

Analysis of Ethiopian National Disaster Risk Management Policy by Process Model

Petros Wako and Neng Shen

Huazhong University of Science and Technology
College Public Administration/Department of Administrative management

Abstract: *In any government, public policy formulation is very crucial issues to serve the peoples. Policy formulation passes through different processes. This paper seeks to identify the process that Ethiopian disaster risk management policy goes through. The paper analysis evaluates the policy by the process model. The finding indicates that the DRM policy adheres to both processes of both bottom-up and top-down approach in policy formulation. The process model phases are such as problem identification, agenda-setting, policy formulation, policy legitimisation and implementation, and policy evaluation. This paper argues that any public policy adhering to every step enables of policy to meets its intended objectives. The ways that policy follows determine the achievements of the projected idea.*

Keywords: Process Model, Policy, Disaster, Risk, Management, Ethiopia

1. Introduction

Ethiopia is one of the world's fastest-growing countries. The Ethiopian economy is among the strongest in the Nile region, with the more significant part of growth being from agricultural production. Coffee is an integral export crop in the region; however, seasonal droughts and substandard cultivation methods threaten economic growth from agriculture. More recently, the government has pressed growth in the manufacturing, textiles and energy sectors to reinforce the economy in addition to agriculture.

Ethiopia is highly vulnerable to a wide range of disasters. Out of many disasters, drought, flood, human and livestock epidemics, crop pests, as well as conflict, are main. From other disasters, drought remains the country's leading hazard; while the flood is second next.

Throughout its history, Ethiopia has experienced frequent disasters that include but not limited to droughts, floods, human and livestock diseases, crop pests, as well as seismic and volcanic activities. Even though Ethiopia has a history of recurrent droughts that spans back to the 1970s, its magnitude, frequency, and impacts in affected areas have resulted in the severe expansion of desertification. This phenomenon is explained by increased climate variability, deforestation, land degradation, settlement patterns and rapid annual population growth rate (DRMESMF, 2011).

According to the scholar, any government has a preference for what to do or not do. Any democratic government cannot afford to turn a blind eye on the plight of the society it represents (Dye, 1978:6). How the government communicates with the citizens is through policy. So analysing how policy initiated, formulated, legitimised and evaluated help us more. This understanding enables the knowhow of policy process and implementation evaluation. Process model mainly focuses on every step that policy development pass through. this paper wants to analyse the national disaster risk management policy of Ethiopia.

As mentioned in Anderson, J. E. (2003) the policy-process (sometimes it is called the policy cycle) approach to policy study has several advantages. First, and most significant, the policy-process approach centres attention on the officials and institutions that make policy decisions and also the factors that influence and condition their actions. We want to struggle about over the complexity of public problems, the goals of the polity, the final forms policy responses can take, and similar matters. Knowledge of those is clearly of value, but we also want to grasp who makes policy decisions and the way they are doing it. Accordingly, answers are considered necessary for such questions as what is the legislature's role in policymaking? How does its configuration affect decision-making? What kinds of factors or deliberations influence the legislator's decisions? The policy-process approach not only helps us come across policymaking and policy, but it also causes us to require a more holistic view of how government functions.

Process models try and generalise about the sequence of steps or actions that occur as policy issues are raised, debated and resolved. They focus more on what happens, when and the way than on which the participants are and why particular outcomes occur. A typical example includes the stages of problem identification, proposal formulation; program legitimating, program budgeting, program implementation, program evaluation and problem resolution/program termination (Jones). Process models are widely employed in policy education. The answer of pressing questions like, "Where will we start?" and "What happens next?" (Hahn, Alan J. (2016).

Kulac and Ozgur(2017) conclude even the stages(process) model was introduced and advanced in developed countries; it is possible to mean that stages model has spread to several underdeveloped and developing countries especially within the last 20 years. Concomitantly, because it was presented within the previous section of this paper, in Peru, Jordan, Thailand, Burkina Faso and Hong Kong, the education policies were analysed within the framework of stages model. In many policy areas whether in micro, mezzo or macro level like regional development agencies policy, abroad postgraduate scholarship policy, postal services policy, property policy and tobacco policy of Turkey, stages model/framework was successfully utilised. For this reason, it is possible to say that the stages model is one among the foremost efficient, comprehensive, systematic, practical, functional, and beneficial model/framework publicly policy analysis by an equivalent token, this paper analysis Ethiopian National Disaster Risk Management Policy.

Based on the country context, the Ethiopian government introduce many policies. National Disaster, Risk management Policy, is among policies that initiated to adapt and manage the risks induced by climatic changes. Herein this paper focuses on the analysis of National Disaster Management Policy of Ethiopia by the process model.

2. Policy Process Activity Contents

Public policy, as introduced in the last chapter, is a course of action adopted or created by the government in response to public problems. As we will see in the coming pages, public problems are those issues identified by the public and elected leaders as worthy of a coordinated response from the government. A response could entail the passage of laws or may involve an executive, such as the president or a governor, directing a government agency to do something. Just as problems often beget action; it is essential to recognise that public policy is just as much what government decides to do as it is what the government decides not to do. Ultimately, public policy is all about choices.

According to Kulac and Ozgur (2017), Public policy analysis requires comprehensive research and a framework so on computing the tiny print of the policies applied. Thus, many public policy analysis models are utilised in various policy fields so on examine all stages of the overall public politics and implementation process. Stages model is one of the foremost well-known and thus the oldest policy analysis frameworks that are employed by many policy analysts, academicians and independent researchers around the world.

Thus process model is a crucial key point of reference for public policy studies. The primary significant and pioneering theory or empirically grounded studies to define, frame and illustrate the stages model that has taken its place in history also known and favourably mentioned are listed as Jones (1970), Dye (1972; 2008), Anderson (1975; 1979; 1982; 2014), Jenkins (1978), May and Wildavsky (1978), Nelson (1978; 1986), Brewer and DeLeon (1983), Peters (1996), Sabatier (1999; 2007). The piecemeal model together of the pioneering frameworks publicly policy analysis, politics process features a progressive cycle (Gosling, 2004: 92). With the general public policy studies in the 1970s and 1980s, the stages model was reformulated and utilised by various scholars in several ways.

According to the scholars, the policy should follow specific processes from its inception to its evaluation. Dye Thomas R. (2008) elaborate that process model helps to understand various activities involved in policymaking. He accentuates that policymaking involves problem identification, agenda-setting, formulation, legitimating and evaluating policy.

Based on this, the paper wants to assess how Ethiopian Disaster risk management policy concerning the steps that are given by the process model. Ethiopian national disaster risk management policy poured from a long history of climatic induced starvations and deaths. It has mass broad dissatisfaction and grievance.

2.1 Problem Identification

Ethiopian failed to have specific policies that address any humanmade and natural disasters before 1973. In 1973 famine that occurred around northern Ethiopia risks the lives of thousands. During that point is a terrible time for Ethiopians. From 1970-1974 droughts sustained a very long time. Death becomes quite common around Wollo and Tigray. At that point, Emperor Haile-Selassie conceals the case for keeping dignity. Due to this, the inner media, interested group and NGO made a vigorous campaign to disclose the case. Organisation and Diasporas appeal to the international community. They vehemently accuse the govt. For conceal the deaths and not even intervene within the area. Many international media and NGO come to the world. They organise

the community and prepare the moving picture. People around the area asks and lament for state intervention for therefore long. The cumulative of this thing come up with 1973 policy.

The 1993 disaster management policy also influence the issues at hand. 1973 policy only specialise in relief distribution for affected populations. Without linking the disaster policy to development is nothing to make a disaster-resilient community. The community representative also demands inclusion of development within the policy, members of the parliaments also asks the question, and other non-governmental development partners make it as a prerequisite for funding the projects.

2.2 Agenda Setting

In agenda setting, which is that the decisive stage of the process model, the problems like how the issues arise and are available to the general public agenda are dealt (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). Moreover, within the process of agenda-setting during which problems are transformed into policy designs (Hill, 1997), problems and possible solutions gain or lose the eye of public and therefore the elite (Birkland, 2005). Agenda setting process is formed by the clear priorities of policymakers (Macrea and Wilde, 1985: 232); thus even many issues are likely to return to an agenda, only an element of them are processed to the general public agenda by governments and other actors (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). By the same token with Peters (1996), it is not feasible for several problems to get on the agenda at the government level. Any joint problem features a degree of importance and innovation (Gosling, 2004: 44-45), which majorly affects the capacity of the issues to succeed in the government level. For example, governments like to act swifter on urgent issues like bird flu, aids, and oil crises (Knoepfel et al., 2007).

In developing countries, there is such an immense amount of agenda that circulate within the sphere. Government attentively follow political power gain policy such as; enforcement, anti-corruption, anti-terrorism education and tax program. Beside this priority pondering for creation of the agenda is an arduous task for concerned interest groups. Before initiation of the policy, every media, especially international media like BBC, CNN et al., continue to broadcast the agenda of drought starvation and deaths of the people. Artists and superstars call au courant sound the importance of state intervention. They accuse the government of non-existence disaster policy that minimises the risks. Political parties used this chance and made the agenda as national agenda. Even faith-based organisation and traditional leaders magnify the current situation. They arouse government policy intervention accordingly by this mechanism government put into pressure to just accept the agenda that contains a mass base.

2.3 Policy Formulation

In the formulation stage, policy alternatives are developed to struggle with the present problems on the general public agenda (Dye, 2008; Ripley and Franklin, 1984). During this way, the amount of policy options is reduced, and therefore, the policymakers make their final choices/decisions easier (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995).

In other words, within the policy formulation stage that's the pre-policy decision stage; a group of policy alternatives and solutions is generated and also narrowed so on ease the ultimate decision (Sidney, 2007). Publicly policy formulation process various mechanism is developed to reply to social problems (Jones, 1977; Peters, 1996), and a variety of actors play crucial roles. These actors are often counted as parliament, government, public bureaucrats, political parties, pressure groups, think tanks and therefore the media. In the formulation stage, which is one among the foremost functional stages of the stages model, the answers of a number of the required questions are sought. These questions are often expressed as follow: what is the decision to affect the problem? What are the goals and priorities? What are the prices and benefits to realise goals? What are the positive and negative externalities in each option? (Cochran and Malone, 1999). The Ethiopian government also tries to follow these steps to formulate its disaster policy.

2.3 Policy Legitimization

Legitimation stage holds a key for public publicly politics process during which different alternatives are taken under consideration, and policies are shaped accordingly. Consistent with Kraft and Furlong (2004), the choices taken by policymakers are given a legal force, or political activities are legitimised. It is difficult for policymakers to direct the legitimation stage independently from the thought that's highly common within the society. Similarly, Anderson (1984) emphasises that the general public influences legitimation stage and thus, policymakers need to take under consideration requests and demands of citizens. Moreover, Anderson (1984) reveals that the political way forward for the policymakers could be short if the request and wishes of the citizens are not taken into consideration within the process of public policy formulation. Policies made by the policymakers to supply solutions to social needs and problems might lose its effectiveness over time. At now, necessary regulations are passed on by making changes within the policies.

The genesis of EDM systems should, therefore, be associated with the 19973/74 famine and the establishment of the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC). On August 29, the defunct Emperor issued Order No. 93/1974 to establish a government agency (RRC) whose immediate responsibilities included mobilising relief resources from domestic and international sources and providing the same to areas affected by drought. Although the legislation conferred RRC enormous responsibilities of dealing with all-natural disasters (flood, fire, whirlwind, drought, and earthquake) (Order No. 1973/74), meeting the challenges of 1973/1974 happened to be intractable for the new agency. Lacking advance preparedness and experience, RRC was overwhelmed with the vast task of the relief operation and reaching out affected people by the famine, let alone undertaking long-term prevention and rehabilitation as stipulated in the legislation. Mobilising domestic relief resources, organising humanitarian supplies from abroad and undertaking relief and rehabilitation measures took time and resources disproportionately.

The period from 1990 to 1994 was a defining moment in the history of disaster management in Ethiopia. Capitalising on a well organised national conference that drew its participants from prominent national policymakers, national, and international experts in disaster management and distinguished scholars, the Dergue’s regime, that was renamed People’s Democratic of Ethiopia, came up with a national prevention and preparedness strategy in March 1990. However, it did not live to see the implementation of the strategy it had sponsored.

Policy legitimisation in Ethiopia

Legitimation Activities	Year
Order No. 73/1974 established the disaster management agency, RRC	1974
Early Warning System (EWS) get underway	1976
Proclamation No. 173/1979 empowers RRC expanding its mandates to include resettling vulnerable people out of drought-prone areas	1979
A prominent national conference deliberated on national disaster prevention and preparedness strategy	1988 and 1989
The government launched the National Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Strategy Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE) issued Disaster Prevention and Management Policy, Emergency Code for Ethiopia and National Program for Prevention and Preparedness generating favourable milieu for a series of reforms in the system of DM	1990
Policy/legal framework put in place setting a stage for a transformed disaster management system (the 1995 Constitution and Proclamation No. 10/1995)	1995
The government launched a series of development programs that concentrate more on disaster prevention and vulnerability reduction. (SDPRP) 2006 (PASDEP)	2002
DPPC lost its ‘autonomy’ and brought under the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, and renamed Disaster Management and Food Security Sector	2008

Table 1 DM Legitimation History(Source:Mulugeta, 2008)

- ✓ In the legitimisation of the policy, both governments follow the identical procedure. The A significant progress in community participation (as witnessed during risk assessments, early warning systems and seasonal assessments); Efforts are underway to raised engage local actors (local NGOs and CBOs) in DRM coordination forums ;
- ✓ The disaster risk reduction activities are moved towards decentralised structures in its operations through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.

- ✓ A connectivity system currently being implemented through which all the district focal offices are connected to the department of the federal government. This may enable smooth of the flow of data in the least vertical and horizontal levels.
- ✓ The productive Safety Net was re-designed in 2014 to scale back disaster risks and increase communities' resilience to shocks.
- ✓ Ministerial council approves the draft and send to the members of parliament. Members of the parliament then after discuss they organise the select committee or commission that inquire into the policy and modify accordingly. Then after challenge to the members of parliament. Members of parliament approve the policy with 2/3 of the vote. Then the prime minister or the president approves the implementation of the policy. Current Ethiopian social group policies are prepared at national and regional levels where national policies are prepared by the federal and within the federal following the formal procedure of dogmas. The committees and also the parliamentary groups have the appropriate to initiate draft bills, and also the bills come to the legislature then signed by the particular initiator and given to the speaker. The bill is agreed as a point by the business advisory committee and presented to plenary session. Before discussion, policy initiator delegate brief the house about stuffing bill significance. Significant progress in community participation (as witnessed during risk assessments, early warning systems and seasonal assessments); Efforts are underway to raised engage local actors (local NGOs and CBOs) in DRM coordination forums ;
- ✓ The disaster risk reduction activities are moved towards decentralised structures in its operations through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.
- ✓ A connectivity system is currently being implemented through which all the district focal offices are connected to the department of the federal government. This may enable smooth the flow of data in the least vertical and horizontal levels.
- ✓ The productive Safety Net was re-designed in 2014 to scale back disaster risks and increase communities' resilience to shocks.

After the briefing, the preliminary reading debate is taken place by that specialise in general issues. Because the presentation is concluded, the bill either is mentioned relevant commission for further scrutiny, or directly, if motion is moved, it will be passed to presentation and enacted as a law. The bill mentioned the concerned committee after the preliminary reading passes several stages before its approval by the House.

Firstly, the committee to which the bill is referred has got to examine carefully and intimately. After the committee members make it clear themselves, it's important to spot issues and inquiries to be clarified and answered by the initiator. The subsequent steps are inviting the initiator section heads and professionals to elucidate the aim and importance of the draft bill and answer the questions prepared by the respective commission beforehand.

The representative of the initiator section gives clarifications over the vague issues and answers to the questions from the commission and participants of the forum. If the bill under question is to own deemed affect the public interest, public hearing is organised by the focal committee. The general public forum is represented by different stakeholders who may include mass organisations, professional associations, civil society organisations (CSOs) and better education and research institutions, Chambers of commerce, public institutions, interested groups and individuals. These stakeholders are invited through broadcast media publicly and thru letters individually together with the copy of the agenda to create necessary preparations earlier.

2.4. Policy Implementation

The implementation stage of the overall public policies carried out after the completion of the legitimation process. As stated by Fitz et al. (1994), policy goals are transformed into actions within the implementation stage. The accomplishment of the policy objectives majorly relies on the proper implementation (Ripley and Franklin, 1986). During this context, if the policies aren't implemented coherently and efficiently, it is not feasible to succeed in the set goals, even the policies are well-formulated (Edwards, 1980). On the opposite hand, social, economic, technological and political conditions significantly influence the implementation stage of public policies (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). On the policy implementation face, according to Process

Model government organise the departments and agencies that are responsible for the implementation of the policies. Accordingly, Ethiopian government organises different organisation from the federal level to locality.

- ✓ Pre-1973 no organised DM system, ad-hoc response to crises. Until 1973, there was no organised disaster management institution, and therefore a response to crisis up until then was ad hoc
- ✓ 1973: Relief & Rehabilitation Commission (RRC) established
- ✓ The first formal Govt. Disaster management institution was established in 1973 with the establishment of the RRC with a mandate of providing relief assistance to drought-affected people in Wollo and Tigray region.
- ✓ The first organisation, RRC, was re-organised and merged with the settlement and Awash Valley Development Authorities in 1978 with a mandate of relief and rehabilitation including settlement programs
- ✓ In 1993, the policy on NPDPM issued. Following the ratification of the policy RRC once again re-organised and changed into DPPC in 1995 with a significant change in its mandate (Relief supplies and Disaster Prevention through linking relief to development)
- ✓ DPPC was renamed again as the Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Agency (DPPA), with a revised mandate to focus on emergency response.

The system in 1993 had been practically *relief oriented* and therefore was quite effective in saving lives, but its contribution to reducing vulnerability to disaster risks as well as poverty reduction efforts low. Reengineering the way the country manages its disaster risks and related vulnerabilities were needed. In order to implement DRM in the country, a new structure was necessary. This structure which is based on BPR has brought Early Warning and Response Directorate and Food Security Coordination Directorate under one roof, i.e. Disaster Risk Management Food Security Sector (DRMFSS) in 2008. The same structures are replicated in all regions of the country for better coordination and implementation.

The committees and the parliamentary groups have the right to initiate draft bills, and the bills come to the legislature then signed by the respective initiator and given to the speaker. The bill is approved as an agenda item by the business advisory committee and presented to the plenary session. Before the discussion, representative of the policy initiator brief to the house on the contents and importance of the bill. After the briefing, the first reading debate is taken place by focusing on general issues. As the first reading is concluded, the bill either will be referred to the relevant standing committee for further scrutiny , or directly, if motion is moved, it will be passed to second reading and enacted as a law. The bill referred to the concerned committee after the first reading passes several stages prior to its approval by the House. Firstly, the committee to which the bill is referred has to examine carefully and in detail. After the committee members make it clear themselves, it is important to identify issues and questions to be clarified and answered by the initiator. The next step will be inviting the initiator government department heads and professionals to explain the purpose and importance of the draft bill and answer the questions prepared by the respective standing committee beforehand. The representative of the initiator government department gives clarifications over the vague issues and give answers to the questions from the standing committee and participants of the forum. If the bill under question is to have deemed affect the public interest, the public hearing will be organised by the focal committee. The public forum is represented by different stakeholders who may include mass organisations, professional associations, civil society organisations (CSOs) and higher education and research institutions, Chambers of commerce, public institutions, interested groups and individuals. These stakeholders are invited through broadcast media publicly and through letters individually along with the copy of the agenda to make the necessary preparations in advance.

The committees and the parliamentary groups have the right to initiate draft bills, and the bills come to the legislature then signed by the respective initiator and given to the speaker. The bill is approved as an agenda item by the business advisory committee and presented to the plenary session. Before the discussion, representative of the policy initiator brief to the house on the contents and importance of the bill. After the briefing, the first reading debate is taken place by focusing on general issues. As the first reading is concluded, the bill either will be referred to the relevant standing committee for further scrutiny , or directly, if motion is moved, it will be passed to second reading and enacted as a law. The bill referred to the concerned committee after the first reading passes several stages prior to its approval by the House. Firstly, the committee to which the bill is referred has to examine carefully and in detail. After the committee members make it clear themselves, it is important to identify issues and questions to be clarified and answered by the initiator. The next step will be inviting the initiator government department heads and professionals to explain the purpose and importance of the draft bill and answer the questions prepared by the respective standing committee beforehand. The representative of the initiator government department gives clarifications over the vague issues and give answers to the questions from the standing committee and participants of the forum. If the bill under question is to have deemed affect the public interest, a public hearing will be organised by the focal committee. The public forum is represented by different stakeholders who may

include mass organisations, professional associations, civil society organisations (CSOs) and higher education and research institutions.

Chambers of commerce, public institutions, interested groups and individuals. These stakeholders are invited through broadcast media publicly and through letters individually along with the copy of the agenda to make the necessary preparations in advance.

The committees and the parliamentary groups have the right to initiate draft bills, and the bills come to the legislature then signed by the respective initiator and given to the speaker. The bill is approved as an agenda item by the business advisory committee and presented to the plenary session. Before the discussion, representative of the policy initiator brief to the house on the contents and importance of the bill. After the briefing, the first reading debate is taken place by focusing on general issues. As the first reading is concluded, the bill either will be referred to the relevant standing committee for further scrutiny, or directly, if motion is moved, it will be passed to second reading and enacted as a law. The bill referred to the concerned committee after the first reading passes several stages prior to its approval by the House. Firstly, the committee to which the bill is referred has to examine carefully and in detail. After the committee members make it clear themselves, it is important to identify issues and questions to be clarified and answered by the initiator. The next step will be inviting the initiator government department heads and professionals to explain the purpose and importance of the draft bill and answer the questions prepared by the respective standing committee beforehand. The representative of the initiator government department gives clarifications over the vague issues and give answers to the questions from the standing committee and participants of the forum. If the bill under question is to have deemed affect the public interest, a public hearing will be organised by the focal committee. The public forum is represented by different stakeholders who may include mass organisations, professional associations, civil society organisations (CSOs) and higher education and research institutions.

Currently, Ethiopian disaster risk management council designs a structure that deals with multi-stakeholder coordination. Disaster is not single sector issues; rather, it is multi-organisation and multi-disciplinary.

The primary responsibility of coordinating and monitoring the progress of the DRM Strategic Programme lies with the DRM Technical Working Group (DRMTWG) which also supports the implementation of the new multi-sectoral and multi-hazard DRM approach in Ethiopia, besides providing a platform for the mutual engagement and support of humanitarian organisations and development partners.

The DRMTWG also forms link between this DRM coordination structure and the Rural Economic Development and Food Security - Sector Working Group (RED&FS - SWG), particularly the Joint Strategic Oversight Committee on DRM (JSOC-DRM).

The DRMTWG continues to work as the nodal coordination forum on all DRM phases – pre-disaster (prevention, mitigation and preparedness), during a disaster (response) and post-disaster (recovery and rehabilitation). The DRMTWG is supported by a set of technical and sector Task Forces. These task forces are primarily responsible for the coordination and actions under each sector and are headed by respective relevant government line ministries and are supported by organisations from other line ministries, UN agencies and civil society organisations. Cross-cutting to all these is the Working Group on Mainstreaming Gender in DRM that will work with DRMTWG and all other sector task Forces to mainstream discussions on vulnerabilities associated with gender and other socially vulnerable groups.

It has been observed that in many of these forums, the discussions largely centre on disaster management issues while risk reduction and recovery aspects get only residual attention. Hence, specific and redirected emphasis will be paid to mainstream DRR and recovery issues in discussions, activities and decisions of all these coordination forums. The constituents of these groups will also be reviewed to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are encouraged to attend and where appropriate, the coordinating agencies reflect the requirements of the group. The ToRs of groups will be revised, and monitoring and evaluation indicators relevant to DRR and Recovery will be included in work plans and reviews. The DRMTWG will be provided with the required technical assistance and support to realise this.

Nevertheless, given the recurrent severity of disasters in Ethiopia, unique multi-agency coordination structures would be activated at times of crises. This includes both Technical and Strategic Multi-Agency Coordination (MAC) groups within the framework of the National Incident Management System (NIMS). The NIMS will also facilitate establishing an Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) that will monitor and collate information from all parts of the country regularly, thus enabling early and smooth response.

2.6 Policy Evaluation

Evaluation is the last stage of the stages of the process model. During this stage, the results and therefore, the outputs of the implemented policies are attempted to place forth and assessed (Dunn, 1981; Peters, 1996). Additionally, it has mainly examined

whether the policies and programs reach the determined goals and objectives (Jones, 1977; Kraft and Furlong, 2004). In other words, the general success of the policies in meeting the aims and targets of the national program is measured within the evaluation stage/process (Peters, 1996; Dye, 2008). In the evaluation stage, the trouble spent within the public politics and implementation process is tackled and scrutinised by using organisational methods supported performance, effectiveness, and productivity (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995; Peters, 1996). Moreover, the conscious or unconscious effects of the policies on the society are examined intimately (Dye, 2008)

Evaluation of the policy in Ethiopia isn't systematic intrinsically intimately. The Ethiopian evaluation system is simply bureaucratically not follow series rational evaluation research. Additionally, to the present, it's bounded by policy impacts and policy achievements.

However, the council of ministers listen to the report of the minister then discuss achievements and challenges. The Agriculture ministry compiles the report face to face to deal with people's Representative (HPR). The house discusses the report and set a direction for minimising the challenges. The house may organise the certain the commission to supervise or identify implementation problems. For the rationale that disaster management mostly the concern of public administration at various large system interlinked with grassroots community.

The NDRM Policy Document (2014) elaborate that Regular evaluations of the DRM Strategic Programme are going to be conducted to work out its effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Before the conduct of any evaluation exercise, baseline exercises are going to be undertaken to determine the benchmark for the implementation of the DRM SPIF. This may include a midterm and end of term evaluation.

In both evaluation exercises, DRM stakeholders (government, donors, UN agencies, and NGOs) are going to be extensively involved within the spirit of participation and transparency which characterises the implementation of the DRM SPIF. Both evaluations are going to be conducted under the purview of the DRMTWG with the results presented and discussed within the said group, as well as, in other bodies of the agricultural Economic Development and Food Security (RED&FS) structure (ibid).

Major policy Achievements

According to DRMFSS (2014) report the following results have been recorded while implementing disaster risk management policy

2.6.1 National Level Achievements

- ✓ Revised Disaster Risk Management Policy endorsed shared with all stakeholders;
- ✓ The country's five-year Growth and Transformation Plan has integral elements on DRR and temperature change Adaptation;
- ✓ A comprehensive risk assessment - data for the Wereda Disaster Risk Profile was composed of 300 districts/weredas, profiles developed for 200 weredas, and Contingency Plans for 50 - the DRMFSS Information Management System launched.
- ✓ A very sophisticated weather risk management system – The Livelihoods, Early Assessment and Protection project (LEAP) –collects remote sensed data and data from automated weather stations to produce vital early warning information to support early action;
- ✓ A scientific database (Risk Baselines) exists that has recorded disaster events for the last several decades. This database is currently being integrated into the inventor system

- ✓ Fully functioning multi-sector and multi-agency national platform - DRM Technical working party - drawing membership from relevant government agencies and development partners – supported by Sector Taskforces;
- ✓ More efforts are placed on linking emergency lifesaving interventions to long-run development – specialise in resilience-building; a shift to an annual humanitarian requirements document (HRD);
- ✓ A specialised department of DRM during a major national university; the middle for Disaster Risk Management (CDRM) is established (capacity building beyond Ethiopia);
- ✓ DRR integrated within the country's school curriculum - into the themes of grade 5-8. - Efforts for DRR integration in lower grades (1 to 4) is additionally in progress.
- ✓ Urban DRM - existing risk analysis tools (such as Wereda Disaster Risk Profile) are being adopted to urban areas for further implementation;
- ✓ The country is aggressively working within the infrastructure development - railway construction, hydroelectric power, communication (mobile network boosting), wereda net connectivity etc.
- ✓ Building codes are developed for brand new constructions (condominiums) within the capital city of the country. A programme has also been developed for the capital city to confirm long-term sustainable urban development. Very successful projects on flood risk management, safe beverage, etc. being implemented.

2.6.2 Local Level Achievements

- ✓ Significant progress in community participation (as witnessed during risk assessments, early warning systems and seasonal assessments); Efforts are underway to raised engage local actors (local NGOs and CBOs) in DRM coordination forums ;
- ✓ The disaster risk reduction activities are moved towards decentralised structures in its operations through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.
- ✓ A connectivity system is currently being implemented through which all the district focal offices are connected to the department of the federal government. This may enable smooth the flow of data in the least vertical and horizontal levels.
- ✓ The productive Safety Net was re-designed in 2014 to scale back disaster risks and increase communities' resilience to shocks.

2.6.3 CHALLENGES Encountered during Policy Implementation

- ✚ Formalised and institutionalised community participation in disaster risk reduction planning and implementation still not well developed
- ✚ Capacity building at the local level– investing more on human capital and infrastructure development inadequate
- ✚ DRR financing - shift from addressing emergencies to risk reduction initiatives – need for enormous awareness-raising campaigns for giant investment on preparedness to reinforce response capacities of communities;
- ✚ Building a robust accountability mechanism; not yet developed
Inadequacy of commitment of the leadership the least bit levels
- ✚ Clear roles and responsibility and inclusive accountability for improved monitoring and evaluation;
- ✚ Most of the individuals that depend on safety net program aren't progressing. The graduation from the system becoming lugging behind

- ✚ Engage the private sector -with the dropping funding from traditional donors;

Generally in Ethiopia, although there are policies achievements, creating resilient people during the time of disaster seek tremendous additional efforts. Henceforth the policy direction should make sure that lives and livelihoods are saved and guarded, which sustainable development is often pursued.

3. Conclusion

Above all, policy is what the government chose to do or not to do. Even though it is difficult to analyse certain policy by only one model, the process model encompasses almost all policy procedures. When we consider policy procedures in Ethiopia, most of the policies follow the top-down approach. Because of most of the policy emanated from the central government. But in the case of national disaster risk management policies, it followed process procedures. In addition to this policy is driven by life-saving motives during 1973 famine. Putting this into consideration, it is very sensitive to follow every step of policy procedures that meet the process model. The problem was identified by the community, international organisation; govern officials, agenda settled by a political group, international media, and civil societies. The policy is legitimised by legislative and executive bodies. Organisational frameworks organised. The national committee manages all the policy implementation. Formally delve of evaluation have been taking place by a member of parliament, national disaster risk management task force, and other concerned international funding organisations. Even though this policy passes through all processes, proper evaluation of its output at the household level should be researched in the future.

References

- [Africa :: Ethiopia — The World Factbook - Central ...](#)retrieved on April 10, 2020 observed from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/et.html> at
- Anderson, J. E. (1975). Public Policy-making, Praeger, Holt, New York.
- Anderson, J. E. (1979). Public Policymaking: An Introduction, 2nd Edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Anderson, J. E. (1982). Cases in Public Policy-Making, Second Edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Anderson, J. E. (2003). Public policymaking: An introduction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, pp. 1 – 34.
- Anderson, J. E. (2014). Public Policymaking: An Introduction, 8th Edition, Cengage Learning, Stamford, Connecticut.
- Birkland, T. A. (2005). An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making, 2nd Edition, M. E. Sharpe, New York.
- Brewer, G. D., and DeLeon, P. (1983). The Foundations of Policy Analysis, Brooks, Cole, Monterey, California.
- Cochran, C. L., and Malone, E. F. (1999). Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices, McGraw-Hill, Boston.
- DRMSPIF (2014) retrieved on April 1, 2020 Observed from <https://www.gfdrr.org/en/ethiopia-disaster-risk-management-investment-framework>
- Dye, Thomas R. (1978) Understanding Public Policy (3rded.), Englewood Cliff NJ: Prentice Hall
- Dye, T. R. (1972). Understanding Public Policy, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Dunn, W. N. (1981). Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). Implementing Public Policy, Congressional Quarterly Press, Washington, DC.
- Fitz, J., Haplin, D., and Power, S. (1994). “Implementation Research and Education Policy: Practice and Prospects”, British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 42, p. 53-69.
- Gosling, J. J. (2004). Understanding, Informing, and Appraising Public Policy, Pearson, New York.

- Hahn, Alan J.(2016) POLICY MAKING MODELS AND THEIR ROLE IN POLICY EDUCATION Cornell University observed from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/7044344.pdf> retrieved on April 11,2020
- Hill, M. (1997). *The Policy Process in the Modern State*, 3rd Edition, Prentice Hall / Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire.
- Howlett, M., and Ramesh, M. (1995). *Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*, Oxford University Press, Canada.
- Jenkins, W. I. (1978). *Policy-Analysis: A Political and Organisational Perspective*, Martin Robertson, London.
- Jones, C. (1970). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California..
- Jones, C. (1977). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, 2nd Edition, Duxbury Press, North Scituate, Massachusetts.
- Kemal A, Sukanya A., Sukhumvit S.& Weerakul C.(2018) Integrated Regional Development Policy Formulation in Ethiopia, *Journal of Politics and Law*; Vol. 11, No. 4; p153-163
- Knoepfel, P., Larrue, C., Varone, F., and Hill, M. (2007). *Public Policy Analysis*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Kraft, E. M., and Furlong, S. R. (2004). *Public Policy: Politics, Analysis and Alternatives*, CQ Press, Washington D.C
- Kulac,O. & Ozgur,H.(2017). An Overview of the Stages(Heuristics) Model as Public Policy Analysis Framework, *European Scientific Journal*,147-157
- Macrae, D., and Wilde, J. A. (1985). *Policy Analysis for Public Decisions*, University Press of America, California.
- May, J. V., and Wildavsky, A. B. (1978). *The Policy Cycle*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California and London.
- Mulugeta Abebe(2010) Disaster Management in Ethiopia: A Review of Its Checkered History, Its Transformation and Some Implications for a Vibrant Disaster Management System, 1975-2008, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, Volume 12, No.4, pp 237-254
- National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy of Ethiopia(2013) retrieved on April 11,2019 Observed on www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/policies/v.php?id=42435**
- Nelson, B. J. (1978) “Setting the Public Agenda: The Case of Child Abuse
- Nelson, B. J. (1986). *Making an Issue of Child Abuse: Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Peters, G. (1996). *American Public Policy: Promise and Performance*, 4th Edition, CQ Press, Washington DC.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1999). *The Theories of the Policy Process*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- Ripley, R. B., and Franklin, G. A. (1984). *Congress, the Bureaucracy, and Public Policy*, The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois.
- Sidney, M. S. (2007). “Policy Formulation: Design and Tools”, F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, M.S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis, Theory, Politics, and Methods*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, p. 79-87.