



TAYAR NEPAL PROJECT BASELINE ASSESSMENT

MUNICIPALITY DRRM PROFILE: *NEELAKANTHA MUNICIPALITY, DHADHING*
(DRAFT FINAL VERSION)

SEPTEMBER 2020

ABBREVIATIONS

CAA - Climate Change Adaptation
CAO - Chief Administrative Officer
CBO - Community Based Organization
CDMC - Community Disaster Management Committee
CRS - Corporate Social Responsibility
DMF - Disaster Management Fund
DMFR – Disaster Management Fund Regulation
DRR – Disaster Risk Reduction
DRRM - Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
DRRNSPA – Disaster Risk Reduction National Strategic Plan of Action
EDMC – Environment and Disaster Management Committee
EOC – Emergency Operation Centre
FGD – Focus Group Discussion
FP - Focal Person
FRS – Future Risks Scenario
GESI – Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
HRs – Human Resources
IOM – International Organization for Migration
JD – Job Description
LDCRP - Local Disaster and Climate Resilience Plan
LDRRM – Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
MA – Municipal Assembly
MDA – Municipality Disaster Act
MDMC – Municipal Disaster Management Committee
MoU – Memorandum of Understanding
NPDRR – National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction
PWD – People with Disability

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- ABBREVIATIONS 2
- 1. MUNICIPALITY PROFILE: NEELAKANTHA MUNICIPALITY 4
 - 1.1. BACKGROUND4
 - 1.2. DRRM ASSESSMENT5
- 2. MUNICIPAL DRRM INDEX 5
 - 2.1. SYNOPSIS OF MUNICIPALITY POSITION ON DRRM INDICES.....5
 - 2.2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET OF DRRM INDEX.....6
 - 2.3. MUNICIPALITY SCORE FOR DRRM INDEX ELEMENTS.....17
 - 2.4. ACTION PLAN TO MITIAGTE THE GAP IDENTIFIED DURING ASSESSMENT20

I. MUNICIPALITY PROFILE: NEELAKANTHA MUNICIPALITY

I.1. BACKGROUND

Neelakantha Municipality is largely built around the old Dhading Bazaar which used to be main bazaar for the largely indigenous and farming community in the north and a gateway for people going to India. Until 1990, it was small settlement with shops and local lodges for rural travelers. However, after the advent of multiparty democracy in 1991, the settlement grew significantly with rising economic activities to cater to rapidly growing population in Kathmandu that it enjoyed with improved road connections in early 1990s.

The Maoist movement heavily affected the growth of Neelakantha Municipality that slowed down during the insurgency years of 1995-2005 as the district suffered enormously by the conflict. The economic activities slowed down and the town had a deserted look. However, this changed rapidly again the peace process in 2006, and the town saw significant rise in construction, with taller buildings coming up quickly to cater to rapid rural urban migration.

The Municipality also became preferred destination of agro-based businesses, and government service-holders for whom Neelakantha was the nearest posting that was outside the Kathmandu but within easy access for weekend return. This helped the Municipality to attract more investment and to grow even faster, and this is evident from what the Municipality is: a cluster of buildings and businesses that are poorly planned, and basic infrastructures trailing behind. This report demonstrates where the Municipality stands with respect to disaster planning and preparedness.

Geography and Demography

Neelakantha Municipality is located in Dhading district and Bagmati Province of Nepal. It is the biggest Municipality in the district, covering around 1/10th (i.e. 199.85 square kilometers) of the total area. The following map shows the geographical and administrative boundaries of Dhading district, including Neelakantha Municipality. Neelakantha Municipality has a varied topography, with terraced hills and dense forests. Out of a total area of 199.85 square kilometers, around 50% i.e. 99.31 square kilometer is covered by dense forests, followed by arable lands (47%), residential area (2.5%), water (1.4%) and others (0.09%)

According to the 2011 Nepal census, the total population of Neelakantha Municipality is 58,515, which accounts for around 17.4 percent of Dhading District's total population. On the other hand, a more recent endeavor carried out by the Central Bureau of Statistics shows that the Municipality's population has increased to 71,131 in 2015. (CBS, 2015).

Neelakantha is a multi-ethnic Municipality with a wide diversity of castes and ethnicities. Based on a 2015-2016 study conducted by Nepal CBS, Neelakantha Municipality is home for people from eleven different ethnicities. Out of the eleven ethnicities, Newar, Brahmin, Dalit, Gurung, Magar and Chhetri constitute the majority. Minor ethnic group such as Kumal shares a small portion i.e. 2.15% of the total population.

A majority of the population in Neelakantha Municipality is Newar (17.5%) followed by Brahman (16.4%), Gurung (16.3%), Chhetri (12.1%), Magar (10.5%) and others. The following graph shows the distribution of population by ethnicity:

1.2. MUNICIPAL DRRM ASSESSMENT

The Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Index is a tool for assessing DRRM systems and capacity of Municipalities of Nepal. There are 10 elements and 658 indicators in the index which looks at a specific area of disaster risk reduction strategy. All 10 elements were adapted from the United Nations Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) disaster resilience scorecard for cities and the indicators are adapted from DRR National Strategic Plan of Action 2018-2030. The ten elements of the DRRM index are as follows:

- Organization readiness for disaster resilience
- Identify, understand and use current and future risk scenarios
- Strengthen financial capacities for DRRM and resilience
- Pursue safer cities and resilient urban development
- Safeguard natural ecosystems to enhance their protective functions
- Strengthen institutional capacity
- Strengthen societal capacity for resilience
- Increase infrastructure resilience
- Disaster preparedness and effective response
- Recovery after shock and build back better

The DRRM index assessment is carried out in all of the 8 project Municipalities. Scoring criteria is established for each of the 10 elements, and Municipalities are assessed using the scores they receive in each of the 10 elements. Each indicator is assessed with scores ranging from 0 to 3. The matrix of Municipal DRRM indices derived for Neelakantha Municipality is attached in annex 3.

The objective of the Municipal DRRM Index assessment is to:

- Assist federal, provincial and local governments (Municipalities) in monitoring and reviewing progress and challenges while implementing their respective DRRM plan of action
- Find strengths of Municipalities in DRRM systems and capacities
- Identify gaps in DRRM systems and capacities
- Develop action plan based on identified gaps
- Internalize the index at municipal level and eventually start a self-evaluation system.

This profile provides the scores that the Municipality secures for each DRRM indices as well as offer the objective evidences to the extent possible. However, some scoring could be subjective based on the observations of the Baseline assessment team. A narrative below summarizes the observations and a broader picture from the Baseline team on where the Municipality stands with respect to achieving DRRM objectives.

2. MUNICIPAL DRRM INDEX

2.1. SYNOPSIS OF MUNICIPALITY POSITION ON DRRM INDICES

Neelakantha Municipality is a well-positioned municipality to have all the competencies and resources to stand high on DRRM indices. Its proximity to Kathmandu including access to federal political leadership and resources that this can draw, its own economic strength derived from attractive vegetable and crop production that its supplies to neighboring Kathmandu valley, and the willingness to change demonstrated by current Municipality leadership can positively deliver high ranking to the Municipality.

The current Baseline assessment notes the municipality is not yet in a position of being prepared for an effective disaster response. It has necessary institutional set up, but these are not yet functional. It has Acts and Regulations, but there are no plans. There is budget allocated in a traditional manner, but these are likely not be effectively used in the absence of the Plans. The Municipality has a strong and vibrant private sector, often led by women, and natural resources from its mountains and rivers, but the Municipality has not been working with them to improve their safety levels and reduce their exposure to disasters. Understandably, a lot is yet to be accomplished.

More specifically, there is Emergency Operation Center (EoC) at municipality level but it's not functional. There is no proper mechanism of information management system during an emergency. Municipality is relying on local media and telecommunication to disseminate information during emergency. They have worked on their policies such as Municipality Disaster Act (MDA) 2019 and have gazette it and prepared subsequent regulations, but implementation shall be constrained due to absence of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRRM) Strategy/ Plan of Action. Municipality has assigned a focal person for DRRM who is co-responsible for care of health section but will this work without a Plan?

On a positive note, during the [focus group discussion \(FGD\)](#), this Assessment noted that municipal leaders and officials have excellent knowledge and understanding of hazards within their territory and this could contribute to an effective integration of DRRM into the municipal planning process. This could mean that the Municipality could move forward with early warning system not yet available in the Municipality. They could share public information through local media more widely to reach to the vulnerable population.

Neelakantha Municipality has funds for preparedness and response, but its adequacy cannot be ascertained in the absence of a Plan. If this budget proves to be inadequate, the Municipality has no preparations to work with the external agencies or its own private sector or even it's neighboring Municipalities given that DRRM need not be carried out in isolation.

The Municipality has some milestone work done towards resilient urban planning. For example, the Neelakantha Municipality have functional town planning guideline, have developed policy/strategy for safe settlement and have enforced national building code. Despite these policies and strategy for safe settlement, the Municipality has not properly integrated ecosystem protection activities in the DRRM plan. The Assessment also notes that that there is no policy and strategy for insurance and reimbursement to engage with and protect its citizens and private sector.

The Municipality is not yet equipped with adequate search and rescue kits and stockpile of non-food relief items required for emergency response. Municipality has LDMC but it dysfunctional as they have not yet even provided trainings and assigned tasks for committee members.

During the FGD and interaction with DRR Focal and DMC members, the Baseline notes the Municipality needs to do more to reach to the vulnerable communities that are more exposed to disasters. Less than 25% of population are aware of potential hazard's risk and this illustrates further that the Municipality needs to work together with private and community level organizations with strengthened capacity and commitment to meet DRRM objectives.

2.2. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET OF DRRM INDEX

The matrix below provides a comprehensive evidence base and score for key elements of the DRRM index. The scores are derived using standard agreed scoring system developed by Tayar Nepal.

Municipality Name: Neelakantha Municipality
Assessment date: 14 August 2020

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
I	Organization Readiness for Disaster Resilience			
1.1	Has the municipality prepared Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Strategy Plan of Action Plan (Local DRRM Plan) in line with DRR National Plan of Action?	0	-Based on discussion with DRR Focal Person on 11 th August 2020 -Based on FGD with Municipal Leaders on 14 th August 2020.	-5 th Municipal Assembly (2076) approved 'Disaster Act 2019' incorporating major aspects of NDRRM Policy/Action Plan (2018-2030). -However, DRRM strategy plan of action has not been prepared yet. In FGD, municipal leaders said that they are planning to formulate DRRM strategy plan of action soon.
1.2	Has the municipality prepared Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Policy in line with National policy for DRR (2018)?	3	-Municipality Disaster Act (MDA) 2019 (See annex p. 44 to 47) approved on 8 th August 2018.	'Municipality Disaster Act (MDA) 2019' includes major policies in the Section 2 (5) (Works, Responsibilities and Rights) in line with National policy for DRR (2018). The act was included in municipality Rajpatra ¹ .
1.3	Has the municipality prepared Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Act in line with National DRRM Act 2017 (2074)?	3	-Municipality Disaster Act (MDA) 2019, (See annex p. 44 to 47) published in municipality Rajpatra.	5 th Municipal Assembly (2076) approved 'Disaster Act 2019' incorporating major aspects of NDRRM Policy/Action Plan (2018-2030). MDA (2019) is formed in line with part seven, no.17 of National DRRM Act 2017 (2074).
1.4	Has the municipality prepared Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Regulations in line with DRRM Regulations 2019 (2076)?	2	-Disaster Management Fund Regulation (DMFR), 2019), Published in municipality Rajpatra (See annex p. 48 to 49) -COVID-19 Prevention, Control and Treatment Fund Regulation-2020' (See annex p. 52)	-MDA (2019) includes regulation also in line with DRRM Regulation 2019. Municipality has also approved 'Disaster Management Fund Regulation' (DMFR), 2019. The regulation covers overall DRRM fund and regulation. - Municipality has also approved 'COVID-19 Prevention, Control and Treatment Fund Regulation-2020' dated on 14 th April 2020.
1.5	Is DRRM integrated into municipal development strategies/functional areas (spatial planning, infrastructure development, social/community development, emergency plan, fiscal plan, GESI Plan)	1	-Regulation for Use of Land, Water Resources 2019, and Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Construction 2020. -(see annex p. 51 and 30) -Based on FGD with municipal leaders/	Municipality has approved different acts, regulations and guidelines such as Regulation for Use of Land, Water Resources policy 2019, and Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Construction 2020. Municipality has endorsed the regulations; however, overall development strategies are not clearly integrated into DRRM.

Commented [KJ1]: This is not exactly that the indicator is looking for. There should be separate DRR policy at the municipality not policies included at Act. Review and revisit the score.

Commented [KJ2]: Please attached Act and Rajpatra.

Commented [KJ3]: This is not exactly indicator is looking for. DRRM regulations and the regulations that mentioned here is different. Review and revisit the score.

¹ Rajpatra is an official Gazette or journal with written documentation of Government decisions.

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
			officials on 14 th August 2020	
1.6	Does the municipality have dedicated section/unit for DRRM with defined mandate and required human resources?	2	-Letter with responsibility (Date: 13 th February 2020) (See annex p. 56)	DRRM unit is set up in alignment with in health section. The chief of the health section is given responsibility of focal person and he has to handle both (health and DRR) units from a single room. There is no decision to set up separate DRR unit. -Focal person is assigned without clear Job Description (JD); no other human resources are managed.
	Sub Total	11		
2	Identify, understand and use current and Future Risk Scenarios			
2.1	Does the municipality (municipal leaders and officials) have knowledge and understanding of main hazards in their territory/region and their likelihood of occurrence? (In the form of multi-hazard maps, data, update intervals, reliability of data)	2	Based on discussion in FGD with municipal leaders, DRR FP, CAO and with other members of MDMC on 14 th August 2020.	63% of municipal/leaders/ officials (7 out of 11) have knowledge and understanding of main hazards in their territory and their likelihood of occurrence (asked to eleven people). Some of them have not seen the multi hazards map of municipality. Total ten people were asked; seven of them have knowledge and understanding of main hazards in their territory.
2.2	Does the municipal leaders and officials have knowledge on exposure and vulnerability form each hazard and (combined hazards scenarios)?	2	Based on discussion in FGD with municipal leaders, DRR FP, CAO and with other members of MDMC on 14 th August 2020.	About 70% of municipal/leaders/ officials (7 out of 10) have knowledge and understanding of main hazards in their territory/region and their likelihood of occurrence.
2.3	Is the knowledge of exposure and vulnerability integrated in the municipal planning process (functional areas)?	1	-From FGD with municipal leaders, DRR FP, CAO and with other members of MDMC on 14 th August 2020. -Vulnerability Assessment (See annex p. 54 and 55)	-The Municipality is in process to integrate knowledge of exposure and vulnerability in the municipal planning process. -One ward (5-number) Vulnerability assessment was completed in one ward (ward o 5) has been made. - Municipality has does not integrated the knowledge of vulnerability in planning process.
2.4	Is there a shared understanding of risks for critical infrastructures, lifelines, and public services between the municipality and utility agencies/services?	1	-Based on the discussion FGD with municipal leaders, DRR FP, CAO and with other members of MDMC on 14 th August 2020.	The Municipal leaders and officials showed a shared understanding of risks for critical infrastructures, lifelines, and public services such as EOC and hospitals.
2.5	Is there a common understanding among DRR focal person, DRRM committee members and	3	Based on discussion in FGD with municipal leaders, DRR FP, CAO and with other	-All municipal leaders have common understanding (during FGD) of potential cascading impacts to environment, infrastructures,

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
	Municipality leadership (Mayor and Deputy Mayor) of potential cascading impacts to environment, infrastructures, economy and population under different scenarios?		members of MDMC on 14 th August 2020.	economy and population under different scenarios.
2.6	Does municipality inform public of potential hazards and risks through commonly understandable medium such as hazard maps, risk information and media in commonly understandable language?	1	News/messages from local FM and TV -Decision of MDMC to disseminate information on dated on 17 th April 2020. (See annex p. 28)	Municipality informs public of potential hazards and risks through community radios and local TV about the possible hazard, risk information only in national (Nepali) language. However, MoU with media has not been made.
	Sub Total	10		
3	Strengthen Financial Capacities for DRRM for Resilience			
3.1	Does the municipality have dedicated budget allocated under disaster management fund for DRR (preparedness, mitigation, prevention, response, recovery and reconstruction)?	2	-Budget sheets (see annex p. 41 to 43) published in Red Books (2076/77, 2077/78)	5.62 % (Rs.18,000,000) of development budget (Rs.18,000,000) was allocated for DRR areas in last FY 2076/077. This year (2077/078) 5.77% (Rs. 32,000,000) of development budget (Rs. 32,000,000) has been allocated for DRRM. Municipality has also prepared to response COVID-19 with the fund.
3.2	Is the Municipality able to allocate budget in implementation of DRRM plan required annually?	3	-Budget sheets (see annex p. 41 to 43) published in Red Books (2076/77, 2077/78) -Break down of DRRM budget by EDMC on 21/09/2019 (see annex p. 40)	5.77% budget is allocated (for 2077/78) in DRRM activities but annual activities plan is not prepared. However, EDMC has broken down DRRM budget into different sections (TO BE ELABORATED)
3.3	Is there a contingency/external sources for financing DRR?	0	Based on observation of documents and discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	There is no certain contingency/external source for financing DRR.
3.4	Is there a mechanism/collaboration for private sector investment in DRR? (through CSR, public-private partnership)	0	Based on observation of documents and discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Municipality has not prepared any mechanism for private sector investment in DRR. Public private partnership practice not applicable.
3.5	Is there a mechanism or incentives to different segments of society and businesses (private sector)	1	MDA 2019 (See annex p. 44 to 47)	There is a provision of rewarding the community and individuals for supporting resilience building in MDA

Commented [KJ4]: Is this possible to provide any exmple? Please provide if any.

Commented [KJ5]: Mention what type of information dessiminated when through which means?

Commented [KJ6]: With this fund or seaparate fund? pls. mention.

Commented [KJ7]: Why?

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
	to support resilience building?			2019, Part 6 (23). [HOW TO BE ADDED]
3.6	Is insurance or other risk transfer mechanism available for public (Individual citizens), vulnerable communities, businesses, infrastructures?	0	Based on discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020	No insurance or other risk transfer mechanism available at the municipality.
3.7	Does municipality have Disaster Management fund with disaster management fund operation guideline?	2	DMF Regulations published in Rajpatra approved on 17 th Dec. 2019. (see annex p. 48)	Municipality has approved DMF with operation guidelines. It has dedicated DM fund.
	Sub Total	8		
4	Pursue Safer Cities and Resilient Urban Development			
4.1	Does the municipality have land use zoning/ planning, and building by-law prepared integrating information of multi-hazard risks?	3	Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Building Construction published in Rajpatra (see annex p. 30)	Municipality has approved and uses both land use zoning/ planning and building by-law integrating information of multi-hazard risks. This is in full operation.
4.2	Are the zoning/planning and building by-laws implemented in the municipality?	2	- Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Building Construction published in Rajpatra (see annex p. 30)	Municipality has approved and implemented both land zoning/planning and building by-laws.
4.3	Does the municipality have policy/strategy plan/integrated plan/act/regulations that included safer settlement development components/areas to promote resilience?	3	Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Building Construction. Approved: 16/04/2020. (see annex p.30)	Municipality has approved Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Building Construction and began to implement to promote resilience.
4.4	Does the municipality have enforced national building code, ?	2	Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Building Construction. Approved: 16/04/2020. (see annex p.30)	That is encoded in Guidelines for Settlement, Town Planning and Building Construction. However, 100% implementation has not been made.
	Sub Total	10		
5	Safeguard natural ecosystems to enhance their protective functions			
5.1	Does the municipality recognize the functions/services that the natural ecosystem provides?	1	-Discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020 - Decision of EDMC on 24 th April 2019. (see annex p. 34)	Municipality has decided to address the issue of ecosystem. The municipality has initiated to promote "Ecofriendly City/settlement as per their decision from Municipality Assembly (MA) and EDMC. However, this has not been included in DRRM plan as the plan has not been made.

Commented [KJ8]: Attached by-law.

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
5.2	Does the municipality have any collaboration between neighboring municipalities for ecosystem protection?	0	Interview with DRR Focal person on 11 th August 2020.	Municipality has not made any attempts to collaborate with other/neighboring municipalities for the protection of ecosystem.
5.3	Is there any policy and law enacted to protect the ecosystem and environment within the municipal area to promote "Ecofriendly City/settlement" development?	3	-Meeting minute of EDMC on 24 th April 2019. (see annex p. 34)	Yes, municipality has initiated to promote "Ecofriendly City/settlement" as per their decision from Municipality Assembly (MA) and EDMC. The decisions invite the citizen to plant at least two trees with in their housing premises every year. Budgets has been given and encouraged to 'Tole Sudhar Samitis' to arrange the plants.
5.4	Does the municipality have Climate Change Adaptation Plan such as local disaster and climate resilience plan (LDCRP) prepared and mainstreamed in its development activities?	1	Based on discussion with DRR Focal Person on 11 th August 2020	Municipality has LDCRP but not mainstreamed in its development activities.
5.5	Does the municipality have policy to integrate Natural Based Solutions (green/blue infrastructures) to enhance its DRRM and CCA?	1	Based on discussion with DRR Focal Person and engineers on 11 th August 2020. - Decision of EDMC on 24 th April 2019. (see annex p. 34)	Municipality does not have policy to integrate Natural Based Solutions to enhance its DRRM and CCA. EDMC has just decided to plant trees for developing green city.
Sub Total		6		
6	Strengthen Institutional Capacity			
6.1	Does the municipality have Local Disaster Management Committee (LDMC) established and functional with defined functions and required capacities?	1	-Minutes of EDMC on 24 th April 2019. (See annex. P. 36,38) - Based on FGD with EDMC on 12 th August 2020.	-Municipality has formed Environment and Disaster Management Committee (EDMC) similar to LDMC. It is functional. -Organization chart, inclusive committee, and job descriptions, capacities in terms of trained human resources have not been maintained.
6.2	Does the LDMC meet GESI criteria in line with DRRM Act or other related legal document?	1	Minutes dated on 14 th May 2019 (See annex p. 35) - Observation of the list of committee on 12 th August.	EDMC does not meet GESI criteria. There are less than (33%) standard norms in EDMC. Female and socially excluded members are not included in the committee.
6.3	Does the municipality have community/ward level DM committees/bodies with required capacities?	3	-From FGD with four ward chair persons on 11 th August 2020.	All wards have DMCs. MDA has defined the provisions for Ward DMC. However, the bodies lack required capacities.
6.4	Does the community/ward level DMC have required capacities?	1	-From FGD with four ward chair persons and EDMC Coordinator on 11 th August 2020.	Lack trained human resources. No ward has managed the trained human resources, but financial and logistical

Commented [KJ9]: Provide reference of law and policy not only meeting minute. The indicator asked for law and policy enacted to protect the ecosystem. Review and revisit the score.

Commented [KJ10]: This should be zero. Please review and rescore.

Commented [KJ11]: If this has not happened, score should also be revisited.

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
				resources and coordination capacities are seen.
6.5	Does the community/ward level DMC seem inclusive in line with provision of national/local Law?	2	Based on discussion with ward chairpersons on 11 th August 2020.	Less than 50% of ward level DMC/bodies have inclusivity. More Ward DMCs do not adhere inclusivity. There is no ToR for the committees.
6.6	Does a coordinated public awareness and education campaign exist to disseminate information on multi-hazards risks to public across the society through messages/ mediums and languages understood and used?	2	-Local TV/ FMs messages -Decision of MDMC dated on 27 th April 2020. (see annex p. 28)	-Nepali (national) language is used to disseminate information on multi-hazards risks to public through local FMs and TV although other local languages exist. -During COVID-19 pandemic, Municipality has disseminated messages from local FMs and TV.
6.7	Are there capacity building training courses related to DRRM and resilience offered to all the sectors of the municipality?	0	-Minutes of EDMC -Decision to draft planning for DRRM on 9 th June 2020. (See annex p. 39)	EDMC has provisioned budget for DRRM this year. The committee has not prepared for training courses. Trainings also have not been managed. Only general orientations have been made.
6.8	Is the municipality proactive seeking to exchange knowledge and co-learn from other municipalities with similar challenges?	0	Based on FGD with Municipal leaders/officials on 14 th August 2020.	Not made any exchanging and co-learning attempts regarding DRRM. Municipals felt of its lacking.
	Sub Total	10		
7	Strengthen Societal Capacity for Resilience			
7.1	Are communities and people aware of potential hazards, risks and safe practices?	1	Based on FGD with municipal leaders on 14 th August 2020.	Less than 25% community people are aware of potential hazards, risks and safe practices. (asked to 12 people only 2 of them showed awareness).
7.2	Are CDMC/CBOs and DRR related grass-root organizations participating in DRRM in each community in the municipality?	2	- Based on discussion with DRR FP (12 th August 2020) -Minutes of MDMC on 27 th April 2020. (See annex p. 25)	Municipality Disaster Management Committee includes members from all the concerned sectors such as Red Cross, Police, Journalism, Federation of NGO, FNCCI etc. provisioned by the act.
7.3	Are there regular training programs provided to the most vulnerable communities/population in the municipality?	0	From FGD with EDMC on 12 th August 2020.	No training has been managed yet regarding DRRM to the most vulnerable population.
7.4	Do the private sector/businesses have contingency/continuity plan?	0	From interview with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Not yet. In FGD municipal leaders said that they are informally talking to some private sectors.
7.5	How effective is the municipality in citizen engagement and	1	-From interview with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020	One third of wards reached by the Municipality through the means of local FMs and TV messages.

Commented [KJ12]: Rephrased the sentence as per score sheet.

Commented [KJ13]: Provide what types of message and to how many people (roughly) reached with effective communication.

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
	communication in DRR related activities?		-Message from FMs and TV.	
	Sub Total	4		
8	Increase Infrastructure Resilience			
8.1	Does the municipality have critical infrastructure protection plan or strategy? (in collaboration with relevant authorities)	0	From interview with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Municipality does not have critical infrastructure protection plan or strategy.
8.2	Are any critical infrastructures located in high risk hazard zones?	1	Based on discussion with EDMC on 12 th August 2020.	25 to 50% of critical infrastructures located in high risk hazard zones such as health posts, schools etc.
8.3	Are any public infrastructures located in high risk hazard zones? (schools, hospitals, community buildings, government buildings)	2	-Based on interview with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020. -Applications from schools (Based on discussion with school resource person on 12 th August 2020.)	<25% of public infrastructures located in high risk hazard zones. (eight schools have recently dropped applications for help to save from risk).
8.4	Is existing protective infrastructure well-designed and well-built based on risk information?	1	Based on discussion with engineers on 12 th August 2020.	1/3 of existing protective infrastructure (school buildings, government buildings, health centers) are well-designed and well-built based on risk information with in municipality
8.5	Are any heritage buildings/sites (cultural, archeological, natural and religious) located in high risk hazard zones?	1	Based on discussion with engineers on 12 th August 2020.	1/3 of existing protective infrastructure (school buildings, government buildings, Health centers) are well-designed and well-built based on risk information with in municipality. Out of three temples one (bhairabi mandir) has been found with in this criteria.
8.6	Will water supply and sanitation services be impacted in the "worst case scenario" for significant proportion of the municipality under the potential disaster scenario?	1	Based on observation and discussion with engineers on 12 th August 2020.	-Water supply and sanitation services will not be impacted in the "worst case scenario" for significant proportion as water supply tanks and land field sites are located at safe zones. -The alternative supply water tanks are constructed.
8.7	Will transportation infrastructure be impacted in the "worst case scenario" for significant proportion of the municipality under the potential disaster scenario? In the event of failure, will the transportation	1	Based on observations and discussions with Municipality engineers on 12 th August 2020.	-In the event of failure, the transportation infrastructure and corridor will remain safe as they are not in disaster prone zones within the municipal area and vital linkages to strategic points. -Some roads are likely to be flooded during heavy rain periods.

Commented [KJ14]: Provide both denominator and numerator information in this cell.

Commented [KJ15]: Same comment as 8.2

Commented [KJ16]: Delete this sentence and rephrased remaining sentence in line with indicator's requirement.

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
	infrastructure and corridor remain safe? (within the municipal area and vital linkages to strategic points)			However, vulnerability assessment has not been carried out.
8.8	Will electricity service be impacted in the “worst case scenario” for significant proportion of the municipality under the potential disaster scenario? In the event of failure, will the electricity infrastructure and corridor remain safe? (within the municipal area and vital linkages to strategic points)	0	-From FGD with engineers on 12 th August 2020.	Electricity service will be impacted in the “worst case scenario” for significant proportion of the municipality under the potential disaster because transmission lines are in vulnerable zones. (many times in a year the service has been impacted) -Long rain often disrupts the supply.
8.9	Will telecommunication services be impacted in the “worst case scenario” for significant proportion of the municipality under the potential disaster scenario?	0	-From discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	-Telecommunication services will be impacted in the “worst case scenario” for significant proportion of the municipality under the potential disaster scenario. - The power back system is weak so in short hours' power cut, telephones do not work.
8.10	Will there be sufficient acute healthcare capabilities to deal with expected major injuries in the “worst case scenario”?	2	- Based on discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Yes, there will be sufficient acute healthcare capabilities to deal with expected major injuries in the “worst case scenario. However, vulnerability assessment has not been made. - Municipality does not have contact list of first responders as well as response plan.
8.11	Will there be sufficient “first responder” capabilities in the event of the “worst case scenario”?	1	Based on discussion in FGD with EDMC on 12 th August 2020 and Red Cross representative on 13 th August 2020.	-There will be few “first responder” capabilities in the event of the “worst case scenario”. No more trained resources available. - Red Cross can provide very few trained members.
	Sub Total	10		
9	Disaster Preparedness and Effective Response			
9.1	Does the municipality have a plan or SOP to act on early warnings/ forecast system?	0	Based on FGD with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Municipality does not have a plan or SOP to act on early warnings and forecast system.
9.2	What proportion of the population is reachable by early warning system?	0	Based on FGD with Ward Presidents on 12 th August 2020.	-No system has been developed. - Such early warning system has not been used.
9.3	Does the early warning system support downstream population?	0	Based on discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	No early warning system to support upstream/downstream population has been developed.

Commented [KJ17]: Is it possible to provide some evidence how the health facility will be run at that situation.

Commented [KJ18]: Move this section to 8.11

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
	(Upstream/downstream and trans boundary)			
9.4	Does the municipality have disaster preparedness and response plan?	0	Based on discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Budget is allocated but no action plan to mitigate further disaster. DRR FP said this year plan is going to be made.
9.5	Does the municipality have human resources to support first responder duties in potential "worst case" event scenario?	1	Based on discussion with DRR FP on 14 th August 2020.	Municipality has list of first responders with contact details but they are not trained. Only few Red Cross members are trained.
9.6	Does municipality have stockpile, up to date inventory, and SOP in place?	1	-Stockpile list and observation of the store. - (see annex p. 32)	Very few stockpiles. They are not well protected. Very few piles were sent to wards. Stockpile is not managed well.
9.7	Will the municipality be able to continue to feed and shelter its population post-event?	1	Based on FGD with municipal leaders and officials on 14 th August 2020.	-Municipality will be able to continue to feed and shelter its population post-event up to 25% of affected. Leaders claimed that they could feed and shelter more than 25% of affected population with immediate decision and outsourcing from the market. -No warehouse, no partners. Decision is made immediately.
9.8	Is there an emergency operation center (EOC) with participation from all agencies, following standard operating procedures specifically designed to deal with "worst case" scenarios?	2	-Decision of Municipality -Organogram -EOC Regulation approved on 11 th January 2020 (See annex p. 50)	EOC has been formed but not functional with separate unit and no sufficient stockpiles, however, It acts in emergency. EOC regulation and organogram has been made but functional body has not been in operation.
9.9	Are the emergency drills practiced involving both the public and responders?	0	Based on FRD with EDMC members on 12 th April 2020.	Once done two years before. -Municipality has no regular activities for the drills.
	Sub Total	5		
10	Recovery after shock and Build Back Better			
10.1	Is there a strategy and/or action plan prepared for post-event recovery and reconstruction, including economic recovery, social recovery etc.?	1	From discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	- Municipality has prepared a strategy included in MDA 2019 but no action plan for post-event recovery and reconstruction. -The strategies included economic recovery but lack social recovery.
10.2	Do post-event assessment processes incorporate failure analyses and the ability to capture lessons learned that would input into design and delivery of rebuilding projects?	0	Based on discussion with DRR FP on 11 th August 2020.	Not practiced yet. There is no any experience of measuring failure and capacity to capture from the lessons learned.

Commented [KJ19]: Contradict with information provided in 8.10. Recheck and rescore accordingly.

Element #	Elements and indicators	Score	Evidence	Comments/Justification/Remarks
10.3	Is there a post event recovery finance mechanism defined/understood and accessible?	1	-DRRM Fund Regulation Act -Guidelines for Municipality Grand and Financial Support. (See annex p. 48)	There is a post event recovery finance mechanism defined in DRRM Fund Regulation Act and Guidelines for Municipality Grand and Financial Support, however, it is not accessible for all effected. Only those who know the provision can have access.
10.4	Has the municipality allocated budget provision for reconstruction?	1	-DRRM Fund Regulation Act -Based on FGD with officials on 14 th August 2020. - Minutes of EDMC (see annex. P. 48 and 40)	Municipality has not allocated specific budget for reconstruction. However, there is the provision of using budget for reconstruction in DRRM Fund Regulation Act collecting from external and internal sources.
	Sub total	3		
	Total score obtained	77 (49.3%)	Full score: 156	

2.3. MUNICIPALITY SCORE FOR DRRM INDEX ELEMENTS

The table below provides overall scores in percentage obtained by the Municipality for each element comprising the DRRM Indices. These scores are significant in providing where the Municipality stands with respect to its position for the DRRM element and supports the Municipality in prioritizing its activities and resources. Similarly, table also provides and narrative with commentary on how the Municipality fares in that indicator and this is the feedback to the Municipality for that Element from the Baseline Assessment team.

S.N.	Elements	Below Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	%
1	Organization Readiness for Disaster Resilience (OR4DR)			Municipality achieved important documentation works (e.g. Acts and Regulations) to support its readiness for disaster resilience. However, DRRM plan is not formulated, and this reflects that key step to preparedness is yet to be taken forward.		61%
2	Identify, understand and use current and Future Risk Scenarios (IUU&FRS)			Municipal leaders and officials have demonstrated good understanding on current and future risks scenarios. But the Baseline study considers that their understanding and exposure on vulnerability practices are not integrated into development planning, and is a key deficiency to be addressed.		62%
3	Strengthen Financial Capacities for DRRM for Resilience		Stands weak in this area. Customary budgetary allocation is made, slightly higher this year than last FY despite combining COVID-19 activities. Absence of annual plan, and any linkages with external fund or source renders the capacity weak. Moreover, existing disengagement with public /private network for DRRM and lack of incentives for			42%

Formatted: Highlight

			private citizens for DRRM weakens DRRM weakens Municipality positive to be effective in DRRM.			
4	Pursue Safer Cities and Resilient Urban Development (PSC&RUD)				Good that the Municipality has approved guidelines (use of land, water resources, building construction) for safer cities and urban development. However, without the guidelines integrated with the policy documents for building resilient society in terms of DRRM, the results of resilient urban growth will not be achieved.	90%
5	Safeguard natural ecosystems to enhance their protective functions (SNE2EPF)		Municipality is grossly weak on this. It has not initiated any measures to enhance and protect their natural ecosystems including the river system that runs at the core of Municipality. A campaign of domestic plantation is made but is seriously deficient to what it could do.	Municipality is grossly weak on this. It has not initiated any measures to enhance and protect their natural ecosystems including the river system that runs at the core of Municipality. A campaign of domestic plantation is made, but is seriously deficient to what it could do.		36%
6	Strengthen Institutional Capacity (SIC)		Local DRRM committee is active in the form of Municipality DRRM and EDMC. DRRM Committee; committees are formed in ward level. However, they lack trained HRs and capacity building opportunities. GESI part in formation of committees is weak			47%
7	Strengthen Societal Capacity for		Since there is clear lack of trained HRs, insufficient work to empower community (officials/committee			28%

	Resilience (SSC4R)		members) for resilience. However, some communities are involved in Municipality DRRM committee.			
8	Increase Infrastructure Resilience (IIR)			Most of the critical and important public infrastructures (drinking water, roads, telephone) are not at risks in 'worst-case scenario'. Some schools, health posts and electricity supply are in vulnerable position.		52%
9	Disaster Preparedness and Effective Response (DP&ER)	<u>Municipality has been effectively working in COVID-19 with approved regulation/procedures but early warning systems and mechanism to respond to different possible disasters and hazards are not considered adequately. Action plan and related simulations are not practised.</u>	Municipality has been effectively working in COVID-19 with approved regulation/procedures but early warning systems and mechanism to respond to different possible disasters and hazards are not considered adequately. Action plan and related simulations are not practised.			11%
10	Recovery after shock and Build Back Better (RAS&BBB)		Municipality has been providing financial support for post event recovery through regular fund/budgetary provision. However, plan for social recovery and analysis of failure is not made and shared			33%

			which would help for post event delivery and re-planning.			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

2.4. ACTION PLAN TO MITIAGTE THE GAP IDENTIFIED DURING ASSESSMENT

The reviews and narratives for each element of the DRRM Index provide indications on the strengths and limitations of Neelakantha Municipality with respect to meeting DRRM indicator expectations. The gaps are refined from above and appropriate actions to mitigate them have been considered by the Municipality with a clear framework for responsibilities, timeframe and resources. These are still in discussion phase, but will contribute a way forward for deliberations and adoption by the Municipality.

Municipality Name: Neelakantha Municipality _____
August 2020

Assessment date: 14

S.N	Elements	Specific Identified Gaps	Action to be taken	Responsibilities and time frame
1	Organization Readiness for Disaster Resilience (OR4DR)	-DRRM integration into municipal development strategies/functional areas (spatial planning, infrastructure development, social/community development, emergency plan, fiscal plan, GESI Plan). - Dedicated section/unit for DRRM with defined mandate and required human resources. -DRRM plan	-Integrate DRRM activities into municipal development strategies/functional areas such as spatial planning, infrastructure development, community development, emergency plan, fiscal plan and GESI plan etc. in relation to priority actions 5, 6, 7 & 8 of DRR NSPA (2018-2030). - Add human resource and define mandate. -Formulate DRRM plan	- DRR FP - Municipal Leaders - Sectorial heads - Formulate DRRM plan within the next fiscal planning.

S.N	Elements	Specific Identified Gaps	Action to be taken	Responsibilities and time frame
2	Identify, understand and use current and Future Risk Scenarios (IUU&FRS)	-Sufficient knowledge of exposure and vulnerability integrated in the municipal planning process. - Public information of potential hazards and risks through commonly understandable medium such as hazard maps, risk information.	- Workshop/seminars on exposure and vulnerability issues in development process to planners and municipal leaders. - Public exposure/publicity of information through media and printed forms regarding potential hazards and hazard maps at local level.	-DRR FP (With in November 2021)
3	Strengthen Financial Capacities for DRRM for Resilience (SFC4DRRM 4R)	- External source such as private sectors, business communities etc. -Networks with private sectors	- Find external source. - Build up networks with private sectors.	-DRRM FP - Municipal leaders - Plan as regular process
4	Pursue Safer Cities and Resilient Urban Development (PSC&RUD)	- Multi hazards risks information integration land use, zoning/ planning.	-Integrate multi hazards risks information in land use and building construction.	- Planning engineers (including in DRRM Plan with in next fiscal planning, and building networks with in July 2021, and integration in land use- regular process)
5	Safeguard natural ecosystems to enhance their protective functions (SNE2EPF)	- Recognition of the functions/services that the natural ecosystem provides. - Collaboration between neighboring municipalities for ecosystem protection. - Climate Change Adaptation Plan (CCA) such as local disaster and climate resilience plan.	- Recognize the function of the natural ecosystem through discussion with experts. - MoU/collaboration with neighboring municipalities for ecosystem protection. - Prepare and mainstream CCA plan in its development activities.	- DRRM FP - Municipal leaders - Development planners (engineers) (With in March 2020 (discussion), with in May 2021 (MoU), with in March 2021 (CAA plan)
6	Strengthen Institutional	- Capacity development. - GESI - Awareness campaigns.	- Workshops/trainings for capacity development for DRRM committees. - Awareness campaigns in community level.	- Chief Administrative Officer - DRRM FP

S.N	Elements	Specific Identified Gaps	Action to be taken	Responsibilities and time frame
	Capacity (SIC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resilience awareness training. - Training courses related to DRRM and resilience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRRM Resilience training to officials. - Prepare training courses related to DRRM and resilience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ward Chairpersons (With in June 2021 (trainings), with in December 2021 (awareness), with in April, 2021 (trainings course)
7	Strengthen Societal Capacity for Resilience (SSC4R)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involvement of community in DRRM - Training to vulnerable people - Involvement and planning of private sectors such as individuals, business organizations, local organizations etc. in DRRM - Information sharing to citizens. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reformulate DRRM committees in community level with GISI principles. - Organize trainings. - Invite private sectors to plan - Organize periodical discussions on DRR practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRRM FP - Ward Chairpersons - Municipal leaders (With in January 2021, for committees, and trainings to people, with in February 2021, private sector planning)
8	Increase Infrastructure Resilience (IIR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical infrastructure protection plan or strategy. - Sufficient “first responder” capabilities in the event of the “worst case scenario”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Preparing action plan and strategies to protect critical infrastructure. - Prepare sufficient first responders and develop their capabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRR FP - Municipal leaders/officials (Within May 2021 for action plan, with in August 2021 for responders preparedness.
9	Disaster Preparedness and Effective Response (DP&ER)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early warning system/mechanism. - Disaster preparedness and response plan. - Human resources to support first responder duties in potential “worst case” event scenario. - Stockpile, up to date inventory, and SOP in place. - EOC with participation from all agencies. - Simulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan & develop system for early (sectorial /hazard specific) warning mechanism. - Plan for disaster preparedness and response. - Plan for recruiting HRs to support first responders. - Arrange necessary things for stockpile. -Prepare SOP for EOC. - Include all agencies in EOC process. - Schedule for simulations and practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRRM FP - MDRRM -Officials (Within January 2022, early warning and preparedness, with in November 2021, stockpile and SOP, with in April 2021, schedule for simulation.
10	Recovery after shock and Build	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategy/ action plan for post-event recovery and reconstruction, including social recovery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prepare Action Plan for post-event recovery and reconstruction, including social recovery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRRM FP - MDRRM

S.N	Elements	Specific Identified Gaps	Action to be taken	Responsibilities and time frame
	Back Better (RAS&BBB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Post-event assessment processes incorporate failure analyses and the ability to capture lessons learned. - Post event recovery finance mechanism accessibility. -Reconstruction budgetary provision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schedule for post event discussion/assessment to analyze failure. - Publicize finance mechanism for accessibility. - Plan budgetary provision for reconstruction. 	(By November 2021, AP, Schedule and publicize, with in January 2022, Plan budget)

*Note: This action plan was developed in discussion with the Municipality DRR Focal Person. The Municipality has not yet approved this document.