The **Goal** of the workshop

**Goal**

Learning how to provide relief assistance in such a way that long-term development is encouraged by using the Vulnerability/Capacity methodology

The difference between Relief and Development:

a. the Traditional approach to Relief
b. the Developmental approach to Relief

---

**TRADITIONAL RELIEF APPROACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Situation</th>
<th>Normal Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Vulnerability</td>
<td>High Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Capacity</td>
<td>Low Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the traditional approach to relief you tried to restore things to how they were before - and you do this by applying the tools of Rescue, Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. However, the normal situation (to which you are trying to return, is a situation in which people are very vulnerable to the next disaster, and one in which people have not improved their capacity to cope with the problems of the next disaster. In fact the traditional approach to relief deals with immediate problems, but does not deal with the implications of these problems on peoples lives. Having been rescued from a disaster they are no more able to cope with the next disaster than they were before the relief effort.
The Developmental approach to relief, however, shows a different picture. Here the situation of the people at the end of the intervention was considerably better than their situation before the disaster. They were more able to deal with problems in the future. As well as the relief tools of Rescue, Relief, Rehabilitation and reconstruction, they had been assisted by the tools of Prevention, Mitigation, and Preparedness before the disaster happened. Thus the effects of the disaster on the people were less, their recovery faster, their post disaster situation was better, and they were better able to withstand the next disaster when it comes.

Many NGOs think that you can either do relief or development, but that these are two separate, and mutually contradictory ways of working. Some NGOs think that you can do both relief and development, but that they have to be handled differently. Now we are saying that you can do development through relief so that the act of a disaster relief exercise will lead to developmental impact.

It does depend, however, on appreciating that development is something which people have to do for themselves. The important statement in this connection is:

**No-one ever develops anyone else: people and societies develop themselves.**

International aid, whether for development, or in response to an emergency, cannot bring development.

However, it can either support and promote development or, unfortunately, undermine and delay it.
The most useful ways of understanding the differences between the two approaches start with appreciating that the people who are affected by a disaster are no different just because they have suffered a disaster. They are still people with strengths or capacities (even though they may have been through a very rough time). Just because they seem very vulnerable, this should not stop us from seeing them as human beings who have the opportunity to interact with their environment to improve their lives - should not stop us from seeing them in developmental terms.

A very useful way of looking at people is by assessing their vulnerabilities and their capacities - and to think how we can decrease their vulnerabilities - i.e. make them less vulnerable to problems: and how we can increase their capacities - i.e. make them better able to overcome problems.

We can usefully define development, therefore, as:

```
Development is the process by which vulnerabilities are reduced and capacities increased
```

We are very used to thinking of vulnerabilities and capacities in physical terms - such a person is vulnerable to disease because he/she is weak, or they have the capacity to withstand drought because they have savings in the bank, for example. But people are not defined by physical things only: it is also very important to think of the ways that people get together socially and organisationally, and it is also very important to think about peoples attitudes and motivations.

A very useful tool for dealing with people at time of disaster is a six part matrix which looks at Capacities and Vulnerabilities under three levels - Physical/material: social/organisational: motivational/attitudinal. This matrix encourages us to make sure we are thinking of people’s vulnerabilities and capacities, and it encourages us to make sure that we are thinking of them in three different ways. It also shows that there are no definite lines between these divisions - some characteristics can be vulnerabilities at some times.

Let us try the methodology out with a country or a disaster with which you are familiar, and see whether this methodology helps us to understand aspects of relief and development that we had not thought of previously.
Also think of using the Matrix in other ways:

a. It could be used as an exercise over time - the matrix at one point, then redone six months later to see what changes had occurred, for instance.

b. It might be done for different groups - the matrix done for women, separately from men, for instance, and then compared.

c. It might be done at different levels - at village, district, province and national levels for instance.