DEVELOPMENT OF A RESILIENCE MEASUREMENT TOOL TO EVALUATE THE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

Gardiya Mudiyanselage Chamal Anjana Perera 188018B

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science in Civil Engineering

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

May 2019

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:	Date:
The above candidate has carried out research	for the Masters thesis under my supervision.
Names of the supervisors: Dr C.S.A. Siriwar	rdana
Signature of the supervisor:	Date:
Names of the supervisors: Dr T.M.N. Wijay	raratna
Signature of the supervisor:	Date:

Abstract

The frequency of disasters and emergencies has increased rapidly during the past few decades and it is necessary to conduct more research in this field to improve the knowledge levels and capacities of individuals/systems. And subsequently this can assist policy makers. Instead of managing disasters after the outbreak, in the present situation the researchers are more concerned about improving the resilience of communities to face impacts. Under this background, methods to measure community resilience are vital because it can be used to identify the vulnerable communities and resilience scores can be used in the decision-making process. To assist the process, this research aims to develop a universal tool to quantify the levels of resilience of communities to the impacts.

From the literature, indicators which are relevant to resilience measurements were listed, suitable indicators were filtered and then the method of measurement was defined. Overall, 108 indicators have been listed on this scorecard under five main capital domains, including, social, economic, physical, human and environmental. This list was sent to the experts and the index was refined based on the expert comments. To provide the resilience score, two types of scoring methods (Community Resilience Scores - CRS₁ and CRS₂) have been introduced in this dissertation where the first method uses a general approach to calculate the resilience and the second method uses a more descriptive approach including the four main disaster management phases (Mitigation, Preparedness, Response and Recovery). The scoring method has been defined to calculate the overall resilience, resilience to floods and resilience to droughts. The method has not validated yet and open for researchers to test this method.

However, applicability of the tool is explained using a few case studies and these cases show the overall resilience values, values for resilience for floods and droughts in some selected regions in Sri Lanka. From the case studies, the overall resilience values (CRS₁) show that social and environmental resilience is higher in the rural areas compared to the urban areas while the economic and physical resilience is higher in the urban areas compared to the rural areas. According to the CRS₂ the response stage shows lower scores in many of the selected regions. Similarly, using the values of the proposed two matrices (CRS₁ and CRS₂), gaps in the major capital domains in a given administrative region can be identified and this is important to undertake further developments and for allocation of resources. The proposed scoring method can be used to prepare resilience level maps and to identify vulnerable regions as well.

The study can be extended to improve the index to measure the resilience to other disasters, including hurricanes, landslides, tsunamis and other coastal hazards.

Key words: Disaster resilience; Resilience index; Resilience measurements; Resilience evaluation; Indicators

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. C.S.A. Siriwardana for his immense support, guidance and encouragement throughout this research. Because of his support I was able to successfully complete my masters and also able to get a very big exposure to local and international environment. And also I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my co-supervisor Dr. Nimal Wijayaratna for his immense support and the guidance for the successful completion of my masters.

Further, I would like to express my appreciation to the former Research Coordinators of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa; Prof. A.A.D.A.J Perera and Prof. R.U. Halwathura who instructed me to improve my research work. And also I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. J.M.S.J. Bandara and Prof. S.A.S. Kulathilaka who were the heads of the department of civil engineering during the duration of my masters for creating a good atmosphere to work.

My special thanks should go to two EU funded projects; ASCENT (Advancing Skill Creation to Enhance Transformation) and CABARET (Capacity Building in Asia for Resilience Education) for providing me the necessary funding and sharing knowledge to carry out my research effectively within the given time.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all the professional from the industry and the academics from local and overseas universities for assisting in the development of the resilience measurement tool with their valuable ideas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	ix
List of Abbreviations	xi
1.0 Introduction and Structure of the Thesis	1
1.1 Background	
1.2 Problem statement	5
1.3 Scope of study	5
1.4 Research objectives	6
1.5 Outcomes	6
1.6 Arrangement of the thesis	6
2.0 Literature Review	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Important aspects of community resilience	8
2.2.1 Terminology	8
2.2.2 Definitions for the term resilience	10
2.3 Existing resilience measurement approaches	11
2.3.1 Mayunga Method	11
2.3.2 REDI Scorecard	13
2.3.3 Disaster Resilience Scorecard for cities	14
2.3.4 Sendai Framework of Action	16
2.3.5 Holistic Community Resilience Framework	17
2.3.6 Sustainable Development Goals	17
2.3.7 INFORM Risk index	17
2.3.8 Model of area-picture of potential threats	18
2.3.9 I2UD's framework for climate change adaptation and resilience	20
2.3.10 PEOPLES Resilience Framework	21
2.3.11 City Resilience Framework	21

2.3.12 Community Resilience Framework of Sri Lanka	21
2.4 Summary of the important tools and frameworks	22
3.0 Research Methodology	25
	25
3.1 Introduction	
3.2 Methodology flow chart	25
4.0 Development of the Tool to Measure Community Resilience	26
4.1 Introduction	26
4.2 Process of the development of the resilience measurement tool	26
4.3 Concept related to community capitals	27
4.3.1 Social Capital	
4.3.2 Economic Capital	28
4.3.3 Physical Capital	28
4.3.4 Human Capital	28
4.3.5 Environmental Capital	28
4.4 Different phases of disaster management	28
4.4.1 Disaster Mitigation	28
4.4.2 Disaster Preparedness	29
4.4.3 Disaster Response	29
4.4.4 Disaster Recovery	29
4.5 Development of list of Indicators to measure resilience	29
4.6 Expert Survey	
4.7 Method of Measurement	35
4.8 Definition of the indicators under main phases of DM	36
4.9 Definition of method of measurement	
4.9.1 Social Resilience	41
4.9.2 Economic Resilience	46
4.9.3 Physical Resilience	49
4.9.4 Human Resilience	53
4.9.5 Environmental Resilience	55
4.10 Output Matrices	58
5.0 Case Studies – Application of the Tool	60
5.1 Introduction	60
5.2 Output Matrix for CRS ₁	
5.2.1 Overall Resilience	
5.2.2 Resilience for Floods	
5.2.3 Resilience for Droughts	
5.3 Output Matrix for CRS ₂	
Old Chapter Marin 101 ChO2	

5.4 Summary of the study	75
5.4.1 Community Resilience Score 1 (CRS ₁)	75
5.4.2 Community Resilience Score 2 (CRS ₂)	75
6.0 Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations	77
6.1 Introduction	77
6.2 Discussion	77
6.2.1 Identification of the relevant indicators	77
6.2.2 Development of the resilience measurement tool	78
6.2.3 Applicability of the resilience measurement tool	
6.3 Conclusions	
6.4 Limitation	80
6.5 Recommendations for future work	80
7 () References	82

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Top 10 countries in the world in terms of absolute losses due to disasters	
(billion US\$) 1998 – 2017	1
Figure 1.2: Top 10 countries in terms of average annual percentage losses relative to	
GDP	2
Figure 1.3: Deaths from floods 1974 – 2018.	3
Figure 1.4: Houses destroyed, Houses Damaged 1974 – 2018	3
Figure 1.5: Affected Population from Floods 1974 – 2018	3
Figure 1.6: Affected population from droughts 1974-2018	4
Figure 1.7: Affected population from land-slides 1974-2018	4
Figure 1.8: Relationship between community resilience and disaster resilience	5
Figure 1.9: Structure of the dissertation	7
Figure 2.1: Community Disaster Resilience Framework (CDRF)	12
Figure 2.2: Relationship between the community capitals and disaster phases	13
Figure 2.3: The model of area/picture of potential threats	19
Figure 2.4: I2UD Resilience framework	20
Figure 2.5: Sri Lankan community resilience framework	22
Figure 3.1: Research methodology flow chart	25
Figure 4.1: Development process of the resilience measurement tool	26
Figure 4.2: Fields of expertise of the experts	31
Figure 4.3: Level of agreement for the social capital indicators	31
Figure 4.4: Level of agreement for the economic capital indicators	32
Figure 4.5: Level of agreement for the physical capital indicators	32
Figure 4.6: Level of agreement for the human capital indicators	33
Figure 4.7: Level of agreement for the environmental capital indicators	33
Figure 5.1: Overall resilience of the selected regions	63
Figure 5.2: Overall Resilience Score – Negative	64
Figure 5.3: Resilience for Floods – Positive	65
Figure 5 4: Resilience to Floods – Negative	66

Figure 5.5: Resilience for Drought – Positive	67
Figure 5.6: Resilience for Drought – Negative	68
Figure 5.7: The overall resilience scores for different regions under main four	phases of
disaster management	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Summary of the tools/frameworks used in the development of the CRS tool 22
Table 4.1: Initially identified indicators
Table 4.2: Refined list of indicators
Table 4.3: The number of indicators relevant to floods and droughts34
Table 4.4: List of indicators for measuring resilience
Table 4.5: Definition of the measurement criteria for indicators under the social capital
41
Table 4.6: Definition of the measurement criteria for indicators under the economic
capital46
Table 4.7: Definition of the measurement criteria for indicators under the physical
capital49
Table 4.8: Definition of the measurement criteria for indicators under the human capital
53
Table 4.9: Definition of the measurement criteria for indicators under the economic
capital55
Table 4.10: Output matrix for the CRS ₁
Table 4.11: Output matrix for the CRS ₂
Table 5.1: Number of Indicators used for the evaluation of overall resilience
Table 5.2: Colour code used in the matrices
Table 5.3: Overall resilience scores - Positive
Table 5.4: Overall Resilience Score – Negative
Table 5.5: Resilience for floods – Positive
Table 5.6: Resilience for Floods – Negative
Table 5.7: Resilience for Drought – Positive
Table 5.8: Resilience for Drought – Negative
Table 5.9: Overall resilience of Sri Lanka under different phases of disaster management
69

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Abbreviation</u> <u>Description</u>

CDRF Community Disaster Resilience Framework

REDI Resilience to Emergencies and Disasters Index

SDGs Sustainable Development Goals

CRS Community Resilience Score

DSD Divisional Secretariat Division

DM Disaster Management

DRR Disaster Risk Reduction

CRS Community Resilience Score