

Summary: Inputs on the post 2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

This note lays out some considerations in response to the “zero draft of the post 2015 framework for disaster risk reduction” (October 2014).

The Goal makes reference to the *prevention of disaster risk creation and the reduction of the existing disaster risk*, which we strongly support. In addition we propose adding reference to the ability to *bounce-back* after a disaster, which is equally important for disaster risk management. These three objectives could be made more clear by dividing them up into three distinct goals.

The Priorities can be strengthened and un-packed further. We propose three main structural changes in addition to strengthening the other goals (which is explained below in the detailed note):

1. Re-focus the *Investing in Resilience* priority on *preventing new risks and reducing existing risks*. All priorities for action require investment, we are therefore concerned that a priority on *Investing in resilience* will become all-encompassing. Focusing this priority on preventing and reducing risks links directly to the goal and is more actionable.
2. Separate *Preparedness* from *Recovery and Reconstruction* and strengthen both. Actions and actors for *Reconstruction and Recovery*, differ greatly from *Preparedness*. Separating the two will highlight the importance of both clusters of activities across all levels of government.
3. Develop a new priority on “*Reducing the financial impact of natural disasters on government and society*”. The few references to financial protection and insurance are currently scattered across different priorities for action. Due to the specific nature of financial protection activities it would be advisable to have it as a stand-alone priority.

Poverty and inequality warrant a central role in the HFA2 system. Poverty is the central driver of disaster vulnerability. The poor generally live in exposed areas, have low capacity to adapt, and bear the greatest adverse impacts from disaster risk and climate-related disasters.

Climate change resilience should be referenced throughout the new Framework as a driver of hazard risk. Actions referenced in the Framework, particularly the under the *Understanding Disaster Risk* Priority, need to reference the need to understand disaster risk under future climate scenarios.

Reference to the coherence and consistency with other international frameworks, in particular the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) could be reinforced by including it in the guiding principles.

International partnerships: Adequate financing to support follow up activities should be encouraged for all stakeholders. There is a strong rationale for making item (h) of Section F broad and inclusive, without specifying preference for any particular financing mechanisms or actors.

Consistent terminology: Since this is an internationally endorsed framework, it presents an opportunity to crystalize terminology, which should be defined and used consistently throughout the document. The current draft defines ‘hazard’ and ‘vulnerability’ in end-notes 1 and 2. It would be useful to also define terms such as ‘exposure’, ‘resilience’, ‘risk’, ‘disaster preparedness’, ‘recovery readiness’, ‘financial protection’, ‘disaster risk reduction’, and ‘disaster risk management’.

The Details: Inputs on the post 2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

Context

The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) has been a useful tool to motivate and track progress of countries to build resilience to disasters over time, and raise international awareness of the main building blocks of disaster risk management. Limitations of the framework have been widely recognized, such as the vague nature of some of the priorities for action and associated indicators, in particular Priority for Action 4 on ‘Reducing the Underlying Risk Factors’, as well as the challenges of self-reporting, without validation or review. The process to update the HFA is an opportunity to overcome some of these shortcomings and build on the framework’s many strengths.

The timing of this process is also crucial, in light of the other ongoing international discussions around the Sustainable Development Goals and climate change discussions. Since all three of these international discussions involve country reporting on indicators of resilience, it is important that these indicators are well aligned so as to ensure coherence between international frameworks. This will avoid over-burdening countries with different timescales and different indicators being reported on by different ministries. Coherence of the international system can also encourage stronger coordination at the national level.

It is evident that disasters and climate change have disproportionate impacts on the poor and vulnerable. Building disaster and climate resilience is a fundamental step required to end poverty and boost shared prosperity, and is therefore critical for achieving international development goals. The World Bank’s new commitments to support IDA-eligible countries¹ involves systematically integrating disaster and climate risk considerations during country partnership framework discussions and the design of new operations. Additionally, these commitments also propose scaling up support for climate and disaster resilience in 25 additional IDA countries. To measure the impact of this work, the World Bank is committed to integrating a new climate and disaster resilience indicator in its Corporate Scorecard by the end of 2015. The HFA2 will provide the basis for this new indicator.

Overall observations on the proposed structure

The zero-draft of the HFA2 proposes one outcome, one goal, four priorities for action, and five targets. It is however, not clear how all these connect. The framework could be strengthened through a clearer explanation on this interrelationship.

The Goal and Outcome

It would be useful to add an introductory paragraph to this section to explain what the objectives of the new framework are and what it seeks to accomplish. Increased clarity may help to frame the discussion better and identify the kinds of data and processes required. A statement that refers to the HFA2 as being a “framework to guide, inform and measure progress in managing disaster and climate risks” could be useful to explain the purpose of this framework to the reader.

The Goal makes reference to the *prevention of disaster risk creation and the reduction of the existing disaster risk*, which we strongly support. In addition we propose adding reference to the ability to

¹ <http://www.worldbank.org/ida/borrowing-countries.html>

bounce-back after a disaster, which is equally important for disaster risk management. These three objectives could be made clearer by dividing them up into three distinct goals.

The Priorities for Action

The Priorities for Action are the processes necessary to achieve the goal and outcome. We have the following suggestions to strengthen and re-structure these priorities:

Further Un-Pack the Priorities for Action

By un-packing some of the priorities for action we believe the HFA2 can provide a more operational and clear guide to governments to manage disaster risk. We propose six Priorities for Action as suggested below. An explanation of the major changes proposed are described in the sub-headings below.

1. *Understanding Disaster Risk*
2. *Strengthening Governance and Institutions to Manage Disaster Risk*
3. *Preventing and Reducing Disaster Risk*
4. *Reducing the Financial Impact of Disasters on Government and Society*
5. *Enhancing Preparedness for Effective Disaster Response*
6. *Strengthening Capacity for Resilient Recovery and Reconstruction*

Re-focus the *Investing in Social, Economic and Environmental Resilience* priority:

The emphasis on investing in this priority is misleading as all priorities for action will include activities that require investments. In addition there are many actions listed under this priority that are not directly related to investments, such as land-use policy and rural development planning, building codes, training health care workers, capacity development and eco-system based approaches. We therefore propose un-packing this priority as follows:

1. Re-focus this priority on *reducing existing risk and preventing the creation of new risk*, in line with the Goal of the new framework. This would therefore focus on actions that are already included in this section such as:
 - a. Strengthening critical infrastructure and cultural heritage
 - b. Land-use policy and urban and rural development planning
 - c. Building codes
 - d. Eco-system-based risk management approaches
2. Move all actions related to government budget and resource and government capacity building to priority 2 on governance.
3. Move all actions related to financial protection, such as fiscal instruments and social safety nets under a new priority related to financial protection – see point below).

Separate *Preparedness and Response* from *Recovery and Reconstruction* priority

Priority 4 includes two separate types of action (which involve different sets of actors), the first being disaster preparedness, including early warning systems, disaster contingency plans and immediate response measures; the second being recovery and reconstruction activities, which require a different set

of activities and multi-million-dollar investments. We would therefore advise to separate preparedness & response from recovery & reconstruction.

The majority of actions listed under the current priority 4 are focused on preparedness, which are quite strong as they stand. Other points that could be added to strengthen a stand-alone preparedness Priority could include stronger reference to:

- Building capacity of national hydro-meteorological agencies and facilitating data sharing with key DRM agencies.
- Early warning systems to strengthen multi-hazard and impact-based forecasting services.
- Strengthening the capacity for early action in response to early warning signals.

Strengthen Priority on *building back better in recovery and reconstruction*

The current priority for action "*Enhancing preparedness for effective response and building back better in recovery and reconstruction*" lacks the specificity and focus required to ensure disaster risk reduction is mainstreamed in recovery and reconstruction. As mentioned above, preparedness and response should be separated from recovery and reconstruction, but greater emphasis needs to also be made for anticipatory measure to enhance recovery readiness.

A dedicated resilient recovery and reconstruction priority could be strengthened with a greater emphasis on inclusive, and effective recovery and reconstruction interventions and measures. This could be done through the institutionalization of post disaster needs assessments and recovery frameworks across regions and all levels of government. Suggestions for this have come from declarations at the 5th Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk reduction, the 4th Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Americas, 6th Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, the Joint-UN Statement at PrepCom1, and the Second World Reconstruction Conference. These include:

- Legislation, policies and plans for resilient recovery readiness;
- Establishment of inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms for resilient recovery;
- Strengthening capacity for recovery planning, implementation, and monitoring at the regional and all levels of government, and establishing clear roles and responsibilities for all actors in a recovery setting;
- Formalized strategic and resource commitments towards recovery planning, implementation and performance management;
- Strengthening performance management systems for recovery such as rapid procurement systems, risk accountability frameworks, best practices and tools, sharing of information, data bases and rosters of experts;
- Promoting more dependable and predictable international financial mechanisms for financing recovery;
- Standardized approaches for post-disaster needs assessments and recovery planning frameworks;

Establish a new priority: *Reducing the financial impact of natural disasters on the government and society*

Financial protection and insurance actions are scattered in different priorities for action in the latest zero draft. Due to the specific nature of financial protection it would be advisable to group them under a stand-alone priority. Such a priority could be titled "*Reducing the financial impact of natural disasters on the government and society*" and could include the following actions:

- Improve understanding and assessment of public contingent liabilities related to natural disasters
 - (a) Promote the availability, quality, and consistency of risk data.
 - (b) Develop and promote catastrophe risk pricing models such as probabilistic catastrophe risk and actuarial models.
 - (c) Assess implicit and explicit contingent liabilities of the state to disasters and improve their integration in fiscal risk management.
 - (d) Establish transparent, timely, and effective post-disaster loss reporting mechanisms.
 - (e) Build the required capacity and technical expertise for disaster risk financing and insurance.
 - (f) Strengthen the use of financial risk information to guide risk reduction activities.
- Develop national financial protection strategies to be implemented through a dedicated Disaster Risk Management Fund.
 - (a) Assess potential post-disaster (short-term and long-term) funding gaps.
 - (b) Develop and use financial decision making tools to assess the costs and benefits of disaster risk financing options.
 - (c) Develop a national strategy for financial protection to clarify contingent liability, secure immediate liquidity following disasters for the short-term, and ensure longer-term reconstruction financing.
 - (d) Establish a national disaster fund with dedicated resources.
 - (e) Adopt pre-disaster budget management and post-disaster budget execution mechanisms for natural disasters.
- Leverage private financial institutions to offer affordable, sustainable, cost-effective financial solutions, including insurance, to governments, homeowners, SMEs, and agricultural producers.
 - (a) Quantify potential property and agricultural disaster losses and identify losses incurred by public and private stakeholders.
 - (b) Develop public market infrastructure (such as systems for collecting and managing data or modeling catastrophe risk) to better develop domestic catastrophe risk insurance and agricultural insurance markets.
 - (c) Improve supervision and regulation of domestic catastrophe risk insurance markets.
- Integrate disaster risk considerations into the design of social protection and safety net programs.
 - (a) Quantify potential disaster-related financial losses on the poorest and the fiscal impact that disasters pose for social protection programs.
 - (b) Secure contingent funding by the government for social protection programs against disasters.
 - (c) Complement social protection programs with insurance principles and private sector products.
 - (d) Improve the process for identifying beneficiaries and assessing their eligibility for post-disaster payouts.

Strengthen Priority 1 on understanding risk

National and local levels:

1. Add reference to the integration of future climate change scenarios into disaster risk assessment
2. Add reference to hazard forecasting and early warning within points 22. (d) & (h).

Global and regional levels:

3. Add reference to the need for development organizations to systematically integrate for disaster and climate risk throughout development operations/financing, and build capacity of development practitioners on disaster and climate risk.
4. Add reference to the need for an open data policy for all risk information and data funded by development financing, so that it is free, open and accessible, in line with the Open Data for Resilience Initiative.
5. Add reference to cross-border risk data and information sharing to address trans-boundary risks.
6. Under point (e) on global campaigns and forums, in addition to the UNISDR campaigns referenced, other examples can be included such as international forums to share good practices from a range of different stakeholders, such as the Understanding Risk Forum.

Strengthen Priority 2 on governance and institutions to manage disaster risk

National and local levels:

1. Add reference to need for inter-ministerial coordination at the highest possible level, ideally through the government's executive office (in order to cut across line-ministries).
2. In point (a) add reference to recovery frameworks as a means to guide the public sector in defining role and responsibilities.

Global and regional levels:

3. Policy commitments by development organizations and bilateral donors to systematically integrate disaster risk considerations into country partnership engagement and through all operations.
4. Recognize the need for strong multi-donor collaboration in support of national resilience priorities, including the use of multi-donor partnership and financing mechanisms.
5. It is not clear what point (d) is referring to. Are multi-stakeholder forums such as the Understanding Risk Forum what is being referred to here? If so, perhaps a few examples could be provided.
6. Point (b) should also seek to foster collaboration and partnerships for resilient recovery.
7. Add reference to the Global Framework for Climate Services under 26. (c).

The Targets

The global targets identified in the zero-draft will be extremely challenging to measure, since return periods for disasters vary, and no year is comparable to another in terms of disaster intensity. It would be useful to discuss how these targets would be measured, as there are many challenges related to data availability and quality as well as methodological hurdles. We would warn against relying on probabilistic risk modelling for this purpose.

The economic impact target will more likely have to measure the reduction in the growth rate of disaster loss as opposed to reduce overall economic losses. This is because of ever rising exposure due to population growth and concentration of assets, combined with increasing climate change impacts.

Strong poverty reduction dimension

Poverty is the central driver of disaster vulnerability. The poor generally live in exposed areas, have low capacity to adapt, and bear the greatest adverse impacts from disaster risk and climate-related disasters.

Poverty and inequality indicators therefore, warrant a central role in the HFA2 system. The World Bank - GFDRR are currently conducting data-driven research on the exposure level of assets, vulnerability, and adaptive capacity of the poor and non-poor in 55 countries for two scenarios: a baseline historical scenario and another including climate change impacts. We would be happy to share the results of this analysis to support the integration of poverty reduction into the HFA2 framework.

Climate change resilience

Climate change resilience should be referenced throughout the new Framework as a driver of hazard risk. Actions referenced in the Framework, particularly the under the *Understanding Disaster Risk Priority*, need to reference the need to understand disaster risk under future climate scenarios.

Fragility and Conflict

In 2010, 15 percent of the world's population lived in fragile and conflict-affected countries, this same population group makes up one-third of people living in extreme poverty. Such settings escalate socioeconomic vulnerability to shocks, including disasters, and introduce obstacles to risk management through, for example, limited access to functioning markets, communities, and public institutions. Unstable and risky contexts need long-term and risk-informed development approaches, with recurrent/persistent crises and fragility managed through systematic engagement. Disaster risk reduction can provide a politically neutral entry point to not only manage risks of the most vulnerable, but also to foster collaboration for stability and development.

Community resilience and gender

Scaling up and sustaining community-level DRM requires bridging the gap between the local, sub-national and national levels, and understanding the complementary roles of institutions. Communities must be connected to higher-level policymaking through access to technical assistance and risk information for comprehensive disaster risk management. Organized communities with expertise in building resilience should be recognized as partners. Community leaders can set priorities, influence government policies, and design and implement investment programs that are responsive to community needs.

Empowering women is a critical ingredient for building resilience. Women are often the designers and builders of community resilience at the local level. Inclusive community resilience needs to emphasize socially inclusive approaches to DRM. Marginalized groups such as the disabled, the displaced, the elderly, indigenous persons, migrants, women and children suffer disproportionately from disasters and should have equal access to necessary resources and services to manage risk. Resilience is strengthened by addressing the underlying, non-hazard or climate-related sources of vulnerability which requires multi-disciplinary DRM approaches with a focus on poverty reduction. These considerations need to be integrated throughout the priorities for action.

Coherence and consistency with other international frameworks

The preface speaks of the coherence with the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals and Climate change agreements. This could be reinforced by including it in the guiding principles of the zero-draft. Since the HFA2 will be agreed upon in March, ahead of the other international discussions, this could ensure that relevant indicators agreed in the HFA2 are incorporated in the other frameworks to ensure

consistency. It will also avoid over-burdening countries with different reporting requirements that use different methodologies.

International partnerships

Managing disaster risk requires coordinated efforts by all member-states and stakeholders and strong international partnerships to support the framework. The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) was specifically established as a global partnership to support the implementation of the HFA and will continue to play a major role in supporting countries to mainstream disaster risk management into sector and development planning. In this light, it would be appropriate to reference GFDRR, possibly under 40 (f) under Section F on international cooperation and global partnerships.

Adequate voluntary financial contributions to support the follow up activities of the framework should be encouraged for all financing mechanisms and stakeholders at local, national, regional and global levels. There is a strong rationale for making sub-item (h) of Section F broad and inclusive and resist from specifying any preference for particular financing mechanisms or actors to the exclusion of others.

In addition, sub-item (h) of Section F can benefit from a more precise explanation as to what the requested financial contributions to the UN Trust Fund for Disaster Reduction would be used for. We assume that this would be used for monitoring and evaluation of the framework and facilitating global and regional platforms, as described in point (g). For the purposes of clarity, points (g) and (h) can be merged. The current reference to ‘follow up activities’ is too sweeping and belongs to the shared work space of all member-states, stakeholders and their development partners. Concerning sub-item (g) of Section E, it will be proper to remove the reference to implementation, as UNISDR’s unique mandate is the coordination, monitoring and review of the progress in implementation of the framework, and not the implementation of the framework per se.

Reporting and monitoring

It would also be useful in the document to clarify the proposed reporting periodicity. Maintaining the regular two-year reporting period is advised.

An opportunity to define terminology in a consistent manner

It should also be noted that since this will be an internationally endorsed policy framework, it is crucial to use terminology in a consistent manner. This is a space where there are similar terms that mean different things, but are often used interchangeably. The new framework would benefit from an explanation of the correlation between disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction. The current draft defines ‘hazard’ and ‘vulnerability’ in end-notes 1 and 2. It would be useful to also define terms such as ‘exposure’, ‘resilience’, ‘risk’, ‘disaster preparedness’, ‘recovery readiness’, ‘financial protection’, ‘disaster risk reduction’, and ‘disaster risk management’.