, despite recognizing 'gender' as a crucial factor. Most countries admitted that there has been gender mainstreaming in other development fields, but not yet in DRR. In the description under gender perspective, most countries are merely showing commitment to what should be done and what will be done. Therefore the analysis will look at what have been done, instead of the commitments by the member states.

If merely relying on the indicators, Cuba is the country of the best performance in engendering DRR, with all positive responses in the means of verification, and sees itself as 'significant' relying on 'gender' in DRR. Yet from the description, only gendered assessment after disaster and gender equality in general stated in law are mentioned. From an overall grading seen from both the indicator and gender perspective description, Sweden is the country with best practice on engendering DRR. It has five positive responses of the six means of verification (except that it has no women organization involved in the national planning), yet it self-assessed as 'partial' reliance on 'gender' in DRR in a humble gesture. From the description under the gender perspective, it can be seen that Sweden has gone far ahead comparing with the other countries. It is interesting to point out that there is no women organization involved in the DRR because Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) which is the leading agency for DRR is fully implementing gender into DRR programmes and projects. The strategy of gender mainstreaming in the DRR agency itself makes Sweden the only country fully integrating gender into DRR policies and planning, and

the only donor country which has exported its gender mainstreaming in DRR to the development recipient countries.

### **4.3.2 Analysis on the gender dimension in the HFA national report**

#### ***4.3.2.1 'Gender' is perceived in different ways***

Large gaps can be found between how 'gender perspective' is passed down to the member states from UNISDR and how 'gender' is perceived by the nations, as well as how 'gender' is perceived differently among various countries.

Based on the means of verification of the core indicators that are related to gender, a chart is made (see Appendix B) so as to get a clear picture of which country has achieved which gendered indicators. The answer to the open-ended question under 'drivers of progress – gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized' is also examined. Member states are supposed to indicate their level of reliance on 'gender' in disaster risk reduction as 'significant', or 'partial / ongoing' or 'no / little'. In addition, the last section 'stakeholders' is also examined from a gender perspective, to see if women organizations or government sectors are included as contributors to the report and the national DRR work.

The overall results on the means of verification can arguably sometimes be very distant from the self-assessed level of reliance on 'gender' in DRR. Some countries indicated significant level of reliance on 'gender' as a driver for disaster risk reduction did not show higher performance on gender-related means of verification. There are roughly three kinds of scenario that result in this contradiction.

The first scenario consists of mostly developed countries, for example Norway and Finland. These countries are internationally known as pioneers in the gender field in general, both in academic and in practice. Yet not much implementation on engendering in the DRR field has been done, with only one positive response under the six gender-related means of verification. It is perhaps related with their nature of being less disaster-prone. According to the data from the International Disaster database ([www.em-dat.net](http://www.em-dat.net)), countries in Scandinavia are less affected by disasters both in terms of number of disasters happened and number of victims in the disasters over the past 30 years between 1976 and 2005. On the other hand, both countries indicated ‘significant’ for the level of reliance on ‘gender’ in DRR, But according to what they have described, it is more to the level of reliance on gender in general, not particularly on gender in DRR. So in the description part of gender perspectives in DRR, they all stated that ‘gender quality’ has been established in the constitution.

The second case consists of France, Croatia and some traditional island countries such as Seychelles and Saint Kitts and Nevis. There is no positive response for the gender-related means of verification, but still perceived themselves as having ‘significant’ reliance on gender in DRR, because they do not think gender is a variable in disaster in their countries. France in its reports pointed out that “*there is no distinction between men and women’s vulnerability when it comes to natural disasters*”. Seychelles puts it, “*there is no gender issues when it comes to DRR*” and Croatia, “*there is no gender difference in the area of risk reduction and recovery*”. Similarly, Saint Kitts and Nevis stated that “*there are no institutionalized or traditional/cultural hindrances to gender involvement*”, pointing out that there is no necessity for the gender perspective in their countries’ contexts.

The third scenario covers some countries which over-evaluated themselves so as to look nice in the report, and not fall behind other countries. For example, Lethoso and Kazakhstan assessed themselves to have ‘partial’ reliance on gender in DRR, but from the entire report including the description for the gender perspective, it did not show

any implementation across policy and practice. Portugal also belongs to this category, with all negative responses for the gender-related means of verification, it perceived itself having ‘significant’ reliance on gender in DRR, claiming that there is gender equality policy fully implemented, but did not give any detailed information on what the policy is and how fully the implementation is.

These contradictions showed that gender perspectives in DRR from the policy which can be linked to the means of verification for each indicator, are different from how gender mainstreaming in DRR is perceived by the member states. In policy, ‘gender’ is seen as a cross-cutting issue that can be integrated in all stages of DRR. However in reports, none of the all-rounded gender perspective can be seen. Instead, ‘gender’ is perceived as concrete components. Therefore different countries are seeing different components in gender mainstreaming in DRR in different ways. For some countries like Norway and Finland, ‘gender’ in DRR is more related with gender equality in general at the institutional and legislative level. But in other countries like Cayman Islands, ‘gender’ in DRR can be very concrete and down to earth, such as ‘offering washrooms for women in emergency shelters’.

The different understandings on ‘gender’ are deeply rooted in the contextualized gender relations, corresponding to the criticism on the Eurocentric nature of gender mainstreaming, taking for granted that women are universally more disadvantaged than men. Though countries like Nepal and Bhutan admitted that women in the traditional society are under-privileged in terms of literacy rate and access to political power, there are also countries like Seychelles, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Fiji, where women are not more vulnerable than men. Take the example of Fiji, gender concerns are not in its DRR plans because its society is traditionally gender sensitive, with the specific care of women strongly disciplined in Fiji’s culture. Besides contextualized gender relations in developing countries, there are also cases of gender neutral in DRR in developed countries, for example Switzerland, stating that ‘*experiences from*

*recent disasters have so far not evidenced the need for specific action in order to improve the consideration of gender in disaster risk reduction’.*

#### **4.3.2.2 Women empowerment**

Generally speaking, women empowerment is given great importance and is the strategy mentioned the most in the reports from gender perspective, both at the national level and the community level, both in terms of access to resources and access to agency.

According to the means of verification on the inclusion of women organizations in the DRR decision-making at the institutional level in terms of access to agency, not many countries are doing so. Among the 110 member states that submitted their national periodic report 2009-2011, 75 of them launched and owned a national platform for disaster risk reduction<sup>7</sup> (UNISDR, 2011). Among these 75 countries, only 21 of them have women organizations participating in the national platform, and only one of them is developed countries, Japan. Kenya stood out by indicating 10 women organizations, followed by Togo 7, and Nigeria 5 (see Appendix B). Women organizations on DRR are more vibrant in developing countries, and disaster prone countries like Japan, Bangladesh and Haiti.

It is important to note that the number of women organizations involved in the national platform does not necessarily correspond to the degree of women participation. In the case of Macedonia, two women organizations namely National Women’s Council and the Macedonian Women’s Lobby are part of the national platform for disaster risk reduction, which consists of 32 ministries and governmental

---

<sup>7</sup> To view the list of countries with national platform, please visit:  
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/national/list/>.

agencies, 21 inspectorates, 85 municipalities, 42 NGOs, 79 research centers and observatories, 173 laboratories. Considering such a big body of the platform, it is doubtful that whether the 2 women organizations would voice out in an effective way, or just sink among the voices from other stakeholders.

In some countries, not only women organizations, but also government sectors on women affairs are participating in the national platform for DRR. For example in Tanzania, the Ministry of Gender, Community Development and Children is involved as part of the national platform. In Dominican Republic, the Ministry of Women is part of the National Emergency Commission and the National Technical Committee, and is involved in the process of implementing risk management. In Peru, besides the women civil organization called *Mujeres Unidas para un Pueblo Mejor*<sup>8</sup>, Ministry of Women and Social Justice is also part of the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. In the list of stakeholders that contributed to the report (2009-2011), Canada, Dominican Republic, Peru, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Samoa, Lebanon, Venezuela, Saint Lucia mentioned their government sector on women, to show that it is one of the contributors to the report as well as the stakeholders in the DRR.

When it comes to women's political participation, the involvement of women organizations and women government sectors in the national platform for DRR is not the only measure that the member states are taking. Bangladesh mentioned designating women's seat in all committees in the DRR platform at the national level, so as to better mainstream gender in all planning. In some other countries, such gender mainstreaming effort is implemented in all government sectors, not limiting to the ones related with DRR. In Burundi, a minimum of 30% of women representation is requested in the government organizations, so as to ensure women's need are taking into account in all policies and all departments. Thailand is another country on the

---

<sup>8</sup> Literally translated as "Women United for a Better Village".

path of mainstreaming gender in all government sectors, by designating one of the executives in every ministry and department as the Chief Gender Equality Officer. However, the impact with specific regards to disaster risk reduction work is not addressed.

Women's participation is not limited at a national level, it has also demonstrated at a community level. In Germany, women are 'more actively integrated into the local early warning systems', as they have their specific role in educating the next generation of knowledge on disaster preventive behaviors. In Namibia, women are involved in camp management and distribution of food in disaster response. However comparing with women's political participation at the national level, the participation at the community level is still limited, with only few countries mentioning it.

It is also important to stress that the women's participation in the committee at the community level does not necessarily lead to women's substantial influence in decision-making. In Vanuatu's case, it mentioned that there is usually one or two women included in the village disaster management / preparedness committees, but women may not always be included in *formal* decision-making. The example of Vanuatu showed that due to traditional bias and attitudes, women's participation can sometimes be ineffective to the substantial decision-making process.

According to the other means of verification on if there is dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities with respect to women empowerment in terms of access to resources, 42 countries out of 110 indicated positive response (see Appendix B). It is one of the gender measures practiced by most member states according to the indicators, showing at least 42 member states have taken actions to address women's vulnerability at the post-disaster stage, to increase women's access to resources like relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities. Besides this, there are other forms of increasing women's access to

resources available both at the post-disaster stage and pre-disaster stage according to the reports.

Women empowerment in terms of access to financial resources is implemented by some countries at the post-disaster stage. Mongolia introduced household development planning to all female-headed households, to increase their household earnings by creating sustainable sources of income. In Mozambique, agricultural extension services are especially prioritized for women heads of family. While in Sri Lanka, skills of drying fish is taught to women as part of the livelihood development.

At the pre-disaster stage, training on awareness raising and disaster preparedness is the activity found the most from the reports. In Kyrgyzstan, Brunei, Jamaica and Togo, implementation has been done to empower women the knowledge and skills of disaster preparedness, such as basic life saving skills and home fire fighting.

The reports have also revealed the difficulties in implementing the strategy of women empowerment. Timor-Leste mentioned that one of the obstacles is the lack of awareness among the women organizations. There is no representative from women organizations in the Community-Based Disaster Risk Management network although there are many women groups in Timor-Leste. The report mentioned that it is because women organizations never show up upon invitations.

Such lack of awareness among women organizations does not only happen to the NGOs, but also at other different levels. Myanmar mentioned that UN agencies (e.g. UN Theme Group on Gender), Myanmar Women's Affairs Federation and NGOs are working in different areas of gender mainstreaming, but there is lack of presence in DRR.

There are also obstacles at the community level in terms of implementation. Solomon Islands mentioned that the difficulties do not only lie on the advocacy which aimed at changing women's conservative attitude to participate in the decision-making, but

also on recruitment of female staffs in the implementing organizations who are requested to often travel to remote places.

In sum, both dimensions of resources and agency are demonstrated in the reports. Besides the measures indicated in the monitor template, having women's organization participating in the national platform and a dedicated provision for women at the disaster response stage, other forms of access of agency and resources are practiced by different countries, including the participation of the government sector on women, the women's participation at the community level, women economic empowerment, as well as trainings on awareness raising and preparedness skills. From the reports, it can be seen that the dimension of resources is practiced at a larger extent by the member states, comparing with the dimension of agency. From an operational point of view, increasing women's access to resources is easier to be put into practice. While working on the dimension of agency encounters more obstacles when inviting women to participate in the decision making, such as lack of awareness among the existing women organizations and the women in the community. Furthermore, even when women are involved in the decision-making body, they may not make strong and substantial voices due to traditional bias especially in the traditionally male-dominant societies.

#### ***4.3.2.3 Men Engagement***

Through reviewing the policy documents and monitor templates under Hyogo Framework for Action, the dimension of men-engagement is not found at all. This brings the doubt on whether men engagement is required in each development field? Is there any possibility that DRR is an exception that men-engagement is not necessary in the work because of its masculinity nature? After reviewing some national periodic reports (2007-2009) and the national reports (2009-2011), the

answer is 'no'. Several countries have showed concern on the need of men engagement in the report, like Jamaica by asking "*how to get males involved?*"

Australia and Togo are the only two countries that expressed concern on men's issues and men's vulnerability in DRR among all the reports. Australia showed in its report that there has been a program of activities that has allowed men to relax in a supportive environment as part of their personal recovery at the community level in one of the states in Australia. It is the only country that has implementation addressing men's vulnerabilities in terms of their psychological stress at the post-disaster stage, though in a very limited scope.

On the contrary, Togo's account on men's vulnerabilities is departed from a strong feminist perspective, which sees men's issues and men's vulnerability for the sake of better addressing women's vulnerabilities. Togo's report (2007-2009) elaborated men's vulnerability and women's vulnerability in relation to each other in at least two aspects, implying that understanding women's vulnerability in gender relations is a requirement for enhancing women's capacity. First, the death of men who were the main breadwinner of the family often resulted in a severe vulnerability of women who experience a sudden change to the heads of households. The eager to the access of food, housing and household goods for women themselves and family often put them more exposed to exploitation. Second, stress of men resulting from unemployment and economic problems can contribute to domestic violence. Therefore gender-based violence usually goes up after disasters took place. Although there is no practical implementations in Togo because both men's issues and vulnerabilities are seen as 'problems' and the reasons for women's vulnerabilities, it is a big progress comparing to the other reports in terms of the recognition on men's issues and men's vulnerability in DRR.

Besides seeing men's issues and men's vulnerabilities, some countries expressed the need to engage men in women empowerment. As discussed in the theory, an

important rationale for men-engagement is that it is a prerequisite for women empowerment and the achievement of gender equality because gender is relational (Cleaver, 2002). Men's recognition and participation is necessary in the process because gender equality is closely related with men's attitude and behavior. Such argument can be supported by an interesting account from Vanuatu (2009-2011) when they wrote about the difficulties in implementing women's participation.

*'There is widespread perception that greater involvement of women would reduce some of the problems of politicization that have affected disaster preparedness and response initiatives administered by male parliamentarians.'*

Vanuatu's account pointed out the concern on women empowerment in conflict with other priority issues in DRR, but highlighted the male-dominant nature of parliament. It showed that not only the decision-making process is administered by men, but the widespread perception is constructed and held by men.

Similarly at the community level, women in Solomon Islands experienced the difficulty in expressing their opinions and making decisions, because it is hard for the "dominant males to accept and integrate women's views into their decision-making".

Both examples illustrated how men's attitude and behavior have hindered women's substantial political participation especially in traditionally male-dominant societies, and how important it is for men to recognize that women empowerment is a win-win strategy for both genders.

In sum, comparing with no 'men engagement' seen in the policy documents and monitor templates by UNISDR, some national reports by the member states showed concern on men engagement though in a limited scope, indicating there is a need to engage men despite its masculinity nature of DRR. Men's issues and vulnerabilities, as well as men engagement as a prerequisite for women empowerment, can be seen

from the reports. However a limitation of recognizing men's vulnerabilities is that it departs from women's vulnerabilities. The perception on men as 'problems' or 'perpetrators' has to be further altered, to see them as human beings, as fathers, husbands and sons.

#### ***4.3.2.4 Vulnerability by Gender***

From the means of verification on whether there are gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments, only 18 out of the 110 countries said 'yes' (see Appendix B), making it the gender measure implemented by the least countries. It is indeed a statistical basis for the policy planning to address different needs of different gender groups, but the implementation by only 18 countries showed how difficult it is when it comes to practice. Nevertheless, many countries showed their recognition and acknowledgement of vulnerability by gender in DRR.

Though gender disaggregated vulnerability assessment as the mean of verification assumes that both men and women have different specific vulnerabilities based on their gender roles, a large focus on women's vulnerability in particular is seen from the reports. Vulnerability of men and women is only mentioned in reports of few countries, such as Pakistan, Haiti, Côte d'Ivoire, Cape Verde, Sri Lanka and Vietnam. In other reports, it is always women's vulnerability whenever vulnerability is mentioned from a gender perspective.

Programmes specifically to address women's vulnerabilities are seen in many reports. In Brunei, women's household safety such as fire prevention is included in the DRR preparedness programme. Specific concern on women at the post-disaster stage is an important aspect for some countries to address women's vulnerability. In Mozambique, attention is given at the response stage, to ensure that women are not discriminated in access of food, shelter, clean water and sanitation facilities;

nutritional programmes are available especially targeting pregnant women. In Saint Lucia, single-female headed households are targeted after disasters to ensure their access to relief supplies. Counseling, psychosocial and rehabilitation programmes are available in Sri Lanka to help women and girls affected by domestic violence and sexual harassment especially at the post-disaster stage. In Bangladesh, violence against women is seen as a key priority in disaster management. In Mozambique, police units have developed specialized staffs to assist women who report cases of violence. In addition, HIV-AIDS campaigns are launched in Mozambique to sensitize women, especially young girls to help them prevent HIV infections through sexual relations.

On the contrary, men's vulnerability is not specifically addressed at all. As mentioned in the men engagement section, the programme in one state of Australia that helps the relief men's psychological stress is the only programme available to address men's issues. Even in the case of Togo where men's vulnerabilities are mentioned, it still has a strong focus on its relationship with women's vulnerabilities, indicating that women are more vulnerable because of these men's issues.

Vulnerability by gender is challenged by a rising concern on other factors and individual characteristics, for example social-economic factor, age (vulnerability of children and the old) and health (vulnerability of disabled), financial status (vulnerability of the poor), ethnic groups (vulnerability of minorities), and the location (vulnerability of people living in the remote area). For example, Tanzania has reported that the social-economic factor irrespective of gender is a greater determinant of vulnerability in the country. In Sierra Leone, both men and women in the most remote area are found vulnerable in terms of access to disaster preparedness information by radio with limited alternative channels, because the national disaster management programme can only have one hour per week on the radio for free of charge, and other airtime is not used due to lack of funding. In some countries like Germany, Switzerland and Panama, empirical data discovered that gender is not a

variable in terms of vulnerability, they argued since both men and women are enjoying the same treatment in society that neither counterpart is more under-privileged. Perhaps it is the reason for the change in monitor template (2011-2013), that dedicated provision for women is substituted by dedicated provision for disabled and elderly.

To sum up, relating with the vulnerability by gender in the monitor template (2009-2011) which shows no particular focus on either gender, the vulnerability approach in practice is largely focused on women's vulnerabilities with programmes targeting women implemented in a great many member states but only one aiming at men. On the other hand, gender is found to be an indecisive variable in vulnerability analysis in many countries, both developed and developing. To some extent, it showed that the vulnerability by gender is not universally the same, which further reflected the gender relations are contextualized in various countries. That is why there is a trend of weakening the vulnerability by gender factor in the monitor template (2011-2013).

#### ***4.3.2.5 Summary on the DRR implementation from a gender perspective***

The national periodic reports (2009-2011) submitted by 110 member states are analysed in this part, with supplementary data on the 76 national periodic reports (2007-2009), to examine if there is gap between 'getting a gender mainstreaming policy into place' and 'implementing gender mainstreaming in practice'. The answer is 'yes'.

Gender, perceived as a cross-cutting issue and stated to be integrated into all policy planning in DRR, is seen as partial fragment or components of gender mainstreaming in actual implementation. Though almost all countries have showed the recognition on the importance of gender mainstreaming in DRR, limited implementations have been

done. To some countries, the limited implementation is demonstrated in the gender equality in constitution, while in others, it can be concrete measures like building toilets and sanitation facilities for women. According to the various concrete measures that member states have taken, both dimensions of resources and agency in women empowerment are practiced both at the national and community level, however women's access to resources are more often practiced because of the stronger feasibility. The need on men engagement is addressed by several countries, through looking at men's issues and men's vulnerability, as well as the need to change men's attitude to better enhance women empowerment, but almost no implementation has been done in terms of men engagement. Vulnerability by gender in policy involves both men and women, but only women's vulnerability has been addressed in the implementation. Furthermore, there is a tendency of weakening the vulnerability by gender, but rather other social-economical factors and other characteristics because vulnerability is found to be contextualized.

An important thing to point out is that the different practice of gender perspective in DRR is found to have no obvious relation with the country's level of economic development; instead it is deeply rooted in their specific gender relations in different countries' contexts. The specific gender relations in various countries shaped their perceptions on gender, and responded with different gender measures under the same policy framework, which resulted in the gap between 'getting a gender mainstreaming policy into place' and 'implementing gender mainstreaming in practice'.

## 5. Conclusion

The aim of the study is to reflect upon the current disaster risk reduction policies from a gender perspective, to examine whether it is in line with the theoretical discussions and whether it is connected with the reality in terms of implementation. Two research questions are raised in order to grasp the full picture of gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction with the example of Hyogo Framework for Action.

*1) How is gender mainstreaming described in DRR policy documents and reports with the example of Hyogo Framework for Action? Are there any changes over time?*

*2) Are women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender addressed in those policies and reports? If yes, how are they addressed?*

The policy documents and the monitor templates by UNISDR for Hyogo Framework for Action are examined, to look for the elements of gender, women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender, to see if there is any gap between how they are discussed in theory and how they are addressed in the policy documents. In addition, the reports submitted by the member states under the Hyogo Framework for Action are examined, again to look for the elements of gender, women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender, to see if there is any gap between how they are addressed in policy documents and how they are perceived and reacted upon in the reports of different member states in terms of implementation.

Through textual analysis, both research questions are answered. There are indeed changes in how gender mainstreaming described in the policy documents by UNISDR under the Hyogo Framework for Action. With the theoretical background on how gender perspectives in development has gone through from WID to GAD and to men engagement, the gender mainstreaming in DRR has showed its limited change of focusing on women to focusing on gender, but with no men engagement touched upon.

Looking at the gender themes of women empowerment, men engagement, and vulnerability by gender, gaps between the concepts in theory and the description in policy of UNISDR and the illustration in reports by member states can be seen more comprehensively.

Women empowerment in theory consists of three interrelated dimensions, resources, agency and achievements. In policy documents, it has experienced the shift from focusing merely on the dimension of resources to both dimensions of resources and agency. While in the reports of the member states, women empowerment is practiced in terms of the dimension of both resources and agency, yet much more has been done on access to resources.

Men engagement has been started in the gender mainstreaming discussion since 1990s, with focus given to men's issues, men's vulnerabilities and men's recognition and participation in women empowerment. Whereas in the policy document of HFA, men engagement is not addressed at all, but the concern on targeting men in DRR has been mentioned by several member states in their reports.

Vulnerability by gender is seen as an important rationale for the gender integration in DRR, that women and men have different vulnerabilities facing disasters. In policy, vulnerability has experienced from only focusing on women to focusing on both genders. While in the reports by member states, vulnerability of women is strongly emphasized and targeted in the DRR programmes, leaving the vulnerability of men in a blank.

Although gender in theory, policy and reports are examined, the focus is on the policy. Linking the analysis on the policy documents with the theoretical framework, putting the development of gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction under the background of gender mainstreaming in development in general, though disaster risk reduction is a late-comer, it is moving in a conservative way. It has just made its shift from women in development to gender and development in 2005, from merely

focusing on women to focusing on women in gender relations. Yet the gap between the theory and the policy is corresponded by the call from the field that there is a need for men engagement in DRR.

Following the step of gender mainstreaming in general, the implication to the current disaster risk reduction policy is that, men engagement should be introduced as a part of gender mainstreaming strategy in disaster risk reduction. This is not to say, that men engagement should be integrated in all countries, but rather it is a change in perception, from seeing men as ‘problems’ and ‘perpetrators’ to seeing them as human beings who also have vulnerabilities as women and who can be strategic partners in gender equality.

While linking the analysis on the policy documents with the reports from member states, the gap between the two lies in the lack of recognition on contextualized gender relations. It is important to stress that the three gender themes selected are inter-related with one another. For instance, men engagement is argued to be a prerequisite for women empowerment; women empowerment shows a strong emphasis on women’s vulnerability; men’s vulnerability being left out in vulnerability by gender calls for men engagement in disaster risk reduction. Yet all these combined analysis are pointing at one direction ----- the current disaster risk reduction policy under the Hyogo Framework for Action is lack of consideration on contextualized gender relations. The gap between the policy and the implementation report is echoed by the criticism in academia, that gender mainstreaming is criticized for a Eurocentric view which takes for granted that the women-more-vulnerable-than-men relationship is universal.

Therefore, the other implication to current disaster risk reduction policy is that contextualized gender relations have to be taken into account in DRR policy and programme design. Whichever gender mainstreaming strategy adopted has to be based on the country’s gender contexts. In areas where women are more

disadvantaged, strategies like women empowerment has to be reinforced, both in terms of access to resources and access to agency. In countries where gender is not a decisive factor in terms of vulnerability facing disasters compared to other social-economic factors and individual characteristics, gender mainstreaming is not that necessary in disaster risk reduction. In traditionally male-dominant societies, men engagement is needed as a strategy to enhance women empowerment. In places where men's vulnerabilities in terms of psychological stress after disasters are prominent, men engagement is also necessary to address their particular need.

In conclusion, men engagement and contextualized gender relations should be taken into account in the disaster risk reduction policy design.

## Executive Summary

Disaster risk reduction is a field that has been internationally committed to be part of development since 2005 when Hyogo Declaration and Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 were agreed and adopted by 168 member states. It is also the first Disaster risk reduction framework that has included gender mainstreaming in the documents including the policy and the monitor templates. However gender mainstreaming in development field in general has started since 1970s, experiencing women in development in the 1970s, to gender and development in the 1980s, and the call on men engagement since the 1990s. This thesis attempt to examine how gender mainstreaming is described in the policy documents of Hyogo Framework for Action, by putting it under the lens of how gender mainstreaming in development has gone through in theory. Furthermore, the national periodic reports submitted by the member states under Hyogo Framework for Action would be examined to check whether the disaster risk reduction policies reflect the reality on the implementation level. By linking the policies with its upstream and downstream, the thesis attempts to reflect on the current disaster risk reduction policy on gender mainstreaming, and provide suggestions for future revision on the policy.

By scrutinizing the policy document, monitor template and national periodic reports under the Hyogo Framework for Action using textual analysis, the analysis is carried out in two dimensions. First, how gender mainstreaming in the policy documents and monitor templates under the Hyogo Framework for Action has been described over time, from 2005 until now. Though it is a short time span, but still an increasing focus on gender perspective in disaster risk reduction can be seen from the policy design, both in terms of from seeing 'gender' as a general consideration to seeing it as an expected outcome and cross-cutting issue, as well as decomposing the vague concept of 'engendering disaster risk reduction' into concrete guided measures for the member states to take action on. Furthermore, a shift from focusing on women-specific to

gender can be seen from the language use in the documents over time, though a strong emphasis is still on women.

Second, key theoretical concepts in gender and development, as well as gender and disaster risk reduction, are looked up in the policy documents, monitor templates, and national reports submitted by member states as themes for the analysis. These key concepts are women empowerment, men engagement and vulnerability by gender. These concepts are chosen because women empowerment is the most important component in gender mainstreaming, men engagement is the new trend of gender and development since 1990s, while vulnerability by gender is the most important rationale for engendering disaster risk reduction work.

Based on Kabeer's three-dimensioned model on women empowerment, 'resources', 'agency' and 'achievements', that both 'resources' and 'agency' constitute capabilities, women empowerment in policy has gone through the process of focusing merely on resources to both dimensions of resources and agency. Women empowerment strategy was demonstrated at the level of providing trainings or early warning information in the policy document 2005, but later expanded its scope to both encouraging women's political participation in the decision-making process as well as providing resources like relief, shelter and medical facilities in the monitor templates. In actual implementation according to the reports by the member states, women empowerment is also practiced in both dimensions on resources and agency, yet much more has been done on enlarging women's access to resources comparing with the agency dimension. More forms in term of both dimensions are practiced in various countries. In the dimension of resources, besides providing relief, shelter and medical facilities to women at the response stage which is indicated as a mean of verification in the monitor template, other forms includes providing awareness-raising and skill trainings at the pre-disaster stage, and providing financial resources to empower women economically. While in the dimension of agency, women's participation in the decision-making process is also practiced at the community level. However, the

biggest obstacle to further empower women in the dimension of agency is lack of awareness among women, including women organizations, women in the community. Furthermore, even when women are involved in the decision-making body, they may not make strong and substantial voices due to traditional bias especially in the traditionally male-dominant societies.

Men engagement is seen as a new strategy in gender mainstreaming in theory, as a response to the criticism of over-emphasis on women. Scholars argue that the other counterpart men also have issues and vulnerabilities that worth attention, also men engagement is a prerequisite for women empowerment, because gender equality can never achieved without men changing their attitude and behavior as the dominant part in gender relations. In the policy documents and monitor templates of Hyogo Framework for Action, men engagement is not touched upon at all. However in the reports by the member states, several countries have showed concern on the need of men engagement. Men's issues and men's vulnerabilities are not much recognized from the reports, even when Togo mentioned men's vulnerabilities, it is departed from the women's vulnerabilities, implying that men's vulnerabilities caused women to be more vulnerable. Yet the need of men engagement in women empowerment is illustrated by several countries, pointing out that men's perception on women often excluded women in the substantial decision-making process.

Vulnerability by gender is an important rationale for gender to be integrated into disaster risk reduction, because men and women have different vulnerabilities facing disasters. The theoretical basis is embedded in the case-based empirical data, showing that although women in general are more vulnerable than men in disasters, there are also cases where men are more vulnerable than women. In the policy documents and monitor templates under Hyogo Framework for Action, vulnerability has experienced the shift from merely focusing on women's vulnerability, to vulnerability by gender but with strong attention on women's vulnerability. According to the reports by the member states, vulnerability by gender is only recognized by a small sum of countries,

while the majorities pose a strong focus on women's vulnerabilities, with many programmes targeting women especially at the post-disaster stage. On the other hand, the decisive factor of gender in vulnerability approach is challenged by other social-economic factors or individual characteristics, like age, health conditions or the living location, because vulnerability by gender is not found to be prominent in several countries, both developing and developed.

Through analysis on the policy documents under the Hyogo Framework for Action, linking it with the upstream theory, conclusions can be made that gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction is progressing in a conservative way. Although an over-emphasis on women's vulnerability is gradually being diluted in the policy, yet the other counterpart men is still completely left out. However, the need of men engagement is found from the reports of several member states when putting the policy into practice. While linking the policy documents with the downstream reports from the member states, gender mainstreaming in disaster risk reduction policy is found to be distant from the empirical implementation in the member states, because of the ignorance of contextualized gender relations. From the reports, it can be seen that the women-more-vulnerable-than-men reality is not universal. Even in some cases, the gender difference in vulnerabilities in disasters is not obvious. This finding echoed with the theoretical criticism that gender mainstreaming as a Eurocentric view is taking for granted that women-subordinate-than-men is universally homogenous.

Therefore, the thesis argues that on the one hand, men engagement strategy should be introduced into disaster risk reduction policy design, changing people's perception on 'men as problems and perpetrators' and 'women are always more vulnerable', but treating men and women in a more balanced way. On the other hand, contextualized gender relations have to be taken into account in the disaster risk reduction policy design. An emphasis on men engagement, or women empowerment should be based on the gender relations in the specific country context. Even in certain cases, gender mainstreaming is not necessary to be part of disaster risk reduction plan.

## Bibliography:

- Albrecht, Lone, 2005. *Textual Analysis and the Production of Text*, 2nd Ed. Denmark: Samfundslitteratur Press.
- Backlund, Ann-Katrin, 2011. A lecture about Choosing and Collecting “Data”, SIMM12 Research Methods of Social Sciences. Lund University, unpublished.
- Bannon, Ian & Correia, Maria, C. (eds.), 2006. *The Other Half of Gender: Men’s Issues in Development*. Washington: Worldbank.
- Beckman, Malin, 2006. “Resilient Society, Vulnerable People: A Study of Disaster Response and Recovery from Floods in Central Vietnam”. *Uppsala: Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish Univeristy of Agricultural Sciences*.
- Boserup, Ester, 1970. *Woman's Role in Economic Development*, Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, UK.
- Cannon, Terry, 1994. Vulnerability Analysis and the Explanation of ‘Natural’ Disasters. In A. Varley, ed. *Disasters Development and Environment*. John Wiley & Sons, pp. 13-30. Available at: [http://leeclarke.com/courses/disasters/cannon\\_vulnerability\\_analysis.pdf](http://leeclarke.com/courses/disasters/cannon_vulnerability_analysis.pdf). 3 June 2012.
- Chant, Sylvia & Gutmann, Matthew, 2000. *Mainstreaming Men into Gender and Development: Debates, Reflections, and Experiences*. London: Oxfam.
- Cleaver, Frances, 2002. Men and Masculinities: New Directions in Gender and Development. In: F., Cleaver, ed. 2002. *Masculinities Matter! Men, Gender and Development*. New York: Zed Books, pp.1-27.
- Commission of the Status of Women, United Nations, 2004. The role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality: Agreed Conclusion. In: 48<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission on the Status of Women. New York, USA 1-12 March 2004. New York: United Nations. <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw48/ac-men-auv.pdf>. 3 June 2012.
- Corner, Lorraine, 2008. “Book Review on Women's Role in Economic Development”, *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 598-601.
- Cornwall, Andrea, 2000. “Missing Men? Reflections on Men, Masculinities and Gender in GAD”. *IDS Bulletin*, Vol.31, No. 2, pp.18–27.
- Daly, Mary, E., Fall 2005, “Gender Mainstreaming in Theory and Practice”, *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 433-450.

Delaney, Patricia L.; Shrader, Elizabeth; & LCSPG/LAC Gender Team, 2000. Gender and Post-Disaster Reconstruction: The case of Hurricane Mitch in Honduras and Nicaragua. World Bank.

De Leon, Juan Carlos Villagran, 2006. "Vulnerability: A Conceptual and Methodological Review". *Studies of the University: Research, Counsel, Education* – Publication Series of UNU-EHS, No.4 (2006).

Enarson, Elaine, 1999. "Violence Against Women in Disasters: a Study of domestic violence programs in the United States and Canada", *Violence against Women*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. 742-768.

Enarson, Elaine & Morrow, Betty Hearn, (eds) 1998. *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster: Through Women's Eyes*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, USA.

Few, Roger, 2007. "Health and Climate Hazards: Framing Social Research on Vulnerability, Response and Adaptation". *Global Environmental Change*, 17 (2007), pp.281-295.

Flood, Michael, 2004. "Men, gender and development", *Development Bulletin*, no. 64, pp. 26-30.

Fothergill, Alice. 1998. "The Neglect of Gender in Disaster Work: An Overview of the Literature" in *The Gendered Terrain of Disaster*, eds. E. Enarson & B.H. Morrow, 1st ed, Praeger, Connecticut, London, pp. 11-25.

Fothergill, Alice. 1999. "Women's Roles in a Disaster", *Applied Behavioral Science Review*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 125-143.

Hodge, Robert, & Tripp, David, 1986. *Children and Television: A Semiotic Approach*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Holstein James, A., & Gubrium, Jaber, F., (eds.), 2008. *Handbook of Constructionist Research*. New York: Guilford Press.

IDNDR (International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction), 1994. *Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World: Guidelines for natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation*. In: World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction. Yokohama, Japan 23-27 May 1994. United Nations.

Jacobsen, Joyce, P., 2006. "Men's issues in Development". In: *The Other Half of Gender: Men's Issue in Development*, (eds.) I. Bannon & M.C. Correia. Washington: Worldbank, pp.1-28.

Jain, Devaki, & Chacho, Shubha, 2008. "Unfolding Women's Engagement with Development and the UN: Pointers for the future". *Forum for Development Studies*, vol. 1, June 2008, pp.5-36.

Jaquette, Jane, S. & Staudt, Kathleen, 2006. "Women, Gender and Development" in *Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice: Institutional, Resources, and Mobilizations*, eds. J.S. Jaquette & G. Summerfield, Duke University Press, Durham and London, pp. 17-52.

Jupp, Victor (ed.), 2006. *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. London & New Delhi. SAGE Publication.

Kabeer, N., 1994. *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*. Verso: London.

Kabeer, Naila, 1999. "Resources, Agency, Achievement: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment". *Development and Change*, vol. 30 (1999), pp.435-464.

Linne, Tobias, 2011. *Analyzing Textual Data, SIMM02 Research Methods of Social Sciences*. Lund University, unpublished.

McKee, Alan, 2003. *Textual Analysis: a Beginner's Guide*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Mohanty, Chandra, T., 1988. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", *Feminist Review*, no.30, Autumn 1988, pp. 61-88.

Moser, Caroline, 1989. "Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs", *World Development*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 1799-1825.

Moser, Caroline, & Moser, Annalise, 2005. "Gender Mainstreaming since Beijing: a Review of success and limitations in International Institutions", *Gender and Development*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 11-22.

Oakley, Ann, 1972. *Sex, Gender and Society*. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd.

Perrons, Diane, 2003. "Gender mainstreaming in European Union policy - Why now?" Paper presented to ESRC Gender Mainstreaming Seminar, Leeds, 24-5 October 2003.

Popping Roel, 2000. *Text analysis: What and why? Computer-assisted Text Analysis*. London, California, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Prugl, Elisabeth & Lustgarten, Audrey, 2006. "Mainstreaming Gender in International Organizations", in *Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice: Institutions, Resources and Mobilization*, eds. J.S. Jaquette & G. Summerfield, Duke University Press, Durham and London, pp. 53-70.

Pälli, Pekka; Tienari, Janne, & Vaara, Eero, 2009. "Textual Analysis", in AJ Mills, G Durepos & E Wiebe (eds), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*, SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 924-6.

<http://sage-ereference.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/view/casestudy/n341.xml?rskey=17QRIC&result=1&q=textual%20analysis>. 3 June 2012.

Rubin, Gayle & Reiter, Rayna, 1975. The traffic in Women: Notes on the “Political Economy” of Sex. In J. Rivkin & M. Ryan, eds. *Reprinted in Literary theory an anthology 1998*. Monthly Review Press, pp. 157-210.

Sen, Amartya K., 1985. *Commodities and Capabilities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silverman David, 1993. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Syed, Jawad, 2010. Reconstructing Gender Empowerment. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, vol. 33, no.3, pp.283-294.

Thurairajah, Nirooja, & Baldry, David, 2010. “Women's empowerment in post disaster reconstruction: Perspectives on policies and frameworks”, *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, vol.14, no.4, pp.347-361.

UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction, 2005. *Strategic Directions for the ISDR System to Assist the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. In: Eleventh Session of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction, IATF/DR-11. Geneva, Switzerland 24-26 May 2005. New York: United Nations.

UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2007. *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. United Nations. <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/1037>. 3 June 2012.

UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2009. *A Practical Guide to HFA Monitoring and Review through a multi stakeholder Engagement Process 2009-2011*. <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/documents/HFA-monitor-user-guidance-final.pdf>. 3 June 2012.

UNISDR, (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2009. *2009 UNISDR Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. New York: United Nations. [http://www.unisdr.org/files/7817\\_UNISDRTerminologyEnglish.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/7817_UNISDRTerminologyEnglish.pdf). 3 June 2012.

UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2011. *Who We Are – Our Mandate*. <http://www.unisdr.org/who-we-are/mandate>. 3 June 2012.

UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2011. *What We Do – Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)*. <http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa>. 3 June 2012.

UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2011. *HFA Monitor Template: HFA monitoring and review through a multi stakeholder engagement process 2011-2013*. <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/national/>. 3 June 2012.

UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), 2012. *Towards a post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*. [http://www.unisdr.org/files/25129\\_towardsapost2015frameworkfordisaste.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/25129_towardsapost2015frameworkfordisaste.pdf). 3 June 2012.

United Nations, 1970. *Resolutions adopted on the Reports of the Second Committee*. In: 25th Session of the General Assembly designating Second UN Development Decades (1971-1980). New York, USA 24 October 1970. New York: United Nations.

Van Dijk, Teun, A. (ed.), 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Volume 2: Dimensions of Discourse. London: Academic Press.

Vijayamohan, Pillai N. & Asalatha, B. P. & Ponnuswamy, B., 2009. "Women in Development – Dissecting the Discourse", MPRA Paper 13119, University Library of Munich, Germany.

Walby, Sylvia, 2005. "Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice", *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, vol. 12, no 3, pp.321-343.

White, Sarah, 1997. "Men, Masculinities, and the Politics and Development", *Gender and Development*, vol.5, no.2, pp.14-22.

Widdowson, H.J.,1995. "Discourse Analysis: a Critical View". *Language and Literature*, vol.4, no.3, pp.157-172.

## Appendix A:

**Below are the list of policy documents and reports from UNISDR that used for the analysis:**

A Practical Guide to HFA Monitoring and Review through a multi stakeholder Engagement Process 2009-2011.

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/documents/HFA-monitor-user-guidance-final.pdf>.

Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters.

Extract from the final report of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (A/CONF.206/6).

[http://www.unisdr.org/files/1037\\_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf).

Hyogo Framework for Action: National Progress Reports.

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/?pid:222>.

National HFA Monitor template (2011-2013)

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/national/?pid:73&pih:2>.

Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2011.

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2011/en/home/download.html>.

Indicators of Progress: Guidance on Measuring the Reduction of Disaster Risks and the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2008).

[http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2259\\_IndicatorsofProgressHFA.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2259_IndicatorsofProgressHFA.pdf).

Progress Report on the Matrix of Commitment and Initiatives to Support the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework (IATF/DR-12/inf.11).

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=1039&pid:24>.

Report of the World Conference on Natural Disaster reduction (Yokohama, 23-27 May 2994) (A/CONF.172/9).

[http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10996\\_N9437604.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10996_N9437604.pdf).

Strategic Directions for the ISDR System to Assist the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (IATF/DR-11/finaldoc7).

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=1040&pid:24>.

Towards a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2012).

[http://www.unisdr.org/files/25129\\_towardsapost2015frameworkfordisaste.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/25129_towardsapost2015frameworkfordisaste.pdf).

Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World (1994). <http://nidm.gov.in/amcdrr/yokohama.pdf>.

## Appendix B: Chart of national responses to gender-related indicators in HFA interim reports.

Countries	<b>Priority for Action 1:</b> Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.	<b>Priority for Action 2:</b> Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.	<b>Priority for action 4:</b> Reduce the underlying risk factors.	<b>Priority for action 5:</b> Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels		<b>Level of Reliance on Gender as a driver for DRR</b>	
	<b>Core indicator 4:</b> A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.	<b>Core indicator 1:</b> National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for sectors.	<b>Core indicator 5:</b> Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes.	<b>Core indicator 2:</b> 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.	<b>Core Indicator 4:</b> Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.		
	<b>Means of verification:</b> <i>Women's organizations</i> participating in national platform.	<b>Means of verification:</b> <i>Gender disaggregated</i> vulnerability and capacity assessments.	<b>Means of verification:</b> Measures taken to address <i>gender based issues</i> in recovery.	<b>Means of verification:</b> Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans with <i>gender sensitivities</i> .	<b>Means of verification:</b> Dedicated provision for <i>women</i> in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities.		<b>Means of verification:</b> Post disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on <i>gender aspects</i> .
Algeria	No	No	No	No	No	No	Significant
Anguilla	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No / little
Antigua and Barbuda	2	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No / little
Argentina	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Armenia	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No / little

Australia	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Bahrain	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Partial
Bangladesh	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Barbados	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / little
Bhutan	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No / Little
Bolivia	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Botswana	1	No	No	No	Yes	No	No / little
Brazil	No	No	No	No	No	No	Significant
British Virgin Islands	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No / Little
Brunei Darussalam	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Bulgaria	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little
Burkina Faso	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant
Burundi	4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Canada	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Significant
Cape Verde	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant
Cayman Islands	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / little
Chile	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Colombia	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Partial
Comoros	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / little
Cook Islands	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Partial
Costa Rica	1	No	No	No	No	Yes	Significant
Croatia	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Significant
Cuba	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant
Czech Republic	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial

Côte d'Ivoire	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Dominican Republic	1	No	No	No	Yes	No	Partial
Ecuador	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant
Egypt	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Significant
El Salvador	1	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Partial
Fiji	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Partial
Finland	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Significant
France	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No / Little
Georgia	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No / Little
Germany	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Significant
Ghana	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Significant
Guatemala	3	No	No	No	No	No	No / little
Guinea-Bissau	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little
Haiti	Yes	No	No	Yes	-	Yes	No / Little
Honduras	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No / little
India	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Partial
Indonesia	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Italy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Jamaica	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Partial
Japan	2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Kazakhstan	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Kenya	10	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No / Little
Kyrgyzstan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Lao People's	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little

Democratic Republic							
Lebanon	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Significant
Lesotho	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Partial
Madagascar	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Partial
Malawi	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Malaysia	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Maldives	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Mali	2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Marshall Islands	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little
Mauritius	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Mexico	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Partial
Moldova	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No / little
Monaco	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Partial
Mongolia	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Partial
Morocco	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Significant
Mozambique	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Partial
Myanmar	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Namibia	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Significant
Nepal	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
New Zealand	No	No	No	No	No	No	Significant
Nicaragua	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Nigeria	5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant
Norway	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Significant
Pakistan	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Significant

Palestinian Territory, Occupied	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No / Little
Panama	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little
Paraguay	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Partial
Peru	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No / little
Philippines	1	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Partial
Poland	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Portugal	No	No	No	No	No	No	Significant
Romania	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little
Saint Kitts and Nevis	No	No	No	No	No	No	Significant
Saint Lucia	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Partial
Samoa	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Senegal	3	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Significant
Seychelles	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Significant
Sierra Leone	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Soloman Islands	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Sri Lanka	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Sweden	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Switzerland	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Significant
Syrian Arab Republic	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Tanzania	No	No	No	No	No	No	Significant
Thailand	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Partial
The former	2	No	Yes	No	No	No	Partial

Yugoslav Rep of Macedonia							
Timor-Leste	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No / little
Tjikistan	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Togo	7	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Turkey	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Turks and Caicos Islands	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No / Little
United States of America	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Uruguay	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / little
Vanuatu	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep of	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Partial
Viet Nam	No	No	No	No	No	No	No / Little
Yemen	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial
Zambia	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Partial
	21	18	27	43	42	28	

