

RDI Op-Ed, No. 12 (DCR-1) 20211124

The Need for Orchestrating Strong Leadership for the Disaster-Induced Urban Displaced

The growing need for disaster resilience in the urban displaced is imminent in today's world. Natural hazard induced disasters have increased dramatically in the past 40 years. From 2000 - 2019, a number of 7,348 major recorded disasters were reported, which is a 42.7% increase from the 1980 - 1999 period with a total of 4,212 major recorded disasters (UNDRR, 2020). The climate crisis has contributed to this increase; 90.9% of recorded disasters in 2000 - 2019 were due to climate-related events (UNDRR, 2020). Disaster-induced Internally Displaced People (IDPs) are at the heart of the issue, losing their homes and assets while struggling to assimilate to their relocation areas. A number of 705,000 new disaster-induced displacements in Indonesia have been recorded in 2020 (Internal Displacement, 2021). It is known that 60 - 80% of IDPs end up in informal settlements in urban areas (IDMC, 2018). The length of their resettlement is not a short one - it takes an average of 20 - 30 years (UNHCR, 2015). The IDPs' vulnerability is further exacerbated by the lack of facilities and social networks in their new settlements. Implementing policies regarding IDP management and ensuring IDP rights become crucial in the net of the disaster management cycle.

There are a handful of guidelines pertaining to the management of IDPs, one of the most recent being The Words into Action (WiA) guidelines produced by UNDRR in 2020. This guideline is aligned with the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) and is used as a practical handbook in developing local disaster risk reduction strategies (UNDRR, 2020). Indonesia's National Board for Disaster Management (BNPB) has integrated the SFDRR into national disaster

risk reduction (DRR) strategies (BNPB, 2021), although integration alone is insufficient in managing IDPs after relocation. While BNPB has released Peraturan BNPB RI No. 03 Tahun 2018 about IDP Management During Disaster Emergencies, there are many challenges faced in policy implementation. These challenges include weak coordination and cooperation among related DRR sectors and the absence of consensus regarding terminology across sectors (Surianto et al., 2019). The situation of IDPs in Indonesia heavily relies on government action, yet their current leadership is not up to par.

The leadership needed in the grand scheme of IDP management becomes pertinent as several institutions are involved in IDP management in Indonesia. The main body that is expected to handle IDPs in Indonesia is the Indonesian National Board for Disaster Management (BNPB) alongside the National Cluster of Displacement and Protection (Klaster Nasional Pengungsian dan Perlindungan) under the Ministry of Social Affairs RI (Kemensos RI). The National Cluster of Displacement and Protection is made up of subclusters that pay attention to IDP needs, including shelter, sanitation and hygiene, Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM), security, child protection, protection of vulnerable groups, women empowerment and protection towards gender-based violence, and psychosocial support (Kemensos, 2020). International organizations involved in the coordination of humanitarian response include OCHA, IFRC, UNDP, IOM, amongst others. On a national level, CSOs such as MPBI and Care Indonesia are involved in local DRR efforts. Even at local levels, the Indonesian

government has Tagana or Taruna Siaga Bencana and Desa Sigap Bencana, which are community empowered groups involved in all stages of disaster management. However, all of these bodies still act in a fragmented and independent order. The issue at stake is how there can be one conductor that can orchestrate the entirety of institutions involved in IDP management, including data collection and management and instilling resilience in the urban displaced.

The Lack of Coordination in Data Collection and Management

In addition to the implementation of the GIS-baAt the early stages of disaster response, the first contact with IDPs is during the relocation to temporary camps. This is when Disaster Response Assessments take place – these assessments collect information about, but are not limited to, campsites, humanitarian aid needed, water and sanitation conditions. Government, international organizations, and NGOs individually take their assessments during the same period, which may cause assessment fatigue for IDPs. The core of this problem is the absence of prior discussions about how assessments can be conducted together instead of a per-institution basis. This results in a conflict of interest when deciding on whose data should be used.

Intense debates primarily happen over whose data should be used as a source, indicating who has the most accurate data. This is partly because government funds will be allocated to the institution that provides the baseline data of a camp. What needs to be understood during assessments is that every institution will have different methodologies, questions, sample sizes, and survey items, which will produce different results. Since the methodologies and respondents are different, the results will not be identical. Nevertheless, these variations should not be considered an obstacle, rather an opportunity for collaboration. It is highly suggested to create one master assessment form or even integrated assessment forms between all stakeholders collecting data.

After the discussants delivered their feedThere are existing comprehensive information systems that can complement

baseline data for IDPs. For example, the Displacement Tracking Metrics (DTM) by IOM provides holistic data on displacement, including movement, location, groups, and individuals in the forms of dashboards and narrative reports. The perspective that should be used is a collaborative one – while government data is assumed to be used as the baseline, results from all assessments can be supplementary to each other. To do so, there needs to be a multisectoral forum outside of emergency situations about how to integrate assessment tools so that the final assessment tool can be immediately used during disasters.

Lessons Learned from Disaster Displacement in Indonesia

Instilling disaster resilience in the urban IDPs starts right after emergency response. Psychosocial support is a component of humanitarian response that deems crucial during the beginning of IDP relocation to camps. IDPs at camps are in a vulnerable state of mind – psychosocial support is needed to make IDPs feel as comfortable as possible despite their relentless worry. IDPs need conversation and recreational activities to take their mind off of their situation, conducted based on age groups. Other needs will also vary based on cultural values and other beliefs; therefore, social workers should be able to accommodate.

The lack of disseminated camp profiles impacts the humanitarian aid that is received and distributed to IDPs. Donors and volunteers don't have localized sources to rely on when planning to send donations or other forms of assistance. Because of this, it is not uncommon that the aid sent becomes unused; for example, an abundance of clothes sent to camps later go to waste. When sending clothes, it is also important to note whether they are culturally acceptable for the recipients and how they are packaged and sent in a humane way. Food donations should be appetizing and age-appropriate when possible to provide diversification for IDPs. In the end, it should not be forgotten that IDPs often don't have cash on hand. The humanitarian aid that is received is sometimes sold for cash – this is contradictory towards the monetary value of donations that are sent and reported.

The post-disaster situations of IDPs in relocation sites do not come second to initial humanitarian assistance for IDPs. While the government does provide physical facilities such as permanent residences for IDPs whose homes were destroyed, this is not the end of restoring their livelihoods. IDPs face challenges such as jeopardized access to previous sources of income, lack of basic facilities, and unfamiliar social settings, which must also be considered by the government when providing aid. It will take years of assistance to ensure that IDPs are able to get back on their feet at relocation sites. However, it is a perceived notion that physical housing is enough, causing other underlying conditions to be overlooked. For instance, IDPs' previous workplaces become too far after relocation, which hampers their access towards stable income. This is why unemployment and poverty are prevalent in relocation sites. Basic facilities such as water and sanitation are also minimal at relocation sites, increasing the threat of communicable diseases such as diarrhoea and dengue fever that will reduce the overall quality of health in IDPs.

In the displaced communities in Garut, RDI found that the top 3 ways to overcome problems faced in relocation areas are increasing education and awareness, coordinating with authorized stakeholders, and creating movements to reduce poverty and unemployment. Yet, the top 3 barriers in tackling those issues are the lack of action from the government, the lack of commitment from the government, and the lack of basic facilities. From FGDs conducted with the displaced communities about their situation and hopes, it was found that they would appreciate it if the government could facilitate FGDs similar to the ones conducted by RDI. IDPs' opinions are rarely considered by the government, resulting in the mis-formulation of solutions. The solutions and facilities provided by the government are seen as far from fixing the root of the problem and rather only addressing symptoms of the problem. In the end, the government feels that they have upheld their part, while the IDPs don't have their needs accommodated. The lack of government's understanding of IDPs' needs in relocation sites may be due to the lack of awareness

about these issues, ultimately resulting in the lack of policies and action.

What's Next?

With the existing efforts to accommodate IDPs' needs during disaster response and after relocation, there needs to be strengthened coordination at the national level. At the frontline is the National Cluster of Displacement and Protection (Klasnas PP) under the Ministry of Social Affairs RI (Kemensos RI) in coordination with the Indonesian National Board for Disaster Management (BNPB), who are seen as the conductors of the response. International organizations, NGOs, and CSOs go hand-in-hand in managing disaster response. Based on the key issues discussed in this paper, there are three main points to consider:

- Conducting a national forum led by BNPB and Klasnas PP to reach a consensus about terminology and data collection methods during IDP assessments will produce more holistic information while decreasing the psychological burden on IDPs.
- The quality of information through collaborative data collection from camps will improve coordination on humanitarian aid sent for the betterment of IDPs' conditions.
- In implementing DRR strategies, it should be noted that providing assistance for IDPs does not end at providing new homes to live in. The involvement of IDPs in decision making while creating distinct plans on how to restore their livelihood are included in strengthening their resilience towards current situations and future disaster risks.

Coordination at provincial and local levels should also be maintained for an all-round response that can cover the points aforementioned. Academics' roles in research and providing knowledge about displacement and NGOs' roles in providing supplementary data and aid will strengthen IDP management. In turn, this strengthened leadership will be able to provide a strongly orchestrated response in protecting and maintaining the rights of IDPs.

Author

- **Nadya Daulay**
(nadya.daulay18@mhs.uinjkt.ac.id)
State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
- Supervised by: **Danang Azhari**
Resilience Development Initiative

Acknowledgement

The materials in this article were presented by keynote speakers: Dr. Saut Sagala from Resilience Development Initiative; Drs. Iyan Kusmadiana., MPS.SP., from the Directorate of Social Protection for Victims of Social Disasters, Ministry of Social Affairs; Milly Mildawati, Ph.D from Bandung Social Welfare Polytechnic; and Tjossy Sipasulta, M.Sc from the Internal Organization for Migration in a Webinar for the national workshop titled 'Making Displacement Safer: The Internally Displaced Persons' Resilience in Indonesian Cities'. This webinar was hosted by RDI and held on October 4, 2021. The webinar was also attended by three discussants: Ni Masjitoh Tri Siswandewi, M.Si from the Indonesian Disaster Management Community (Masyarakat Penanggulangan Bencana Indonesia); Ida Widianingsih, S.IP., MA., Ph.D from Padjadjaran University; and Suryani Amin, M.Si from Resilience Development Initiative.

*) For further reference, all presentation materials by the speakers can be accessed [here](#), and the recorded video of the webinar [here](#).

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this op-ed are those of the author or authors of this article. They do not necessarily represent the views of RDI, its editorial committee, or the mentioned speakers' affiliation.

Further Reading

- BNPB. (2021). Sosialisasi Penyusunan Laporan Interim SFDRR Indonesia Periode 2015-2021. Accessed from <https://bnpb.go.id/berita/sosialisasi-penyusunan-laporan-interim-sf-drr-indonesia-periode-20152021>
- IDMC. (2018). Unsettled: Urban displacement in the 21st century.
- Kemensos RI. (2020). Klaster Nasional Pengungsian dan Perlindungan (Klasnas PP).
- Surianto, et al. (2019). Regional Policy for Disaster Risk Management in Developing Countries Within the Sendai Framework: A Systematic Review. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*. 2019 Jul 15; 7(13):2213-2219. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.614>
- UNDRR. (2020). The Human Cost of Disasters: An Overview of the Last 20 Years (2000 - 2019).
- UNHCR. (2015). Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2015.