

Mainstreaming Participatory Vulnerability Analysis in ActionAid International

Ethlet Chiwaka, ActionAid International¹

Benfield Hazard Research Centre
Disaster Studies Working Paper 13
June 2005

Abstract

This paper will briefly talk about the road map for mainstreaming Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA) at ActionAid International. It will explore experiences of applying the approach in countries where ActionAid International works, drawing out some of the successes, challenges and lessons learnt. It will conclude with some suggestions for ways forward. The points discussed in this paper are in no way exhaustive. They draw on the author's field experience of using PVA as an approach to disaster reduction in ActionAid International's work. The views expressed in this paper represent the author's view only.

1. Introduction

ActionAid International (AAI) is a development agency, which works with poor and marginalized communities to eradicate poverty. We work in over 40 countries, in six thematic areas including emergencies/humanitarian work, targeting over 13 million lives.

One of our foci as an organization is disaster risk reduction. ActionAid International believes that disasters are not one-off events, but the result of contexts of vulnerability, hence it has adopted a long-term approach to emergencies – one that links emergencies to the process of development. AAI recognizes that disaster risk reduction (as part of the poverty eradication agenda) can only be meaningful with an understanding of vulnerability. For this understanding the vulnerable themselves must be involved in the analysis of their own vulnerability to disasters. This process required the development of an approach to analyze vulnerability – the approach developed is 'Participatory Vulnerability Analysis'.

¹ Ethlet Chiwaka has been working at ActionAid International for over 10 years. She is currently working as an Advisor for Participatory Vulnerability Analysis in the International Emergencies Team.

2. What is PVA?

Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA) is a systematic process that involves communities and other stakeholders in an in-depth examination of their vulnerability and at the same time empowers or motivates them to take appropriate action. The overall aim of PVA is to link disaster preparedness and response to long-term development. The message at the heart of PVA is that communities know their situations best and so any analysis should be built on their knowledge of local conditions. The essence of PVA is for the community not only to develop action plans, but to have their confidence built through valuing their knowledge and to be able to constantly seek opportunities to enhance their resilience to difficult conditions.

ActionAid International recognizes that vulnerability is dynamic and complex such that it cannot be analyzed directly. However, it is important to break down the complexity of vulnerability into manageable components so that we can jointly develop actions, interventions, and strategies to reduce exposure to hazards and shocks. PVA enables communities and development practitioners to make a qualitative analysis of vulnerability or a predictive judgment of what might happen to them as individuals or as communities. Understanding vulnerability requires scrutiny of power relations that determine who gets what, who makes what decision and who is most affected by these decisions in society. These decisions can hinder or enhance the realization of human rights, which is fundamental to the reduction of vulnerability. PVA builds on the recognition that everybody has fundamental rights established in legal and policy instruments, and international agreements. It also considers in particular who has obligations, and who is in a position to help reduce insecurities in human lives, strengthen or improve people's infrastructure of protection and promote empowerment. This is founded on the notion of human security, which allows us to link vulnerability, power and human rights.

There are multiple determinants of vulnerability and some of them fall outside individuals or the community. Therefore PVA incorporates a multi-level and multi-agency approach which enables communities and field staff to conduct vulnerability analysis at the community, district/regional, national and international levels.

PVA uses a step-by-step analytical framework that produces: systematic analysis of the causes of vulnerability, situation analysis of vulnerability, analysis of existing actions, and action plans from analysis – with key players who can mitigate or exacerbate vulnerability. PVA tracks how vulnerability is progressive over time and uses participatory tools² which ActionAid International field staff are familiar with.

² PRA and REFLECT: see www.actionaid.org.uk/education/reflect and Section 6 below.

PVA involves three phases – preparation, understanding the analytical framework, and conducting the analysis.

→**Phase 1 – preparation:** PVA resource persons (champions and PVA Advisor) provide insights on preparation for a PVA exercise which comprise developing terms of reference, analyzing secondary data, identifying stakeholders for the PVA exercise and briefing them on the objectives. One of the key messages in this section is not to research information already known or readily available from secondary sources – unless of course it is in dispute or needs to be verified.

→**Phase 2 – analytical framework:** the framework has four analytical steps: (i) situation analysis, (ii) analysis of the causes of vulnerability, (iii) analysis of community action and capacity and (iv) drawing action from analysis.

→**Phase 3 – multi-leveled analysis and action:** conducting analysis and generating action at the community, district, national and international levels using the step-by-step analytical framework with other actors.

What PVA does

- It involves a predictive judgment of what might happen to us as individuals or communities.
- It is capable of directing development interventions.
- It seeks ways to protect and enhance people's livelihoods and rights through influencing policy.
- It supports institutions in their own role of disaster prevention and preparedness.

3. PVA Development Process

3.1 *Origins*

The need for vulnerability analysis arose from various fronts, mainly the organization's change of strategic focus. In 1999 ActionAid International's new organizational strategy, *Fighting Poverty Together 1999-2005*, articulated a bold new vision and agenda to refocus the organization's work from delivering services to addressing the fundamental causes of social injustice and poverty.³ This meant that far greater emphasis was given to policy and advocacy work across the world and that the core approach had to change to a Rights-Based Approach. Translating the Rights-Based Approach into practice meant that we had to put people at the centre of our work and use their knowledge for analysis. We needed good analysis and consequently vulnerability analysis for humanitarian work.

³ David and Mancini 2004, *Going Against the Flow* <http://www.livelihoods.org/lessons/Learning>

The development process for the approach to vulnerability analysis at AAI goes back to 2000 when a study was commissioned on vulnerability assessment methods. What came out was that none of the existing methods suited our needs (participation of the vulnerable themselves in the analysis of their own vulnerability, finding solutions and influencing policies). A meeting was held in Dorset to discuss how to take vulnerability analysis forward in AAI. This was attended by ActionAid International staff, researchers and representatives of other NGOs. The workshop was very instrumental in bringing out a key understanding of what is known and what's not known. It was agreed the organization had enough knowledge on participatory processes and vulnerability to make it work. A desk study was commissioned to draw out links between vulnerability and other related concepts and detail what is involved in vulnerability analysis.⁴ People had basic understanding of vulnerability and the need for it to be reduced but they did not have the know-how for vulnerability analysis, i.e. where to start from or what to do, so no progress was achieved. It was realized that having a guide would provide a starting point and so producing a guiding framework was agreed as the best way forward. The University of Swansea was commissioned to take the lead in this process and they developed a comprehensive guide that takes into consideration ActionAid's core principles. What was produced was extremely detailed and far too long to be usefully followed by field staff embarking on vulnerability analysis.

3.2 Political will

At the same time as the guide was being developed, some mistakes were made in misunderstanding and misjudging the level of political commitment needed to push the agenda. Country Directors were left out of the buy-in process. ActionAid works on the assumption that Country Programs are autonomous and that means that vulnerability analysis could not be imposed on them. Therefore, we had to go through a process of engaging Country Directors in the PVA agenda. However, we did not allocate resources to having a trainer who could push the agenda forward; again not much progress was made.

3.3 Use of core institutional processes

What happened next was a series of processes to generate interest or political will internally. The International Emergencies Team, as part of the bigger organization, had to think critically about how to engage Country Programs. First, there was a review in 2002 looking at the impact of emergency work at ActionAid which highlighted the fact that emergency preparedness/disaster risk reduction were needed to increase community capacity to respond and community control over relief resources used to mitigate the effects of emergencies and diminish vulnerabilities. It was difficult by the end of the review to draw sufficient analysis on the organizational understanding of risks/vulnerability, what it meant to AAI's emergencies work, and how AAI could support communities to reduce it.⁵

⁴ Ahmed, 2002 – Study report on Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (unpublished)

⁵ Emergencies Review, 2002 <http://www.actionaid.org.uk/788/emergencies.html>

Clearly, there was a need to re-think AAI's approaches to contextual analysis and emergency programming based on the issues raised during the review. Following this process, a strategy for emergencies work was developed, which recognized the importance of analysis to ensure information for decision making and program design is generated with communities and that analysis is key to maintaining a rights-based focus in emergencies. In the same year, a DEC review of the Southern Africa food crisis⁶ highlighted that communities benefiting from AAI's programs were not hit any different from communities not benefiting from AAI 's work. This led to an increased acceptance of the PVA approach at the Directors' level. It is worth mentioning that at the same time ActionAid was going through a process of internationalization, becoming ActionAid International, moving our international secretariat to South Africa and creating a global movement that links people and organizations in developed and developing countries together, as equal partners in fighting global poverty. This process has meant a lot of changes in the way we do things and make decisions

3.4 What happened next

We then worked to get a tighter guide appropriate for local staff based on information from the Swansea field guide. This process was led by our former PVA advisor (Donald Mavunduse) and a team from countries that had conducted some work related to vulnerability analysis. This guide was then field tested in The Gambia. However, before being published, an international meeting on participatory methods was held in Ethiopia, which highlighted that although the guide was good, it lacked a rights-based perspective. Publication was put on hold in order to ensure rights-based thinking was integral to the guide. The field guide has since been revised, with the rights perspective incorporated and is now published, five years after that first meeting in 2000.⁷

The approach to mainstreaming PVA has been to train staff at the field level in one country that has expressed interest, and involve people from neighboring countries to participate in the training. This approach has so far proved successful in most of the countries where PVA has been rolled out because it reinforces a sense of ownership. In addition, we have found that it is easier to get participation of partners and stakeholders when the PVA exercise is organized at the local level rather than international level. Similarly, we have found it easier internally to get the involvement of countries located in the sub-region where PVA is being rolled out, when a Country Program hosting the PVA exercise coordinates this process. This does not mean that we have not faced challenges in this area.

There is real a challenge in bringing together people from various institutions. For example in Sierra Leone we spent a lot of time preparing for the national-level feedback, which followed the community-level analysis. We had made

⁶ http://www.dec.org.uk/html/asset_1328.shtml

⁷ <http://www.actionaid.org.uk/wps/content/documents/pva.pdf>

arrangements for community representatives to come to Freetown, including representatives from partner community-based organizations (CBOs) with whom we carried out the PVA – only three people came to this meeting and there was no government representative, which defeated the whole purpose of the process. We are constantly seeking ways to increase engagement of decision makers as well as policy makers in this process.

PVA requires participation of partners and stakeholders in the area where it is being conducted. The success of PVA depends partly on the diversity of stakeholders involved because their actions can exacerbate or reduce vulnerability. Our experience has shown that it is rewarding to start at the micro level, with a smaller team, and scale up afterwards. So we conduct PVA in one district, and within the district we further select villages or areas where discussions are held.

4. Application of PVA

In Zimbabwe PVA was used to analyze vulnerability to HIV/AIDS to inform development interventions and policy work. The outputs have been used to beef up a proposal for food security interventions for households affected by HIV/AIDS. In addition, the outputs are being used to advocate for inclusive methods for food security-related vulnerability assessment, which are key for early warning and preparedness at the country level. There is more work in the pipeline to influence donors, government institutions and networks to release more funding for disaster risk reduction as well as champion more inclusive approaches to vulnerability analysis.

In The Gambia, where the PVA field guide was piloted, PVA was used to analyze vulnerability to hazards. The findings revealed that vulnerability to disaster is gender differentiated and that, depending on what resources men and women have access to or control over, such resources can be used to strengthen protection. In Bangladesh, PVA has been used to analyze vulnerability to floods and cyclones, so that communities and field staff can develop strategies and interventions for preparedness. In western Uganda, PVA was used to analyze post-conflict effects as part of the strategic planning process for Bundinbugyo area. The outputs from the PVA exercise strengthened the voice of women on issues of rape, child mothers and early marriages. Women have since been linked to national organizations promoting gender equality, to help them strengthen a gender awareness campaign.

In Nigeria, PVA was used to analyze ethnic conflict to inform ActionAid International's response to the conflict that erupted in several parts of Nigeria in 2003. The scoping study helped communities initiate a process of conflict resolution at the local level. In Sierra Leone, PVA was used to analyze vulnerability to conflict. Some of the outputs have been used to develop a

PVA Training/Implementation Process Case Study

Methodology – Case of Sierra Leone (9-17th March 2005)

- Planning started 4 months before the exercise, ActionAid Sierra Leone (AASL) budgeted for the exercise in the 3 year plan for 2005-2007.
- In January AASL developed TOR for the exercise, which were circulated to all potential participants (including partners and stakeholders) after a quick stakeholder analysis. The objectives of the exercise were (i) To come up with a framework for development area appraisal, reviews and programming in thematic areas of work, (ii) To link issues coming up at community and district level to the national level process on prevention of conflict and vulnerability reduction.
- AASL coordinated and invited participants from other AAI programs in the sub-region. The exercise attracted participation of staff from AAI The Gambia, AAI Nigeria and AAI Liberia; and ten partner organizations and stakeholders in Bo town.

The methodology involved three components:

- I) Involvement of stakeholders whose actions and decisions may increase or decrease people's vulnerability. Stakeholders, partners and ActionAid staff went through a three-day training program on PVA, which involved harmonizing our understanding of vulnerability, analysis and the methodology for the PVA exercise.
- II) Community Level Analysis. Communities know their situation best and what makes them vulnerable. The PVA team was divided into two, one group went to Baoma old town, the other to Wonde Chiefdom. Each of the two meetings in each location was attended by over 100 people (chiefs, elders, teachers, religious leaders, women, men and youth). Data collection was done through use of participatory tools.
- III) District level analysis workshop at Bo town to capture stakeholders' perceptions of vulnerability to conflict and receive their feedback and commitments on the outputs from the community-level analysis. Participants included community representatives from Baoma and Wonde (ten from each area), the PVA team and heads of departments and NGOs in Bo.
- IV) National level analysis in Freetown on 17th March to capture perceptions of vulnerability to conflict at this level, establish dialogue between the three levels and get feedback and commitments on the actions suggested by communities and district authorities. Community representatives attended this workshop for their voices to be heard as well as pass on the deliberations to their respective communities about the commitments made at this level.

proposal on conflict resolution, which is being funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). At the sub-regional level the process has led to stronger and substantive collaboration on conflict work. The west-Africa sub-region is now in the process of developing a sub-regional initiative that will

link conflict reduction work from community to international level through the Africa disaster reduction platform. In Pakistan, PVA was used to develop case study material for the World Conference in Disaster Reduction in Kobe, Japan, in January 2005.⁸ The case studies strengthened the voice of AAI and other NGOs present at the conference. In addition, the process led to a local advocacy strategy on disaster preparedness being developed and the strengthening of a community cooperative/alliance, which will spearhead disaster reduction in the community where PVA was conducted.

5. Successes of Mainstreaming PVA

1) Generating genuine momentum

There has been commitment (through the International Emergencies Team) from the development stage to implementation; this has been reflected through budget allocation (after realization that earmarked resources were needed to make progress) towards capacity building on PVA, development of the guide and recruitment of a trainer/advisor. Through this support PVA has been given space to evolve: for example the idea of a guide, which was first suggested in Haiti during a PVA session, has evolved over the past few years leading to the publication of a field guide that meets the needs of field staff.

2) Role of PVA 'champions'/Country Programs

The institutionalization of PVA at ActionAid International has also been successful because of pioneer Country Programs, partner organizations and stakeholders who were determined to pilot it and contribute to its development, for example Bangladesh, The Gambia, Ghana, Nigeria, and Haiti. Through the rollout process of PVA in these programs, other non-participating countries have seen that PVA is consistent with ActionAid International's values (participation, rights-based approaches, people-centered advocacy). The PVA approach reinforces the notion of participation, that the vulnerable themselves should be involved in analyzing vulnerability and designing actions and strategies to reduce their vulnerability. It is a serious-minded approach to long-term problems. The approach brings the sum of all parts neatly together, i.e. listening to people, hearing people's voices, measuring how effective AAI programs are in reducing vulnerability and generating people-centered advocacy.

3) Empowerment

PVA empowers communities to take actions that reduce their own vulnerability. At AAI we have seen communities build on their collective power to take actions that will transform their lives. For example in Zimbabwe during the PVA exercise communities recognized that there is a strong link between the consequences of HIV/AIDS and food insecurity. Civil society organizations (CSOs) and the government have been working with communities to find ways of caring for HIV/AIDS patients. One of the approaches adopted is home-based care, where

⁸ <http://www.unisdr.org/wcdr/>

patients are looked after by relatives (generally female), supported by CSO volunteers. As a result the burden of care is pushed onto women or girls. This role is very demanding to the extent that they find it difficult to engage in productive activities like farming. The communities decided to advocate for changes in the criteria for food-for-work programs to include HIV/Aids care work. Through the PVA process they were able to raise this issue at the district and national levels. This was the first time for this particular community to work together in this way. Discussions are in progress to make an amendment to the food-for-work criteria.

In Sierra Leone, women cannot own land because of gender marginalization. During the PVA exercise, for the first time women formed a group and came up with strategies to raise awareness of these issues in their own community and begin to negotiate with men for equal ownership of land and other resources. At the village feedback meeting, women used a song as a starting point to raise this issue. They gained support from young people both male and female. ActionAid International will continue to support the women's group to campaign for equal ownership of land and other assets.

6. Challenges Faced

1) Lack of a culture of disaster preparedness

There is a need to get people to think of disaster preparedness or disaster risk reduction in development programs. In some countries disaster preparedness is not seen as part of development programming. Due to this culture and attitude it is difficult for some staff and Country Programs to appreciate the importance of PVA in facilitating the process of disaster preparedness. There are projects and programs being implemented directly or through partners which do not take vulnerability into consideration. Our experience shows that disaster preparedness is about policy, resources and listening to the voice of the vulnerable themselves. Our strategy is to hold governments accountable for disaster preparedness. However, to do any meaningful work around disaster preparedness, staff and partners need to understand vulnerability, its causes and how it can be reduced.

2) Existence of other participatory methodologies

As cited above, within AAI there exist various participatory methodologies/approaches: REFLECT for adult literacy and social change; Stepping Stones for HIV/Aids programming; PRA for appraisals, planning and sometimes reviews; Participatory Review and Reflection Processes for generating learning and areas needing improvement for annual/three-year plans. This alone is another area of contention. We have had to start every session justifying the need to introduce another participatory methodology. Questions arising include – what is the value added? What difference can it make? If it uses REFLECT tools, how different is it from REFLECT? From the perspective of the pioneers of PVA, the difference is clear: specificity of focus on vulnerability,

and a systematic analysis. At ActionAid International we are in the process of mobilizing resources to pilot the merger of the PVA and REFLECT methodologies.

PVA assumes that staff are familiar with participatory tools used for PRA/REFLECT and so makes no provision for training in such tools. The reality is different: there have been real constraints during training and implementation of PVA. There are very few people out there who are conversant with participatory methodologies and there is a lack of consistency due to staff turnover. In addition AAI's shift in emphasis from service delivery to policy and advocacy in practice has meant that Country Programs had to get rid of some of the staff who were good at participatory methods and hire policy staff, some of whom have never had training in participatory methods. Linked to this issue is that to generate genuine and meaningful outputs from the PVA exercise facilitators require good facilitation and analytical skills, and knowledge of rights-based approaches and social change. Therefore before PVA is conducted, ActionAid International staff and partner organizations need to sharpen the relevant skills.

3) Language

Vulnerability is a complex term and often has no one-word translation in local languages. PVA requires involvement of communities to participate in district and national forums which are usually attended by elites and the language spoken is English. We have faced real challenges in keeping community members abreast of all the discussions because of the time the translation takes and the lack of willingness from other participants to speak the local language even when they know it. In other instances language has been a barrier to in-depth probing by the PVA team in the field when they themselves are not fluent in the locally spoken language. Similarly there are challenges in countries where AAI is working but are not English speaking, for example Brazil, Mozambique and other Portuguese speaking countries, Senegal and other French speaking countries. At ActionAid, there are three official languages – English, French, and Spanish. So far the manual and other documentation on PVA have been in English only because of lack of financial resources for translation. This has affected take-up of PVA by non-English speaking countries.

7. Lessons

1) Sophisticated understanding of risk

People know the risks they live with, and they have coping strategies. There is nothing complicated about vulnerability that communities cannot understand. They know their situation best; have practical suggestions on how they can reduce it. What they lack is involvement in the process of analyzing vulnerability and decision making for interventions/actions, which reduce vulnerability. What AAI has learnt so far is that there are challenges in practice to recognize the

wealth of knowledge which vulnerable people themselves have and the contribution they can make.

2) Power and partnership

Decision-making processes for PVA are crucial for a successful PVA exercise. Who decides what, who is to own the report, ensure follow-up and fund the programs becomes very complicated where AAI is working through partnership. For example, AAI Zimbabwe's partner, FACT Chiredzi was not willing to share ownership. We had planned to conduct PVA in two areas, one where FACT Chiredzi has been working for a long time, the second a new area, which is neglected by many CSOs in Chiredzi. The idea was that for this new area, PVA would generate information, which would be used as a baseline survey (a sort of appraisal). FACT Chiredzi staff identified this area and arranged meetings. Its leadership decided to cancel the field trip at the last minute because of political tensions in this area, fearing that PVA might unlock political discussion and grievances. Much as the PVA team felt that we needed to go this area to conduct PVA, we could not overrule the decision of FACT Chiredzi. This is a direct consequence of decentralized decision-making process at AAI – we believe that more power and ownership should come from the field but sometimes these decisions have negative implications on the most vulnerable.

3) 'Money' – mainstreaming should be well resourced

Lack of adequate resources to mainstream PVA has been a key constraint. This has been reflected at two levels. First, resources set aside by the International Emergencies Team which is currently championing the process of mainstreaming PVA at ActionAid International, have not been adequate. Decisions on resource allocation have not been made with a long-term perspective. This is not new: generally, mainstreaming of participatory methodologies at ActionAid International has been faced with similar constraints; mainstreaming is not seen as a process but a 'short-term activity'. However, elsewhere AAI has done very well, for example in mainstreaming REFLECT where the team has successfully raised resources. AAI is currently re-focusing its thinking strategies to ensure smooth rollout of PVA.

Second, there are many country programs intending to conduct PVA, yet PVA requires real investment for the initial training, to train facilitators including staff from the country office, partner organizations and other stakeholders in the area of operation. The practice has been for country programs to budget for one cycle of PVA and actions coming out of it in three-year plans. However, with competing priorities for the limited resources available, most of these countries do not budget for PVA.

At the centre of PVA is the recognition that actions and interventions generated through PVA need to be strategically followed up for the benefits of PVA to be appreciated by both communities and partner organizations. This is a big challenge because it is common practice among researchers and development

practitioners to generate information from communities without financing the actions generated. In order to push the agenda forward the International Emergencies Team has ended up financing country program PVA processes. It supported AAI Zimbabwe to conduct PVA, and staff members from Brazil and Liberia to attend PVA sessions. There are requests from many other countries for funding for PVAs. There is now recognition that for greater take-up of PVA, the International Emergencies Team needs to raise resources to mainstream PVA. Some work has been done with fundraising teams in the past but needs re-thinking. Plans are in the pipeline to develop concept notes and proposals for PVAs.

4) Planning

AAI has spent time and resources developing tools and methodologies for planning, and the general perspective is that the organization has gone a mile on planning systems. The reality on the ground is that Country Programs and partner organizations are still struggling with planning systems. AAI is now looking into bringing synergy to this area, particularly between PVA and REFLECT, to strengthen planning systems. It makes sense for PVA to be conducted in REFLECT circles because the outputs generated from PVA exercises require collective action. In this way communities as well as staff and partners will see PVA as a continuous process. For example in Sierra Leone women formed two committees during the PVA exercise, to mobilize women for gender awareness and advocacy, and to seek support from development agencies for trauma counseling. The success of these initiatives will depend on coordinated follow-up by communities and ActionAid International and partner organizations.

8. Conclusions

PVA is unique and has so much to offer, both internally at AAI, and externally to influence the approaches of donors and other key players in the field of vulnerability analysis. The challenges faced can be overcome. PVA needs to be given the space to evolve. Below are some suggestions on how some of these challenges can be dealt with:

- 1) Come up with a long-term strategy on how to mainstream PVA at AAI, including how far we want to engage externally. So far it is clear that this will mean recruiting staff on a long-term basis to facilitate this process because there is a real challenge for country program staff to capture all the techniques in one workshop.
- 2) There is a need for a well thought through process on how to capitalize on momentum to build CS/CSOs. PVA generates outputs that require collective action from the community. As a result, communities find it necessary to form groups or build a sense of community that can follow ups on action generated from the PVAs.

- 3) Raise resources to finance the strategy and finance PVAs in country programs, including actions generated from these exercises.
- 4) Build a cadre of staff, and networks that will champion PVA in country programs and regions but also share best practices and learning. This will feed into further development of the approach.
- 5) Systematically bring synergy between PVA and other participatory methodologies. There is need to link PVA with adult literacy so that poor and marginalized people can feel more able to talk at district level.
- 6) Think critically about how to balance participation and systemic dimension of PVA. On the one hand PVA gives the poor and marginalized a voice in the policy and decision making arena; on the other hand there is a prescribed process that has to be followed to conduct a meaningful PVA (i.e. community-, district-, national- and international-level analysis). The challenge is balancing the two. Similarly, there is need to build on the strength of capability for PVA to capture the perceptions of people of various categories and at different levels on vulnerability with all forms of documentation (reports, audio-visual, pictures, media, etc.).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank many people who over the past year have contributed to PVA work. Particularly the International Emergencies Team (Roger Yates, Dr Unnikrishnan PV, Khurshid Alam, Seydou Dia, Zvidzai Maburutse, Louise McLean, Marion Khamis, Robin Le Mare and Jack Campbell), Felistas Chikaura, Daisy Chasauka, Ian Mashingaidze, Omar Badjie, Agness Campbell, Martha Lansana, Ayodeji Ajayeoba, Daniel Waritey, Gunze Subah, Shashanka Saadi, Capson Sausi, Alberto Silva, Kate Newman, Antonella Mancini, and Rene Kantelberg as well as communities in Uganda, Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone who have shared their experiences and insights with me.

Integrated Planning Against Risk

This paper was presented at the ESRC-funded Integrated Planning Against Risk (IPAR) series seminar on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management: Organisational Learning and Change at University College London, 21 April 2005 (see <http://www.swan.ac.uk/cds/research/ESRC.htm> for details of this seminar and the IPAR series).