

## Chapter – VIII:

# Capacity Building

*Effective disaster management requires trained manpower to deal with complex situations effectively and rapidly to reduce the impact of disaster on human life and property. It is necessary to continuously undertake measures to build capacity amongst those who are handling disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, reconstruction and also create awareness amongst the people. In terms of the national policy 2009, the approach to capacity building includes awareness generation, education, training, research and development.*

### 8.1 National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM)

In the backdrop of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, a National Centre for Disaster Management was established at New Delhi in 1995. It was re-constituted as National Institute of Disaster Management in February 2007. NIDM had four academic divisions viz. Geo-Hazard Division, Hydro-Met Hazard Division, Policy Planning & Cross Cutting Issues Division and Response Division.

#### 8.1.1 Mandate of NIDM

NIDM is the apex body for training and research in the area of Disaster Management. It is also responsible for documentation and development of national level information base relating to Disaster Management policies, prevention mechanisms and mitigation measures.

#### 8.1.2 Disaster Management Centres in states

Government of India through NIDM supported the Disaster Management Centers (DMCs) of the Administrative Training Institutes (ATIs) and other nodal institutes nominated by the states. The training programmes of these centers and NIDM were developed through an annual

training conference attended by the Relief Commissioners of the states, Director Generals of the ATIs, and representatives of the concerned nodal Ministries and Departments of the Government of India.

#### 8.1.3 Training programmes of NIDM

NIDM imparted training to Central and State Government officers, engineers, architects, civil defence volunteers, public health workers, grass root level functionaries, teachers and school children, etc. The different format in which training was imparted by NIDM included:

- ❖ face-to-face training,
- ❖ web- based training,
- ❖ satellite based training, and
- ❖ capacity building programme for engineers and architects in earthquake risk management.

During 2007-08 to 2011-12, NIDM conducted 375 in-house training programmes covering 10413 participants. Under the capacity building programme on earthquake risk management, 1361 architects and 2528 engineers were imparted training. Similarly, 106448 participants were

imparted training by DMC of Administrative Training Institutes of states.

We noted the following deficiencies in the functioning of NIDM:

### 8.1.3.1 Implementation of capacity building programmes

During 2004-05, MHA launched programmes of National Programme for Capacity Building of Engineers in Earthquake Risk Management (NPCBEERM) and National Programme for Capacity Building of Architects in Earthquake Risk Management (NPCBAERM).

#### Capacity Building of Architects in Earthquake Risk Management:

**Purpose:** The project was to ensure seismically safer habitats by training of practicing architects.

**Duration of the project:** June 2004 to May 2007.

**Target:** Training to 250 faculty members at National Resource Institutes (NRIs). These institutions were to undertake training programme for 10000 architects.

**Project Cost:** ₹ 4.51 crore.

#### Capacity Building of Engineers in Earthquake Risk Management:

**Purpose:** The project was to ensure seismically safe construction by training of the civil and structural practicing engineers.

**Duration of the project:** April 2004 to March 2007.

**Target:** 420 faculty members of various State Resource Institutes (SRIs) to be trained at NRIs. These SRIs were to undertake training programmes for 10000 engineers.

**Project Cost:** ₹ 12.36 crore.

The programme was reviewed by the MHA in February 2007. Due to significant shortfalls in achievement of the targets, the programme was extended for three more years but implementation was transferred to NIDM from June 2008.

We noted that MHA and NIDM failed to successfully implement the projects as the physical and financial targets were not achieved. Only 349 architects and 1171 engineers were trained (June 2008) as against 10000 of each category targeted.

In December 2010, MHA decided not to extend the programme any further and asked for refund of unspent balance. At that time there was a shortfall of 86 per cent and 75 per cent shortfall in the training of practicing engineers and architects respectively.

We noted that initially funds were released to the Relief Commissioners but there was no coordination with them. Out of total releases of ₹ 9.05 crore utilisation certificates amounting to ₹ 3.13 crore were pending (August 2012). It might have been more useful to have modules of Earthquake Risk Management in the course content of Civil engineering and architectures colleges in consultation with professional bodies concerned.

MHA stated (September 2012) that the programme could not run successfully due to non availability of engineers and architects for training. They stated that future training programmes for capacity building would be designed keeping in mind the availability of the trainees and the lessons learnt from the schemes.

### 8.1.3.2 Deficient functioning of ATIs

In February 2008, MHA approved a non-Plan scheme for extending financial assistance to the Administrative Training Institutes (ATIs) and State Training Institutes. Under the scheme, assistance of ₹ 25 crore was released over a period of five years to develop Centre of Disaster Management in these institutes. NIDM was to implement it up to 31 March 2012. Thereafter the State Governments/UT Administrations and institutes concerned were to take over the responsibility of operation of the Centres.

The Disaster Management Centre (DMC) was to act as focal point at the state and UT level for imparting training in the field of disaster management. Each institute was to conduct a minimum of 20 training programmes with an average of 20 participants in each programme, in consultation with NIDM with total duration of not less than 100 working days a year.

We noted that NIDM had released only ₹ 17.08 crore, of which, ₹ 15.89 crore was utilised by ATIs and utilisation certificates amounting to ₹ 1.20 crore were pending (August 2012).

We further noted that during 2007-08 to 2011-12, 106448 participants were imparted training under the scheme. In the five years of its execution, percentage of shortfall ranged from 45 to 76 *per cent*, with 2 to 10 ATIs not conducting any training program at all. Details are in **Annex - 8.1**.

Despite annual meeting of NIDM with the ATIs, successful implementation of the scheme could not be ensured. There was

no impact and evaluation study to ascertain the extent of targeted benefits delivered at the closure of the scheme.

MHA stated (December 2012) that the scheme did not provide assistance/support for creation of faculty positions on regular basis in the Centres of the State ATIs. As a result many of the Centres were not able to fill in the faculty positions which led to poor performance in conducting training programmes and also less expenditure on pay and allowances.

### 8.1.4 Poor implementation of IDRN portal

MHA developed India Disaster Resource Network (IDRN) portal with the support of UNDP and launched it in 2004 through National Informatics Centre (NIC).

#### India Disaster Resource Network

IDRN was a web portal designed to systematically build up an organised information system of specialist equipment and expertise for disaster response. This was to enable disaster managers to identify the location of the resources and access it for disaster response with the minimum loss of time.

The nodal authorities (District Collector or DDMA) were responsible for updating the inventory data. It was a live system and was to serve as a useful tool for disaster preparedness and response.

MHA entrusted (June 2008) NIDM with the responsibility of updating and maintaining the portal but two posts that were created in MHA were not transferred to NIDM. We noted that the portal was being managed without any dedicated staff. We also noted that the states encountered problems in

logging into the portal and uploading their databases.

It was mandatory to carry out a security audit of the portal periodically by a specialised external agency. We found that no such audit had taken place after 2004, despite repeated warnings by NIC. The red flag raised by the NIC regarding serious threats to the portal had also not been addressed (August 2012).

MHA stated (December 2012) that NIDM had recruited one computer programmer on contract basis to maintain IDRN portal and services of NIC were being requisitioned.

The inventory of resources was thus vulnerable and its reliability in a disaster situation was uncertain.

### 8.1.5 Evaluation of academic and training programmes

The academic and training programmes of NIDM had never been evaluated by an independent agency.

MHA stated (December 2012) that Governing Body of the NIDM in its meeting held in July 2012 had directed to NIDM explore possibilities of engaging Institutions/experts for impact evaluation of training programmes of NIDM, and action was being taken accordingly.

### 8.1.6 NIDM related issues

#### 8.1.6.1 Shortfall in meetings

As per NIDM Rules and Regulations 2006, the Institute<sup>1</sup> was to meet at least once in

<sup>1</sup> Institute is the apex body of NIDM. It comprises the Minister in charge of MHA as ex-officio president, vice chairman of NDMA as vice president ex-officio, one

every year. The Governing Body<sup>2</sup> was to hold its meetings at least once in three months.

We noted that the Institute met only once in April 2007 and the Governing Body met six times during June 2007 to July 2012 as against requirement of 24. Shortfall in the meetings delayed the adoption of Service Rules, finalisation of Recruitment Rules and engagement of an agency for evaluation of training programmes and overall impact assessment.

### 8.1.6.2 Manpower management in NIDM

NIDM was sanctioned 57 posts to carry out its mandated work of capacity building. A detailed analysis of sanctioned strength and year-wise men in position disclosed that NIDM had never functioned with its full capacity as many of the critical posts of Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and Researchers were lying vacant at the end of each financial year. This impacted the completion of the targeted programmes. The details are in **Annex - 8.2.**

#### Restructuring NIDM:

In the Governing Body meeting (July 2012) the need to restructure NIDM was expressed as there was no representation of experts dealing with forest fires, coastal hazards, and biological disasters in the academic structure.

member of NDMA, chairperson of NEC and secretaries of different Ministries/Departments as ex-officio members, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Governing body of NIDM comprises 16 members chaired by Vice Chairperson of NDMA.

MHA stated (December 2012) that draft recruitment rules were being framed to fill

the faculty position.

## 8.2 Pilot project on capacity building in disaster management

A pilot project on “Capacity Building in Disaster Management” for government officials and representatives of local bodies at district Level was implemented through an MoU between Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) and NDMA in February 2010 at an estimated cost of ₹ 2.18 crore. The duration of the project was 12 months.

This project was to be undertaken in 55 districts of selected 11 states identified on the basis of their vulnerability to various natural and manmade hazards. Since the project was not completed in time, NDMA, at the request of IGNOU, extended the project timelines thrice between September 2011 and September 2012. The project was still in progress (September 2012).

We noted that NDMA awarded the project through an agreement without a penalty clause, thereby giving undue advantage to

IGNOU. Delay in implementation of this project had also affected the future plans of capacity building in disaster management across the country.

MHA stated (December 2012) that it was a pilot project without having much knowledge on various activities. As various inputs were added in the project at various stages by different stake holders, as it advanced during its execution, these added delays in the project. Delay in the project did not derail the capacity building efforts rather it enhanced the capacity building efficiency of the project. It further added that the pilot project was an educational endeavour and IGNOU not being a commercial organization they did not insist on ‘Liquidated Damages’ clause. However, future projects would be designed based on the experience of this pilot project.

## 8.3 Capacity Building efforts in states

The audit findings relating to capacity building efforts at the state level are described below:

### 8.3.1 Utilisation of capacity building grants by the states

Thirteenth Finance Commission had recommended a grant of ₹ 525 crore for building capacity within the administrative machinery for better handling of disaster response and for preparation of state and district level disaster management plans.

Guidelines of the scheme for release and utilisation of grant-in-aid for capacity building for disaster response was issued by Ministry of Finance in October 2010.

‘On account’ payment of first instalment of grant-in-aid amounting to ₹ 105 crore to 28 states was released in October 2010.

We noticed shortcomings and critical gaps in capacity building efforts undertaken in the states selected for test check.

- Ministry of Finance had released ₹ 6 crore to Rajasthan (October 2010) under the scheme. The State Government debited this central grant under "Search and Rescue" to credit the previous expenditure of ₹ 6.75 crore and show the grant as utilised to avoid lapse. During 2011-12, funds amounting to ₹ 6 crore were released by MoF of which only ₹ 3.47 crore was utilised, again by making a transfer entry to credit the previous expenditure incurred for "Search and Rescue", and funds of ₹ 2.53 crore remained unutilised. Disaster Management & Relief Department of Rajasthan Government stated (July 2012) that grant of ₹ 2.53 crore remained unutilised due to late issue of new parameters by Government of India. The reply is not relevant as the department debited the central grant of ₹ 9.47 crore (2010-11 and 2011-12) to avoid lapse of grant through transfer entry to meet the excess expenditure of some other head instead of spending it on capacity building.
- In Andhra Pradesh, funds amounting to ₹ 6 crore receivable during 2011-12 under the scheme were not received till March 2012 due to non approval of plans by Government of India. Reasons for non approval were mismatch of funds among different components and delay in submission of plans/ proposals.
- West Bengal was provided grants of ₹ 5 crore, from the year 2010-11 under the scheme. The three test checked districts received (February 2011) ₹ 1.40 lakh each for various training programmes. In Birbhum, school safety training was not conducted while in Darjeeling, funds were

kept in the accounts and no training was conducted.

### **8.3.2 Training and mock drills**

- In West Bengal, capacity building was taken up under Disaster Risk Mitigation Programme-II which was in operation in six districts (out of which two were test checked districts-Birbhum and Darjeeling). Though the programme implemented from April 2008 was to be completed by March 2011, it lagged behind and was still in operation. Training, however, was not conducted for vulnerable sections of society like patients, students, fishermen and farmers in any of the three test checked districts. Further, students could have been sensitized in disaster management by introducing it in school curriculum. This was yet to be done.
- Comprehensive annual training program to impart training to officials and sections of society in the UT of Andaman and Nicobar Island was not prepared by the Directorate of Disaster Management (DDM). Only a training program was prepared which was yet to be approved by the UT Administration. Consequently, no training was conducted by DDM (July 2012).
- Training schedule was prepared by Odisha State Disaster Management Authority (OSDMA) to train the officials involved in disaster management in a phased manner. No such training was organised at the state level for learning the emergency skills. However, on four occasions during 2007-12, resource persons from the OSDMA were deputed to various District Emergency Operation Centres for imparting training on request.

During 2008-09, in 111 Multipurpose Cyclone Shelters of six coastal districts, five types of training were given to local people (orientation training: 4440, search and rescue: 2775, first aid: 2775, operation and maintenance of equipment: 222). However, no such training were imparted thereafter (June 2012). We further noted that other lead agencies like Home Guards, National Cadet Corps (NCC), National Services Scheme (NSS), Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS), and revenue personnel were not imparted any such training at the state or district level. Medical personnel were not trained in hospital preparedness for emergencies or in mass causality incident management.

- In Odisha, only five mock drills were conducted during 2007-12 at four locations by Odisha Disaster Rapid Action Force personnel as a preparatory measure, and one joint exercise/mock drill was organised on train accidents. However, in these mock drills there was no involvement of agencies such as medical

department, home guards, fire services, etc.

- In Tamil Nadu, the Fire and Rescue Services Department conducted mock drills at the district level for fire prevention and mock drills for rescuing flood affected victims. However, mock drills and community awareness for other disasters like earth quake especially in the state capital which was in seismic Zone-III were neither contemplated nor carried out.

- In Uttarakhand, two training programmes on primary health for Haridwar and Rudraprayag districts were organised in 2007-08 and 2009-10 in which 196 trainees participated. It was also noticed that no master trainers were trained to impart training to the staff at the district, block and village levels engaged in the prevention and mitigation of disaster management. Medical personnel were also not trained in hospital preparedness for emergencies or mass causality incident management.

### ***Recommendations:***

- ***The academic and training programmes of NIDM need to be evaluated for providing an assurance that stated objectives and value for money had been achieved.***
- ***The implementation of IDRN needs to be firmed up and the inventory data of resources needs to be updated.***
- ***Expeditious steps are required to fill the critical vacant posts in NIDM so that adequate training programmes are conducted.***

