7

This section responds to the basic questions asked by practitioners and other actors involved in the process of elaborating and validating the framework and toolkit.

Q&A

TOPIC: GENERAL

Who is this framework and toolkit for?
This framework and toolkit are first and foremost for practitioners working on people-centred DRM/DRR. The contents of the resources assume that audiences have experience in the sector, such as DIPECHO partners do, but that they want to build their capacity on inclusion. Within this, the framework and toolkit should be especially relevant to project managers, project coordinators, technical and policy advisors in charge of designing, implementing and evaluating DRM/DRR initiatives at all levels and working on different components of integral approaches to DRM/DRR. During the elaboration and validation process, we also found that government, academics and other actors found the framework a useful approach to their own work on DRM. It was also found helpful to talk about inclusion in other sectors, such as education, or health. There are many ideas of how to make the framework "speak" to other actors in the toolkit (check section Using the framework for...".

What is inclusion?
Inclusion is about "being in", i.e. to have the possibility to engage with others, and to have a say on an issue, or to take part in joint action. Like being in a "circle". As there can be many types of such circles, it is important to ask "inclusion into what?" and "included by whom?".

What is inclusive DRM?
Inclusive DRM ensures the full and meaningful participation of all groups and individuals in identifying and reducing risk. In doing so, it promotes equality of rights and opportunities in the face of risk appreciating and responding to people´s diverse characteristics, capacities and vulnerabilities. By removing barriers that keep excluded people out and transforming power relations, it contributes to everybody´s resilience. The bottom line of inclusive DRM is that everybody is safer, and no one is left aside.

Don´t we need to make a case for inclusive DRM?
In the process of elaborating the framework, many practitioners and government officials were consulted if they thought there was a need to make a stronger the case for inclusion. People said that the challenge was not to convince people about the need to make DRM inclusive, but to show how to go about this. This is what the toolkit aims to show.

Is this framework for inclusive DRM or also inclusive DRR?
Both disaster risk management and disaster risk management are integral approaches to reduce disaster risk and disaster losses. The difference between can be subject of discussion, as there are some schools of thoughts that make more distinctions between them than others. But any such differences do not affect the applicability of the framework to each of these approaches. The framework focuses on what "inclusion" is in the context of any work to reduce risk and diminish disaster impacts. Moreover, because the framework focuses on inclusion, it can be adapted to any other sector. The toolkit is "DRM/DRR" specific in that it is constructed on the base of DRM/DRR examples and processes within the areas of work that DIPECHO partners have greater experience.

TOPIC: DIMENSIONS OF INCLUSION

Are all the dimensions of inclusion equally actionable?
All ingredients are equally actionable. How much you do on each, will depend on your vision, your ambition, your capacities and your context, at a given time.

Why do the dimensions of inclusion appear in a different order along the toolkit?
The four dimensions are essential aspects of inclusion that travel together, not steps to follow in a particular order. The toolkit presents them in a certain order. However, in some parts of the toolkit we have intentionally changed this order, so that readers remember that they can go in any order. They are not a sequence of actions but things we want to see in each step of what we do to call our DRM work "inclusive".

What can I use the dimensions for?
For anything you can imagine! To guide the assessment, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a DRM initiative. To collect evidence for advocacy, to frame discussions for learning, as a health check of government policies, or that of your own organization. In the framework and toolkit there are many examples of what you can use it for, especially under the section "Using the framework to..."

How can I share the 4 dimensions with the communities?
The framework was designed primarily for practitioners. However, the framework and toolkit can be adapted to discuss inclusion with communities and any other stakeholder. The dimensions and levels within each are illustrated in a set of cartoons to make this easier. The text in the cartoons is short and each cartoon has an accompanying description of the "features" is represents. This description can be used as a guidance to draw new cartoons that speak more to each local context. The cartoons can be changed as long as they depict and capture the "features" for each level.

Why do I need to look at all 4 dimensions instead of selecting the ones that are more important for me?
Inclusion requires all four dimensions. They are "essentials" to any DRM action. What you can choose is how to combine them (more of one, less of another). If you are blind to one dimension, your work will not be inclusive. But if you do not tackle a dimension but you are aware of it, your work might still qualify as "inclusive DRM". For example, you might chose not to challenge sensitive social norms at the beginning of your engagement in a community, and rather work to create trust and opportunities to tackle them at a later stage. What matters is that your long term strategy for engagement looks at all 4 dimensions.

Why cannot we have quantitative indicators for each level of achievement for the dimensions?
An indicator alone – quantitative or qualitative – cannot capture the quality of inclusion. For example, e.g. 50% of participating women in group meeting. This indicator could only have meaning if we know: Is it easy to bring them in meetings in this context? Who are these women? Better off ones or really the most marginalized ones? Do they actually have a say in the meeting? And can they act on it? Are they likely to continue coming? A regional framework cannot answer these questions for each particular context. In the section "4 dimensions" there is text box with more points to discuss on this. The bottom line is that the dimensions will lead you to ask questions about what inclusions you are realizing. And these questions will lead you to design your indicators.

Why is the dimension called "participation in decision-making" and not just "participation"?
Participation is a very broad concept, which is understood in many different ways. In this framework, "participation" applies to all dimensions. Tailoring approaches, removal of barriers, recognition of diversity all involve participation. Other forms of participation (like being involved in one activity) are also important for DRM. "Participation in decision-making" spells out one specific aspect of participation. It means that people are able to influence the decisions that affect and can renegotiate power relations that underpin exclusion.

ASSESSING THE LEVEL OF INCLUSION IN DRM PRACTICES

What do you mean by "DRM practices"?
By "practices" we mean any DRM initiative or activity, in any specific area, at any level, by any actor. The important thing is that it needs to look like a "practice"; that is, it must be boiled down to the level of detail that will allow to "see" what the initiative or activity is about and how it was done. For example, "mobilising people" or "raising awareness" are not practices, because we cannot see what it is meant. In general, the jargon stops us from picturing what we are talking about. We need to describe the work so that we can tell "how" people were mobilized, step by step. Then we can assess if this process was inclusive.

How can I use the scoring?
The scoring alone is meaningless. It is the entire assessment what matters; the scoring and justification, the assessing whether the level of achievement is good enough, identifying what else could be done and documenting how change happened (or did not happen. If we are unable to show any change, documenting what we did becomes very relevant for learning).
What do we do if different people score the dimensions differently for the same DRM "practice"?
It is very likely that different people will score things differently. Their understanding of the dimension will be different, and they will interpret the information they have in various ways. You can focus on the "because" and check if the case is strong enough to justify the scoring. The description of each level and the cartoons should allow you to identify the strengths of the practice and to what extent the features of each dimension are present.

If the assessment can be subjective, will I be able to compare results over time?
You can use the assessment to track progress in time applying the framework to your work over the years. The scoring might be subjective, because you did not have a good understanding of the dimension, or because you understood it too well and realized that its potential was not achieved. However, the narrative, the story you tell, can allow you track change in the way a DRM initiative or activity was conceived and implemented, from an inclusion perspective. It does not matter if, for example, the second time you apply the assessment the score is lower because you increased your capacity to challenge yourself or notice forms of exclusions that you did not consider at the start. What you want is to tell the story of your effort. This is what counts.
How were the levels of achievement defined?
The levels were inspired by real examples from DRM initiatives in the region and beyond. The features of each level were discussed in meetings and workshops with practitioners. The final fine-tuning was influenced by the "power cube", a framework that defines different levels of power, which underpins inclusion/exclusion dynamics. You can find a link to this framework in the section "4 dimensions of inclusive DRM" and and the Tools Catalogue.

Are the higher levels of achievement realistic?
Higher levels are aspirational. That is, it will be probably very hard to find many examples of those levels in our practice today. They represent a level of achievement that we should aim for, and that we think could be attainable in the future. Notwithstanding that there will always be room to become more inclusive, even after that! This should not be considered frustrating. It is actually more honest, and might help us to conceive long term strategies required to achieve this ambition.

Does a higher level of achievement require having gone through the others to get there?
No, you do not need to go through lower levels of achievement first. Levels of achievement are representations of different scenarios of inclusion, not steps or a process.. A DRM intervention can well start at level of achievement 2 or 3 because of the way it was designed and implemented, without having gone through the processes depicted in lower levels.
Can a "practice" score low on ingredient and very high in another?
It is likely that practice will score differently in different levels. A practice can be very strong in recognizing diversity but the approach might be still very much blanket cover and therefore it will rank low on "tailored approach". Likewise, "participation in decision making" can be ranked very high, but if only one group is participating, "recognition of diversity" will be low because diversity was not recognized.

Will people become frustrated if they do not score high?
The framework was designed as a thinking tool, to challenge our mindsets, promote critical reflection and learning. The framework helps us visualizing how the work could look like. It does not say "this is easy". Otherwise we would not have identified the need to strengthen our capacities to work inclusively in DRM. This framework and toolkit arise from the realization that inclusion, when working in the challenging contexts where we operate, is actually hard to achieve, and takes time, effort, expertise. Frustration can only arise if the framework is misunderstood. If it is used how it was indented, in a practice that scores low practitioners will be able to see the opportunities that lie ahead to become more inclusive. And this will be good news...

How can we track impact without number-based indicators?
Number-based indicators do hardly even track impact. They can measure how many people attended a meeting or a rally, or how many people received training. But this does not equal "change", which is what you need to show in order to speak about impact. Impact is the positive change that results from what you do. In this context, it is the difference between what it was before, and how is it now as a result of efforts done, in terms of inclusion and safety of people at risk. In order to use numbers to monitor that change, you would need to set up very complex statistical systems and even then, you would not be able to explain how change took place. And if you can explain it, you cannot attribute it to your actions. This is why the framework focuses on the explanation of the process as a means to measure efforts.

CARTOONS

What are the cartoons?
Cartoons illustrate scenes that represent the different levels of achievement for each dimension of inclusion proposed by the framework. These scenes are examples of each level of achievement. Each level of achievement could have been represented by many other scenes. What is important is to focus on the basic features of the level. These basic features of each level of achievement have been described int eh framework and can be used as guidance to discuss what other scenes could represent that level fo achievement. You can contextualize all cartoons using this guidance.

What can I use the cartoons for?
The cartoons can be used to learn about the dimensions in a fun way. Characters, scenes, issues highlighted, they have all been designed to help us go deeper into the different aspects of each dimension of inclusion without having to resort to long explanations. They can be used in workshops, meetings and presentations to build understanding on inclusion and how it relates to DRM. Cartoons can also be used to score a practice (and by "practice" we mean literally everything we can imagine that relates to DRM, from the smallest activity to an international policy framework). Cartoons can also give us a sense of direction, of "what next", when we look at the higher levels represented. There are many ideas that can inspire practitioners wishing to become more inclusive hinted in the cartoons.

What should I pay attention to when looking at the cartoons?
Every detail of each cartoon is there to represent something. The characters, what they say, where they are, how they talk, to whom, what specific issues are they raising, etc.

What if a cartoon shows something that is also relevant for another ingredient?
All cartoons have elements of other dimensions than the one they are primarily meant to illustrate. This is because the scenes represent real examples and in real life dimensions are interlinked. You can make a note about what you "see" in relation to other dimensions in the cartoon you are analyzing and use this as a discussion point in a training. The key would be to discuss "why" you think that cartoon applies to another dimension. You can also check the cartoon against the features of that other dimension you think it relates to, to see if you can decide to which level it would correspond. This can also be an interesting discussion in a training!

What happens if some of the scenes do not apply to my reality?
The framework was designed to apply to an entire region so cartoons will never apply fully to one particular country or context. This does not have to be a problem as long as you are able to use them to discuss what each dimension might entail and the

features of each level of ambition. However, you can also adapt the cartoons, using the features described for each level as a guidance on what needs to be represented.

What happens if my practice shares some of the features of the cartoon but not all?
If you can see some features of the level of achievement in your practice, but not all of them, look at the cartoon below and check if it better represents where you are. You are allowed to score somewhere in the middle too. What is important is not to become too concerned with the scoring, but pay attention to the case we make to justify it. When making the case you can bring in information (quantitative and qualitative) that will help you realize whether you are at a lower or higher level of ambition.

Where do the cartoons come from?
Cartoons were drawn by one of the consultants who developed the framework in consultation with INCRISD partners. They are inspired by real examples from different countries visited and have been fine-tuned after testing them in workshops.

TOOLKIT

Who is the toolkit for?
The toolkit is aimed at practitioners wishing to improve the quality of inclusion in their DRM work or to promote inclusion in other programmes, projects and policies through advocacy, by building capacity, etc. However, other types of actors (such as government officials) have found it useful. The toolkit can be adapted to be shared with any type of actors engaged in DRM. In the section "Using the framework for…" there are practical tips on how the framework can be used for different activities, and how these activities can be used to share the framework with others. Also, cartoons could be contextualised to be used with local communitiers. The descriptions of the features of each level of achievement explain what the scene needs to represent. As long as this is respected, all cartoons can be replaced with local scenes.

Why is there not checklist of excluded people in the toolkit?
Because of its nature, exclusion cannot be pre-determined or pre-identified through a checklist. To know who is in and who is out, we need to have a process informed by strong context and power analysis. Checklists are a shortcut that does not leave us where we need to go to do inclusive DRM.

What happens if I cannot find the tool that I need in the list?
The list of tools in the toolkit is not exhaustive. It is there to show that there are many tools out there that can be used to work on inclusive DRM. If you need a tool that is different from the ones listed, you can start by checking with your colleagues and partners. There are also many knowledge management portals such as http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional where you can search for specific tools and resources. You can "screen" tools by using the framework to check if they are strong enough for inclusion. If you found one that you liked, please contact info@incrisd.org so that it is added to the toolkit.

Why are there no videos or examples of practices from my country?
Videos are from Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan because those were the countries visited by the team who fine-tuned the framework. It is hoped that the repository will grow over time and include videos and examples from all countries in Asia and beyond.

How can I include my videos in the catalogue?
To include your video in the catalogue please upload it to youtube. Contact info@incrisd.org providing the relevant information for each video and the link so that it can be added to the catalogue. You can look at the catalogue to check what information will be required. If you are unsure about something you can leave that box empty but try to give as much information as you can.

Why is my tool not in the list?
The list includes tools that were proposed by INCRISD and partners and screened by the team who put together the toolkit. New/alternative tools are welcome! If you have another tool to share please send a link and basic information about the tool to info@incrisd.org so that it can go online. You can check the tools catalogue to check what information will be required.
How do I get my practice included in the case studies?
There are guidelines to put together a case study in the toolkit. Please refer to them, put your case study together and send it to info@incrisd.org so that it can go online.

What is the difference between a case study and a success story?
A success story highlights went well and the impact of an initiative or action. Success stories are normally used to show impacts, attract funding or to profile the work of an organization in front of their audiences (including the media) more generally. A case study is an in-depth analysis. It explores both what went well and what did not go so well. Case studies are usually used to capture how change (impact) was achieved for the purpose of learning and critical reflection. The emphasis is on the process, not just the results.

What can I do if I have questions that are not answered in this Q&A or in the toolkit?
You can go to the forum at www.incrisd.org and make your question there so that we can help you.