

DEFINING INTENT: A FRAMEWORK FOR MINISTERIAL DISASTER- MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Tariq Ahmad

India's pursuit of a holistic and risk-resilient approach to disaster management requires disaster-risk considerations to be integrated across all levels of governance and sectors of the economy. Ministerial Disaster Management Plans (DMPs) of ministries and departments of the Union Government form an important part of this architecture by providing a framework through which disaster-risk management can be incorporated into the functions, programmes and domains under their respective purview. Their development, therefore, contributes to India's broader objective of strengthening disaster resilience as 2047 approaches,¹ including the priorities articulated through the “*Amrit Kaal Vision 2047*” and the “Sustainable Development Goals” (SDG). The requirement for Union ministries and departments to prepare DMPs was established under the “Disaster Management Act, 2005”, and has subsequently been developed through the “National Disaster Management Plan” (NDMP) with appropriate guidance having been issued in respect of ministerial and departmental DMPs.² As this framework has evolved, an increasing number of ministries and departments have formulated their respective plans.³ These DMPs, however, differ considerably in scope, level of detail, sectoral orientation, and treatment of the entities and functions within their domains. Some focus primarily on arrangements within the ministry itself,⁴ while others extend into the wider sector through frameworks, guidance, templates, or other provisions intended for entities within their functional purview.⁵

Such variation is not inherently problematic. Ministries differ substantially in their mandates, institutional structures, and relationships with the entities within their respective domains. The statutory and policy framework establishes the broad purpose, contents, and expected outcomes of ministerial DMPs, but does not by itself determine how a particular ministry intends its DMP

¹ Jacob Koshy, “NDMA Pushes Ministries to Embed Disaster Resilience into Planning under Vision 2047”, *The Hindu*, 10 June 2026, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/ndma-pushes-ministries-to-embed-disaster-resilience-into-planning-under-vision-2047/article71085710.ece>

² Government of India, *The Disaster Management Act, 2005*, sec. 37, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/18558?sam_handle=123456789%2F2505

³ Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, *Annual Report 2023–24* (New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs, 2024), https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/AnnualReport_27122024.pdf

⁴ Ministry of Panchayati Raj, *Disaster Management Plan of Ministry of Panchayati Raj* (New Delhi: Ministry of Panchayati Raj, 2022).

⁵ Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Ministry of Jal Shakti, Government of India, *Disaster Management Plan of Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation* (New Delhi: Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Ministry of Jal Shakti, 2023), <https://static.pib.gov.in/WriteReadData/specificdocs/documents/2023/jul/doc2023722227201.pdf>

to operate within its institutional and sectoral context. This raises a distinct question of *intent*: what is the Ministry seeking a particular provision of its DMP to do?

The question is important because the same provision may have fundamentally different implications depending on its intended application. It may be intended to inform stakeholders, recommend an approach, provide a model or framework, establish a common baseline, support regulatory action, or prescribe a mandatory requirement where the requisite authority exists.⁶

Where this intent is not sufficiently clear, provisions may be interpreted differently by the entities expected to use or implement them. An approach intended as guidance may consequently acquire an unintended prescriptive character, while a provision intended to establish a common approach may instead be treated as optional.

This issue is particularly relevant to ministerial DMPs because the functional domain of a ministry may extend beyond the entities over which it exercises direct administrative or regulatory authority. A ministry may simultaneously perform administrative, regulatory, policy, and coordination functions, across different parts of its domain. Consequently, the breadth of the risks and systems that a ministry is expected to address does not necessarily correspond to the authority through which it can prescribe action. The intended function of the DMP must, therefore, be considered alongside the institutional relationship between the ministry and the entities to which its provisions apply.

The ongoing formulation⁷ of the “Disaster Management Plan” of the “Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways” (MoPSW) provides a practical context within which to examine this issue. The maritime sector incorporates entities operating under different institutional and jurisdictional arrangements, while the continuity of maritime functions can have implications extending beyond individual organisations. This article therefore argues that **articulating the intended function of a ministerial DMP should be treated as a conceptual step preceding its substantive formulation**. Establishing this intent can help determine the appropriate scope, character and level of prescription of its provisions, while clarifying their relationship with the disaster-management arrangements of entities across the Ministry’s domain.

Background

The statutory and policy framework for ministerial DMPs has evolved progressively since the enactment of the Disaster Management Act, 2005. Section 37 requires every Ministry or Department of the Government of India to prepare a disaster-management plan and specifies broad elements to be addressed within such plans. The Act also places ministerial planning within the wider national disaster-management architecture: measures for prevention and mitigation are to be undertaken in accordance with the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP), while the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) is entrusted with laying down guidelines for the preparation of disaster-management plans by ministries and departments.⁸

⁶ Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, *The Disaster Management Act, 2005*, sec. 2(e), <https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-09/The%2520Disaster%2520Management%2520Act%2C%202005%5B1%5D.pdf>

⁷ National Institute of Disaster Management, *TIDINGS: NIDM Newsletter*, no. 88 (January–March 2026), https://nidm.gov.in/PDF/Newsletter/88_Jan_2026E.pdf

⁸ *Disaster Management Act, 2005*, sec. 37

The statutory requirement preceded the development of a comprehensive national planning framework. The National Policy on Disaster Management, 2009 and the first NDMP, issued in 2016, progressively established this framework, with the NDMP subsequently revised in 2019 to incorporate implementation experience and align the national approach more closely with the priorities of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.⁹ The evolving framework further articulated the roles of ministries and departments in disaster-risk management and gave greater attention to institutional, financial and preparedness mechanisms.

NDMA subsequently issued dedicated guidance¹⁰ for the preparation of ministerial and departmental DMPs, addressing areas including institutional arrangements, organisational responsibilities, capacity building, contingency planning and business continuity. More recent guidance¹¹ has moved away from some of the template-based rigidity of earlier approaches towards more generalised recommendations, while retaining a defined framework for ministerial disaster-management planning. The framework has consequently become more capable of accommodating differences among ministries while establishing broad expectations regarding the contents and outcomes of their DMPs.

Ministerial DMPs developed within this framework nevertheless continue to differ in their scope and orientation. This reflects the diversity of ministerial mandates and, in particular, the different institutional relationships that ministries have with the entities and functions within their domains. Some ministries may primarily address disaster management within their own administrative structures, while others must also consider entities over which they exercise regulatory, policy, programme or coordination functions without necessarily exercising direct administrative control.¹²

This distinction is important because the statutory framework establishes what a ministerial DMP is expected to achieve, but does not by itself resolve how its provisions should operate across these different institutional relationships. The issue is further reinforced by Section 37's requirement for ministries and departments to review and update their DMPs annually. A ministerial DMP is therefore intended to remain an evolving planning instrument rather than a one-time statutory document. Changes in risks, institutional responsibilities, regulatory arrangements and operational experience can alter both the requirements addressed by the plan and the manner in which particular provisions should function.

The evolution of the framework thus brings the question of **intent** into focus. Beyond determining what a ministerial DMP should contain, its formulation must consider how the Ministry intends its provisions to operate within its particular institutional and sectoral context.

Understanding the Ministerial Disaster Management Plan as a Planning Instrument

The Disaster Management Act, 2005 defines disaster management as a continuous and integrated process of planning, organising, coordinating and implementing measures necessary or expedient

⁹ National Disaster Management Authority, *National Disaster Management Plan 2019* (New Delhi: National Disaster Management Authority, 2019), <https://ndma.gov.in/sites/default/files/PDF/ndmp-2019.pdf>

¹⁰ National Disaster Management Authority, *Template for DMP of Central Ministries/Departments*, 2019, <https://ndma.gov.in/sites/default/files/PDF/Template-DMP-Ministry-Dept-2019-JAN-Final-Draft1-cpg%20-AT.docx>

¹¹ National Disaster Management Authority, *Guidelines for Preparation of Disaster Management Plan for Ministry/Department of Government of India* (New Delhi: National Disaster Management Authority, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, 2024), [https://ndma.gov.in/sites/default/files/PDF/Guidelines for Preparation of DMP for Ministry-Departments of Govt. of India.pdf](https://ndma.gov.in/sites/default/files/PDF/Guidelines%20for%20Preparation%20of%20DMP%20for%20Ministry%20Departments%20of%20Govt.%20of%20India.pdf)

¹² Ministry of Panchayati Raj, *Disaster Management Plan of Ministry of Panchayati Raj*.

for the prevention of disaster threats, risks and consequences; preparedness and capacity building; impact assessment and response; rescue and relief; and rehabilitation and reconstruction. Within this framework, a Disaster Management Plan (DMP) provides the planning instrument through which these activities can be organised and implemented systematically. At the ministerial level, this planning function also requires the delineation of institutional responsibilities, dependencies, coordination arrangements and command-and-control structures across the ministry and relevant entities within its domain.

The statutory and policy framework establishes these broad requirements, but a ministerial DMP can perform different functions depending on how it is intended to operate within the institutional ecosystem. At a conceptual level, the provisions of a ministerial DMP may be executed via following modes of implementation:

1. **Informative** – Provides stakeholders with information on relevant hazards, disaster scenarios, institutional arrangements and other aspects of disaster management, primarily to establish awareness and a common understanding.
2. **Advisory** – Recommends good practices, approaches or aspects that entities within the ministry's domain may consider incorporating into their own disaster-management arrangements, while leaving their adoption to the assessment and discretion of the respective entities.
3. **Model Plan or Framework** – Provides a framework for approaching disaster-management planning or a model plan that entities within the ministry's domain can use as a reference and adapt to their specific circumstances.
4. **Normative** – Establishes a standard set of mechanisms, methodologies or baseline requirements that are expected to be followed in the absence of additional context-specific requirements. Such provisions establish an expected standard without necessarily constituting a regulatory requirement.
5. **Regulatory** – Establishes specific requirements under an applicable statutory, regulatory or administrative authority. These may include reporting mechanisms, data formats, social-inclusion requirements, training processes or other specified procedures.
6. **Mandatory** – Specifies methods, contents or actions that the relevant entities are required to undertake or incorporate, where such mandatory application is supported by the requisite institutional or legal authority. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) for specific subjects, such as hazardous-material spills, may constitute examples where a defined procedure is required to be followed.

These functions can be understood as a spectrum of increasing expectations regarding the application of a provision—from providing information and recommendations to establishing standards and, where supported by appropriate authority, requirements for compliance. The categories are not mutually exclusive, and a single ministerial DMP may contain provisions serving several of these functions. Importantly, the classification concerns the **intended function and application of a provision**, rather than the overall statutory purpose or expected outcome of the DMP.

The relative emphasis on these functions can also vary according to the nature of the DMP and the institutional relationship between the authority preparing the plan and the entities responsible for its implementation. DMPs prepared for individual facilities or organisations generally operate closer to the entities responsible for implementation and can therefore place greater emphasis on normative, regulatory and mandatory operational arrangements. Ministerial,

national and state-level DMPs, by contrast, often encompass a wider institutional ecosystem and may consequently place greater emphasis on information, advice, models and frameworks. The appropriate balance, however, is ultimately influenced by the scope of the ministry's domain, the nature of its institutional authority and its relationship with the entities within that domain. This distinction is particularly important for ministerial DMPs. The breadth of a ministry's domain may require it to address risks and functions extending well beyond the organisations under its direct administrative control. The ministry may therefore need to inform, advise, provide models, establish common standards or exercise regulatory functions across different parts of its domain, depending on its mandate. Consequently, determining **how the provisions of a ministerial DMP are intended to function** is an important consideration in deciding their scope, level of prescription and relationship with the disaster-management arrangements of entities within the sector.

How a Ministerial DMP Differs from Others

The Disaster Management Act, 2005 establishes a statutory planning architecture in which national, state and district authorities prepare disaster-management plans within defined institutional and territorial responsibilities. The Act also establishes relationships between these levels through provisions governing the preparation of plans and the guidelines applicable to them. This creates a relatively defined relationship between the geographical jurisdiction of a plan, the authority responsible for its preparation and the institutions responsible for its implementation.

A ministerial DMP operates on a different organising principle. Rather than being defined primarily by geographical jurisdiction or a subordinate administrative tier, it is structured around the **functional or sectoral domain of a Ministry**. The entities within this domain may therefore fall under different administrative and jurisdictional arrangements. This is particularly evident in the case of the Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways (MoPSW), whose broader maritime domain includes major ports administered within the Union Government framework as well as non-major ports operating under State governments and State Maritime Boards. Although both form part of the maritime sector relevant to MoPSW, the Ministry has different institutional relationships with them.

The relationship between a Ministry and the entities within its functional domain can broadly involve three overlapping roles:

1. **Administrative authority** – direct administrative responsibility for, or control over, entities, functions or assets within the Ministry's remit.
2. **Regulatory authority** – authority to establish and enforce requirements governing activities, entities or processes within the Ministry's statutory remit.
3. **Policy and advisory role** – responsibility for developing policies, frameworks, guidance and programmes for entities or activities within a broader domain, without necessarily exercising direct administrative or regulatory authority over them.

Most ministries combine these roles to varying degrees. The distinction is important because the existence of influence through policy, programmes, funding or coordination should not be conflated with regulatory or administrative authority. Nor does the inclusion of a requirement in a ministerial DMP, by itself, create an authority to impose that requirement where such authority does not otherwise exist.

MoPSW illustrates the resulting complexity particularly well. The Ministry has an institutional relationship with major ports that differs from its relationship with non-major ports, while its

disaster-management responsibilities may nevertheless concern the continuity of maritime functions across these institutional boundaries. Maritime infrastructure supports interconnected functions extending from trade and logistics to energy and industrial supply chains, meaning that disruption at an entity outside the Ministry's direct administrative relationship may nevertheless affect functions that fall within the Ministry's broader sectoral responsibilities. The issue is therefore not simply the extent of the Ministry's authority, but how a ministerial DMP should operate when the functional domain it seeks to address is broader than the authority available to implement its provisions.

This creates an important distinction between the **domain addressed by a ministerial DMP and the authority through which its provisions can be implemented**. Where the two coincide, the DMP can more readily translate its provisions into institutional action. Where they diverge, the Ministry must account for the different institutional relationships through which its provisions may operate. A provision addressed to an entity outside the Ministry's direct administrative or regulatory authority may require a different basis or mode of application from one addressed to an entity over which the Ministry exercises such authority.

The distinction provides the institutional context for the question of **intent**. The issue is not merely which entities or functions a ministerial DMP addresses, but how the Ministry intends its provisions to operate in relation to them. For a ministerial DMP spanning a complex and institutionally dispersed domain, articulating this intent can help establish the appropriate scope and character of its provisions and clarify their relationship with the disaster-management arrangements of entities within the sector.

The Intent Gap

In the context of MoPSW's DMP, the gap created by an absence of explicitly articulated intent can be illustrated through provisions such as a risk-assessment framework or guidance for SOP development. Where such provisions are intended to extend beyond the Ministry itself to entities within its domain, their practical effect depends substantially on how the Ministry intends them to be treated. The same provision may be understood as information, advice, a model or framework, a normative baseline, a regulatory requirement or a mandatory prescription, as discussed above.

This distinction creates two corresponding risks where intent is not made sufficiently clear. The first is **implicit normativity**, whereby a provision intended only to inform, advise or provide a reference approach is treated by an entity as a requirement. The second is **implicit optionality**, whereby a provision intended by the Ministry to establish a common or expected approach is treated merely as advisory. Both can undermine the intended function of the DMP: the former may impose expectations beyond what the Ministry intended or is authorised to require, while the latter may result in approaches considered important to the Ministry being disregarded as optional.

The issue is particularly relevant in the case of entities such as non-major ports, where the MoPSW DMP may address matters extending into a domain over which the Ministry does not exercise the same degree of direct administrative authority as it does over entities under its control. Intent cannot, by itself, create regulatory or mandatory authority. It can, however, communicate how the Ministry expects a provision to be treated within the authority available to it. For example, if MoPSW intends a risk-assessment framework to contribute to a system-of-systems approach across the wider maritime domain, it may be important to communicate that the approach is an expected component of planning rather than merely an illustrative

methodology. Conversely, where the Ministry intends to provide entities with flexibility to develop context-specific approaches, the DMP should avoid language that could imply that its reference methodology constitutes a mandatory requirement.

The need to articulate intent does not imply that every ministry should seek to prescribe a uniform methodology across its entire domain. The appropriate treatment of a provision depends on the Ministry's objectives, institutional relationships and the diversity of the entities to which it applies. For ministries such as the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs or the Ministry of Panchayati Raj, for example, substantial variation in the capacities and operating contexts of implementing local-government organisations may make a common, exhaustive methodology neither practical nor desirable. Their DMPs may therefore appropriately provide conceptual guidance, reference approaches or models rather than prescribe detailed processes. The same consideration, however, does not necessarily apply to a ministry seeking to establish greater consistency across a highly interconnected sector in which disruptions to individual entities can affect wider system functionality.

The absence of articulated intent can also discourage the adoption of innovative planning approaches. An entity-level planner may reasonably question the adoption of methodologies that materially alter the scope or intensity of its planning process—such as GIS- and data-driven assessment, system-of-systems analysis or function-oriented approaches—where their status within the ministerial DMP is unclear and no separate requirement exists. Conversely, where the Ministry intends such approaches to contribute to a common planning framework, failing to communicate that expectation may result in their being treated as optional.

Intent is therefore not merely a prefatory statement or an instruction on how to read the DMP.

It is a **supplementary planning input that establishes the intended treatment of individual provisions** and allows the substantive content of the document to be developed accordingly.

The latest NDMA guidance places particular emphasis on areas such as risk assessment and SOP development, especially for ministries dealing with critical assets.¹³ However, emphasis on these components does not by itself establish how they are intended to function across the entities within a ministry's domain. Explicitly determining this treatment is therefore an important step in translating broad planning requirements into a coherent ministerial framework.

Addressing the Intent Gap

If a ministry intends aspects of its DMP to achieve a degree of consistency beyond what can readily be achieved through informative or advisory provisions, several institutional routes may be available. Specific aspects could potentially be addressed through appropriate guidance within the NDMA framework;¹⁴ sector-specific requirements could be incorporated into relevant legislation or regulations; or the Ministry could deliberately restrict the scope of its DMP to provisions that can operate primarily as information, advice or reference frameworks. Each of these approaches has different institutional implications, and stronger statutory or regulatory mechanisms may require considerably greater time and effort to establish.

These alternatives nevertheless reinforce the value of articulating intent within the DMP itself. Intent does not substitute for statutory authority, nor does it create an obligation where one does not otherwise exist. It provides a comparatively immediate means of communicating how the

¹³ National Disaster Management Authority, *Guidelines for Preparation of Disaster Management Plan for Ministry/Department of Government of India*.

¹⁴ *Disaster Management Act, 2005*, sec. 6(2)(c).

Ministry expects its provisions to function and, where necessary, identifying aspects for which a stronger institutional mechanism may subsequently be required. In this sense, articulating intent should precede decisions on whether additional guidance, regulation or other institutional mechanisms are necessary.

The intended function of the DMP also has practical implications for its formulation. In particular, it should inform the intended audience, level of technical detail and extent to which concepts and methodologies need to be explained within the document itself. A DMP directed primarily towards professional planners can assume a greater technical baseline, whereas one intended to establish a common framework across diverse stakeholders may require greater explanation of unfamiliar approaches. This is particularly relevant where the DMP introduces methods that are not yet conventional components of disaster-management planning, including data-driven spatial analysis or system-of-systems assessment.

The same consideration affects the scope and length of the document. The objective should not be exhaustive treatment of every relevant methodology, but an appropriate balance between what the DMP itself needs to establish and what can be addressed through supplementary guidance or reference material. The intended function of the DMP should therefore influence not only what provisions are included, but also the manner and depth in which they are presented. This makes the articulation of intent a consideration in the formulation and drafting of the DMP, rather than an additional statement appended after its substantive structure has already been determined.

Way Forward

The formulation of a ministerial DMP should begin by establishing how the Ministry envisions the document, and its principal provisions, functioning within its domain. This need not require a separate or elaborate section in the final document. Rather, intent should be established as part of the formulation process and reflected in the treatment of major components such as risk assessment, SOPs, business continuity, data requirements and capacity building. The intended treatment should subsequently be communicated through the scope of the DMP, its terminology, implementation provisions and relevant cross-references.

This assessment should be undertaken alongside a mapping of the Ministry's institutional authority and relationship with the entities to which individual provisions are addressed. The two considerations are complementary: **intent determines what the Ministry seeks a provision to achieve, while institutional authority determines the means through which that intention can be given effect.** Where an entity is under direct administrative control, the DMP may prescribe institutional processes to the extent permitted by the applicable framework. Where an entity falls outside that authority, the Ministry should distinguish between provisions intended as information, advice, models or common baselines and those for which a stronger basis for implementation is envisaged. The language of the provision should correspondingly communicate its intended treatment, reducing the possibility of advisory provisions being interpreted as requirements or provisions intended to establish a common approach being treated as merely optional.

Where a Ministry considers that a particular approach requires greater consistency beyond the immediate scope of its DMP, additional institutional mechanisms may be necessary. The NDMA ministerial and departmental DMP guidelines could, for example, provide greater direction on the need to articulate the intended treatment of provisions and on approaches that materially alter the scope or intensity of planning by entities within a ministry's domain. Where

appropriate, the NDMA's role as a statutory guidance authority could also be used to provide a common framing for such approaches. This would be particularly relevant where a ministerial DMP seeks to influence planning by entities outside the Ministry's direct administrative control. The MoPSW context illustrates the potential value of such an approach. Where the Ministry seeks greater consistency between its own DMP framework and the disaster-management arrangements of non-major ports, the relevant State authorities and State Maritime Boards can be made aware of the intended relationship between the two planning frameworks. The Maritime State Development Council could provide an additional forum¹⁵ for communicating and coordinating this relationship, particularly where harmonisation of approaches across the maritime domain is considered desirable. Such mechanisms would complement, rather than substitute for, the articulation of intent within the MoPSW DMP itself.

The intended function of a provision should also inform decisions about what belongs in the DMP and what may appropriately be addressed through supplementary guidance. A ministerial DMP need not reproduce every methodology in exhaustive detail merely because the Ministry considers an approach important. Instead, its formulation should establish which concepts, methods and requirements need to be sufficiently developed within the DMP and which can be supported through separate technical guidance or reference material. This is particularly relevant where the DMP introduces approaches that are not yet conventional components of disaster-management planning and may therefore require additional explanation.

The same consideration applies to the intended audience. A document directed primarily towards professional disaster-management planners can assume a greater technical baseline, whereas one intended to establish a common framework across diverse stakeholders may require greater explanation of unfamiliar concepts and methodologies. The resulting level of technical detail will affect the scope and length of the document. Its size should therefore emerge from the intended function, audience and level of treatment required, rather than from an attempt to provide exhaustive coverage of every relevant subject.

The annual review and updating of ministerial DMPs provides an opportunity to revisit these considerations where changes in the risk environment, institutional responsibilities, regulatory framework or experience from disaster events affect the appropriate treatment of particular provisions. The central requirement, however, is that intent should be established during formulation rather than inferred after the substantive structure of the DMP has already been developed.

Conclusion

Ministerial DMPs occupy a distinctive position within India's disaster-management planning architecture because the functional domains of ministries do not necessarily correspond with their administrative or regulatory authority. Their formulation therefore involves a question that extends beyond statutory contents and prescribed outcomes: **how does the Ministry intend its DMP, and the provisions within it, to function across the domain for which it has responsibility?**

Articulating this intent at the outset provides a practical means of aligning the scope and level of prescription of the DMP with the institutional authority and mechanisms through which its provisions are to be implemented. It can also reduce the risk of implicit normativity, where advisory provisions acquire unintended force, and implicit optionality, where approaches

¹⁵ Indian Ports Act, 2025, chap. III, sec. 6(1), "Maritime State Development Council".

intended to establish a common planning framework are treated as merely discretionary. Importantly, articulating intent does not itself create statutory authority; rather, it enables the Ministry to identify where its intended approach can be achieved through the DMP and where additional institutional mechanisms may be required.

The objective, therefore, is not to establish a uniform model for ministerial disaster-management planning. Ministries operate across different institutional structures, sectors and relationships, and the appropriate treatment of provisions will necessarily vary. The more useful objective is to ensure that this variation is **intentional rather than implicit**, allowing ministerial DMPs to function as coherent planning instruments within their respective domains while contributing to the broader objective of a Risk Resilient India 2047.

About the Author

Mr Tariq Ahmad is a Research Associate at the National Maritime Foundation. His research focus is on port adaptation, disaster and climate change resilience, maritime spatial planning and blue economy. His background is in architecture and spatial planning (urban & regional). He may be contacted at rsor1.nmf@gmail.com.