**UNDP comments on Zero Draft of the**

**Post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction[[1]](#footnote-1)**

*UNDP welcomes the current zero draft, which represents significant improvement over the pre-zero draft. We thank UNISDR and the Bureau members for their leadership and look forward to working with member-states and other stakeholders to support further refinement of the framework as the process goes forward.*

This paper provides our comments on the zero draft in two parts. The first part provides overall comments on the entire framework followed by specific comments and suggestions on the specific articles/ paragraphs of the zero draft.

* **Overall Emphasis:** The framework should provide a clear vision for disaster risk that integrates as a substantial and indelible part of economics, poverty and development. Climate change needs to be emphasised a ‘game-changer’ rather than a driver of risk.
* **Disaster Risk and Development**: The document makes repeated references to the drivers of disaster risk and the need to address these as a means to achieving resilience. Much emphasis continues to be on “risk reduction” as a distinct activity as opposed to making disaster risk concerns an integral part of sustainable development. The draft could be strengthened by more explicitly acknowledging the contribution of the development process in generating risk. This could then be the starting point for transforming development itself.
* **Disaster Risk and Climate Change:** While the document recognizes the Climate change as a driver of risk, it is important to highlight that the global debate generated by climate change issues could be used as an opportunity to gain political traction on disaster risk reduction issues as well. The draft currently treats climate change as one of several risk drivers; however, climate change needs to be seen as integral and part of a recalibration of this framework compared to the HFA. To that extent linkage with climate change could be a ‘game-changer’.
* **Alignment between global policy processes:** It follows logically from the above two points that a more deliberate alignment is sought between the HFA2, SDGs and the post-2015 climate framework. Especially, a clearer role for climate change adaptation (now a substantial financing and policy ‘route’ for DRR) in reducing disaster risk needs to be articulated. Similarly, HFA2 should be aligned explicitly with the DRR related elements of SDGs. Since the SDG and CC policy processes will conclude after the HFA2, it is important that the HFA2 highlights the need to align its measurement system (targets, indicators, reporting cycles, timelines etc.) with these.
* **Articulation of HFA2 priority areas:** UNDP recommends the structure of the framework be opened for discussion. At present we see three inter-connected areas that could be explored for improvement: the relationship between the priority areas through to the goal, the role and articulation of the priority area on resilience, and, very much connected to this, how each of the priority areas will work together. The inter-relationship between the four proposed priority areas needs to be made clearer. We recommend articulation of a clear Theory of Change to underpin the HFA2. Such a ToC will:
  + Highlight the connections between the long-term HFA2 outcome and goal to the intermediate priority areas and targets using credible evidence;
  + Elaborate and justify how the five priority areas fit and how each priority area will address the challenges linked to achieving the overall outcome and goal; and
  + Elaborate assumptions and risks associated with achieving the overall expected outcome and goal of HFA2.

This will then help ensure that there is adequate focus on all issues, and there are direct and logical connections between the framework goal, priority areas and targets as well synergies with wider development processes. In addition there is worth in considering whether the current four priority areas need to be further unpacked or realigned[[2]](#footnote-2).

* **Disaster Risk, Fragility and Conflict:** The zero draft recognizes conflict as a driver of disaster risk in some contexts. There is a need to further emphasize that the roll out of HFA2 will take into account conflict and fragility dimensions in such situations. Further, roll out of HFA2 in such contexts will require alignment with other policy processes (e.g. the New Deal) that have been explicitly designed to address the needs of fragile countries.
* **Means of Implementation:** There is considerably opportunity now to spell out clearly what different institutions and actors should bring with regard to disaster risk. The current version tends to underplay the significant support provided by the wider UN family, international financial institutions and other stakeholders. Similarly the financing references in the document need to be strengthened and deepened throughout the document, with key elements being national commitments to finance DRR and an articulation of a wider opportunities and channels of financing.

*The following table provides specific re-wording proposals for the respective paragraphs of the Zero draft Post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction as well as recommendations that contribute towards practically developing the text, based upon the comments highlighted above:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Paragraph Number** | **Text** | **Comment** |
| In many places |  | Ensure a consistent use of the DRR terminology throughout the document. |
| 3. | “Evidence indicates that exposure of people and assets in all countries has increased faster than vulnerability2 has decreased, thus generating new risk and a steady rise in disasters losses with significant socio-economic impact in the short, medium and long term, especially at the local and community level.” | These next three points in paras 3, 5, 10 all address the issue of generation of risk and its components. The concepts of vulnerability and exposure increase may not be fully understood by policy makers. It is suggested that the text directly highlights that the development process itself is a key driver of disaster risk. |
| 5. | focused on tackling underlying risk drivers and compounding factors, |
| 10. | need to: focus action on understanding risk and how it is created; |
| 7. | Developing countries, in particular small island developing States, landlocked developing countries, least developed countries and Africa need special attention and support through bilateral and multilateral channels | We welcome the focus on these groups of countries. However, in addition we would highlight the importance of focus on high risk middle-income countries that are characterised by high rates of economic growth, fragility coupled with low capacity. |
| 9. | The concurrent post-2015 processes on sustainable development, climate change and  disaster risk provide the international community with a unique opportunity to ensure coherence and alignment across policies, practices and partnerships for implementation. | Since the SDG and CC policy processes will conclude after the HFA2, it is important that in addition to this text, the HFA2 highlights the need to align its measurement system (targets, indicators, reporting arrangements) with these. |
| 12. | The prevention of disaster risk creation and the | This is an important aspect. However, the language needs to be simplified. In addition climate and climate adaptation needs to be mentioned here. |
| 13 | Reduce disaster economic loss by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[xx]; | Reducing total disaster economic loss is extremely difficult especially in growing economies. A better measure would be proportion of GDP lost measured at national or sub-national levels. |
| 13 | damage to health and educational facilities by | The rationale for singling out these two sectors is not evident. Since HFA2 states a focus on SIDS and Africa, prioritizing sectors such as agriculture and environment/natural resource management would be equally important. Therefore, it suggested that HFA2includes a provision for development of sectoral risk reduction plans depending of national/ regional contexts as part of its implementation plans. |
| 13. | xx]; and increase number of countries with national and local strategies by [a given percentage] by 20[xx]. | Reviews of the HFA strongly suggest that output driven targets do not allow an understanding of achievements towards disaster reduction outcomes. Instead a target could be explored expenditure on DRR. Such a target would encourage development of robust financial tracking systems fro DRR. |
| Para 15 H | Disaster risk reduction requires transparent risk-informed decision-making based on open and gender-specific/sex/age/disability-disaggregated data, and freely available, accessible, up-to-date, easy-to-understand, science-based, non-sensitive risk information complemented by local, traditional and indigenous knowledge, as relevant.” | The text needs to be simplified. |
| 17. | All actors are encouraged to build multi-stakeholder partnerships, at all levels, as appropriate, and on a voluntary basis, to contribute to the implementation of this framework. States and other actors are also encouraged to promote the strengthening or establishment of national, regional and international volunteer corps, which can be made available to countries and to the international community to contribute to addressing vulnerability and reducing disaster risk. | This is too general. There is an opportunity to explore innovative approaches that are based on more recent understand of governance systems/ networks for DRR. |
| 19 | 19. Taking into account the experience gained through the implementation of the HFA, and in pursuit of the expected outcome and goal, there is a need for focused action across sectors by States at local, national, regional and global levels in the following priority areas:  1) Understanding disaster risk;  2) Strengthening governance and institutions to manage disaster risk;  3) Investing in economic, social, cultural and environmental resilience;  4) Enhancing preparedness for effective response, and building back better in recovery and reconstruction. | There needs to be a stronger linkage between the priority areas and the targets set out in section B. |
| 22 and 23 |  | Throughout these sections a stronger showing of understanding climate risk is required. |
| 22d | d) Build the capacity of local government officials, public servants, communities and volunteers through sharing of experience, training and learning programmes on disaster risk reduction, targeting specific sectors to ensure consistent. | This article would be better placed in the governance section since it emphasized capacity development for DRR. If it should remain here then the focus should be placed on CD for risk assessment or disaster information systems.  As regards terminology, now capacity development is regarded as the more appropriate terminology. |
| 22j | j) Promote national strategies to strengthen public education and awareness of risk information and knowledge through campaigns, social media, community mobilization and other available means, taking into account specific audiences and their needs. | Added clause, indicated in bold: Promote national strategies **and develop capacities** to strengthen public education and awareness of risk information and knowledge through campaigns, social media, community mobilization and other available means, taking into account specific audiences and their needs. |
| 25b | Adopt and implement national and local plans, across different timescales aimed at addressing short, medium and long term disaster risk, with targets, indicators and timeframes; | This article needs to mentioned an integrated planning approach that encompasses disasters, climate change, environment and development.  The notion of “mainstreaming” through national development planning and programming could be included here. |
| 25h | Stimulate, in accordance with national practices, the development of quality standards and mechanisms, including certifications, for disaster risk management, with the participation of the private sector and professional associations and scientific organizations. | The text needs to highlight that quality standards should be commensurate with the available capacities and resources in a given context. In order to continually improve these standards, investment needs to be made in developing local capacities. |
| 27. | Priority 3: General Point. | This priority could be more comprehensive and its practical implementation clearer. Its links with other priority areas of HFA2 as well as with the SDGs could be made more explicit. |
| 28a | a) Allocate resources at all levels of administration for the development and the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies, plans, laws and regulations in all relevant sectors; | Resource allocation should be mandatory by law (in addition to resource allocation for implementation of law and regulations). |
| 28 E & G | e) Promote the incorporation of disaster risk assessment into rural development planning and management, in particular with regard to mountain and coastal flood plain areas, including through the identification of land zones that are available and safe for human settlement;  g) Enhance the resilience of health systems by integrating disaster risk reduction into primary health care, especially at local level developing the capacity of health workers in understanding risk, applying and implementing disaster risk reduction approaches in health work, and supporting and training community health groups in disaster risk reduction approaches; | There is inconsistency in approach/methodology. Whilst (e) speaks of incorporating risk assessment into development; (g) speaks of integrating disaster risk reduction into sectoral development. Instead, we suggest “incorporating disaster risk reduction” in both instances, wherein risk assessments are implicit. |
| 28 I and J | i) Strengthen policy, technical and institutional capacities in local and national disaster risk management, including those related to technology, training, and human and material resources;  j) Review existing financial and fiscal instruments in order to support risk-sensitive public and private investments, and promote the integration of disaster risk reduction considerations and measures in economic valuations, investment tracking, cost-benefit analyses, competitiveness strategies, investment decisions, debt ratings, risk analysis and growth forecasts, budgeting and accounting, and the determination of incentives; | These are capacity issues, and best placed, within the current structure, within the governance section. |
| 28 f | f) Encourage the revision of existing or the development of new building codes, standards, rehabilitation and reconstruction practices at the national or local levels, as appropriate, with the aim of making them more applicable in the local context, particularly in informal human settlements, and reinforce the capacity to implement, monitor and enforce such codes, including through a consensus-based approach; | See additional clause: “…with the aim of making them **not only applicable to local context but also to available capacities and resources**, particularly in informal human settlements, and reinforce the capacity to implement, monitor and enforce such codes, including through a consensus-based approach;” |
| 29 a, b and c | a) Recognize the different multilateral processes, work through the United Nations and other relevant institutions and processes, as appropriate, to promote coherence at all levels and across sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk reduction policies, plans and programs;  b) Promote the development and strengthening, as relevant, of financial, risk transfer and risk sharing mechanisms in close cooperation with business and international financial institutions;  c) Enhance the engagement with institutions involved with financial regulation in an effort to better understand the impacts of disasters on the financial stability of countries, companies and individuals, and thereby promote key policy developments around financial stability and inclusion. | These are essentially governance issues and should be moved to governance section. |
| 30 |  | *Add this to the end of the paragraph: ‘addressing disasters as part of the development continuum instead of separate events along with better understanding of and access to information on long-term climate trends will ultimately support this priority.’* |
| 31 b | Continue to further strengthen early warning systems and tailor them to the needs of users, including social and cultural requirements; | Additional element in bold: “strengthen **end-to-end** early warning systems and tailor them to the needs of users, including social and cultural requirements;” |
| 31 e and f | e) Adopt public policies and establish coordination and funding mechanisms  and procedures to plan and prepare for post-disaster recovery and reconstruction;  f) Ensure the engagement of diverse institutions, multiple authorities and stakeholders at all levels, in view of the complex and costly nature of post-disaster reconstruction; | Both of these are actually governance issues. Its not clear why they are here in the preparedness section. |
| 31 g and h | g) Learn from the recovery and reconstruction programs over the HFA decade and exchange experience knowledge and lessons learned in order to develop guidance for preparedness for reconstruction, including on land use planning and structural standards improvement;  h) Promote the incorporation of disaster risk management into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes and use opportunities during the recovery phase to develop capacities that reduce disaster risk in the medium term, including through the sharing of expertise, knowledge and lessons learned. | These are the only paragraphs that address the issue of recovery. In view of the lessons learned during the HFA decade, it is imperative that HFA2 provides more elaborate guidance on recovery.  We suggest, para 31g to include reference not only “guidance for preparedness” but also other governance dimensions of recovery including institutional arrangements, policies, legislation, financial mechanisms and accountability frameworks.  We suggest, para 31h should also highlight post-disaster needs assessments as well as development of recovery frameworks. |
| 40c | c) Mainstream disaster risk reduction measures appropriately into multilateral and bilateral development assistance programmes, including those related to poverty reduction, natural resource management, urban development and adaptation to climate change. | This article is best placed in the governance section under priority 1 as it relates to global and regional level implementation. |
| 40 f | United Nations system entities, including funds, programs, and specialized agencies, through the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience… are called upon to ensure optimum use of resources and support to developing countries, at their request, and other stakeholders in the implementation of this framework in synergy with other relevant frameworks, including through the development and the strengthening of capacities, and clear and focused programs that support States’ priorities in a balanced and sustainable manner. | In general the role of the UN (as well as other stakeholders) should be further elaborated. The UN plan of action should be presented as one of several frameworks that guides UN support to disaster risk reduction. In particular, at the country level, UNDAF play an increasingly important role in supporting and mainstreaming DRR in development.  In addition with regard to climate a clearer relationship with the UNFCCC is recommended using the following language: *as an intentional two-way collaboration—a sharing of resources, framework monitoring information, and periodic inputs into both processes to ensure dynamic, alterable actions throughout the timeframe of the HFA2 when new information or innovation allows."* |
| 40 g | “… supporting countries, including through the national platforms or their equivalent, in developing national plans and monitoring trends and patterns in disaster risk, loss and impacts…“ | We welcome this article, which is important to define the critical role played by UNISDR on disaster risk reduction. However, it needs to be fully informed by the ongoing discussions on the global architecture for supporting HFA2 implementation.  In particular, the role of UNISDR at the country level is not clear. It is arguable whether UNISDR is best placed to provide such support given its global mandate and lack of presence at the country level. The current articulation presents a lop-sided view and downplays the significant support provided by other UN agencies, international financial institutions and other international stakeholders. It is therefore recommended to ensure adequate representation of these entities in future drafts. |
| 40 h | Adequate voluntary financial contributions should be provided to the United Nations Trust Fund for Disaster Reduction, in the effort to ensure adequate support for the  follow-up activities to this framework. | Adequate funding for UNISDR and disaster risk reduction is important. The UN Trust Fund for DRR, it should not be mentioned as the only financing mechanism for DRR especially in view of the increasing importance other complementary financing mechanism such as Green Climate Fund, financing mechanism under discussion for the SDGs etc. As regards the UN Trust Fund, it is important to clarify that it can be accessed by government, non-government as well as all UN agencies. |

1. To discuss this further please connect with Jan Kellett in Geneva ([jan.kellett@undp.org](mailto:jan.kellett@undp.org)) and Kamal Kishore in New York (kamal.kishore@undp.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In this regard UNDP supports aspects of the World Bank’s suggestion to further unpack the priority areas, as submitted to the co-chairs on November 11th 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)