Criticisms of current monitor

1. Make it joined up. Where does everything fit in? National to local, it feels as if HfA is handed down and that doesn’t make for good relations. National doesn’t always know best, locals know what they need and where they need it.

2. Help us to show all the things we have done, as well as the things we haven’t. Don’t make us fraudulent! The Peer Review showed those who reviewed the UK, exactly what we meant. At the end of the Peer Review the reviewers came back and said we understand what you’re moaning about. You do a lot in the UK which you can’t report in the Monitor.

3. Keep it simple – the language – it’s in English, but I still have to translate it! Don’t repeat questions, look at the requirements you make on those who fill in the forms and on those who have to provide the information. Is DRR as dull as dishwater. We don’t think it is, but reading the reports it looks like it. (And as Andrew confirmed he has to read them all!)

So what did we do about it, given its voluntary;

4. With the assistance of the EU, OECD and particularly UNISDR, 3 Peer countries reviewed the UK using the monitoring form as a guideline. Andrew put down some of the reasons for the Peer Review. We would offer 3 more;
• It raised DRR and Prevention up the political agenda in the UK;
• It allowed others to critically challenge what we wrote and what we did;
• It got right down to the local level and to those we feel need to fully understand HfA.

Did anybody listen?

5. Definitely like the idea of completion of the Monitor every 4 years, much more sensible. But the 4 year period seemed odd as it doesn’t fit with the suggested time periods for the new HfA or SDGs (10 or 15 years?) Would it be better to suggest completion 2 or 3 times in the lifetime of the agreements?

Is it joined up?

6. This was very difficult to see.
• The draft said on p3 that DRR requires local level action. Most disasters are small-scale and local. We absolutely agree – but how is this represented in a national monitor. Is it enough to say that the local level can fill it in as well?
• The new monitor seems to silo things into education, or health. Don’t we want to join up all these things and more especially at the local level? It’s not clear how the private sector is joined up with this, nor science and technology. Surely they have a part to play cross-sectorally?
• How do Peer Reviews and the recommendations in those fit in? Are they the verifier of the monitor? Are the findings added to the monitor? What is their role? How can we best use them?
• Finally, how is the monitor joined-up to the SDGs, and new monitors on climate change. Are we now doing ¾ monitors every so many years answering the same old questions? If we are, guess which one won’t get done because its voluntary? Many of us would argue that DRR underpins all the SDGs. HfA will be the first of these groups out of the block, we could lead the way on this.

Does the draft help us to show the things we have done?

7. Well it could do. It’s good to see flexibility coming in and that we can choose the indicators we respond to. But it won’t help us find the information we want. I think I’ll choose the easy ones and the ones I understand. Hence Macroeconomic Resilience on p 46 will probably not be one of the UK’s choices!

8. Don’t re-invent wheels. There’s an awful lot out there from people who work in these fields (e.g. View from the frontline) which are good at showing success and how to move to the more difficult things.

9. Interesting to see the attempts at trying to set targets (50% reduction in mortality). Might be a bit high even for us, but good that you are trying.
10. Peer Reviews must include the local level. They loved it in the UK, so good to discuss their work with others.

Keep it Simple?

11. The one I worry most about. Does this draft start to make DRR exciting, useful, grab the attention of those who work so hard in the field, show the added-value that DRR gives us? I think not yet. The dashboard is a really nice idea, which cheers it up a lot and looks good.

12. It's not yet in a language which I as an English speaker feel comfy with. It’s getting there. But perhaps it needs the comments of those who complete it in their second or third language.