



Government of Canada
Gouvernement du Canada

Office of Critical
Infrastructure Protection and
Emergency Preparedness

Bureau de la protection
des infrastructures essentielles
et de la protection civile



TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

January 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PURPOSE.....	2
WHAT IS DISASTER MITIGATION?	2
THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY	3
PROPOSED ELEMENTS.....	4
POLICY CONSIDERATIONS	5
GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA	6
FUNDING DISASTER MITIGATION	7
IMPLEMENTING DISASTER MITIAGATION	7
GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY	8
STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION.....	9
<i>Option One - National Coordination of Mitigation Efforts.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Option Two - A National Mitigation Program Management Group.....</i>	<i>11</i>
TABLE 1: POSSIBLE ROLE OF MITIGATION STAKEHOLDERS.....	12
NEXT STEPS	13
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION POINTS.....	14

INTRODUCTION

Canadians in all regions are exposed to risk from natural and human-induced disasters. As natural and social environments change, technological dependencies and interdependencies contribute to the complexity of managing the consequences of disasters. Experience suggests that adverse effects of disasters can be diminished through proactive and sustained risk reduction measures taken before disasters occur.

There are many examples of successful mitigation measures. The Red River Floodway, built in the 1960s, is an example of structural mitigation. Costing just over \$60 million the floodway has been used more than 20 times to reduce flood impacts. During the 1997 Red River Flood alone, it is estimated to have prevented \$6 billion in damages. Examples of non-structural mitigation include public education, preservation of natural environments, flood plain mapping, community relocation, and improved prediction of severe weather. A comparative study of Ontario and Michigan following a severe rainfall event in 1986 concluded that damage in Ontario, from the same storm, was less severe than in Michigan due to Ontario's policies that limited development in floodplains.

The losses prevented by successful mitigation measures have led governments, the private and voluntary sectors, and other stakeholders to believe that mitigation is an investment in Canada's future and not a cost. Accordingly, the Government of Canada is moving forward to develop a national strategy by which all levels of government and interested stakeholders can co-operate effectively to evaluate, prioritize and implement risk and impact reduction measures.

In the fall of 1998, OCIEP¹, in cooperation with the Insurance Bureau of Canada (IBC), conducted five regional workshops and a national conference on mitigation. Participants included a broad range of stakeholders, including not-for-profit organizations, First Nations groups, industry, academia and governments from every jurisdiction. Through these discussions, a consensus was reached that a national mitigation policy is needed.

In 1998, the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Conference of Senior Officials Responsible for Emergency Preparedness² endorsed the proposal that the existing emergency management framework for Canada be expanded to include disaster mitigation and that an appropriate national strategy to implement this expansion be given serious consideration. Since these discussions, pressure has increased from a number of sources for the Government of Canada to lead the development of a disaster mitigation strategy. These groups include: provincial premiers, the Insurance Bureau of Canada, the Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, and the International Joint Commission.

¹ Emergency Preparedness Canada was amalgamated with the Critical Infrastructure Protection Task Force in February 2001, to form the Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness.

² Annual Conference of Assistant Deputy Ministers responsible for emergency management to decide on mutual interest policy issues such as funding and training.

PURPOSE

The Government of Canada supports a collaborative and coordinated approach for disaster mitigation. This document is posted on our web site and forms the key element for a consultation process that will include a continuous dialogue with stakeholders. The consultations are intended to obtain views on the scope, policies and mechanisms for coordinating and implementing disaster mitigation activities in Canada. As a starting point for dialogue, this document provides a concept of disaster mitigation and a rationale for a national disaster mitigation strategy. It proposes a possible mitigation framework and poses questions to stimulate ideas and discussion. The purpose is to encourage better mutual understanding of disaster mitigation and contribute to the formulation of recommendations to the Government of Canada concerning the development in 2002 of a policy framework for Canada's first-ever National Disaster Mitigation Strategy (NDMS).

WHAT IS DISASTER MITIGATION?

Effective emergency management encompasses four pillars:

- **Mitigation** – sustained actions to reduce or eliminate the long-term impacts and risks associated with natural and human-induced disasters;
- **Preparedness** – developing effective policies, procedures and plans for how best to manage an emergency;
- **Response** – actions taken immediately before, during or directly after an emergency occurs; and
- **Recovery** – efforts taken to repair and restore communities after an emergency.

The concept of disaster mitigation is complex enough. Its definition is debated. In the emergency management context, 'preparedness' and 'response' sometimes might be considered 'mitigation'. However, 'preparedness' and 'response' actions are primarily geared toward readiness for dealing with unexpected or imminent events. In contrast, 'mitigation' focuses on sustained measures, implemented well in advance, to avoid or lessen the impact of anticipated disasters (e.g. incorporating policies aimed at vulnerability and risk reduction into daily decision making). Mitigation reduces the risk, impact and reoccurrence of disasters. Mitigation is intended to diminish the response and recovery activities required to manage disasters when they occur. Consequently, mitigation can save lives and minimize damage to property.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

The current focus of emergency management in Canada tends to be centered on preparedness, response and recovery arrangements. Mitigation tends to be an implicit requirement. As a result, the state of preparedness, response, and assistance in Canada is increasingly comprehensive and of high quality with respect to known “routine” emergency situations. Mitigation requires further attention. Mitigation requires enhanced efforts and integration and coordination to complement existing emergency management capabilities. The NDMS will seek to lay the foundation for strengthened mitigation measures, including coordination, collaboration, information sharing and knowledge development.

One in three Canadians live in regions that are susceptible to earthquakes. Many reside in areas subject to flooding. Transportation accidents, hazardous spills and severe storms affect many Canadians each year. These incidents cause death, injury and damage to the economy, society, technological infrastructure and environment which harms the security and wellbeing of citizens. Experts believe that larger natural disasters than have ever been experienced in Canada are inevitable. A key finding of the International Joint Commission's (IJC) final report on Red River flooding concluded that another flood, greater than the 1997 event, is expected. Canadian seismologists have predicted that a major earthquake will occur along Canada's West Coast. Global climate change is expected to increase the risks of certain types of extreme weather and climate events.

Over the past 50 years, significant changes have occurred in our economic, socio-demographic, and technological environment. Increasingly, Canadians choose to live in urban centers that are heavily reliant on technology, highways, airports, harbors, rail lines, dams, and water/sewer pipelines. The infrastructure on which Canadians rely is susceptible to natural disaster. At the same time, advanced computer-based technologies and increased dependencies create new risks and vulnerabilities that warrant ongoing proactive measures. In the face of these increasing and changing risks, a concerted campaign of mitigative action could prevent hazards from becoming disasters.

Catastrophic disasters cause enormous costs to Canadians. In the last five years, Canada experienced three of its most devastating natural disasters. Together, the 1996 Saguenay floods, the 1997 Red River flood, and the 1998 Ice Storms have so far amounted to an estimated \$7.8 billion in costs to governments, private and voluntary sectors³. Losses from less significant disasters and from indirect or unquantifiable costs related to social, institutional and environmental impacts will never be known. If the predicted increase in catastrophic events is true, it is likely that individuals, communities, and governments, will face increased risk of death, suffering, destruction, and cost from disasters. Supporting mitigation efforts could save large expenditures in response and recovery costs incurred due to disasters. In 1995, the U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) estimated that \$1 invested in disaster mitigation saved \$2 in damages.

³ OCIEPEP Disaster Database, 2001

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

The 1998 consultations determined that while Canadians are aware of hazards in their environment, they do not have fully adequate knowledge of the risks and how to mitigate against them. A key message from the consultations was the need for leadership from the Government of Canada and the requirement for cooperative arrangements among all levels of government and with key stakeholders in the area of disaster mitigation.

On September 11, 2001, the world witnessed the terrorist attacks against the United States in New York and Washington that raised fundamental questions about Canada's capacity to protect the safety, security and well-being of Canadians from catastrophic events of a scale rarely seen in this country. The attacks suggest the need for proactive collaboration among all players to examine risks and vulnerability to all hazards and implement measures to reduce Canada's exposure to them.⁴

Our recent experience with major disasters, escalating costs, increasing and changing risks, and stakeholder concerns highlight that the current approach for dealing with disasters could be enhanced by both structural and non-structural mitigation measures to reduce the risks and costs from disasters. The Government of Canada is initiating consultations, in response to these concerns, to investigate mechanisms and policy options for disaster mitigation.

PROPOSED ELEMENTS

The proposed elements of a national disaster mitigation strategy described here are based on the themes and key areas highlighted by the 1998 consultations. The results of these consultations were instrumental in leading to the Government's decision to work towards a national disaster mitigation strategy. The proposed elements listed below provide a focus for dialogue to help determine priorities and activities for a NDMS.

Leadership and Coordination - Decisions that affect societal capacity to resist, respond to and recover from consequences of disaster are made everyday, by many agencies. Disaster mitigation activities occur at all levels of government, the private sector, non-government organizations (NGOs) and communities. Co-ordination of disaster mitigation activities is required among these interests to ensure an integrated approach to managing mitigation. The 1998 consultations highlighted support for Government of Canada leadership and coordination regarding disaster mitigation. The Government of Canada's coordination of Y2K transition activities confirmed the value of systematic coordination to deal with potential disruptions.

Partnership and Shared Responsibility - The 1998 consultations reflected a consensus that disaster mitigation requires partnerships and shared responsibilities. The multiplicity of players and expertise required to address mitigation comprehensively continues to be acknowledged. Partnerships among all levels of government, professional groups and academia, and the private and voluntary sectors are

⁴ The Government of Canada is currently examining the impact of the September 11 attacks on the United States on national public safety and security capacity. Until all aspects can be considered in full detail, prevention and response measures that address terrorism will be considered apart from the NDMS.

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

encouraged to develop consensus on disaster mitigation matters. Partnering should ensure mitigative measures are implemented in a coordinated and efficient way. Local participation and that of other stakeholder groups in disaster mitigation is key to success.

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment - To be effective, any measures to reduce the impact of probable disasters should be taken based on sound risk assessment and hazard identification. Conducting risk assessments can be complex, but they are an essential undertaking. Comprehensive approaches in this area involve historical research, data gathering and scientific estimations about hazard frequency, magnitude, damage potential, and vulnerability of potentially affected peoples and communities.

Research, Information Dissemination, and Decision Support Systems - Research provides useful knowledge and tools upon which disaster mitigation decisions should be based (e.g., risk assessment methodologies, land use practices, building engineering and best practices). Current, accessible, coordinated, and complementary tools will assist better-informed decision making on disaster mitigation.

Public Awareness, Training, and Education - A culture of prevention and risk reduction could ultimately be achieved through sustained public awareness, training, and education programs that encourage governments, decision-makers and individuals to take into account the evolving threat and risk environment and the importance of implementing disaster mitigation measures. Before governments and individuals can reduce their risk from hazards, they need to perceive and understand the threats, associated risks, and the range of contingencies for reducing the risk or impact. Education and awareness programs should be multi-targeted and designed to reach the general public, stakeholders, technical experts and decision-makers.

Incentives and Resources - There must be an incentive for disaster mitigation if it is to become a consideration for all stakeholders. Most mitigation implementation occurs at the local level and requires up-front expenditures for benefits to be attained in the future. However, any mitigation incentives should take into consideration the necessity for broad based multi-level funding among all stakeholders. Mitigation incentives and resources must be sensitive to all federal, provincial, regional, and local concerns and flexible enough to fully support the necessary mitigation activities.

- **What elements should be included in a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?**

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The consultations are intended to contribute to the development of a national disaster mitigation strategy and policy framework within which to coordinate mitigation activities in Canada. Listed below for discussion purposes are preliminary considerations for a policy framework:

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

- a) Disaster mitigation in Canada should be implemented nationally in a consistent and coordinated manner.
- b) OCIPEP should act as the federal lead in coordinating and supporting national disaster mitigation efforts in Canada.
- c) Provincial/Territorial emergency management organizations should assume lead responsibility for coordinating mitigation efforts within provinces and territories.
- d) The NDMS should be flexible and inclusive to permit all jurisdictions to meet key mitigation priorities while observing national objectives and respecting or reinforcing parallel initiatives.
- e) The NDMS should be the basis upon which decisions to implement disaster mitigation measures, in any jurisdiction, will be supported.

- **What policy considerations are relevant to developing a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?**

GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA

Guiding principles and criteria could be developed following the consultations, to provide direction and coordinate the various mitigation initiatives undertaken by governments and stakeholders. The guiding principles would ensure that the objectives of the NDMS are met and that mitigation proposals meet the specified NDMS criteria. The guiding principles would be designed to ensure sufficient flexibility for provinces/territories and stakeholders to develop regional mitigation strategies that are based on priorities identified in their respective jurisdictions, in consultation with local stakeholders.

- **What do you think should be the guiding principles of a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?**
- **What criteria should be used to evaluate respective disaster mitigation proposals?**

FUNDING DISASTER MITIGATION

All governments, the private and voluntary sectors, and individuals have a role to play in disaster mitigation. Since mitigation is a shared responsibility, the consultations should provide insights beyond determining roles, responsibilities and mechanisms for mitigation and help answer questions on whether and how best to fund mitigation and what each stakeholder can do to support the implementation of disaster mitigation in Canada. Options for funding mitigation should take into account the preference for cost-shared arrangements among all levels of governments and key stakeholders. Methods for funding disaster mitigation can only be determined after the consultation process has been completed, when a full range of views have been considered, and once governments have agreed to next steps.

- **How should disaster mitigation initiatives be funded?**
- **What would be a reasonable federal/provincial/territorial cost-sharing arrangement?**
- **What cost-shared initiatives would be most appropriate or effective?**
- **What should be the private sector's contribution?**

IMPLEMENTING DISASTER MITIGATION

Stakeholder participation, availability of financial resources, the range of hazards, and vulnerability to them will influence successful disaster mitigation. In view of these factors, two alternative approaches to establishing the NDMS may be considered:

- a) Include all disasters in the NDMS from its inception.
- b) Phase-in the NDMS by addressing natural disasters first and in subsequent phases include human-induced disasters, based on case-by-case review of merits, affordability and manageability.

The first option is in line with OCIPEP's *all-hazards* approach to managing emergencies and disasters. Implementation of such an option, however, would be an enormous undertaking. The second approach could make initial implementation of the NDMS more manageable and allow incremental expansion over time to other forms of cost-effective disaster mitigation. The NDMS could be implemented to reduce risk and vulnerability over the long-term, in line with available resources, and could include both structural and non-structural mitigation measures. Should the second option be preferred, mitigation of human-induced disasters would continue to be addressed under other existing mechanisms.

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

Current provisions of the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements (DFAA) administered by OCIEPEP cover the costs of returning property to pre-disaster conditions. The Government of Canada, through OCIEPEP, provides funding in accordance with the DFAA to reimburse provinces/territories for expenses related to disaster response and recovery. After 30 years, the Government has launched its first review of the current DFAA guidelines. Any potential mitigation proposals received under the DFAA review will be considered in conjunction with NDMS proposals.

- **How should the National Disaster Mitigation Strategy be implemented to ensure that risk and vulnerability to various kinds of disasters are addressed in a realistic and manageable manner?**
- **What other options for implementation would you propose?**

GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The *Emergency Preparedness Act* serves as the foundation for federal engagement in emergency planning and for the federal government's relationship with other jurisdictions in Canada. The *Act* assigns a wide range of leadership responsibilities to the designated Minister, from training and education to research and development to financial assistance programs. By Order in Council, the Minister of National Defence is the Minister designated as the lead Minister Responsible for Emergency Preparedness under the *Emergency Preparedness Act*.

The legislation also mandates each federal Minister to identify the contingencies affecting his or her portfolio and areas of accountability – and to develop effective plans to address those contingencies. The Solicitor General, for example, is responsible for the National Counter-Terrorism Plan, while the Minister of Health manages the Federal Nuclear Emergency Plan.

Canada's emergency management system is premised on a tiered approach. Municipal/local authorities provide the first level of response, using local police, fire fighting, medical and emergency measures personnel. When the situation exceeds the capacity or resources of a municipality, the province or territory steps in to help, usually under the coordination of their Emergency Measures Organization (EMO's). Ninety-five per cent of disasters in Canada are handled exclusively at the local or provincial levels.

The federal government responds to disasters, when costs per capita exceed certain levels, when provincial or territorial resources are exhausted or when specialized support residing in federal institutions is required – for example, the Canadian Forces or Health Canada's Level 4 laboratory in Winnipeg. Addressing mitigation will require the establishment of similar provincial and territorial arrangements to facilitate national guidance and the coordination and implementation of mitigation measures.

Interdepartmental Mitigation Coordination Committee (IMCC)

Current Status: The Government of Canada has taken the first steps toward national leadership on mitigation. In January of 2001, a federal interdepartmental committee on mitigation, coordinated by OCIEP, was established to compile information on roles, responsibilities, programs and activities related to mitigation in order to assess gaps and overlaps, and evaluate opportunities and priorities for federal government action on mitigation.

Potential Future Role: In the future, this federal interdepartmental committee could serve as a standing committee for the review of internal priorities for the Government of Canada. The committee could help ensure that initiatives are consistent with the NDMS guiding principles and criteria (that may be developed in the future) and complement the goals and objectives of other jurisdictions and stakeholders.

National Disaster Mitigation Strategy Federal/Provincial/Territorial Advisory Group

Current Status: Recognizing the shared responsibilities of federal, provincial and territorial governments, OCIEP has established a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy FPT Advisory Group to address mitigation issues in support of a NDMS. Each province/territory has nominated a representative to the NDMS FPT Advisory Group to oversee the process for identifying respective mitigation priorities.

Potential Future Role: Future roles of the NDMS FPT Advisory Group could include responsibility for reviewing provincial/territorial mitigation initiatives prior to presenting them to the existing Federal/Provincial/Territorial Conference of Senior Officials Responsible for Emergency Preparedness (which has a broad mandate and role). Coordination mechanisms should provide the federal, provincial, territorial governments, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders with a forum for dialogue and to coordinate policy decisions respecting mitigation.

- **What role would you see for the National Disaster Mitigation Strategy Federal/Provincial/ Territorial Advisory Group?**
- **Is there another mechanism you would propose for federal/provincial/territorial coordination?**

STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Meaningful participation by stakeholders (using the term in the broadest sense to include governments, private sector, communities, non-government sectors and others) is essential to the development, implementation and evolution of disaster mitigation activities. Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in these consultations to ensure

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

that proposed initiatives address specific regional and community needs, reinforce mutual objectives, and strengthen the guiding principles and criteria of the NDMS.

Participation in the NDMS could be based on the current tiered approach for managing disaster response and recovery in Canada. The provinces and territories would work collaboratively with local governments and mitigation stakeholders to identify local hazards and identify mitigation gaps, overlaps and priorities within their jurisdictions and bring together decision making and implementation of mitigation measures that support the NDMS. The federal government is seeking clarification in this area on the most appropriate stakeholder roles for implementing a national mitigation strategy.

The following preliminary options set out different ways for stakeholders to participate in the initiative for establishing Canada's first ever NDMS. Options reflect a starting point for dialogue.

Option One - National Coordination of Mitigation Efforts

- To engage local level participation in the creation of a nationally integrated framework for disaster mitigation, local/municipal governments could be encouraged to conduct hazard, risk and vulnerability assessments and to review requirements and priorities for disaster mitigation.
- Coordination mechanisms reporting to the provinces and territories could be established.
- Provinces/territories could bring forward proposals to the NDMS FPT Advisory Group for consideration, prioritization and national coordination of mitigation initiatives.
- The contribution of local/municipal stakeholders could be incorporated into coordination mechanisms at the local/municipal level.
- Regionally and nationally represented stakeholders could participate through the NDMS FPT Advisory Group.
- The NDMS FPT Advisory Group would review proposals to ensure consistency with the NDMS policy framework and criteria. Projects would be supported on an *ad hoc* basis.

Pros

- Foster consistency in developing comprehensive local/regional strategies, while allowing flexibility for jurisdictions and stakeholders to reflect respective vulnerabilities and priorities.
- Provide a basis to begin developing national multi-hazard and risk assessments, which are important elements for a comprehensive, nationally coordinated strategy.
- OCIEP would maintain a leadership and coordinating role as chair of the NDMS FPT Advisory Group and the IMCC.

Cons

- The capacity of governments to develop mitigation plans would vary. We will miss opportunities to develop synergies.
- Stakeholder participation in mitigation may be difficult to coordinate nationally.
- In the absence of a formal body overlooking the coordination of mitigation activities, the NDMS FPT Advisory Group may be overwhelmed.

Option Two - A National Mitigation Program Management Group

- Establishment of a formal program management group in OCIEP to administer the NDMS once a national policy has been adopted.
- Provinces and territories would work in consultation with local authorities and local stakeholders to identify gaps and develop respective disaster mitigation proposals.
- Proposals would be submitted to the program management group for evaluation following provincial/territorial consideration.
- Proposals that meet NDMS policy objectives and conditions could become eligible for assistance on a negotiated cost-shared basis, assuming that such funding is available.

Pros

- Same merits as Option One.
- Provides formal arrangements for coordinating on-going mitigation activities that would not require the NDMS FPT Advisory Group's consideration of proposals.
- Coordination of the program would involve local, provincial/territorial, and federal participation in the process.
- Encourage the use of existing mechanisms for coordination and ensuring local participation.

Cons

- Could be costly to governments.
- Could be difficult to manage given the breadth of activities that would be conducted.
- Would be difficult to ensure the decision process is understood and consistent in all jurisdictions.

- **Which option makes the most sense to you?**
 - **Are there other options that should be considered?**
 - **How should participation of local/municipal authorities be included in the National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?**

There are many possible roles for stakeholders in a NDMS. To build on the two options outlined above, a chart follows for further discussion.

Table 1: Possible Role of Mitigation Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Possible Role
OCIPEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead the development of a NDMS in partnership with stakeholders. • Through the federal interdepartmental committee encourage all departments and agencies to participate into the formulation and implementation of the NDMS. • Facilitate federal/provincial/territorial participation in formulation and implementation of NDMS. • Monitor progress on development of a NDMS and provide core program management support. • Work with federal interdepartmental committee to guide federal government mitigation projects.
Other Federal Government Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate on federal interdepartmental committee. • Complete assessment of roles and responsibilities, and programs and activities. • Evaluate complementarity, gaps and duplication of existing mandates and programs. • Recommend ways to co-ordinate mitigation programs and activities. • Seek federal interdepartmental committee advice and support before submitting proposals to Cabinet for funding individual mitigation initiatives.
Provincial/Territorial Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate on the federal/provincial/territorial NDMS FPT Advisory Group. • Facilitate development of strategic mitigation plans and mechanisms through the NDMS FPT Advisory Group that meet key priorities of the NDMS. • Coordinate provincial/territorial self-assessment of provincial/territorial roles and responsibilities, programs, and activities through EMOs to assess gaps and overlaps in existing programs. • Encourage local governments and municipalities to participate.
Municipal/local Governments/ First Nations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work collaboratively with provinces/territories to determine local level mitigation priorities. • Participate on a provincial/territorial coordination mitigation group.

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY

DISCUSSION PAPER

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Encourage citizen-based groups to participate.• Develop mitigation action plans at the community level.• Implement and enforce of mitigation policy at the local level.• Submit proposals to NDMS FPT Advisory Group and/or an OCIEP program management group for coordination of private/public efforts.
Academia/Private Sector/Non-Government Organizations/Citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop projects and plans to implement mitigation measures• Contribute to recommendations on mechanisms and tools for partnerships with the private sector, academia and NGOs.• Submit proposals to NDMS FPT Advisory Group and/or an OCIEP program management group for coordination of private/public efforts.

- **What are appropriate roles for each of the stakeholders in disaster mitigation?**
- **Are there other stakeholders that should be included?**

NEXT STEPS

OCIEP will continue to work in collaboration with other federal departments through existing key mechanisms, including the Interdepartmental Mitigation Coordination Committee, the Emergency Management Senior Advisory Committee and the NDMS FPT Advisory Group to advance the development of Canada's first-ever NDMS. We look forward to your views on the issues outlined in this discussion paper and would appreciate receiving written comments by May 31st, 2002. To ensure on-going collaboration, OCIEP will be posting comments on its web site and distributing copies of consolidated comments to key stakeholders. Other consultative mechanisms will include governmental bi-lateral and multi-lateral meetings, regional stakeholder meetings and roundtables during the period beginning in early 2002 and continuing to May 2002.

Please send your comments to:

Allan Bartley, Director General
Policy Planning and Readiness
Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness
122 Bank Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0W6

Or, send your emails to: ndms@ociepep.gc.ca.

TOWARDS A NATIONAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGY DISCUSSION PAPER: SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION POINTS

Proposed Elements (page 6 and 7)

- What elements should be included in a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?

Policy Considerations (page 7 and 8)

- What policy considerations are relevant to developing a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?

Guiding Principles and Criteria (page 8)

- What do you think should be the guiding principles of a National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?
- What criteria should be used to evaluate respective disaster mitigation proposals?

Funding Disaster Mitigation (page 8 and 9)

- How should disaster mitigation initiatives be funded?
- What would be a reasonable federal/provincial/territorial cost-sharing arrangement?
- What cost-shared initiatives would be most appropriate or effective?
- What should be the private and other stakeholder's contribution?

Implementing Disaster Mitigation (page 9 and 10)

- How should the National Disaster Mitigation Strategy be implemented to ensure that vulnerability to various kinds of disasters is addressed in a systematic and manageable manner?
- What other options for implementation would you propose?

Governance and Accountability (page 10 and 11)

- What role would you see for the National Disaster Mitigation Strategy Federal-Provincial-Territorial Advisory Group?
- Is there another mechanism you would propose for federal/provincial/territorial coordination?

Stakeholder Participation (page 11 to 14)

- Which option makes the most sense to you?
- Are there other options that should be considered?
- How should local/municipal level participation be included in the National Disaster Mitigation Strategy?
- What are appropriate roles for each of the stakeholders in disaster mitigation?
- Are there other stakeholders that should be included?