

MECHANISMS FOR ACTIVE INDIGENOUS PARTICIPATION AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE INTEGRATION IN DISASTER RISK REDUCTION: POLICY FRAMEWORKS, BARRIERS, AND PATHWAYS FORWARD

Utpal Deka¹

Received: 30 April 2026 || **Revised:** 13 June 2026
Accepted: 16 June 2026 || **Published:** 31 July 2026

Abstract: Indigenous Knowledge (IK) and traditional practices provide place-specific, sustainable, and culturally resonant strategies for disaster risk reduction (DRR), yet their systematic incorporation into formal frameworks remains limited, frequently resulting in the marginalization of active participation by indigenous communities. This paper critically examines global, regional, and national policy frameworks that support IK integration in DRR, with a particular focus on mechanisms designed to ensure meaningful indigenous involvement in decision-making, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Drawing on key instruments such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030), Hyogo Framework for Action (2005–2015), United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) Words into Action guidelines, the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), and national examples from India (e.g., NDMP 2019, Forest Rights Act 2006), Canada, and Africa, the study analyses how these frameworks promote hybrid DRR systems that blend traditional knowledge with scientific approaches. It highlights advantages including enhanced resilience, equity, cost-effectiveness, and psycho-social support, while addressing persistent challenges such as knowledge erosion, power imbalances, climate-induced unreliability of

¹ *Utpal Deka* is an assistant professor in the Discipline of Economics at the Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open University, Guwahati, Assam, INDIA. Correspondence regarding this article must be sent to: utpaldeka007@gmail.com

indicators, marginalization, and documentation gaps. Through a qualitative literature review and policy analysis, the paper identifies gaps in systematic co-production, ethical participation, and long-term evaluation. Findings emphasize the urgent need for strengthened legal protections, direct funding, community-led initiatives, and intersectional approaches to foster genuine inclusion. The paper proposes actionable recommendations centred on Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), knowledge co-production platforms, and community sovereignty to build inclusive, resilient DRR systems capable of addressing escalating climate risks.

Keywords: Active Participation, Community Resilience, Disaster Risk Reduction, Indigenous Knowledge, Integration Mechanisms, Policy Frameworks, Traditional Practices.

Introduction and Background

Disasters, intensified by climate change, environmental degradation, rapid urbanization, and deepening socio-economic inequalities, continue to pose escalating threats to human security and sustainable development worldwide (IPCC, 2022; UNDRR, 2025). Indigenous peoples, who represent approximately 6% of the global population (around 476 million) yet steward up to 80% of the world's remaining biodiversity, disproportionately inhabit hazard-prone ecosystems such as coastal zones, mountainous regions, arid lands, and river basins (FAO, 2021). Their traditional knowledge systems (accumulated over millennia through intimate interaction with local environments) offer adaptive, low-cost, and culturally grounded strategies for anticipating, mitigating, and recovering from hazards. Despite this potential, indigenous knowledge and the communities that hold it are frequently marginalized, undervalued, or entirely excluded from mainstream disaster risk reduction (DRR) policies, planning, and implementation (Hiwasaki et al., 2014; Berkes, 2026).

The central problem is the persistent lack of effective, enforceable mechanisms to ensure the active, meaningful participation of indigenous communities and the systematic, ethical incorporation of their traditional knowledge into formal DRR frameworks. Global policy instruments, such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030), explicitly call for inclusion under Priority 1 (Understanding Disaster Risk) and Priority 3 (Investing in Resilience), yet in practice indigenous voices are often reduced to tokenistic consultation or completely sidelined (Hadlos et al., 2022).

This exclusion stems from multiple intersecting factors: historical colonial legacies that devalued non-Western knowledge systems, technocratic biases that privilege scientific and expert-driven approaches, and structural power imbalances that enable external actors to “extract” indigenous knowledge without equitable benefit-sharing, prior informed consent, or community control (Iloka, 2016; Mercer et al., 2010).

The consequences are profound. Culturally disconnected DRR interventions often fail to gain community trust or compliance, leading to lower effectiveness, reduced early warning uptake, and persistent vulnerabilities. In rapidly changing contexts driven by climate change, traditional indicators (e.g., bio-signals, seasonal cues) are becoming less reliable, while oral transmission of knowledge is disrupted by urbanization, migration, formal education, and generational disconnect (Ali et al., 2021; Rai, 2019). In countries like India, where indigenous and tribal populations (8.6% of the total) face compounded risks from floods, cyclones, droughts, and landslides, national policies such as the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP, 2019) and the Forest Rights Act (2006) acknowledge the value of traditional knowledge but provide limited operational mechanisms for active participation or co-production (Ogra et al., 2021). Similar patterns are evident across Africa, the Pacific, and Latin America, where modernization and policy gaps accelerate knowledge loss and exclusion (UNESCO, 2021).

Without dedicated, enforceable mechanisms such as Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), knowledge co-production platforms, direct funding for indigenous-led initiatives, and intersectional safeguards—DRR remains predominantly top-down, inefficient, and inequitable. This not only undermines the resilience of indigenous communities but also deprives global DRR efforts of valuable, context-specific insights that could enhance accuracy, cultural acceptability, sustainability, and equity. This study addresses this critical gap by systematically analysing existing policy frameworks and proposing actionable mechanisms to ensure genuine indigenous participation and authentic integration of traditional knowledge in DRR.

Review of Related Literature

The scholarly discourse on indigenous knowledge (IK) and traditional practices in disaster risk reduction (DRR) has matured significantly over the past two decades, transitioning from primarily descriptive and ethnographic accounts to more analytical, policy-oriented, and theoretically grounded examinations of integration, participation, and equity.

Conceptual Foundations of Indigenous Knowledge in DRR

Early foundational works define IK as a dynamic, cumulative body of place-specific observations, practices, beliefs, innovations, and worldviews developed through generations of direct interaction with local environments (Shaw et al., 2008; Berkes, 2026). Unlike static views of “traditional” knowledge, contemporary scholarship emphasizes its adaptive, evolving nature, continually refined through observation, experimentation, and intergenerational transmission (Hiwasaki et al., 2014; Walshe & Nunn, 2012). Key characteristics include holism (humans as integral to ecosystems), place-specificity, oral/practical transmission (stories, songs, rituals, apprenticeships), community ownership and inclusivity, and low-cost, sustainable attributes (Mercer et al., 2010; Iloka, 2016)

The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) has played a pivotal role in legitimizing IK within global DRR discourse. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030) explicitly calls for its integration under Priority 1 and Priority 3, positioning IK as complementary to scientific knowledge for more comprehensive risk profiles (UNDRR, 2015). UNDRR’s Words into Action guidelines (2021) provide practical tools for incorporation, emphasizing participatory processes, cultural relevance, and ethical engagement to avoid extractive practices.

Contributions of IK across the Disaster Management Cycle

Empirical literature consistently demonstrates IK’s value across all phases of the disaster management cycle. In risk assessment and understanding, indigenous communities leverage long-term environmental observation, generational memory, and seasonal calendars to identify hazard patterns and high-risk zones (McAdoo et al., 2006; Panda et al., 2023). For early warning and preparedness, bio-indicators (animal behaviour, plant phenology, atmospheric signs) and community protocols (lookouts, traditional signals) provide timely, localized alerts where formal systems are absent or delayed (Hiwasaki et al., 2014; Rahman et al., 2017). Mitigation strategies draw on nature-based solutions such as agro-forestry, terracing, diverse crop varieties, flexible architecture, and protection of natural buffers (mangroves, wetlands, forests) that reduce exposure sustainably (Mercer et al., 2010; Shaw et al., 2009). During response and recovery, strong mutual aid networks, equitable resource distribution, traditional healing, and communal rituals support survival, trauma recovery, and social cohesion (Walshe & Nunn, 2012; Ali et al., 2021).

Policy Frameworks and Mechanisms for Participation

Global policy evolution reflects growing recognition of IK. The Hyogo Framework for Action (2005–2015) initiated support by urging inclusion in national plans (UN, 2005). Sendai advanced this by mandating integration and participation (UNDRR, 2015). UNDRR guidelines (2021) advocate co-production, participatory mapping, and joint validation. Regionally, Canada's CNSC IK Policy Framework (2023) mandates FPIC and joint committees, aligned with UNDRIP. Africa's Plan of Action promotes community-led initiatives and direct funding (UNESCO, 2021). In India, NDMP (2019) and the Forest Rights Act (2006) acknowledge IK, but mechanisms for participation remain weak, with implementation gaps (Ogra et al., 2021).

Mechanisms commonly proposed include FPIC (ensuring consent), knowledge co-production (equal collaboration), digital archiving with community control, direct funding for indigenous-led projects, and intersectional safeguards (Hadlos et al., 2022; Rai, 2019).

Challenges and Emerging Directions

Persistent challenges include knowledge erosion (urbanization, migration, formal education), marginalization as “superstitious,” climate-induced unreliability of indicators, power imbalances in extraction, and documentation gaps (Ali et al., 2021; Rai, 2019).

Despite growing recognition of IK in DRR, several critical gaps persist in the literature and practice. Most studies remain case-specific, lacking rigorous comparative, multi-hazard, or cross-regional analyses that could generalize findings (Hadlos et al., 2022). Systematic, community-controlled documentation of oral IK is inadequate, risking permanent loss as elders pass and youth migrate (Rai, 2019).

Integration mechanisms such as FPIC, co-production, and direct funding are frequently proposed but rarely subjected to empirical evaluation for equity, long-term impact, or scalability (UNDRR, 2021). Global frameworks (Sendai) advocate inclusion, yet national implementation particularly in India, Africa, and the Pacific often exhibits urban/policy bias, limited funding, and weak enforcement (Ogra et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021). Intersectional dimensions (gender roles in knowledge transmission, disability inclusion within indigenous groups, youth involvement) remain under-explored (Ali et al., 2021).

Ethical participation models ensuring indigenous sovereignty, avoiding extractive research, and enabling community-led initiatives are conceptually strong but infrequently tested in real-world policy contexts (Hadlos et al., 2022). Platforms like LCIPP and NAPs are emerging but lack comprehensive

analysis of their DRR-specific effectiveness. This study addresses these gaps by systematically analysing policy mechanisms for active participation and authentic IK incorporation in DRR, assessing barriers through comparative evidence, and proposing actionable pathways forward.

Objectives

Primary Objective

To critically examine global, regional, and national policy frameworks that enable the active participation of indigenous communities and the systematic incorporation of their traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction (DRR), with a view to identifying effective mechanisms and pathways for equitable, resilient, and culturally grounded DRR systems.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify and systematically analyse key policy frameworks and instruments that explicitly support or mandate the integration of traditional/indigenous knowledge in DRR processes.
2. To evaluate the design, implementation, and effectiveness of designated participatory mechanisms in facilitating meaningful indigenous involvement across DRR decision.
3. To assess major barriers to active participation and authentic incorporation of traditional knowledge in DRR
4. To propose evidence-based, actionable recommendations for strengthening indigenous participation, upholding community sovereignty, and enhancing traditional knowledge integration in DRR.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, desk-based approach combining systematic literature review and policy document analysis. A systematic search was conducted across databases including Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, and JSTOR using keywords such as “indigenous knowledge DRR”, “traditional knowledge disaster risk reduction”, “FPIC DRR”, “LCIPP”, and “indigenous participation Sendai Framework”. Inclusion criteria: peer-reviewed articles and official policy documents from 2005–2025 in English focusing on IK integration and participation. Exclusion criteria: purely technical studies without policy or participation focus. Approximately 45 high-quality sources were screened and thematically coded using NVivo-inspired manual coding for patterns related to frameworks, mechanisms, barriers, and recommendations.

Policy analysis followed content analysis techniques to examine explicit provisions, implementation gaps, and effectiveness indicators in key documents (Sendai Framework, NDMP 2019, CNSC IK Policy 2023, etc.). The study acknowledges limitations of relying solely on secondary sources and the absence of primary data (e.g., indigenous interviews). Future research should incorporate community-based participatory methods. No primary fieldwork was conducted due to resource and scope constraints.

Discussion

The integration of traditional and indigenous knowledge (TK/IK) into disaster risk reduction (DRR) represents a critical evolution in global and national approaches to building resilience against escalating climate-amplified hazards. This discussion critically examines the extent to which existing policy frameworks and participatory mechanisms enable active involvement of indigenous communities and the authentic incorporation of their knowledge systems. Structured around the four specific objectives of the study, the analysis draws on key international instruments (Sendai Framework, Hyogo Framework, UNDRR guidelines, LCIPP, NAPs), national policies (India's NDMP 2019, Forest Rights Act 2006, and comparative examples from Canada and Africa), empirical case studies, and emerging scholarship. It highlights both progress and persistent structural barriers, culminating in evidence-based recommendations for advancing equitable, sovereign, and effective DRR.

Identification and Analysis of Key Policy Frameworks Supporting TK/IK Integration in DRR

Global policy architecture has progressively recognized TK/IK as a legitimate and complementary resource to scientific knowledge in DRR. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030) marks a landmark shift by explicitly calling for the integration of indigenous and traditional knowledge under Priority 1: Understanding Disaster Risk and Priority 3: Investing in Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience (UNDRR, 2015). Unlike earlier frameworks, Sendai frames TK/IK not as supplementary folklore but as essential for comprehensive risk profiling, culturally grounded early warning systems, and community-led resilience investments. It implicitly requires participatory processes such as community consultations and joint knowledge validation to ensure indigenous perspectives shape national and local DRR strategies.

The predecessor Hyogo Framework for Action (2005–2015) laid foundational groundwork by urging governments to incorporate traditional knowledge into national plans and promote community participation (UN, 2005). While less prescriptive than Sendai, it catalyzed the initial global

policy shift toward recognizing non-Western knowledge systems. UNDRR's Words into Action guidelines (2021) operationalize these commitments by providing concrete tools: participatory mapping workshops, co-design of early warning protocols, validation of bio-indicators (e.g., animal behaviour, plant phenology) against scientific data, and inclusive stakeholder platforms. These guidelines emphasize ethical engagement, cultural relevance, and avoidance of extractive practices.

At the climate-DRR nexus, the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP), established at COP23 (2017) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), serves as a dedicated mechanism for indigenous participation in climate adaptation and risk management. LCIPP facilitates direct dialogue between indigenous representatives and Parties, enabling inputs into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). NAPs, in turn, are mandated to incorporate TK/IK where relevant, particularly in vulnerability assessments, adaptation planning, and community-based resilience measures (UNFCCC, 2018). This creates a formal channel for indigenous knowledge to influence climate-linked DRR.

Nationally, India's National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP, 2019) acknowledges the value of local and indigenous knowledge in community-based resilience and mandates its consideration in state and district plans. The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 (Forest Rights Act) legally recognizes indigenous rights over traditional lands, resources, and ecological knowledge, providing a statutory basis for protecting and utilizing TK/IK in DRR contexts. However, operational mechanisms such as mandatory consultation protocols or dedicated funding streams remain underdeveloped, with implementation often constrained by centralized decision-making and urban bias (Ogra et al., 2021).

Comparative examples illustrate varying degrees of progress. Canada's Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) Indigenous Knowledge Policy Framework (2023) mandates Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) for any project affecting Indigenous lands or knowledge and requires joint committees where Indigenous elders, knowledge holders, and scientists co-design monitoring protocols, impact assessments, and mitigation strategies. This framework, aligned with United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), exemplifies robust, enforceable participation mechanisms. Africa's regional Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction (UNESCO, 2021) promotes community-led IK initiatives and direct funding for indigenous organizations to conduct vulnerability assessments, emphasizing participation from planning through evaluation.

Collectively, these international and national policy frameworks have advanced several critical mechanisms for indigenous knowledge integration, including FPIC (which ensures consent and veto power), knowledge co-production models that promote equal collaboration in validation and strategy design, community-controlled digital archiving to preserve oral traditions, and direct funding streams for indigenous-led DRR projects (Hadlos et al., 2022; Rai, 2019). When effectively implemented, these mechanisms foster greater trust, equity, and long-term sustainability in hybrid DRR systems. However, enforcement remains inconsistent, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

The Sendai Framework (2015–2030) marks a landmark shift by positioning indigenous knowledge as essential rather than merely supplementary to scientific approaches (UNDRR, 2015). Yet, critical analysis reveals a significant gap between global commitments and national-level implementation. In India, for example, urban bias and limited dedicated funding continue to constrain effective translation of these policies into practice (Ogra et al., 2021). In contrast, Canada's Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) Indigenous Knowledge Policy Framework (2023) provides a stronger, more enforceable model through mandatory FPIC and joint oversight committees. This comparative perspective highlights the persistent tensions between aspirational global standards and the realities of binding domestic mechanisms.

Evaluation of Participatory Mechanisms and Their Effectiveness

Designated mechanisms such as FPIC, knowledge co-production, LCIPP platforms, NAPs, and community-led consultation structures aim to facilitate meaningful indigenous involvement across DRR phases. Their design and effectiveness vary significantly.

Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC): Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is a fundamental principle enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007). It requires that indigenous communities provide their free, prior, and informed collective agreement before any project, policy, or intervention that may affect their lands, territories, resources, or traditional knowledge proceeds. FPIC demands transparent information sharing in accessible formats and languages, independent advice, culturally appropriate consultation through community-chosen representatives, and the explicit right to withhold or withdraw consent.

In disaster risk reduction (DRR) contexts, FPIC ensures that indigenous knowledge is not extracted or applied without ownership, that interventions

respect cultural and spiritual values, and that indigenous priorities genuinely shape early warning systems, mitigation infrastructure, evacuation planning, and post-disaster recovery.

Canada provides one of the strongest examples of operationalization. The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission's (CNSC) Indigenous Knowledge Policy Framework (2023) mandates FPIC for any regulatory activity or project impacting Indigenous lands or knowledge. It requires joint oversight committees comprising Indigenous elders, knowledge holders, and technical experts to collaboratively co-design monitoring protocols, conduct impact assessments, and develop mitigation strategies. This approach has proven effective, ensuring Indigenous priorities actively shape outcomes and fostering trust, equity, and mutual accountability (CNSC, 2023).

By contrast, FPIC implementation in India remains significantly weaker in DRR contexts. While the Forest Rights Act, 2006 recognizes indigenous rights over traditional lands and resources, and the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP, 2019) acknowledges the value of local and indigenous knowledge, there is no explicit, legally enforceable FPIC requirement for DRR initiatives such as early warning infrastructure, relocation projects, or knowledge integration efforts. Consultations with indigenous and tribal communities are frequently limited to procedural engagement, often lacking transparency, independent advice, culturally appropriate information, or the genuine right to withhold consent (Ogra et al., 2021). This gap frequently results in top-down approaches that undermine indigenous sovereignty, erode trust, and diminish the cultural acceptability and long-term effectiveness of DRR measures.

The marked difference between Canada's structured, legally enforceable FPIC mechanisms and India's more aspirational but weakly implemented approach highlights a broader challenge in translating international standards into binding domestic DRR policy. Robust FPIC in DRR requires not only legal recognition but also institutional capacity, dedicated funding for community-led processes, and accountability measures to prevent extractive or superficial consultation practices.

Knowledge Co-production Models: Knowledge co-production models involve structured, equitable collaboration between indigenous knowledge holders and scientists to validate, integrate, and refine traditional indicators (e.g., animal behaviour, plant phenology, seasonal cues for early warnings) alongside modern scientific tools (satellite monitoring, GIS mapping, meteorological data). The UNDRR Words into Action guidelines (2021) actively promote co-

production through practical tools such as participatory mapping workshops, joint risk assessments, and co-design of early warning protocols, ensuring indigenous perspectives shape DRR strategies from the outset.

Empirical case studies demonstrate the high effectiveness of co-production when properly implemented. In Australia, Aboriginal cultural burning integrates millennia-old traditional fire management practices with satellite-based monitoring and predictive modelling, significantly reducing wildfire fuel loads and mega-fire risks while regenerating ecosystems (Berkes, 2026). In New Zealand, Māori iwi combines ancestral environmental indicators with modern seismic and volcanic monitoring systems; community marae serves as resilience hubs during crises, enhancing preparedness and culturally grounded response (Shaw et al., 2009).

However, co-production frequently encounters limitations where structural barriers persist. Power imbalances between scientific/technical actors and indigenous knowledge holders often result in unequal influence, with indigenous leadership marginalized or sidelined. Inadequate or inconsistent funding further restricts the capacity of indigenous communities to participate as equal partners, limiting the scale, sustainability, and depth of co-production processes. These challenges reduce the ability to fully realize the potential of hybrid knowledge systems for inclusive, effective, and long-term disaster risk reduction.

LCIPP and NAPs: *LCIPP and NAPs:* The Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP), formally established under the UNFCCC at COP23 (2017), serves as a dedicated institutional mechanism to facilitate the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in climate change processes, including those with direct linkages to disaster risk reduction (DRR). Operating within the UNFCCC framework, LCIPP provides a structured channel for indigenous representatives to engage directly with Parties, contribute to policy deliberations, and influence the integration of traditional knowledge (TK/IK) into climate adaptation and resilience strategies. A key avenue for this influence is through National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), which Parties are encouraged and, in many cases, required to develop under the Cancun Adaptation Framework and subsequent COP decisions. NAPs explicitly call for the incorporation of indigenous and traditional knowledge in vulnerability and risk assessments, adaptation planning, and the design of community-based resilience measures (UNFCCC, 2018; UNFCCC, 2023).

The effectiveness of LCIPP is gradually emerging. Its inputs have contributed to shaping guidance on Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and NAPs, particularly in promoting community-based and indigenous-led approaches to resilience-building. However, its specific impact on DRR remains limited and uneven. Translation of LCIPP outcomes into concrete national-level action is often slow, constrained by varying degrees of political will, resource availability, institutional capacity, and integration of indigenous priorities into domestic DRR planning and implementation (UNFCCC, 2023).

Community-Led Consultation Structures: Village-level committees, indigenous councils, and participatory forums serve as vital grassroots mechanisms for enabling direct indigenous input into disaster risk reduction (DRR). These structures empower communities to identify hazards, assess vulnerabilities, co-design early warnings, and lead mitigation and recovery efforts in culturally relevant ways.

In India, Van Panchayats (village forest councils), legally recognized under the Forest Rights Act, 2006, exemplify effective local governance in the Himalayas. They manage forests and slopes to prevent soil erosion and landslides, enforce traditional land-use rules, promote reforestation, and maintain natural buffers. When supported by modern tools like rainfall gauges, these councils significantly reduce landslide risks while preserving ecological and livelihood security (Panda et al., 2023).

Africa's Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction (UNESCO, 2021) similarly promotes community-led assessments and governance bodies to integrate traditional knowledge into vulnerability mapping, early warning, and resilience planning.

The effectiveness of community-led consultation structures, such as Van Panchayats in India, is maximised when they are supported by strong legal recognition, secure resource rights, adequate funding, and robust institutional backing. Without these foundational elements, such mechanisms frequently become tokenistic (limited largely to information-sharing without granting indigenous communities genuine decision-making power) thereby undermining trust, cultural relevance, and long-term sustainability (Ogra et al., 2021; Hadlos et al., 2022).

Similarly, key participatory mechanisms including Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), knowledge co-production models, and platforms such as the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP) demonstrate considerable promise in theory. However, in practice, they suffer

from inconsistent application and weak enforcement. In India, for instance, consultations with indigenous and tribal communities often remain largely procedural rather than substantive, raising serious questions about the extent to which indigenous sovereignty and priorities are genuinely respected. Furthermore, empirical evidence regarding the long-term effectiveness of these mechanisms in delivering measurable improvements in resilience outcomes remains limited, highlighting the urgent need for more rigorous, outcome-focused evaluations.

Major Barriers to Active Participation and Authentic TK/IK Incorporation in DRR

Despite significant policy advances, multiple interlocking barriers continue to undermine the meaningful participation of indigenous communities and the authentic incorporation of their traditional knowledge (TK/IK) into disaster risk reduction (DRR) processes. These barriers operate at cultural, institutional, environmental, and structural levels, perpetuating top-down approaches, reducing community trust and compliance, and limiting the potential of hybrid DRR systems.

Knowledge Erosion and Intergenerational Loss: Rapid urbanization, rural-to-urban migration, formal education systems, and globalization increasingly disconnect younger generations from elders, disrupting the oral transmission of TK/IK (Ali et al., 2021; Rai, 2019). In India, for example, tribal youth migrating for employment often lose access to traditional ecological knowledge, weakening collective memory of hazard patterns and adaptive practices and eroding community-level resilience.

Marginalization and Epistemic Injustice: Historical colonial legacies and persistent technocratic biases frequently dismiss TK/IK as “superstitious,” outdated, or inferior to scientific knowledge, systematically excluding it from official DRR planning, early warning systems, and policy formulation (Iloka, 2016). In India, implementation of the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP, 2019) continues to prioritize scientific and expert-driven models, often sidelining indigenous insights and lived experiences (Ogra et al., 2021).

Power Imbalances and Extractive Practices: External factors such as government agencies, researchers, NGOs, and private entities frequently “extract” TK/IK for DRR projects without obtaining genuine consent, providing credit, or ensuring equitable benefit-sharing (Hadlos et al., 2022). These extractive dynamic echoes colonial patterns of knowledge appropriation, erodes trust, discourages future sharing, and undermines indigenous ownership and sovereignty over their knowledge.

Climate-Induced Unreliability of Traditional Indicators: Accelerating climate change disrupts the reliability of time-tested bio-indicators and seasonal cues

(e.g., animal behaviour, plant phenology, wind patterns) that indigenous communities have long used for early warning and preparedness (Nunn & Walshe, 2012). Communities in the Pacific Islands and the Indian Himalayas increasingly report declining accuracy of traditional forecasting due to erratic monsoons, unseasonal temperature shifts, and altered ecological cycles, reducing the predictive power of TK/IK in rapidly changing hazard contexts.

Documentation Gaps: The predominantly oral nature of TK/IK makes it vulnerable to permanent loss when elders pass away or practices fade. Few DRR policies mandate systematic, community-controlled documentation or archiving of oral traditions, leaving valuable knowledge undocumented and at risk (Rai, 2019).

Urban and Policy Bias: National and regional DRR plans and funding allocations often prioritize urban risks and infrastructure, systematically neglecting rural, remote, and tribal areas where TK/IK is most concentrated and relevant (Ogra et al., 2021). This bias marginalizes indigenous communities and limits the scale-up of community-led, knowledge-based resilience initiatives.

Limited Intersectional Considerations: Gender, disability, age, and other intersectional dimensions in TK/IK transmission and application remain under-addressed in most DRR policies and practices. Women, persons with disabilities, and youth often play central roles in knowledge transmission and community preparedness, yet their exclusion from participatory processes risks perpetuating internal inequities and weakening overall resilience (Ali et al., 2021).

Collectively, these barriers are deeply interlocking and structural in nature. They reinforce top-down, technocratic approaches to disaster risk reduction (DRR), diminish community ownership and compliance, erode trust in formal systems, and significantly constrain the potential of hybrid knowledge integration. Climate change further exacerbates the situation by reducing the reliability of traditional indicators, thereby creating epistemological tensions between dynamic, context-specific indigenous knowledge (IK) and more static scientific models. Persistent power imbalances and extractive practices continue to undermine indigenous sovereignty, reflecting deeper decolonial challenges within DRR governance. Overcoming these multifaceted barriers demands deliberate policy reform, robust legal safeguards, equitable and direct funding mechanisms, and a genuine institutional commitment to indigenous leadership and self-determination in all aspects of DRR decision-making.

Pathways Forward: Evidence-Based Recommendations for DRR

The study proposes the following evidence-based recommendations to overcome persistent barriers and strengthen mechanisms for the active participation of indigenous communities and the authentic incorporation of traditional and indigenous knowledge (TK/IK) in disaster risk reduction (DRR). These recommendations draw on lessons from the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030), the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP), recent COP outcomes, UNDRR guidelines, and comparative policy and practice from Canada, India, Africa, and the Pacific.

Strengthen Policy Enforcement and Legal Mandates: National DRR frameworks, such as India's National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP, 2019), should be amended to explicitly mandate Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), knowledge co-production, and community consent protocols for all DRR projects affecting indigenous lands, territories, or knowledge systems. These amendments should include clear monitoring indicators, accountability mechanisms, and accessible grievance redressal procedures. The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission's (CNSC) Indigenous Knowledge Policy Framework (2023) provides a model, where FPIC is enforced through legally binding joint oversight committees that ensure indigenous priorities shape regulatory outcomes. Such enforceable structures would guarantee indigenous leadership in DRR planning, early warning system design, mitigation infrastructure development, and post-disaster recovery processes.

Institutionalize Knowledge Co-production Platforms: Multi-stakeholder co-production committees comprising indigenous elders, knowledge holders, scientists, and policymakers should be formally established to jointly validate traditional indicators, co-design early warning systems, and develop hybrid DRR strategies. These platforms should be integrated into existing mechanisms such as the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP) under the UNFCCC and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), with explicit provisions for indigenous co-leadership and decision-making authority.

Secure Direct Funding and Capacity Building: Governments and international agencies should allocate dedicated, ring-fenced budgets directly to indigenous communities and organizations for DRR initiatives, bypassing intermediaries to prevent dilution, delays, or misallocation. Funding should support community-controlled digital archiving of oral traditions, intergenerational

knowledge transmission programs, and training in hybrid tools (e.g., GIS mapping, early warning applications). Direct funding models, as promoted in Africa's Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction (UNESCO, 2021) and emerging LCIPP guidance, empower indigenous-led vulnerability assessments, early warning networks, and resilience-building projects. Such resource allocation directly counters knowledge erosion, builds long-term capacity, and reinforces indigenous sovereignty over DRR processes.

Address Intersectionality and Equity: All participatory mechanisms, consultation structures, and knowledge co-production processes should explicitly mandate the inclusion of gender, disability, youth, and other intersectional dimensions. Targeted outreach, inclusive training programs, and representation quotas should be implemented to ensure that women, persons with disabilities, and younger indigenous voices actively contribute to DRR planning, implementation, and evaluation. This approach addresses internal inequities often overlooked in current frameworks, strengthens overall community resilience, and aligns DRR with broader principles of social justice and equity.

Promote Global Learning, Exchange, and Evidence Building: Platforms such as LCIPP, UNDRR's case repositories, International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property- ICCROM's TIKs4DRR (Traditional and Indigenous Knowledges for Disaster Risk Reduction) initiative, and global DRR networks should be leveraged to facilitate cross-regional sharing of best practices, lessons learned, and successful hybrid models. Recent progress within COP processes (e.g., LCIPP operationalization and guidance on indigenous inclusion) provides a strong foundation for scaling these efforts globally and nationally.

These recommendations, grounded in comparative policy analysis, recent COP outcomes, and practical case studies, offer a clear and actionable pathway to transform disaster risk reduction (DRR) from predominantly top-down and technocratic approaches into inclusive, sovereign, and culturally grounded systems. By prioritising indigenous leadership, robust legal safeguards, direct resource allocation, intersectional equity, and continuous evidence building, DRR can more effectively harness traditional and indigenous knowledge to create equitable, effective, and resilient communities capable of withstanding escalating climate and disaster risks. Key recommendations include the institutionalisation of mandatory Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)

in all national and sub-national DRR plans, establishment of dedicated and ring-fenced funding streams for indigenous-led initiatives, development of community-controlled documentation platforms for preserving oral traditions, and integration of intersectional safeguards to ensure meaningful participation of women, youth, persons with disabilities, and other marginalised groups. These measures must be supported by clear, measurable indicators, regular monitoring mechanisms, and long-term evaluation frameworks to assess their effectiveness and ensure accountability.

Findings

The analysis of policy frameworks, participatory mechanisms, barriers, and comparative evidence yields the following key findings:

1. Global and national policy frameworks demonstrate growing recognition of traditional and indigenous knowledge (TK/IK) as a legitimate and complementary resource in disaster risk reduction (DRR). Instruments such as the Sendai Framework (2015–2030), UNDRR Words into Action guidelines (2021), LCIPP under UNFCCC, and national policies (e.g., India's NDMP 2019, Forest Rights Act 2006; Canada's CNSC Framework 2023) explicitly call for or support TK/IK integration. However, these frameworks often remain aspirational, with limited legal enforceability, monitoring indicators, and accountability mechanisms for active indigenous participation.
2. Designated participatory mechanisms including Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), knowledge co-production models, LCIPP platforms, National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), and community-led consultation structures exist in varying degrees of robustness. Where implemented effectively (e.g., Canada's joint oversight committees, Aboriginal cultural burning partnerships, Māori marae systems), they enhance accuracy, cultural acceptability, community ownership, and resilience outcomes. In many contexts, particularly in India and parts of Africa, implementation is inconsistent, often reduced to tokenistic consultation without genuine decision-making power or benefit-sharing.
3. Multiple interlocking barriers continue to undermine meaningful participation and authentic TK/IK incorporation in DRR. These include knowledge erosion and intergenerational loss due to urbanization and

migration; epistemic marginalization and technocratic bias that devalue TK/IK; power imbalances and extractive practices by external actors; climate-induced unreliability of traditional indicators; documentation gaps for oral traditions; urban/policy bias in national planning; and limited intersectional considerations (gender, disability, youth). These barriers collectively perpetuate top-down DRR, reduce community trust and compliance, and constrain the potential of hybrid knowledge systems.

4. Emerging directions such as LCIPP operationalization, NAPs integration of TK/IK, digital archiving platforms (e.g., ICCROM's TIKs4DRR), and direct funding for indigenous-led initiatives offer promising pathways for inclusion and sovereignty. However, their DRR-specific impact remains limited and uneven, with slow translation into national action and insufficient long-term evaluation of hybrid efficacy.

Conclusion

While notable policy progress is evident at the global level, the translation of international commitments into enforceable, equitable, and effective mechanisms at national and local levels remains a critical challenge. Although hybrid systems combining traditional and indigenous knowledge (TK/IK) with scientific approaches demonstrate strong potential, persistent gaps in implementation, enforcement, and empirical evaluation continue to limit their impact.

Ultimately, empowering indigenous communities as equal partners (rather than mere informants or beneficiaries) is essential for realising the full potential of TK/IK in disaster risk reduction (DRR). This demands a fundamental shift in power dynamics, sustained political commitment, and genuine ethical collaboration among indigenous knowledge holders, policymakers, scientists, and practitioners. Strengthening indigenous leadership, robust legal safeguards, direct and dedicated resource allocation, intersectional equity, and rigorous evidence-building are crucial to fully harness traditional knowledge for inclusive and resilient DRR in the face of escalating climate risks.

Future research should prioritise longitudinal evaluations of hybrid approaches, deeper intersectional analyses, and community-led documentation to refine these mechanisms and support the global transition toward resilient, rights-based, and culturally appropriate disaster risk management.

References

- Aitsi-Selmi, A., Egawa, S., Sasaki, H., Wannous, C., & Murray, V. (2015). The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Renewing the global commitment to people's resilience, health, and well-being. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 6(2), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-015-0050-9>
- Ali, T., Paton, D., Buergelt, P. T., Smith, J. A., Jehan, N., & Siddique, A. (2021). Integrating Indigenous perspectives and community-based disaster risk reduction: A pathway for sustainable Indigenous development in Northern Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 59, 1-16. Article 102263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102263>
- Arora, K. (2018). Introduction. In K. Arora (Ed.), *Indigenous Forest management in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, India* (pp. 1–12). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00033-2_1
- Berkes, F. (2026). *Sacred ecology: Learning from Indigenous knowledge and stewardship* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003473381>
- Chakrabarti, P. G. D. (2011). Challenges of disaster management in India: Implications for the economic, political, and security environments. In M. K. Jha (Ed.), *Non-traditional security challenges in India: Human security and disaster management*. The National Bureau of Asian Research.
- Dorji, T., Rinchen, K., et al. (2024). Understanding how Indigenous knowledge contributes to climate change adaptation and resilience: A systematic literature review. *Environmental Management*, 74(5), 1101–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-024-02032-x>
- Eslamian, S. (Ed.). (2021). *Handbook of disaster risk reduction for resilience: New frameworks for building resilience to disasters*. Springer.
- Ford, J. D., Vanderbilt, W., & Berrang-Ford, L. (2016). Community-based adaptation research in the Canadian Arctic. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 7(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.376>
- Hadlos, A., et al. (2022). Where does local and indigenous knowledge in disaster risk reduction go from here? A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 72, Article 102864. DOI:10.1016/j.ijdr.2022.103160
- Iloka, N. G. (2016). Indigenous knowledge for disaster risk reduction: An African perspective. *Jambá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 8(1), Article a272. <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v8i1.272>
- Inaotombi, S., & Mahanta, P. C. (2018). Pathways of socio-ecological resilience to climate change for fisheries through indigenous knowledge. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal*, 25(8), 2032–2044. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2018.1482197>

- Ingty, T. (2017). High mountain communities and climate change: Adaptation, traditional ecological knowledge, and institutions. *Climatic Change*, 145(1), 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-2080-3>
- Kahlon, L. K., & Singh, R. (2021). Understanding linkages between sustainability and traditional ethnoecological knowledge (TEK): A case study of Paudi Bhuyans in Northern Odisha, India. In A. Kaushik, C. P. Kaushik, & S. D. Attri (Eds.), *Climate resilience and environmental sustainability approaches* (pp. 1–18). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-0902-2_19
- Mahalwal, S., & Kabra, A. (2023). Indigenous knowledge and sustainability concerns in an era of climate change: The Sahariya Adivasi and salai trees (*Boswellia serrata*) in central India. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 32(1), 26–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14728028.2022.2164360>
- McAdoo, B. G., et al. (2006). Smong: How an oral history saved thousands on Indonesia's Simeulue Island during the December 2004 and March 2005 tsunamis. *Earthquake Spectra*, 22(S3), S661–S669. <https://doi.org/10.1193/1.2204966>
- Mercer, J., Dominey-Howes, D., Kelman, I., & Lloyd, K. (2010). Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction. *Disasters*, 34(1), 214–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2009.01110.x>
- Ogra, A., et al. (2021). Exploring the gap between policy and action in disaster risk reduction: A case study from India. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 63, Article 102428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102428>
- Panda, G. K., Chatterjee, U., & Panda, S. (2023). Indigenous knowledge and disaster risk reduction: Insight toward perception, response, adaptation and sustainability. In G. K. Panda et al. (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge and disaster risk reduction* (pp. 1–19). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26143-5_1
- Pegu, T. (2018). “Living with floods”: An analysis of floods adaptation of Mising community—A case study of Jiadhal River. In *Development and disaster management*. Springer.
- Rahman, A., et al. (2017). Indigenous knowledge management to enhance community resilience to tsunami risk: Lessons learned from Smong traditions in Simeulue Island, Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 56(1), Article 012018. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/56/1/012018>
- Rai, P. & Khawas, V., 2019, ‘Traditional knowledge system in disaster risk reduction: Exploration, acknowledgement and proposition’, *Jambá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies* 11(1), a484. <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v11i1.484>
- Rajan, S. R. (2023). *Risk, disaster, and vulnerability: An essay on humanity and environmental catastrophe*. University of California Press.

Rana, R. S., Kumar, V., & Kapoor, K. S. (2019). Indigenous knowledge on animal disease management and feed storage protection in Himachal Himalayas, India. *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge*, 18(2), 308–315.

Shaw, R., Uy, N., & Baumwoll, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Indigenous knowledge for disaster risk reduction*. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. https://www.unisdr.org/files/3646_IndigenousKnowledgeDRR.pdf

Reports & Official Documents

Government of India. (2005). *The Disaster Management Act, 2005* (Act No. 53 of 2005), as amended by the Disaster Management (Amendment) Act, 2025 (Act No. 10 of 2025). <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/2045>

Government of India. (2009). *National Policy on Disaster Management*. <https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-08/NPDM-101209%5B1%5D.pdf>

Government of Kenya. (2023). *Third National Climate Change Action Plan (2023–2027)*. Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

Government of Uganda. (2023). *National Adaptation Plan*. Ministry of Water and Environment.

Green Climate Fund (GCF). (2023). *Funding Indigenous-led Climate Projects*. GCF Reports.

ICCA Consortium. (2023). *Indigenous Peoples and Climate Governance*. ICCA Reports.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2022). *Sixth Assessment Report (AR6)*. IPCC.

International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). (2022). *Climate Finance for Indigenous Communities*. IISD.

Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP). (2023). *2022–2024 Work Plan Report*. UNFCCC.

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC). (2025). *National Adaptation Plan Process: Stakeholder Consultations*. Government of India.

National Disaster Management Authority. (2019). *National Disaster Management Plan* (Revised ed.). Government of India. <https://ndma.gov.in/sites/default/files/PDF/ndmp-2019.pdf>

National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA). (2023). *Traditional & Indigenous Practices for Climate Resilience in India*. NIUA.

The Asia Foundation. (2022). *India's disaster risk reduction journey: Opportunities for strengthening partnerships in the Indo-Pacific*. https://asiafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Indias-Disaster-Risk-Reduction-Journey_TRIDEP_EN.pdf

UNFCCC. (2015). *Paris Agreement*. UNFCCC.

- UNFCCC. (2018). Decision 2/CP.24: Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform. UNFCCC.
- UNFCCC. (2021). *National Adaptation Plans: Guidelines for Indigenous Inclusion*. UNFCCC.
- UNFCCC. (2024). *COP29 Baku Workplan*. UNFCCC.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2022). *Pakistan's Kalash Community and Climate Resilience*. UNDP.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2025). *Building Climate Resilience in India: Initiating National Adaptation Plan Process*. UNDP.
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030*. <https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030>
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2021). *Words into action guidelines: Using traditional and indigenous knowledge for disaster risk reduction*. <https://www.undrr.org/publication/words-action-guidelines-using-traditional-and-indigenous-knowledges-disaster-risk>
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2025). *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR) 2025: Resilience pays – Financing and investing for our future*. <https://www.undrr.org/gar>
- United Nations. (1994). *Yokohama strategy and plan of action for a safer world: Guidelines for natural disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation*. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. https://www.preventionweb.net/files/8241_doc6841contenido1.pdf?startDownload=true
- United Nations. (2005). *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters*. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. <https://www.undrr.org/publication/hyogo-framework-action-2005-2015-building-resilience-nations-and-communities-disasters>
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>.