UNOPS Comments on Zero Draft

General Comments

- The boundaries that define the DRR "work-space" need to be clearly stated. For example DRR is driving agendas for positioning countries to establish the foundations upon which risk-based approaches to development can be undertaken. For example: the identification and analysis of future and existing risk; the establishment of risk information systems; knowledge as to how to access and utilise risk information to shape policy, planning and policy within and across sectors, UN Agencies, NGOs and communities; and the development of robust response management systems.
- In this regard, DRR is responsible for influencing and providing high level guidance to inform development planning decisions but is not responsible for the actual development outcomes nor is it responsible for the level of resilience these outcomes achieve.
- Lessons from HFA and the years prior suggest that DRR language is not appropriate when engaging with policy and planning officials or for that matter other "non DRR" officials. Instead of the DRR Framework promoting the "reduction of disaster risk" it should instead be strongly articulating DRR as a risk management philosophy for strengthening resilience.
- The three headings: Understanding disaster risks; strengthening governance to manage disaster risk and preparedness for response, recovery and reconstruction need to be reworked to give them a development focus. The way they are currently worded only reinforces the view that DRR is a separate stand-alone entity working parallel to government systems rather than a risk management concept designed to enhance the resilience of development outcomes. It is time to "talk the walk" and leave nothing open to misunderstanding.
- This statement is also reactive in nature suggesting that DRR is linked only to disasters (disaster response, and early recovery) whereas DRR should be linked to building resilience – being proactive – understanding risks and ensuring development is undertaken in such a way that systems are able to cope with or recovery rapidly from events. i.e. they are more resilient
- The list of actions under each of the three heading are too micro level and too many. They need to be consolidated within higher level functional groupings. The framework will need a guidance note that should provide the "what and how to" details.
- It is important that the Post 2015 DRR Framework is not too agency or sector prescriptive. DRR is a risk management philosophy that is trying to advocate for whole-of-government risk-based approaches to sustainable and resilient development. It is understandable that specific UN Agencies want their name in lights but it does nothing to defend the inter-related and comprehensive nature of DRR processes.

Global Targets

- It is suggested that the targets are more development focused and related to the achievement of sustainability and resilience outcomes. DRR tries to influence policy, planning and practice toward risk-based approaches and this is what the targets should reflect. This comment relates to previous remarks about setting the DRR boundaries whereby its entry and exit points in the development processes need to be clearly defined. These should not be too prescriptive as they are now as DRR applies to all infrastructure

across all sectors. So when setting DRR targets they perhaps should be focused on areas that DRR can influence directly such as the following:

- The capacity to access and analyse data related to future and existing risk and the establishment of risk information systems.
- The % of sectors that have been capacitated to access, understand and utilise risk information to inform their policy, planning and practice.
- The number of sector plans and policies that have been edited, updated or drafted utilising risk information
- The robustness of emergency response and recovery systems in terms of increasing awareness, strengthening early warning, response and early recovery systems.

Goals

The goals should promote the need to manage future, existing and residual risk through risk-based approaches. Resilience is about enhancing the performance of systems in the face of multiple hazards. The three goals (as worded) are basically saying the same thing but using different words.

Guiding Principles

It is suggested that many of the guiding principles are a list of issues that have been identified as impeders to success of DRR during the period of HFA. There are too many and they need to be culled to provide a very concise set of principles that will be more meaningful to governments and other stakeholders.

Under Priorities for action

A general observation is that while there are efforts to ensure that DRR becomes an integral and meaningful ingredient of sustainable development, the priorities as listed in the framework continue to promote it as a separate stand-alone issue and not a cross-cutting issue.

One could argue that reconstruction is a function of mainstream development (and not DRR). The lessons and findings from early recovery should inform infrastructure assessments (among other things) but it will only be through a detailed assessment of critical infrastructure damage where the root causes of any damage is identified, that will provide the platform for build back better reconstruction. This aspect is not driven under a DRR agenda.

With relevance to this, in paragraph 17c the reference too critical infrastructure is out of place in this section. A statement on infrastructure in "understanding [disaster] risk" section would be more appropriate.