

Gendering Disaster Risk Reduction: 57 Steps from Words To Action

Elaine Enarson

One quake or eruption or flood at a time, we learn (or don't) how we are manufacturing the great and small catastrophes of our day. Politicians fly back to their comfort zone, relief workers set up off stage to relieve human suffering, and journalists file their stories. Soon, scientific, government and academic studies follow with recommendations meant to interrupt the risk production process. The "lessons learned" mantra implies a process of learning, reflection and change that is widely believed, deeply desired and rarely realized in practice. Time and again, it is instead its particular horror and political context that drives change, and so it was with the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Meeting in Kobe so soon after the Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami, the work of the 2005 World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction had a great sense of urgency. To many, the most pressing need was self-evident: to extend technological advances in forecasting and warning systems to all peoples and marry these with effective community warnings. But the dialogue extends well beyond this: What frameworks or systems could best reduce the risk of avoidable harm in the next decade? What tools or resources were needed to turn the ship around? How could successes be scaled up and momentum sustained?

If Kobe was the moment for concerted world action, the *Hyogo Framework for Action* is the vehicle. With their agreement to the HFA, national signatories committed to an integrated and prevention-based approach closely linked to sustainable and safer

development. Woven throughout this important roadmap is the sense that neither governments nor communities alone can make the kind of changes needed to build safer and more sustainable ways of organizing our lives in the 21st century. What is not so clear is that men cannot continue to act alone, either. Signing on to the HFA, nations also agreed in principle on this strategic priority for 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.” But with few exceptions “gender” stays put in the introduction.

Knowing how useful concrete examples, specific suggestions, action guides and indicators can be, the ISDR developed *Words into Action: Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action*, a step-by-step guidelines for realizing the five broad goals of the HFA. This document is the basis for this discussion, in which I offer a number of steps to governments and their private and public partners seeking to implement the agreed principle of gender inclusivity.

Implementation: Just another wish list?

Government planners, policy analysts, administrators, researchers and other experts may not come readily to the gender perspective. But, without the full and equal participation and leadership of girls and women in the eye of the storm, we cannot succeed in the daunting work ahead to reduce risk and respond wisely to disasters when they do occur. Only the most naive confuse guidelines and checklists with the difficult political work of crossing boundaries, bridging gaps, challenging power systems and building partnerships where none are likely or even desired. But it is an article of faith in

our field that guidelines can indeed prompt action or at least set standards and goals.

Gender is, indeed, a clearly identified “guiding principle” in *Words Into Action* (page 11):

Gender is a cross-cutting concern requiring attention throughout the planning, implementation and evaluation phases of the activities adopted to implement the *Hyogo Framework for Action*. Toward this end, the need for sex-differentiated data is stressed as is the need to analyse the gender division of labour and power relationships between the sexes as these may impinge on the success or failure of all risk reduction strategies. As gender is a central organising principle in all societies, the daily routines of women and men across and within societies put women and men, girls and boys, differently at risk. While gender concerns in disasters cannot be equated with poverty or the challenges of sole parenting alone, it is evident from past disasters that low-income women and those who are marginalised due to marital status, physical ability, age, social stigma or caste are especially disadvantaged. It must be recognised, too, that gender also shapes the capacities and resources of women and men to minimise harm, adapt to hazards and respond to disasters when they must.

This statement is worth revisiting for, following this introductory statement, *Words Into Action* is curiously blind to sex, sexuality, gender and gender relations. When it comes to implementation, *Words Into Action* rarely calls directly upon governments to recognize, develop, strengthen and utilize the capacities of high-risk women; to anticipate gender-based risks to the health and well-being of boys and men in disaster recovery; to recognize the significance of the gender division of labor in the public and private spheres of our everyday lives; to address the underlying gender inequalities that both

directly and as cross-cutting factors undermine disaster resilience; or to simply count heads and impacts in ways that enable gender-based analysis and planning.

[Figure 1 about here]

In the sections below, I take up each of the sub-points raised in the five major lines of action and propose more concrete actions. Most are drawn from workshops on gender and disasters conducted since 1993 (Pakistan, Costa Rica, Australia, Canada, US) and from the Ankara meeting organized by the UN Division for the Advancement of Women (Environmental Management and Mitigation of Natural Disasters: A Gender Perspective) in 2001 and the subsequent Gender Equality and Disaster Risk Reduction Workshop in Honolulu in 2004.

I hope and anticipate that the action steps below will inspire much more specific and context-sensitive action planning involving women and men in all aspects of disaster risk reduction. These actions steps are largely for “including women,” which is shorthand for policy and practice driven *both* by women and men. One hopes that future gender guidelines can focus less on the exclusionary practices and gender inequalities that, at present, put girls and women front and center in this discussion.

HFA Action Area 1:

Making disaster risk reduction a priority

Four general lines of action are identified to help national governments promote DRR on a priority basis: 1) multi-stakeholder dialogue, 2) coordination mechanisms, 3) strong institutional basis, and 4) appropriate resources. Decades of hard-won experience in gender mainstreaming suggest that consulting with women early, often and

continuously is essential in developing effective development and disaster initiatives. But how?

First, assess the status quo: How are women and gender issues currently reflected in existing national DRR systems and approaches? *Conduct a desk review of gaps and opportunities for bringing women's organizations and the needs and interests of girls and women into the work already underway in this country.*

Secondly, *write a clear gender equity policy* to ensure that the National Platform explicitly recognizes the need for women's full and equal participation. It should reflect appreciation of women as decision-makers who bring expert knowledge of disaster risk and risk reduction, especially but not exclusively at the household and community levels. *Use gender-specific language* in policy statements and terms of reference and *develop formal mechanisms for including women* as the national platform is developed and resourced. For example, appoint women's representatives from disaster affected communities or ask women scientists from established national associations to sit or both; recognize the demands on women's resources, energies and time, and enable and compensate their participation as fully as possible.

But which women should be involved? *Map women's organizations and networks* in the nation, including development and grassroots organizations active in high risk areas. Time and again, it is women at the grassroots who step up in the wake of disasters; their contribution to monitoring and mitigating known hazards is now well-established. Consult with women leaders in and out of government and with gender and development organizations to find and inventory all relevant groups, associations and networks knowledgeable about housing, livelihood, health, the environment, conflict and

other contexts within which residents are exposed to hazards and disasters. In the same vein, *seek out credible women leaders* in high-risk and disaster-affected communities, especially to promote mitigation and preparedness; they have connections and knowledge that may well be lacking in government.

Add women's bureaus to the inter-ministerial network to ensure that women with technical and professional skills and those who are active in the areas of family, health, violence, education, employment and the environment can contribute. Too often, these experts are overlooked when key actors and agencies are sought out; to take just one example, women and family ministries must be at the table as it is difficult to overemphasize the significance of family issues in disasters.

Hire gender experts to ensure that all DRR consultations of the National Platform are organized in ways that bring women and men together for dialogue and action planning. *Plan only family-friendly events* organized in ways, places and times that make them accessible to women with different abilities and languages, and to all women and men with family responsibilities.

[Figure 2 about here]

HFA Action Area 2:

Identifying, assessing and monitoring risk, and enhancing early warnings

In this area, the current “roadmap” to risk reduction emphasizes the need for: 1) useful data and information, 2) meaningful risk assessment, 3) effective early warning systems, and 4) effective communication of DRR information and early warnings. This is a critical area for increased gender sensitivity. We fail communities when we fail to reach women with lifesaving information. Further, women’s perspectives on hazards,

vulnerabilities and capacities can enrich community-based risk assessments. There is no single “community” or “household” to reach but a mosaic of intersecting households embedded in communities of all kinds; there is no single “women’s perspective” either, so concerted effort must be made to engage as broad a range of women as possible.

Are government planners well-served by existing information systems? Do they have the sex- and age-disaggregated data needed for gender-sensitive disaster risk reduction initiatives? Finding out is a critical first step. *Assess possible gender bias in local, state and national information systems.* Gender-based analysis of hazards, capacities, vulnerabilities, communication systems and early warning systems is not possible without this fundamental building block.

By *initiating gender and disaster research collaboratives*, government actors can begin to capture qualitative, community-based insight into risk communication and warning systems. These can include *government and university partnerships* that include gender and women’s studies units as well women’s organizations with research capacities and NGOs active in communities at risk. *Fund gender and disaster researchers* who engage with high-risk communities in participatory action research. GIS maps are increasingly a valued tool for local risk assessments, but fall short if women are under-represented or gender-specific information and perspectives are not incorporated into the mapping process, so it is also important to *fund gender-sensitive participatory GIS mapping*.

Words Into Action recommends that all risk assessments be based on updated geophysical data; it is equally significant that governments invest resources and develop

the capacity needed to mandate *updated sex- and age-specific socioeconomic data* as an essential planning tool.

Require that developers *consult with gender and communication specialists* when under contract to design risk communication and warning strategies. Similarly, public awareness about risk and effective warnings and warning systems is enhanced when messages are specific and not overly general. Both the message and the media are important; effective use has been made of women's radio shows to increase women's emergency preparedness, for example, and of sporting events attractive to boys and men. *Target and market messages to women and men, respectively* with attention to age, culture and context.

Similarly, refine risk communications to reach specific groups of women and of men.

Evaluate existing risk communication practices for gaps that may limit the access of high-risk girls and women to information and warnings. Don't reinvent the wheel. Local women's groups or national organizations have expert knowledge about how best to claim the attention of particular groups, for example mothers or migrant working women or low-income women with disabilities. Governments should require that communication specialists under contract *consult with women's organizations* and gender experts to identify popular education and communication outlets likely to reach target populations of women and men equally before, during and after an emergency.

But it is equally important to recognize that community-based women's groups and networks can themselves serve as information experts conveying information to marginalized populations and, importantly, sharing their knowledge with governmental and nongovernmental actors. Knowledge exchange is the linchpin of community

preparedness and cannot succeed without building and exchanging women's (as well as men's) diverse points of view. As most community women's groups are under-resourced, they may have the potential but not the capacity to step into this role in a sustained way so government should *develop well-resourced risk communication partnerships with women's groups in high-risk communities*. Though the important role of women and girls in community education in the family, school and local community is well established by research and frequently observed by practitioners in the field, it is currently an under-utilized resource.

[Figure 3 about here]

HFA Action Area 3:

Increasing awareness, education and training:

The defining character of the HFA is its focus on increasing awareness at all levels of how hazardous living conditions are made and can be unmade. Toward this end, the HFA roadmap *Words Into Action* stresses the need for: 1) compilation, dissemination and use of disaster risk reduction information, 2) training on risk reduction for key stakeholders, 3) mainstreaming risk reduction in education systems, and 4) comprehensive awareness programs. As in the discussion above, the multifaceted roles of women as family and community educators cannot be over-emphasized.

Which women should be targeted for active participation in governmental outreach? There is no one answer. The first task of gender-sensitive awareness, education and training programs must be to identify high-risk women who must be reached. Is it women health care providers in rural areas, women raising families alone in urban shanty towns, elders in migrant communities or poor women stigmatized by

infection, disability or ethnicity? Local expertise must then be deployed to reach these groups, as in the case of risk communication discussed above. Governments can *create gender-balanced awareness planning teams* to make these determinations.

But women are also educators. The experience of GROOTS International, to take one example, demonstrates the effectiveness of women-to-women peer training conducted by women's groups with hard-won knowledge of what women and girls need in the aftermath of disasters and how they can organize to mitigate hazards and vulnerabilities before they occur. *Scaling up proven community-driven and women-led awareness programs* is essential. Community education approaches are essential in order to cultivate long-term relationships and strategies for local awareness and action and are also the essential step to reach women facing literacy and other barriers.

At the postsecondary level, *curricula evaluation teams* can review and assess college and university courses to identify gaps and opportunities for increasing sensitivity to gender in disaster-related courses. This can and should also be done in the case of training and certification programs. Are nations teaching the most current research findings about women, men and gender in disaster contexts? If not, what is needed? How can this be changed? One approach is to *support at least one women's institution or program in the nation to develop and operate a full-fledged degree programme in disaster risk reduction*. The benefits of a new generation of girls and women knowledgeable about hazards and disasters far outweigh the costs.

Developing *context-specific gender and disaster training modules* is another approach that can be utilized across institutions and sectors, including planning, development, health studies, social welfare, law, engineering, information technologies

and other relevant fields. *Contract with gender and education specialists* to help develop and disseminate these DRR course modules targeting both women and men. For example, engineering, architecture and planning students, male or female, may not know about the roles women have played in constructing seismically-resistant housing, but should.

New gender-sensitive educational media created by and for women have proven highly effective, for example community video created by disaster-affected women to increase awareness of women in other risky environments. Girls as well as adult women can participate in developing and disseminating new ideas about reducing disaster risks if they are supported in this role. *Fund the production of women-led community education materials* and make these widely available.

The organization as well as the content of trainings is important. As noted with respect to activities of the National Platform, governments should *develop standards for gender-inclusive awareness programming*, ensuring that these are accessible to women and that women are compensated for the extra burden imposed on their time and energy. This is one way of demonstrating commitment to the principles of gender-sensitive risk reduction practice. Similarly, *gender benchmarks and indicators* are needed in risk reduction programming and project planning, with special attention to gender-budgeting and women's active participation in project monitoring and evaluation. How, without asking, will governments learn if their awareness, education and training dollars are spent in ways that reach girls and women?

At a different level, government leadership can also promote gender sensitivity in the work of public and private partners with which countries collaborate. *Supporting*

mentoring programs and institutional exchanges, for example, will increase the capacity of all partners to conduct the level of gender analysis required to fully and equally engage girls and boys, women and men in disaster risk reduction. The partners of the National Platform can also *create or support information sharing networks* to increase gender awareness. The Gender & Disaster Sourcebook, for example, is a one-stop resource with international materials on all dimensions of disaster risk reduction. By *linking to the Gender & Disaster Network*, these resources can be shared.

[Figure 4 about here]

HFA Action Area 4:

Reducing risk in key sectors

Making risk reduction a priority, effective risk communication, and education and training all heighten awareness about hazards and disasters; but, at the heart of the HFA, is the commitment governments make to taking action to reduce risk in key areas. Those highlighted in the HFA are environmental management, livelihoods and social protection, physical planning, engineering, and the financial and economic sectors. Sustainable recovery planning cannot succeed without close attention to how risk is increased and can be decreased in these realms. What is not clearly identified in *Words Into Action* is how to build on gender sensitive practices that reduce risk, though a well-established body of research and practice affirms the effectiveness of gender-sensitive approaches.

Implementation of sectoral projects and programs should be informed by this knowledge.

[Figure 5 about here]

As noted earlier, *building capacity for conducting gender-sensitive disaster risk assessments* is an essential step for capturing and acting upon specific knowledge about

hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities in the everyday lives of women and men, boys and girls. Gender-sensitive risk assessments are essential to capture and act on this knowledge in specific contexts. For example, within socio-economic economic groups women and girls are generally disadvantaged and traditional strategies to redress these may not reach them; increasing employment, for example, may not address the root causes of women's poverty. Government-led interventions in this area must also reflect women's vulnerability to environmental hazards and the active roles of girls and women as users and managers of environmental resources. Consult with *women's work associations, unions, producer groups* and others to identify and support traditional or indigenous good practice in environmental resource management and to plan employment-intensive crisis interventions. *Include gender-sensitivity as a standard* in funding, implementing, monitoring and evaluating pre- and post-disaster livelihood initiatives as a way to recognize gender as a cross-cutting theme in pro-poor DRR initiatives.

In the area of social protection, it is essential to prioritize the protection of women, girls and boys from gender-based violence in disaster contexts. *Mitigate gender violence* by building pre-disaster relationships with women's groups knowledgeable in this area. Collaborative plans are then possible for specific actions such as community education to increase awareness of the threat of violence in this context and increased dedicated funding to programs providing prevention and response services. Similarly, government can demonstrate leadership by recognizing the role of wives, mothers, daughters and partners as informal "shock absorbers" in times of disaster. As women are likely than men to depend on state-supported social services such as housing, health and

education including child care and other family supports, *identifying strategies for ensuring social service continuity* through partnership with grassroots women is a step that increases the disaster resilience of women and women's groups playing key social support roles. Identify and *prioritize the protection of critical social infrastructures*, as well as critical communication or energy infrastructures, including women's spaces, child care centers, shelters, faith-based places, and other community structures that build solidarity and sustain meaningful recovery.

Gender-sensitive risk reduction also means engaging women as housing reconstruction experts, for example through *increased support to local women's building cooperatives* that train women in safer building techniques, or by helping to develop these. Partnering with women's groups to monitor reconstruction is another strategy that has been trialed and proven effective. Governments can *fund women's development groups knowledgeable about women-led and community-based* evaluation and monitoring roles during reconstruction. *Including gender experts on planning teams for reconstruction* will help ensure that gender patterns are reflected, for example differences in women's land rights and tenancy, use of space for home-based production, women's transportation resources and needs and the value of women's spaces for psychosocial support, shared child care, livelihood projects and other post-disaster activities that can be anticipated. *Consultations with both local experts and women with technical and scientific expertise* are not a luxury or distraction but essential steps to sustainable recovery for all.

With respect to financial planning, by *supporting existing microfinance systems* reaching low-income women, governments also reduce their disaster vulnerability. This

is especially so for women in the informal sector but is also a major form of social protection for women operating small businesses around the world. *Provide gender training to economic recovery experts* and ensure that recovery planning groups or teams are gender balanced. *Make women's small businesses a priority in business continuity planning.* Additionally, *insurance schemes promoted by women's groups for low-income women should be scaled up.*

Disaster risk can certainly also be reduced through an integrated and cross-sectoral approach that engages all relevant government ministries, including those with mandates for promoting gender equity. *Develop personal networks* with women's organizations and advocates actively engaged with promoting the goals of the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), for example, or the gender-specific Millenium Development Goals.

Explicit policy for gender-sensitive recovery planning will help guide the work of the National Platform partners. *Established gender benchmarks and indicators* will be needed and can best be developed at the country level to reflect specific conditions. Explicit policy guides are needed linking sustainable development, gender equality and disaster risk reduction at all levels. Ensure that this fundamental principle is reflected in emergency planning for response and recovery to avoid reconstructing vulnerabilities.

[Figure 6 about here]

HFA Action Area 5:

Strengthening disaster preparedness

As expected, the implementation guide for the HFA gives strong support to the concept of preparedness, urging that signatories support: 1) activities in support of disaster preparedness, 2) assessments of disaster preparedness capacities and mechanisms, and 3) strengthen planning and programming for disaster preparedness.

Women's capacity to undertake activities that help them and their families and communities prepare for disastrous events can and must be strengthened. Toward that end, *women's groups active at the local level must be resourced.*

Assist municipalities to compile gender-sensitive risk profiles needed for an integrated and gender-sensitive approach emphasizing preparedness and risk reduction. Especially in preparedness plans, it is important that governments *partner with women's groups knowledgeable about high-risk women* and also *engage women with professional and technical experts.*

Make existing resources such as gender-sensitive relief guides available to response agencies but recognize that community members, including girls and women, are always the first (and last) responders. *Revise and disseminate existing tools* to produce context-specific guidelines.

Figure 7 about here]

Organizational cultures and practices historically dominated by men are slow to change and perhaps ore slowly yet in the field of disaster management. A practical step to promote gender inclusiveness is to *incorporate gender sensitivity into results-based evaluation* systems of disaster preparedness and response. *Adapt personnel policies to*

reward demonstrated gender sensitivity in these areas. *Tie funding to effective gender mainstreaming* in emergency preparedness and relief operations by making this a National Platform standard. Governments can create an enabling environment and demonstrate leadership and political will in this area. Equally important, government leaders can strive to the extent feasible *to provide the human and financial resources needed to institutionalize gender-fair policy and practice* in the area of preparedness and relief.

To realize the full spirit of the Hyogo Framework for Action, government leadership is needed to *promote interpersonal and inter-organizational networks* between girls' and women's organizations and male-dominated emergency organizations. In the short-run, potentially life-saving preparedness and relief operations can be made stronger and gender-inclusive sustainable recovery planning can become the norm. In the long-run, acting now to build and promote dialogue—women and men at the same table speaking a common language—will leverage the momentum, political will and organizational work cultures needed to sustain a gender-sensitive, community-led and effective disaster risk reduction strategy.

Looking ahead

At the heart of the Hyogo Framework for Action is the certain knowledge that safer ways of organizing our social life on this dynamic planet can and must be found. Working with both women and men is the catalyst and essential precondition. But there is no one way to do much of anything, and certainly not when the challenge is to reverse course and address the driving forces creating the hazards and disasters of the 21st century. No single-minded focus will do—on developing countries only, on women

only, on women as deficient victims only or women as heroic environmental stewards. Instead, gendering disaster risk reduction is a challenge as complicated as our own personal histories and families and just as difficult to navigate

Engaging women and girls fully and equally is not a luxury that only some countries can afford nor is it a distraction from the main business of disaster risk reduction. Hard decisions must be made. Gender mainstreaming disaster risk reduction can be imposed (and ignored) from on high or bubble up from below; it can be tolerated or promoted, enabled or starved of resources; it can certainly be championed by men and women but just as easily be disparaged as an external political agenda or cultural imposition and confined to bureaucratic backwaters. At a minimum, effective mainstreaming takes political imagination and leadership, sufficient and appropriate resources, long-term partnerships and sustained attention. It challenges established priorities and power relations and empowers women as decision-makers.

A nation state strong in the face of disaster is one that capitalizes on the everyday knowledge of its people. It is a country whose leaders know how women and men have historically coped with hazards and disasters, and who appreciate the political, economic, and social forces that have especially disempowered girls and women in risky environments. It is a country whose leaders at all levels of government know that their most important stakeholders are the women and men whose lives and futures are most at risk and who reach out to develop, strengthen and sustain community partnerships with women as well as men.

Acknowledgements

Readers are referred to papers in this edition and to the Gender and Disaster Sourcebook [<http://www.gdnonline.org/sourcebook/index.htm>] and other resources of the Gender and Disaster Network [www.gdnonline.org] for materials in support of this essay.

I acknowledge with pleasure the hard work of the many women and men who have elaborated these action steps over the years. I also gratefully acknowledge the contributions of my former colleagues on the ISDR Gender Expert Team to the development of these ideas. Naturally, I do not assume their agreement nor do I represent these ideas as those of the ISDR. I offer these remarks especially to Fouad Bendimerad in appreciation for *Words Into Action*.

References

UN ISDR (2005). Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters (HFA). Retrieved September 22, 2007 from: <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/hfa/hfa.htm>

UN ISDR, Words Into Action: A Guide for Implementing the Hyogo Framework. Retrieved September 22, 2007 from: <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/hfa/docs/Words-into-action/Words-Into-Action.pdf>

Figure 1 Five Action Areas of the Hyogo Framework for Action

Making disaster risk reduction a priority

Identifying, assessing, & monitoring risk/enhancing early warning

Increasing awareness, education and training

Reducing risk in key sectors

Strengthening disaster preparedness

Figure 2 National government policy for gender equity in emergency assistance

Gender Equality and Humanitarian Assistance: A Guide to the Issues is a 29-page policy document produced by Beth Woroniuk for the Canadian International Development Agency in 2004. It focuses on capacities as well as vulnerabilities and men as well as women with sections on what gender-sensitive humanitarian assistance means, myths and misunderstandings around it, concrete assessment questions to be asked across sectors and in program development, and references to related work.

Source: CIDA website: (<http://www.cida.gc.ca> or [http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/Africa/\\$file/Guide-Gender.pdf](http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/Africa/$file/Guide-Gender.pdf))

Figure 3 Government bureau working with women and men to map risk

Engendering Geohazard Assessment and Mapping Project, funded by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), was first implemented in 2004-2005 as a pilot initiative of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) in the Philippines. The project aims to provide women and men with equal access to information that indicate the geohazard susceptibility of pilot communities. Key lessons learned from the project are that it is important for both men and women to undertake geohazard survey, assessment and mapping; but it is even more important, in the context of a vulnerable community, to provide women and men with equal access to information.

Source: *Gender Perspective: Working Together for Disaster Risk Reduction: Good Practices and Lessons Learned*, pages 43-45. Available on the ISDR website:

http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/isdr-publications/09-gender-good-practices/gender-good-practices.pdf

Figure 4 Gender and Disaster Sourcebook

What is the link between gender equality and disaster risk? What lessons have been learned in the field and through scientific study? How can this knowledge be applied in practice to reduce risk and respond equitably to disaster events? These are the questions an international team of writers set out to answer by compiling materials for this new electronic resource. Click on *planning and policy frameworks* to access the many practice-based checklists and planning guides prepared by United Nations agencies, and on *good practice* for examples of innovative approaches already implemented through women's organizations, governments and nongovernmental organizations. The Sourcebook is hosted on the website of the Gender and Disaster Network (<http://www.gdnonline.org/>), the global virtual network with members working in government, at the community level and in academia.

Source: The G&D Sourcebook can be accessed on line through the GDN:

<http://www.gdnonline.org/sourcebook/index.htm>

Figure 5: Institutional support for gender-sensitive action research

Gender in Community Based Disaster Management is a two-year project spearheaded by the UN Centre for Regional Development (UCRD) that aims to: investigate gender sensitivity in current disaster management strategies and studies; identify policy gaps and bottlenecks; develop action plans and produce and distribute educational materials; and

research and programme development in support of gender sensitive CBDM. With support from the Hyogo Trust Fund Action Research Project, participatory workshops involving government and community members are being conducted in a number of case communities selected in Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Turkey.

Source: UNCRD Hyogo Office website: <http://www.hyogo.uncrd.or.jp/cbdlm/cbdlm.htm>

Figure 6 Local government working with women to reduce risk in Peru

Women are building disaster-resilient houses and communities in Peru in an innovated project involving women's community groups and local government. Estrategia, which is a 16-year old Lima-based NGO supporting women leaders in poor communities, initiated the project, negotiating with local authorities and NGOs to create strategic partnerships that increase the geographic scope of their work and garner financial support. The initiative provided an entry point for women to negotiate with the local government to develop more resilient housing policies for the poor.

Source: Gender Perspective: Working Together for Disaster Risk Reduction: Good

Practices and Lessons Learned, pages 40-42. Available on the ISDR website:

http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/isdr-publications/09-gender-good-practices/gender-good-practices.pdf

Figure 7: Partnerships for gender-sensitive humanitarian response

Women, Girls, Boys and Men—Different Needs, Equal Opportunities is a comprehensive guidebook produced by the UN InterAgency Standing Committee, now available in Arabic, French, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish. This Handbook sets forth standards

for the integration of gender issues from the outset of a new complex emergency or disaster, so that humanitarian services reach their target audience and have maximum positive impact. The Handbook will also assist donors to hold humanitarian actors accountable for integrating gender perspectives and promoting equality in all aspects of their work. A parallel *Gender Equality E-learning Initiative* offers support for implementing the guidelines to the 150 humanitarian organizations who belong to the umbrella organization InterAction [[www. www.interaction.org/](http://www.interaction.org/)].

Source: Adapted from the IASC website:

<http://ochaonline.un.org/AboutOCHA/GenderEquality/KeyDocuments/IASCGenderHandbook/tabid/1384/Default.aspx>.