SECTION
9

PADR in specific contexts

Sections 4–8 have considered the standard use of PADR as a tool to assess risks in the community and to develop plans of action to reduce those risks. Section 9 considers a few more specialised situations where PADR can be used, sometimes in combination with other tools.

9.1 PADR and church mobilisation (*Umoja*)[11]

Tearfund and its partners have given high priority to mobilising and equipping churches to reach out to their surrounding community and to address some of the pressing problems. A process known as Church and Community Mobilisation (CCM) has been developed. This methodology has been used widely in Africa and Asia, in such diverse contexts as Tanzania, Liberia, Sudan, Cambodia and Nepal. Resource material under the name *Umoja* has been produced, specifically to help NGOs and associations of churches that want to envision and equip local churches to mobilise whole communities for action. See tilz.tearfund.org/Churches/Umoja for further information.

The methodology is essentially a call to integral mission, a challenge for the church to engage with the spiritual and physical needs of people round about, a challenge also to care about justice and about God's wider creation. There are five stages in the CCM process:

1 **ENGAGING WITH THE LOCAL CHURCH** Helping churches to develop a vision for service and a belief that change is possible, even with their own limited resources.

2 **ENVISIONING THE LOCAL COMMUNITY** The church brings the wider community together to discuss their situation, their problems and resources, and how things could change.

3 **DREAMING DREAMS AND PLANNING ACTION** Once the participants have agreed a shared vision, they develop an action plan for change, using their own resources, which should deliver the vision.

4 **TAKING ACTION** Implementation of the plan, calling in specialist advice as needed, to ensure positive change takes place.

5 **EVALUATION** Looking back to review how the church and community have worked together to run projects and bring change.

Umoja and PADR can be integrated together when natural hazards are high on the priority list of community concerns. For example, a church may successfully complete the mobilisation process (*Umoja* stage 1) and succeed in envisioning the local community (*Umoja* stage 2).

11 The word umoja means 'togetherness' in Swahili. In some countries a different name is used for the same CCM process. For example, in Brazil it is called *Comunidades Transformadas (Transformed Communities)*.

If drought and related food insecurity emerge as priority issues, the PADR process can be drawn upon to further assess the hazards (PADR step 2), vulnerabilities and capacities (PADR step 3) associated with the drought/food problem. Further information could then be gathered by interviewing community leaders and government officials in order to understand more clearly the dynamic pressures and underlying causes (PADR step 4) contributing to the food problem.

Finally, the two processes can be combined (*Umoja* stage 3 and 4, and PADR step 5). An action plan is developed on the basis of suggestions from members of the community. This should rely on the resources of the community, with the possibility of technical assistance from the NGO and service provision by the government. Specific people in the community should take responsibility for specific tasks, and a drought action committee (or similar) may be needed. The responsibility of leading the process should be shared among a number of people and not fall solely upon the shoulders of the pastor, as he or she has many other responsibilities.

The PADR process can also be used by churches separately from *Umoja*, using a facilitator and the various groups existing within the church. Hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities can be identified and action plans developed – particularly ways in which the church can help its members to prepare for and recover from disaster. Ideally, the process should then spread beyond the church and bring the wider community into the plan. A paper entitled *The local church and its engagement with disaster*, which was published by Tearfund in July 2009, is based on 12 case studies from around the world. *Disasters and the local church*, published in 2011, provides detailed guidance for church leaders in disaster-prone areas.

9.2 PADR in urban contexts

Threats and hazards

When PADR was piloted in an urban environment, the team found that the term 'threat' was more readily understood than 'hazard'. The facilitation team therefore adopted slightly different terminology. People living in that urban slum regarded their greatest threats as:

■ Forced eviction from the slum (by bulldozer) due to illegal settlement.

■ Riots and other forms of violence, such as domestic violence.

■ Theft by neighbouring slum dwellers or people from outside.

People often felt threatened by the action of other people, rather than by natural hazards. Step 2 therefore became 'Threat assessment' rather than 'Hazard assessment'. Different opinions were expressed during the threat assessment concerning the importance of each threat. Prioritisation had to be done carefully in order to gain ownership by everyone.

As well as threats, there were still some specific hazards for an urban environment.

For example:

■ Fire, due to the houses being built very close together.

■ Flood, due to the location of the settlement on marshy land or to inadequate drains, or because the presence of roads and other artificial surfaces gives less opportunity for rainwater to drain away.

■ Earthquake, potentially a greater risk in towns and cities, as there are more multi-storey buildings, often built to low building specifications.

Local people identified the following threats: malaria, fire, flood, crime and demolition. Malaria was selected as the most important.

During the vulnerability assessment, the following vulnerabilities were identified:

• Element at risk: human lives.

• Vulnerable conditions: stagnant water in which mosquitoes can breed.

• Pressure: local authority does not remove rubbish, which then blocks drains.

• Underlying cause: the local authority will not take action because the settlement is illegal and likely to be demolished.

Action planning included involving local people in clearing the drains themselves, providing education about making and using mosquito nets, and advocacy with local authorities to legalise the settlement or provide suitable alternatives.

Social structures

There is often less cooperation and unity among urban people than in rural areas. People become separated from traditional networks and other social structures such as village councils, farmers' cooperatives and informal social gatherings of women.

Urban slums often consist of people from many different places. Even when people have lived in an urban area for many years, they may still have fewer connections with their neighbours than they had in rural areas. One key way to reduce urban vulnerability to disaster is therefore to encourage stronger social groupings and to develop a culture of mutual help and support.

Capacities and vulnerabilities

While people in urban areas may have fewer social capacities, they do have other resources which often do not exist in rural areas. For example, they may be nearer to emergency services or closer to high-quality medical facilities. There is the possibility of good schools and other government and NGO services.

However, there is a difference between 'availability' and 'access'. The facilities might be present, but people in the urban slums may remain vulnerable if they have no access to them. Slum dwellers may live near a health centre, but may be excluded if they cannot afford the fees. Emergency services may exist, but a fire truck may not be able to penetrate an urban slum if the streets are too narrow. Development of social capacities, such as a local fire committee and volunteer team, may be a more effective solution for reducing fire risk than reliance on a fire truck.

One of the impacts of climate change is the enforced migration of more people to high-risk locations around the cities. For example, rising sea levels and river bank erosion mean that many poor people can no longer live in their homes or continue with their farming as homesteads and land are lost to the sea. While migrants have high hopes when they move to the cities, their vulnerability can be greater in the slums and their capacities less than in their former rural homes.

9.3   PADR and conflict

PADR is mainly designed for natural hazards, particularly for those which recur persistently year after year. When the most significant hazard facing a community is conflict-related, PADR may not be the best approach to use, especially if dealing with people displaced from their home environment. Other tools related to conflict analysis and peace-building may be more appropriate, for example, conflict mapping, time lines and conflict trees, and a conflict analysis methodology has been developed for DFID.[12] Tearfund has also published ROOTS 4 – *Peace-building within our communities*, available from www.tearfund.org/tilz.

If people are still in their own homes in a conflict zone, PADR can be used, but it is important to remember some key principles, especially when working with focus groups. These include:

■ Sensitivity – especially if people begin to recall painful memories.

■ Neutrality – so that PADR is not seen to be helping one side or the other. Seek to gather information from the different parties involved.

■ Confidentiality – not revealing any information that may give an advantage to the opposing side or put individuals in danger.

When assessing hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities, the process should be as specific as possible, rather than dealing with conflict as a whole. For example, the hazard should not be listed as 'war', but as 'attacks on the village at night', 'aerial bombing' or 'landmines'. Vulnerabilities might include conflict-specific issues such as lack of mobility, lack of safe shelters, or absence of warning systems. Capacities might include peacekeeping forces, refugee or IDP camps, emergency supplies, or a bomb shelter.

Focus groups

Facilitators should be aware that community members or powerful people may be suspicious of focus groups. It is important that everyone linked to the community is aware of the PADR process and its purpose, so that they do not feel threatened. It may be wise to choose a suitable time and place for focus groups to meet in private, in case they want to discuss sensitive issues. Try to ensure that such discussions are used to strengthen peace and not used by fringe elements as an opportunity to increase tensions. Skilled facilitation is needed.

Key informants

Ensure that key informants are drawn from people on all sides of the conflict, so that differing views can be heard and understood. Be aware that sometimes national government or international groups seek to use or to increase local tensions in order to achieve their own objectives.

Capacity assessment

Some local capacities may have been negatively affected by the insecurity. For example, traditional grazing lands may no longer be available, or areas where firewood used to be gathered may have become too dangerous. Be aware also that in conflict situations, one side

12 DFID (2002)
Conducting conflict assessments: guidance notes

may deliberately target the capacities (especially natural resources and infrastructure) of the other.

In the discussions, encourage people to identify these lost capacities as well as the ones which they are currently able to use. Any suggestion of 'winning back' capacities by violent means should be gently rebuffed, as it is likely only to inflame the conflict. However, action planning can look for ways of regaining capacities by peaceful means or ways of developing alternatives to those which have been lost.

Action planning

If there is no established group to take the action plan forward, it may be necessary to focus planning on the household level rather than the community as a whole. Household contingency plans to avoid or escape from attack should be considered if this level of violence is still expected. This can include assembling an emergency 'quick-run' bag, or agreeing regrouping points in the bush for scattered/divided family groups. Community-based warning systems might also be possible.

9.4   PADR in post-disaster situations

The main use of PADR is in a pre-disaster context, anticipating the expected appearance or reappearance of a hazard. It works best in situations where the hazard is a regular, perhaps annual, visitor to the community. However, the process can also be used after a disaster in order to improve the quality and sustainability of relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction work.

Traditionally, disaster relief agencies carry out damage and needs assessments after a disaster. The aim is to save lives, repair damage and restore some 'normality' to the situation. However, there are problems with this narrow approach:

■ It focuses on short-term needs, rather than seeing the long-term failures in development which contributed to the disaster.

■ Local capacities can be damaged if people are treated as helpless victims.

■ Relief dependency can be created if people rely too much on outside help.

■ If the underlying causes of the disaster are not understood, relief work can sometimes rebuild the same risks that enabled the disaster, or it may create new risks.

PADR can be used to uncover the vulnerability factors which contributed to the disaster. The process is best introduced towards the end of the emergency relief phase, or at the start of early recovery. It should be carried out before any reconstruction of houses, infrastructure or livelihoods. If time does not permit a full PADR, the following condensed form can be used. Questions in section B will need to be developed for the specific local context, based upon answers in section A. For example, if the individual impact is that 30 people died, then the section B question becomes 'Why did those deaths occur?' (The answer might be lack of warnings, lack of swimming skill, weak buildings etc.)

Simplified/ condensed PADR in post-disaster situations

The following questions can be discussed in focus groups (at least one female group as well as a male group).

HAZARD ASSESSMENT

1 What are the main types of hazard affecting this community, in addition to the one they have just experienced?

2 When have disasters occurred in the past?

3 What areas of the community were affected? To what extent?

4 What warning signs or signals indicated that a hazard was approaching?

5 Is the frequency or intensity of the hazards increasing or decreasing?

VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT

1 In the recent disaster, what was the impact of the hazard on the different areas of community life?

• Individual – impact on life and health?

• Social – impact on family life, social events, leadership?

• Physical – impact on houses, roads, bridges?

• Natural – impact on natural resources (water, forest, grass, animals)?

• Economic – impact on livelihoods or financial situation?

2 Why did the disaster have this impact on the community?

• Any lack of knowledge, skills or health services?

• Any social divisions, or groups not functioning, or lack of leadership?

• Any weakness in house construction, or poor location of buildings?

• Any shortage of, or restricted access to, natural resources?

• Any shortage of income, savings or credit facilities?

3 What were the critical missing items – the things which would have greatly helped people to cope better with the hazard (eg boats, tools, warnings etc)?

CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

1 How did the community cope with this recent major disaster? (In the five categories)

• Individual – what skills or knowledge were particularly useful in the community?

• Social – what social groupings and leadership structures were very helpful?

• Physical – what buildings, roads and bridges were useful during the crisis?

• Natural – what natural resources were drawn upon? Were any new ones used?

• Economic – what financial coping mechanisms were used (eg alternative livelihoods, sale of assets, usage of savings)?

2 Think about the ways people used to cope with disaster in the past. Were any of those coping mechanisms not available in the recent disaster? Why are they no longer used?

3 Have there been any schemes or projects in the past to reduce disaster risk? Have these been successful or have they failed? Why?

ACTION PLANNING

In the focus groups, discuss the questions:

1 Based on the above analysis, what actions could the community take which would help its members to cope better if the same or a similar hazard appeared in future? For example:

• Develop a warning system.

• Build stronger social groups and volunteer teams.

• Improve design of buildings.

• Increase availability of natural resources.

• Improve or protect water supply.

• Change agricultural practices.

• Initiate savings groups.

2 Which actions could be taken without outside help – and which actions need outside help? (Assign tasks to individuals, if possible with a time-frame.) What action or input from government is required?