



General Assembly

Distr.: General
23 September 2014

Original: English

Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction

Preparatory Committee

Second session

Geneva, 17-18 November 2014

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

Considerations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

Regional and national experience under the Hyogo Framework for Action

Note by the Secretariat*

Summary

This document has been produced pursuant to the General Assembly resolution 68/211 to support the preparatory process of the Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. It presents an overview of the experience gained through the regional and national strategies/institutions and plans for disaster risk reduction and their recommendations as well as relevant regional agreements under the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters.

Voluntary reporting from countries suggests there is progress in implementing many of the Hyogo Framework for Action priorities of action, although there has been a real challenge in addressing one of the priorities – reduce the underlying risk factors – which helps to explain higher economic losses from disasters over the last ten years. The experience of regions suggests more intense engagement on disaster risk reduction. The Hyogo Framework for Action has been influential in shaping regional agreements and the work of regional institutions. At the same time, each of the regions have their own specific issues and priorities to address in disaster risk reduction efforts.

* This document was submitted late due to the need to include as much information from consultations as possible.



Introduction

1. The General Assembly, through resolution 68/211 of 20 December 2013, decided that the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction would have as one of its objectives the consideration of experience gained through the regional and national strategies/institutions and plans for disaster risk reduction and their recommendations as well as relevant regional agreements under the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters.

2. The experiences contained within the present summary report are presented in two sections. Section I presents information on national strategies/institutions and plans that have been extracted from countries' regular biennial reporting on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework. A summary of progress and experiences along with some figures on mortality rates and economic losses from disasters are also provided. Section II outlines the experiences gained from regional engagement in disaster risk reduction under the implementation of the Hyogo Framework. The experiences are gathered from regional-level reports, agreements and compendiums as well as from interviews with regional intergovernmental organizations and entities. Section II includes an overview of regional experiences and developments since 2005 in five regions: Africa, Arab States, Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe.

Section I: National experiences

3. Since the Hyogo Framework was agreed, countries have reported on the progress and implementation of the framework over three reporting cycles: 2007-2009, 2009-2011 and 2011-2013. The reports provide an informative and insightful look into the national experiences of countries in implementing disaster risk reduction policies and activities. The first part of the national experiences focuses on the progress on the implementation of the five priorities of the Hyogo Framework in general terms with a few country examples to give some context. Also presented are facts and figures on mortality rates and the collective economic losses from disasters.

Experiences and progress on implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action

4. There has been gradual progress in all regions on all of the Hyogo Framework's priorities for action. In particular, progress has been made on strengthening countries' institutional, legislative and policy frameworks; improving early warning systems; upgrading disaster preparedness and response activities; enhancing risk assessment, education and research; and fostering public awareness and a common understanding of disaster risk. A short summary is presented below on the status of progress of implementation as per the three reporting cycles from 2007 to 2013.¹

Priority for Action 1: Ensuring that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

5. There has been significant progress in making disaster risk reduction both a national and local priority among reporting countries since the first reporting cycle. Progress has been especially strong in establishing national policies and legal frameworks, decentralizing responsibilities and capacities, and increasing interest in establishing national platforms or

¹ http://www.unisdr.org/files/32916_implementationofthehyogoframeworkfo.pdf

coordination bodies for disaster risk reduction. In the 2009-11 reporting cycle, a number of countries highlighted that progress did not necessarily translate into effective disaster risk reduction, a finding that was consistent with the findings from the Hyogo Framework for Action mid-term review,² which noted progress in setting up institutional structures and developing plans but limited progress in terms of resourcing and local implementation.

6. Many countries now see the necessity for legal and policy frameworks for disaster risk reduction. Substantial work has been done to establish such frameworks. China established a disaster prevention and reduction legal system including the creation of national laws and a policy framework for disaster prevention and reduction; responsibility of central and local government; and the establishment of government-led prevention, reduction, and relief systems. China has set national targets to significantly reduce the number of deaths caused by natural hazards and limit the direct economic losses from disasters to within 1.5 per cent of gross domestic product.³ Brazil noted comprehensive achievement on legal and policy frameworks, approving a broad set of guidelines and shaping legislation that focuses on disaster prevention. Djibouti developed a national policy on disaster risk management and codified it into law, adopting an institutional framework for its implementation. Cayman Islands formulated a new strategic framework for disaster risk management, backed by a new structure, Hazard Management Cayman Islands.

7. Countries reported on the availability of resources dedicated to disaster risk reduction as opposed to emergency management or relief and response to demonstrate how they are making risk reduction more of a priority. Japan, in the second reporting cycle from 2009-2011, reported that it had allocated 1.2 per cent of its national budget for disaster risk reduction, with \$7.9 billion allocated to hazard-proofing sectoral development investments, such as transport and agriculture. A further \$2.7 billion was allocated and budgeted to stand-alone disaster risk reduction investments, such as risk assessments, institutions and early warning systems.

8. Several countries reported that they were delegating more authority to the local level and fostering community participation in disaster risk reduction. As early as 2009, countries across Asia (e.g. the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and the Islamic Republic of Iran, among others) referred to decentralized systems of governance for disaster risk reduction in countries across Asia. These decentralized systems provided opportunities for participation at the local governance and community levels. Niger reinforced its network of community early warning systems, thereby leveraging capacity building by locally elected officials and their communities and strengthening their role in prevention. The Islamic Republic of Iran made sure that 2 per cent of every local budget was dedicated to disaster risk reduction. Australia's disaster resilience policies and programmes were dependent on delegating authority to local levels and providing them with adequate resources. In Venezuela, as reported in 2011, local risk management committees informed all people about the community risks, threats and vulnerabilities that disasters pose and trained them to prepare and respond to disasters.

9. There was an increasing desire to improve and build on national coordination mechanisms for disaster risk reduction, including the national platforms model that is multi-stakeholder in form and function. Both existing and newly formed national platforms were designed to engage more stakeholders in risk reduction efforts. Montenegro, for example, involved 16 institutions in preparing its national strategy for emergency situations, including universities, institutions with specialized hazard expertise and government officials. In a few cases, national platforms, such as those in the Czech Republic and

² http://www.preventionweb.net/files/18197_midterm.pdf

³ <http://www.unisdr.org/archive/38302>

Germany, were comprised mainly of non-governmental organizations. In 2009, the Bahrain reported that it has instituted a national committee on disaster management and recognized the need for a national policy.⁴ In the Arab States, national commitments to disaster risk reduction were strong. In some Arab States, particularly in countries where there was a multi-stakeholder basis for disaster management (e.g. Egypt and Tunisia), formal national platforms or coordination committees on disaster reduction were developed.

10. A new experience under this priority is the risk of a natural hazard triggering technological disasters (also known as NATECH). The Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011 stands as the most dramatic example of NATECH. Such simultaneous or cascading events can turn into catastrophic events. Administrative organizations, legislation and research agencies are often mandated to deal with a natural hazard or industrial accident, but rarely both. This can complicate effective risk management efforts. The extent of economic damage and the combination of risks means that new institutional arrangements, knowledge management and more risk management policies will need to be put in place. The scope of disaster risk reduction policy is widening with a more holistic and comprehensive risk management approach.

Priority for Action 2: Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.

11. There has been a steady level of substantial progress across all indicators on this priority of action. The Netherlands and Slovenia, in particular, reported comprehensive achievement across all of the indicators in this priority. Italy reported that early warning had been significantly improved since the National Warning System had been in place. Information compiled by a central functional centre and regional functional centres was being circulated daily among decision-makers of the national civil protection system.

12. Several countries reported implementing risk assessments for critical infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools. Serbia reported the adoption of the Law on Emergency Situations, which required a systematic rational risk assessment. Malaysia made disaster risk assessment a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming. In the Maldives, the Ministry of Housing and Environment used high-resolution regional climate models by the Maldives Meteorological Service (MMS) in national and local planning projects. Uruguay's risk assessments included surveillance programmes to monitor the risk of diseases entering the country through animals and animal by-products. India's Disaster Management Act and National Disaster Policy highlighted the need to conduct hazard risk and vulnerability assessments, and towards that end India prepared a Vulnerability Atlas. In Africa, disaster risk information was enhanced in nine countries, all of which now have disaster loss databases with public online access. At least 20 additional countries are expected to have such databases in the future.

13. Many countries reported establishing operational systems to monitor risks, particularly natural hazards and emerging health threats. Honduras purchased an information system for national risk management that must be implemented and adapted to local needs; time was spent to train staff in its use. The United Kingdom developed a "communicating risk" strategy for sharing information to facilitate cooperation on emergency planning. The strategy included legal requirements that mandated that emergency responders must share information with other response personnel.

14. Significant success was reported on establishing emergency notification systems. China established monitoring and early warning systems for major natural hazards, and

⁴ Global Assessment Report 2009

now provide early warning service to local communities. Belarus provided timely information to the public about possible threats and emergencies through a nationwide alert system. Malawi listed an early warning system overseen by the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services. Finland built the world's first national digital radio network based on the "terrestrial trunked radio" standard, enabling top quality sound, data and moving image transmission, even in extreme conditions.

Priority for Action 3: Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.

15. A number of countries reported substantial or comprehensive achievement across all indicators in the third priority for action. The most common reported accomplishment was success in disseminating risk information. China, for example, established a disaster information sharing service and a public campaign on disaster prevention and reduction.

16. Countries reported success in developing and delivering disaster risk reduction curricula materials in schools. More specifically, the last cycle of reports mentioned innovations in educating school children, the public and professionals about disaster resilience and safety. Some examples included smartphone educational applications in Australia and the online educational tool, 'What's the Plan, Stan?' in New Zealand. Key accomplishments were also made on increasing public awareness of disaster risk reduction and facilitating national outreach campaigns on disaster risk reduction. The Solomon Islands reported carrying out extensive public education campaigns, especially before and during the cyclone season. Advocacy efforts related to cities, schools and hospitals have been undertaken in many countries in Africa, in line with global efforts. Disaster risk reduction has been incorporated in school curricula in Ethiopia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria and Sierra Leone.

17. With regard to developing research methods and tools for multi-risk assessment, public research and development of hazard mitigation technologies have improved the national transportation system's resilience to multiple hazards in the United States of America. Methodologies and guidelines were developed to assist the transportation sector in assessing risk, planning for disaster response, evacuation and recovery, and designing for extreme events. In Namibia, the work of the Namibia Economic Policy Research Institute supported research, information and training around poverty reduction and disaster risk reduction.

Priority for Action 4: Reduce the underlying risk factors

18. Countries have been more challenged to factor disaster risk reduction into public investment, land-use planning, infrastructure projects, environmental management and social policies, which are the activities under the fourth priority for action.

19. These underlying risk drivers, such as poor urban governance, vulnerable rural livelihoods and declining ecosystems, undermine development efforts and enhance poverty by concentrating extensive disaster risk in low-income communities and households. There is no single example of comprehensive achievement across all indicators across any of the three cycles, revealing the extent to which this priority was a challenge to countries. Progress has been most limited with respect to priority for action 4.

20. Many countries reported that incorporating disaster risk reduction considerations into environment-related policies and plans had proved elusive. Mozambique, for example, reported that the high dependency of local communities on natural resources for survival, due to high levels of poverty and increased pressure on resources, had made environmental policies entirely impractical.

21. In some cases, lack of financial and management capacity for public and private social insurance programmes was cited as a reason for the lack of progress on priority for action 4. Paraguay mentioned that while national development policy had taken a cross-cutting approach to disaster risk management, the effects of the government's operations had been limited bearing in mind that 36 per cent of the population lives in poverty and 19 per cent in extreme poverty. Viet Nam reported a lack of an "insurance culture" that was resulting in a lack of capacity of the domestic insurance sector.

22. The challenge was especially severe in low income countries with regard to implementing and enforcing mandated risk reduction elements. Micronesia (Federated States of), for example, noted that capacities varied on each of their islands and that land use planning and building codes were not being actively enforced.

23. There were some successful national experiences. Trinidad and Tobago had taken a highly multi-disciplinary approach to designing major national and subnational projects, collecting inputs from technical advisory committees comprised of experts from key agencies and stakeholders across the public and private sectors. Pakistan had intervened socially and economically to reduce the vulnerabilities of at-risk populations through the institution of "Zakat," which derives from the injunction to Muslims to donate one-fortieth of their wealth to charity.

Priority for Action 5: Strengthening the disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

24. Over one-third of the countries reported a substantial or comprehensive achievement across all indicators in the fifth priority for action, which was the highest across all of the priorities. One of the keys to success was the increased targeting of local government to undertake disaster preparedness plans and regular training drills to increase capacity. The Philippines Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010, for example, required a Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office in every local government unit, coordinating testing of early warning systems and communication chains.

25. China strengthened its disaster preparedness plan to include an emergency response plan system, reserves of relief materials, improved disaster relief funding and insurance penetration. Ghana reported that it had developed a national disaster management policy to guide the national disaster management organization on standard operating procedures for emergency response. Several countries (e.g. Armenia and Turkey) reported that they were taking into account the experiences of past disasters to prepare emergency response plans, develop research projects, purchase new equipment, and educate and train members of their rescue and relief forces, as well as the public. In Jamaica, information and lessons learned in the preparedness for response were shared and communicated through reports from all sectors after a disaster event.

26. Some countries reported the establishment or existence of contingency funds for response efforts. In Africa, for example, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa and Tanzania reported the existence of a contingency fund. Similar funds were reported to be in existence in various countries in the Americas (Colombia, Costa Rica and El Salvador), Asia (Islamic Republic of Iran, the Philippines) and the Pacific (Australia, New Zealand). Marshall Islands reported establishing a Disaster Assistance Emergency Fund. In Bolivia, 0.15 per cent of the national budget was dedicated to a contingency fund.⁵ It is important to highlight that disaster risk reduction requires sustainable ongoing investments not only tied to emergencies.

⁵ http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/report/documents/GAR_Chapter_5_2009_eng.pdf

Mortality rates

27. Global physical exposure to tropical cyclones have almost tripled from 1970 to 2009. The combination of the rapid growth of at risk populations and the increasing strength of tropical cyclones would, under normal conditions, result in more deaths. Despite growing exposure of people and intensifying hazards, based on the reports and improved loss databases, the mortality risk associated with major weather-related hazards has been declining globally, especially in Asia where most of the risk is concentrated. In most of the world, the risk of being killed by a tropical cyclone or a major river flood is lower today than it was in 1990. For example, it was estimated that mortality risk associated with tropical cyclones in East Asia and the Pacific fell by 50 percent between 1980 and 2010, although exposure increased by about 160 percent.⁶

28. A combination of achievements towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and investments in preparedness and early warning has contributed to the reduction of mortality over the decades. Improved transport infrastructure and health facilities, better early warning systems and evacuation procedures as well as prompt medical attention has resulted in reduced vulnerability, at least in the case of floods and tropical cyclones. For example, over the past four decades, Bangladesh has been struck by three severe cyclones: Bhola (1970), Gorky (1991) and Sidr (2007). Bhola caused an estimated 300,000 deaths and Gorky was responsible for more than 138,000 deaths. The death toll for Sidr was around 4,000 and was largely attributable to the existence of a cyclone shelter programme.⁷

29. Mortality risk for all hazards continues to be concentrated in countries with low Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and mortality is still increasing in countries with weak risk-governance capacity. In general, higher-income countries and those with rapid economic growth over recent decades have successfully reduced their mortality risk. With economic development, capacities in disaster and emergency management generally improve. To illustrate, the death toll from the 2010 Haiti earthquake was 222,517. In contrast, the death toll from the earthquake in Chile a few months later, which released 500 times more energy, reached 486. Moreover, the earthquake that hit New Zealand in 2010 destroyed some 500 buildings with no casualties.

30. In contrast, in regions with slower economic growth, mortality risk remains high. For example, in sub-Saharan Africa, flood mortality risk has been growing consistently since 1980 because the rapid increase in exposure has not been accompanied by a commensurable reduction in vulnerability.

31. Earthquake mortality risk differs from the mortality risk associated with floods and tropical cyclones. While warning systems are becoming increasingly sophisticated across all the natural hazards, earthquake mortality is closely correlated to building collapse. Earthquake-prone countries with growing economies and the inability to reduce the vulnerability of their building stock may also have increased earthquake mortality risk.

Economic losses

32. Several experiences showed that disasters often have large, significant and long term negative effects on economic activity. Countries with small and vulnerable economies, such as many small island developing States (SIDS) and land-locked developing countries (LLDCs), saw their economic development set back decades by disaster impacts. The

⁶ Asia Pacific Disaster Report 2012

⁷ Global Assessment Report 2011

countries with the highest ratio of economic losses in disasters, with respect to their capital stock, were all SIDS (e.g. Samoa and Saint.Lucia) and LLDCs.

33. The countries with the highest economic vulnerability were those with the highest percentage of economic losses and the lowest economic resilience to shocks, indicated by very low national savings. Damages and losses in the Haiti earthquake were evaluated at around \$8 billion or 120 per cent of GDP,⁸ and there was a drop in real growth from 3.5 to -5.1 per cent in 2010 due to indirect effects.⁹ Many of these countries were extremely limited in their ability to benefit from international trade and were characterized by a very low participation in world export markets (less than 0.1 per cent) and low export diversification. SIDS and LLDCs together constituted 67 per cent of the countries with very high economic vulnerability to disasters.¹⁰

34. The Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011 generated direct losses of about \$206 billion, representing approximately 20 per cent of average annual gross fixed capital formation from 2008 to 2012. As the economy of Japan was highly integrated into the world economy, both direct and indirect supply disruptions caused by the Great East Japan Earthquake were experienced elsewhere. The disaster caused declines in automobile production in the Philippines (-24 per cent), Thailand (-20 per cent) and Indonesia (-6 per cent).¹¹

35. Direct economic losses from the floods in Thailand in 2011 were approximately \$45.7 billion, which equalled more than 60 percent of Thailand's average annual gross fixed capital formation from 2006 to 2010. Estimated direct economic losses from Hurricane Sandy in the United States of America in 2012 were at \$50 billion.¹² Because so many businesses suffer simultaneously, national economies can be severely impacted. Major disasters, such as the floods in Thailand in 2011, Hurricane Sandy in 2012, and the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011, focused attention on the growing impact of disasters on the private sector.

36. The interest of business in risk reduction is not just from potential losses. Private investment largely determines the extent of risk. In most economies, 70 to 85 per cent of overall investment is made by the private sector, including annual institutional investments worth more than \$80 trillion globally. The value of produced capital in East Asia and the Pacific, for example, more than doubled from \$4.6 trillion in 1995 to \$10 trillion in 2005¹³. Globally, \$71 trillion worth of assets are exposed to one-in-250 year earthquakes.

37. Globalization has spurred economic growth and has also dramatically increased the value of assets at risk. Both regulators and investors are increasingly demanding that businesses disclose their hidden risks, including disaster risks. Many businesses are now strengthening their risk management capacities.

38. Based on information from countries that have submitted voluntary reports on their implementation of the Hyogo Framework, the estimated economic loss risk associated with floods and tropical cyclones is projected to increase in the future in all regions. For example, the proportion of the world's GDP exposed to tropical cyclones increased from 3.6 per cent in the 1970s to 4.3 per cent in the first decade of the 2000s. During that time, the absolute value of global GDP exposed to tropical cyclones tripled, from \$525.7 billion

⁸ World Bank

⁹ http://www.forbes.com/lists/2011/6/best-countries-11_Haiti_CHI135.html

¹⁰ Global Assessment Report 2013

¹¹ Global Assessment Report 2013

¹² http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/ADSR_2012.pdf

¹³ Global Assessment Report 2013

to \$1.6 trillion.¹⁴ In the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, with 53 per cent of the global GDP exposed per year, the estimated economic loss risk to floods in 2010 was 170 per cent higher than in 1990.¹⁵

39. Governments are responsible for various public assets, such as schools, health facilities, roads and infrastructure, among others. At the same time, governments are often the insurers of last resort for the houses and assets of low-income households and communities. Unfortunately, in many cases public investment is not only increasing a country's stock of assets, but is also leading to more risks and liabilities. Nationally reported disaster losses in 21 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America 46 per cent of the schools, 54 per cent of the health facilities, 80 per cent of the roads and more than 90 per cent of the water, sewer and power installations were damaged or destroyed in frequently occurring extensive disasters.¹⁶

40. Insurance is one of the main financial tools for households and companies to strengthen their disaster resilience.¹⁷ In principle, insurance should act as a powerful incentive for disaster risk reduction. If insurance pricing reflects real risk, insurance can facilitate risk reduction investments (e.g. earthquake insurance in California). Pooling at the regional level can also strengthen disaster resilience like the South Eastern Europe and Caucasus Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility a cooperative effort between a private insurer, national governments and international organizations to expand insurance coverage. Major disasters can also lead to revisions of the pricing and availability of insurance. For example, the Christchurch earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 led to a review of New Zealand's insurance policies and land-zoning regulations.¹⁸ The floods in Thailand in 2011 led to revised ratings that are expected to increase prices and reduce coverage.¹⁹

41. An issue that is closely related to economic vulnerability is the availability of social safety nets. Poor and indebted households have little or no surplus capacity to absorb crop or livestock income losses. They thus have low resilience to the impact of even minor weather irregularities or hazards, setting off a cascading effect that often increases poverty and future vulnerability due to the lack of economic and social safety-nets.²⁰ Although social protection instruments were not designed to deal with disaster impacts, they can be adapted to reach those at risk, preventing significant medium- to long-term increases in the number of those suffering after disasters.²¹ For example, Chile extended payments from the country's social assistance programmes to households affected by the February 2010 earthquake. Another example is that of the Red Cross in Kenya, which is supporting greenhouse funds in schools and communities. The design and implementation of safety nets for natural hazards are important considerations.²²

42. Uninsured losses drive macroeconomic instability. Direct losses from the 2010 Haiti earthquake (estimated at \$8 billion or 126 per cent of GDP) led to a significant drop in the rate of growth. The 2010 Christchurch, New Zealand earthquake was responsible for an estimated \$6.5 billion in direct losses (5.3 percent of GDP), and the reconstruction, inventory adjustment and large increases in local government spending induced a mild positive (estimated at 0.4 per cent) effect on growth rates. One of the fiscal reasons was that

¹⁴ Global Assessment Report 2011, p.31

¹⁵ Global Assessment Report 2013

¹⁶ Global Assessment Report 2011, p.102

¹⁷ Global Assessment Report 2013

¹⁸ Muir-Wood, 2012

¹⁹ Aon Benfield 2012a.

²⁰ Global Assessment Report 2009

²¹ Siegel, P. and de la Fuente, A. 2010

²² The World Bank: Natural Disasters: What is the Role for Social Safety Nets?

over 80 per cent of the direct losses in New Zealand were insured. Less than 1 per cent of the direct losses were insured in Haiti.²³ This draws greater attention on the importance of risk transfer mechanisms to help mitigate the costs of disasters.

Section II: Regional experiences

43. Section II outlines the experiences gained from the regional engagement in disaster risk reduction under the implementation of the Hyogo Framework. The experiences were garnered from regionally based reports, agreements and compendiums, as well as interviews with regional intergovernmental organizations and entities. The section presents an overview of regional experiences, key developments since 2005, and evolving practices on disaster risk reduction in five regions: Africa, Arab States, Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe. In this report, the Arab States region is taken to mean twenty-two countries of Africa and Asia that are members of the League of Arab States. The Pacific subregion is the same as the Oceania region as per the United Nations Statistics Division configuration.

Regional experiences in disaster risk reduction

44. Each region has had different experiences in reducing disaster risk based on context. In the Asia-Pacific region, the 2004 tsunami brought into focus the need for stronger disaster risk management approaches and accelerated the formal adoption of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Agreement for Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER). Codification of the region's norms and values, in the context of the adoption of the ASEAN Charter in 2008, further strengthened the work on disaster risk reduction. In Europe, the long-standing regional collaborative architecture between the Council of Europe and European Union (EU) allowed for the development of legislation on disaster risk reduction and generated incentives and support to individual countries. The Arab States saw a shift in focus away from "disaster response" to "disaster risk reduction," which included the development of the Arab Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction and the recent adoption of the Framework Plan of Action 2012-2020 to implement the Arab Strategy. In the Americas, there has been a gradual development of institutions and disaster risk reduction frameworks, such as the Central American Policy on Integrated Risk Management.

45. There are numerous examples of actions that have been facilitated by regional engagement, including the development of institutions and instruments that promote and ensure harmonized disaster risk reduction approaches, policies, instruments and programmes across boundaries, such as:

(a) the legally binding instrument of ASEAN, which requires that all member States go beyond the stipulations of the HFA; the EUs legally binding instruments that create minimum standards and actions; and, in the Americas, the Central American Policy on Integrated Risk Management, which provides a framework for integrated disaster risk management in the region.

(b) The linking of climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and sustainable development by integrating these sectors in regional instruments and institutions, such as the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in public investment planning in the Americas; the integration of disaster risk reduction into

²³ Bank for International Settlements Working Paper No. 394, *Unmitigated Disasters? New Evidence on the Macroeconomic Cost of Natural Catastrophes*, 2012.

Arab States regional framework for climate change; the development of the strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific; the consideration of both disaster risk reduction and climate change at a ministerial meeting of the South East European Cooperation Process in Europe; and climate outlook forums in all subregions of Africa, which bring together climatologists and development practitioners in order to make development planning more climate sensitive.

(c) The conducting of regional risk assessments that provide insights on commonly shared, regional or subregional risks, which help countries to understand their relative vulnerability to risks and provide a basis for regional initiatives ranging from disaster loss databases to risk pooling (the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative is an illustration of the latter).

(d) The facilitation of dialogue and stimulation of political commitment, such as the Hyogo Framework and its regional interpretation through the Arab Strategy, which has provided strategic guidance and inspiration for addressing local issues, including water and drought in the Arab States region, and helped make efforts in the region more coherent.

Africa

46. The main driver for systematic action on disaster risk reduction in the Africa region was the 1999-2001 drought, which resulted in substantial economic losses in several countries. In Kenya alone, losses of \$340 million were reported.²⁴ Driven largely by this event, a baseline study on disaster risk reduction potential in Africa was conducted from 2003 to 2004 through the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). The study found that many governments in the region had not taken into account the potential impact of disasters on economic growth and stability in their development planning processes. The study also found specific disaster risk reduction gaps in institutional development, knowledge management, governance, risk identification and emergency response, and observed that there were few incentives in place for promoting disaster prevention activities that were designed to strengthen structural development and food security.

47. Disaster risk reduction in Africa is relatively new and has evolved mainly through a pan-Africa approach. The Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction, established in 2003, has been directing attention to disaster risk reduction work in the region. The Working Group is chaired by the African Union Commission (AUC) and is composed of representatives from the African Development Bank, the eight Regional Economic Communities (RECs), the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), the World Bank, civil society, academia and other regional bodies.

48. Similarly, in June 2003, the African Union Assembly adopted the Africa Regional Strategy for disaster risk reduction at the tenth meeting of the Africa Ministerial Conference on the Environment. This was followed by a ministerial meeting in 2004, at which ministers adopted the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction with a call to develop a programme for its implementation. At the First African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2005, the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the African Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (2005-2010) was adopted. To align the programme with the HFA, the Extended Programme of Action was adopted at the Second Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2010. The region is currently implementing this action plan. The Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction, which meets on a biannual basis, was reconstituted in 2011 to provide coordination and technical support to member States of the African Union.

²⁴ <http://www.irinnews.org/report/84253/africa-disaster-preparedness-woefully-inadequate>

49. Regional engagements in Africa, particularly in the form of ministerial meetings, have resulted in a substantial increase in the political profile of disaster risk reduction on the continent since 2004-2005. This, in turn, has resulted in a focus on reviewing disaster risk reduction policy, mobilizing resources for disaster risk reduction and placing it on the agenda of leaders, all of which points to the importance of ministerial engagement in effective disaster risk reduction efforts.

50. The first African Ministerial Conference on disaster risk reduction was held in 2005 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, followed by a second conference in 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya, and a third conference in 2014 in Abuja, Nigeria. Five sessions of the African Regional Platforms were also held in 2007, 2009, 2010, 2013 and 2014 respectively. These brought together stakeholders from diverse fields to discuss the available knowledge, identify implementation gaps and share information on disaster risk reduction. In parallel, self-reports of countries on their efforts at implementation of the Hyogo Framework have brought attention to both successes and deficits in cooperative and collective disaster risk reduction action in the region. Together, these mechanisms have compelled countries to identify gaps in progress and required actions. Sharing resources on transboundary issues strengthens regional cooperation through regional agreements and platforms.

51. In addition to the pan-Africa approach, subregions working mainly through the RECs have also focused on disaster risk reduction issues. At least five RECs, namely the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Intergovernmental Agency for Development (IGAD), Southern African Development Community (SADC) and East African Community (EAC), have defined disaster risk reduction policies and or strategies based on the HFA. IGAD, which focuses on risks from droughts, epidemics, conflicts and floods, has encouraged leaders in the region to understand disasters in a more comprehensive manner. Following the devastating droughts of 2009-2011, member States of IGAD adopted the Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative with the objective of ending drought emergencies.

52. In another example, the East African Community is in the process of adopting legislation on disaster risk reduction through the East African Legislative Assembly. The capacity of the area to develop and implement policies on disaster risk reduction is not always sufficient, but the fact that policies exist is evidence of a transformation of approaches since 2005. ECOWAS has developed a policy for disaster risk reduction. SADC established a disaster risk reduction unit responsible for coordinating regional preparedness and response programmes for transboundary hazards and disasters; and the SADC regional platform for disaster risk reduction was inaugurated in 2011.

Americas

53. Regional cooperation on disaster risk reduction in the Americas has had a long history. Hurricane Mitch, which struck Central America in 1998 and resulted in devastating human and economic losses, was a “trigger” that led to a search for a long-term and more sustainable perspective towards jointly addressing main risk drivers and institutional mechanisms of cooperation among countries for the purpose of advancing disaster management.

54. Driven by the need to advance disaster management, developments in regional cooperation on disaster risk reduction advanced (initially) among the subregions, with the development of institutions and strategies. For example, in Central America, the Coordination Centre for Natural Disaster Prevention in Central America (CEPREDENAC) was established in 2004 with the responsibility to support member countries in their efforts to advance the implementation of the regional framework for disaster risk reduction. CEPREDENAC was involved in the design and implementation of the Central American Policy for Integral Risk Management, which integrated the Hyogo Framework for Action

priorities and provided established and promoted mechanisms of cooperation with and among its members.

55. In the Caribbean, the approval of the HFA in 2005 contributed to the reshaping of existing specialized regional instruments. In recognizing the critical linkage between disaster management and sustainable development, the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Response Agency (CDERA), now the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), spearheaded the adoption of the Strategy and Results Framework for Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) in the Caribbean framework in 2001 in collaboration with stakeholders. In 2007, and reflecting the priorities set by the HFA, member countries completed a revised and enhanced Regional Strategy and Programming Framework to guide CDM programming in the Caribbean for the period 2007-2012. The enhanced CDM strategy was used as the basis for developing the 2014-2024 CDM strategy, which was recently approved in December of 2013.

56. The existence of intergovernmental institutions created to foster development and cooperation in South America served as an umbrella to address the acute problems faced by countries due to recurrent natural hazards. Under this context, the Andean Community of Nations decided to create the Andean Committee for Prevention and Disaster Response (CAPRADE). CAPRADE advanced the Andean Strategy for Disaster Prevention 2005-2010 (EAPAD), which, by decision of its members, was adjusted to be aligned with the HFA priorities in 2007.

57. The South American Union of Nations (UNASUR) was established in 2008 as a subregional organization. The earthquake that hit Chile in 2010 and the severe floods in Colombia in 2011 were “triggers” that shaped the following priorities of the intergovernmental organization: establishing a High Level Working Group led by Chile, defining a common strategy for disaster management, and preparing a regional policy for disaster risk reduction.

58. The advancement of different subregional groups served to support the design of national plans and policies from 2000 to 2014. Many of the regional policies were aligned with HFA priorities in a manner that reflected a comprehensive approach towards risk. As a result, and with regional support mechanisms in place, many countries in the Americas advanced towards a more comprehensive disaster risk reduction approach. Since 2011, at least 20 countries have developed and passed new comprehensive risk governance frameworks and integrated comprehensive approaches at the sector level (e.g. in health, finance and planning, and education).

59. CDEMA and CEPREDENAC, whose efforts predate the Hyogo Framework, stand out in the Americas for their programmatic impact on disaster risk reduction. The efficacy of CDEMA and CEPREDENAC may relate to their levels of organizational maturity with respect to disaster risk reduction. As examples of activities, in the CDEMA subregion, member States have benefited from the development of regional public goods, such as model disaster risk reduction legislation. Resource mobilization by CDEMA has helped countries that might otherwise have been ineligible to receive it. CEPREDENAC has developed manuals for the design of highways that incorporate disaster risk reduction, and guidelines for the incorporation of disaster risk reduction into public investment and national disaster recovery frameworks.

60. Efforts by regional intergovernmental organizations led to the adoption of the Central American Policy on Integrated Risk Management by heads of state in 2010. The Policy defines five areas of intervention for the region’s disaster risk reduction agenda, which are consistent with the Hyogo Framework.

61. In addition to the subregional developments, there have also been pan-American developments organized mainly through the Organization of American States (OAS), which

approved the Inter-American Plan on Disaster Prevention and Response and the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance in 2012. This Plan is a management tool for coordinating governments' efforts in disaster prevention, preparedness, response and mitigation and applies to the entire region, except Cuba.

62. The OAS enacted a series of mandatory resolutions for technical bodies of the General Secretariat to work with according to the Hyogo Framework for Action and to support member countries in that regard. Other regional examples include:

(a) The Andean Committee for Disaster Prevention and Response, which promotes disaster risk reduction at the subregional level and within its member States through the implementation of the Andean Strategy for Disaster Prevention and Response;

(b) The Caribbean Emergency Disaster Management Agency (CDEMA), which, after a review of its Comprehensive Disaster Management Strategy, established goals for advancing disaster risk reduction in the Caribbean region for the period 2012-2022 (this effort is aligned with the HFA);

(c) The approval of the Declaration and Plan of Action of Pétiön-Ville by presidents of member States of the Association of Caribbean States, which prioritized the integration of disaster risk reduction into national development plans and defined disaster risk reduction as one of its main priorities;

(d) The agreement by the Union of South American Nations to create of a High-Level Working Group to develop a work plan to support member States in the integration of disaster risk reduction (the High-Level Working Group is currently preparing a subregional strategy for disaster risk reduction);

(e) The establishment of a mechanism by the Common Southern Market, the Reunión Especializada de Reducción de Riesgos de Desastres Socionaturales, la Defensa Civil and la Protección Civil y la Asistencia Humanitaria to promote joint initiatives in various areas (e.g. integrated management of humanitarian supplies, addressing watershed and other transboundary issues and the establishment of a network of research institutions in disaster risk reduction);

(f) The creation of the Regional Platform in the Americas in 2009, which supports the implementation of the HFA and its successors, the exchange of information to identify risk trends, and the prioritization of disaster risk reduction actions (there have been four sessions of Regional Platforms: in 2009, in Panama City, Panama; in 2011, in Nuevo Vallarta, Mexico; in 2012, in Buenos Aires, Distrito Federal, Argentina; and in 2014, Guayaquil, Ecuador. Participation in the Regional Platforms has almost tripled since 2009).

Arab States

63. The Arab region is exposed to various geological and hydro-meteorological hazards. The impact of disasters on countries and economies in the region varies and depends on their level of exposure to hazards and the intensity of hazards. Prior to 2005, Arab countries engaged in disaster relief and response activities to the level that allowed for event management. Following the adoption of the HFA in 2005, interest in disaster risk reduction increased, mainly through the League of Arab States. The League of Arab States gradually took on a stronger role in disaster risk reduction and began to focus on enhancing regional coordination mechanisms and harmonizing regional approaches and tools to disaster risk

reduction. Eventually, the region adopted the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2020.²⁵

64. In May 2013, Arab States held the first Arab Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. This event and resultant Aqaba Declaration are considered milestone events that led to regional support for disaster risk reduction. Disaster risk reduction has become integrated into Arab regional frameworks for climate change and sustainable development and is prevalent in the agendas of the civil protection authorities of the Ministers of Interior. An Arab Center of Excellence for Earthquakes has been approved by the League of Arab States to be established in Algeria and will be operational in 2014. Most recently, the Gulf Cooperation Council began working on a disaster risk reduction subregional strategy.

65. Improvements have been made on the systematic study of the causes of risks, vulnerabilities, hazards, earthquake and floods, although the extent of this work has been insufficient. These activities have been driven largely by a broader agenda of regional decision-makers as opposed to a bottom-up agenda. Following the adoption of the HFA in 2005, the region saw stronger engagement from scientific and academic institutions in the region (e.g. the An Najah National University in Palestine integrated HFA priorities of action into the undergraduate curriculum of the engineering faculty and established a scientific centre on urban risk and disaster risk reduction). In Algeria, Egypt and Lebanon scientific institutions have been engaged to support policymakers with knowledge and reliable information.

66. In addition to the League of Arab States, international organizations, such as the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for West Asia, and other organizations, have initiated disaster risk reduction projects, applied research and established capacity development programmes that focus on early warning, drought and desertification, knowledge management, and risk assessment for climate change impacts.²⁶

67. In 2005, the HFA, and its regional interpretation through the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction, provided strategic guidance and inspiration for local level issues, including water and drought, and solidified its position as a point of reference. The regional strategy has also helped make efforts in the region more coherent. The regional strategy was complemented in June 2014 by the endorsement of a plan of action by the Council of Environment Ministers of the League of Arab States. These developments suggest that regional processes can increase awareness, facilitate dialogue and generate political support. Political support, in turn, makes work at a national level on disaster risk reduction more legitimate.

68. Regional engagement has brought together stakeholders who would not normally collaborate on disaster risk reduction, including those from cities, local authorities, the media, civil society and academia. Moreover, regional engagement has provided a focus on themes of common interest in the region, such as urban risk and climate change. Future regional initiatives will focus on food security, water resources management and private sector engagement. These priority issues were determined by reviewing national priorities to identify common themes.

69. Addressing regional transboundary risks has proved challenging in the region, with issues such as locusts from West Africa being addressed on a national basis. Exceptions include transboundary risks related to water and to migrants — issues that have become prominent in regional dialogues. Efforts related to flooding and earthquakes remain national in scope.

²⁵ http://www.preventionweb.net/files/18903_17934asdrfinalenglishjanuary20111.pdf

²⁶ http://www.preventionweb.net/files/32916_implementationofthehyogoframeworkfo.pdf

70. Disaster inventories and databases have been developed in a number of countries. The gradual increase in the number of disaster loss databases that have been established at the national level can be attributed to dialogue at the regional level, which has increased awareness of the need to have baseline data to support disaster risk reduction planning. The League of Arab States values the harmonization of methodologies and tools in efforts to understanding disaster impacts and allows for coherence in the regional approach towards the implementation of disaster risk reduction actions.

Asia-Pacific

71. A number of initiatives dealing with disasters have been undertaken by various regional entities in the Asia and Pacific region. Although these processes have been ongoing for a number of years, several factors accelerated action on disaster risk reduction.

72. The first factor was the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. The tsunami not only strengthened leadership and resolve by countries in the region to improve regional cooperation on disaster risk management, it also launched specific cooperation initiatives on early warning, risk information, preparedness, safe schools and risk financing. A second factor was the adoption of the HFA at the 2005 World Conference on Disaster Reduction, held in Kobe Japan. Based on the HFA, many subregions in the Asia-Pacific region developed or improved their own subregional frameworks for disaster risk management. For example, South Asian countries adopted the South Asia Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Comprehensive Framework on Disaster Management. The Pacific Island countries adopted the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015 whose elements mirror the HFA. ASEAN countries signed the Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response in July 2005.

73. Still another major event that led to accelerated change with regard to disaster risk reduction was Cyclone Nargis, which struck Myanmar in 2008 and killed more than 130,000 people. Cyclone Nargis highlighted and accelerated ASEAN's role in post-disaster activities, including serving as the main coordinating partner between the Government of Myanmar and developmental partners. It also strengthened a number of mechanisms within the ASEAN framework, including on post-disaster assessment, planning, resource mobilization and technical support.

74. Although the drivers noted above were large disasters, regional architectures in themselves have also influenced the development and implementation of disaster risk reduction platforms in the region. For example, groups of countries, either through subregional, inter-governmental organizations (e.g. ASEAN, SAARC, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community Applied Geoscience and Technology Division) or through geographic or political groupings have been able to institutionalize cooperation among governments on disaster risk management, based on shared risks, regional leadership and history of cooperation among countries in the region. For example, in South-East Asia, the adoption of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response in 2009,²⁷ which was the first legally binding instrument related to the Hyogo Framework for Action. The subsequent ASEAN Regional Programme on Disaster Management identified priority areas for the region to jointly work on. Early successes of joint work included those on preparedness through conduct of disaster simulation exercises and the development of standard operation procedures for coordination.

75. Subregional engagement on disaster risk reduction in South Asia started in 1987 at the third SAARC Summit in Kathmandu. Following the Indian Ocean tsunami, the

²⁷ ASEAN 2012

subregion adopted the SAARC Comprehensive Framework on Disaster Management for South Asia. The SAARC environment ministers approved the framework, which was aligned with the HFA, in July 2006. Prior to this, in 2005, the region established the SAARC Disaster Management Center in Delhi, India, to assist countries in the efforts at formulating policies, strategies, and disaster management frameworks; in conducting research, studies, and training programmes; and in disseminating information on best practices. Through the SAARC Disaster Management Centre, the region subsequently developed regional road maps on six key areas of disaster management, from community based disaster risk reduction to climate change adaptation – outlining the tasks ahead in the short, medium and long term to be addressed by local authorities, national governments and subregional organizations. Based on the road maps, a number of projects have been taken up at the subregional level.

76. In Central Asia (comprising Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) a subregional mechanism for disaster risk reduction has yet to be fully developed, but cooperation has been fostered through various groupings, such as the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and the Economic Cooperation Organization. The region has a history of cooperation on responses to disasters, as reflected in the 1998 Cooperation Agreement for Prevention and Liquidation of Emergencies. Now, the focus is shifting towards proactive risk reduction cooperation.

77. In the Pacific subregion, regional engagements have been important in translating global frameworks into action through the Regional Framework for Action 2005-2015; the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006-2015; and the strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific.²⁸ The subregion has been a leader in the integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction issues. Governments in the subregion have developed Joint National Action Plans, which have bridged the gap between climate change and disaster risk reduction. Moreover, whereas earlier disaster risk reduction was addressed from the response paradigm and was heavily government-led, over the last decade there has been a greater multi-stakeholder engagement involving the private sector and communities, moving more towards risk reduction. The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) have worked closely together on integrating the issues of disaster risk reduction, climate change and sustainable development. The Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management has been organized annually since 2009 and held its sixth session in June 2014. In light of the above efforts on integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change issues, there has been a progressive move towards holding the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction jointly with the Pacific Climate Change Round Table.

78. Pan-Asia/Pacific collaborative efforts through regional platforms on disaster risk management have allowed stakeholders to join together in support of regional cooperation. In Asia, six Asian ministerial conferences on disaster risk reduction have been conducted, hosted successively by China, India, Malaysia, Republic of Korea, Indonesia and Thailand. The conferences, which resulted in political declarations in Beijing (2005), New Delhi (2007), Kuala Lumpur (2008), Incheon (2010), Yogyakarta (2012) and Bangkok (2014), have demonstrated an increased awareness of disaster risk reduction over time, and illustrated a growing commitment to address disasters as a development issue.

79. The Asia regional conferences on disaster risk reduction have also contributed to greater engagement of multiple stakeholders and overall coordination and coherence. The scale and participation level of these ministerial conferences has increased over time. Inclusiveness has been strengthened in recent declarations. As a result, declarations since

²⁸ UNISDR 2014

2012 have included commitments by a broad range of stakeholders. One result of these declarations is the gradual acceptance of the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in the region. This can be seen in a review of the region's institutional and policy landscape for climate change and disaster risk reduction.²⁹

80. The annual Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management has assisted in the monitoring and the implementation of subregional plans and strategies³⁰. Regional collaboration has led to the Pacific Disaster Risk Management Network and the resultant Pacific Disaster Net, a vibrant information and advocacy website³¹ for the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. To date, this has resulted in national commitments by 13 of 14 countries in the Pacific. The subregion is also piloting a risk insurance project.

Europe

81. Regional cooperation on disaster risk reduction in Europe has evolved gradually through intergovernmental organizations. For example, this region comprises 47 member States of the Council of Europe, 28 of which are also member States of the European Union. The Council of Europe, European Commission and the South East European Cooperation Process have been very active in disaster risk reduction activities and have cooperated with the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR) — a forum that seeks to stimulate and facilitate the exchange of information of knowledge between participating national HFA focal points, national platforms, and regional and subregional partners.

82. In 1987, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe established an intergovernmental Open Partial Agreement — EUR-OPA Major Hazards Agreement — which was joined by 26 countries. The main objective of the Agreement was “to reinforce and promote cooperation between member states in a multidisciplinary context to ensure better prevention, protection and organization of relief in the event of major natural or technological disasters by calling upon present day resources and knowledge to ensure efficient and interdependent management of major disasters.” The Agreement's work plan reflects the priorities for action in the field of disaster reduction in the European and Mediterranean area within the context of the HFA.

83. The Council of Europe has also enacted a range of disaster risk reduction related resolutions, including a resolution urging the Council of Europe, mayors and local authorities to address urban resilience by embracing the ‘Ten Essentials’ of the Making Cities Resilient campaign, and related measures such as a plan of action on disabilities to reduce vulnerability.

84. In November 2000, the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe launched the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative (DPPI) for its 12 member States.³² The DPPI provides a framework for southeastern European nations to develop programs and projects that strengthen capacities for disaster risk reduction. Since 2005, southeastern Europe has increasingly transformed traditional response-based approaches to a disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation focused approach. The willingness with which countries have embedded the HFA principles within national development plans is an important factor in this respect. The region has also had ministerial meetings that have

²⁹ http://www.preventionweb.net/files/21414_21414apregionalmappingdrrcca1.pdf

³⁰ UNISDR 2014

³¹ <http://www.pacificdisaster.net/pdn2008/>

³² Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia and Turkey

focused on disaster risk reduction. For example, in 2013, ministers of foreign affairs considered disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation during a summit of the South East European Cooperation Process. Progress has also been made in areas on bilateral and multilateral preparedness exercises for transboundary risks, around which DPPI has organized numerous exercises.

85. In the European Union, the 2005 European Consensus in Development and the 2007 European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid committed the EU to support disaster risk reduction policy and action. The 2008 Council of the European Union conclusions on reinforcing the European Union's disaster response capacity, invited the European Commission to present a strategy on supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries.

86. Building on the existing cooperation in disaster response and preparedness, the EU, in 2009, developed a strategy to support developing countries in disaster risk reduction. The European Union also started to develop a cross-sectoral risk management policy that promotes national risk assessments and planning, the sharing of good practices between countries, including through peer reviews, "disaster proofed" investments supported by European Union funds, and awareness raising. Innovative solutions for financing disaster prevention are high on the agenda of the European Union, including the use of insurance as a tool for disaster management and as an incentive to promote risk awareness, prevention and mitigation.

87. Disaster risk prevention and management considerations have also been included in a number of key EU policies and legislation (e.g. cohesion policy, health, environmental impact assessment, climate change adaptation, ecosystems, agriculture, food and nutrition security, water, flood risk management, major industrial accident prevention risk financing, nuclear safety, transport and energy, research and innovation). Furthermore, resilience building has been an integral part of EU development and humanitarian policies.

88. The European Parliament adopted EU Civil Protection Mechanism legislation in December 2013. It was considered a breakthrough in disaster risk reduction in Europe as it solidified disaster risk reduction considerations within the law of the EU. The legislation included a strong emphasis on building a culture of disaster prevention, with particular focus on risk assessment, risk management planning and peer reviews. The European example demonstrates the great extent to which legally binding requirements at a regional level have direct impacts on member States. This example could be reviewed for applicability in other regions.

89. There is a high degree of integration of disaster risk reduction into the operations of the EU. For example, disaster risk prevention and management considerations have been included in EU policies and legislation³³.

90. In April 2013, the European Commission adopted a climate change adaptation strategy that promoted strong linkages between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. The extent to which the Europe Commission has supported other regions through initiatives is also noteworthy, such as "Building resilience to disasters in the Western Balkans and Turkey" initiative of 2012. This initiative aimed to enhance regional cooperation and capacity, mainly on meteorological and hydrological hazards.

91. Disaster risk reduction peer reviews between states has been pioneered by the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR) in cooperation with the European

³³ Examples: cohesion policy, health, environmental impact assessment, climate change adaptation, ecosystems, agriculture, food and nutrition, security, water, flood risk management, major industrial accident prevention risk financing, nuclear safety, transport and energy, research and innovation.

Commission (DGECHO), UNISDR and technical support from OECD. The peer reviews that have been undertaken thus far (in the United Kingdom and in Finland) managed to accelerate progress at a national level.

92. In addition to the formal intergovernmental processes, cooperation on disaster risk reduction has also progressed through the EFDRR, which serves as a forum for exchanging information and knowledge, coordinating efforts throughout the Europe region, and for providing advocacy for effective action to reduce disaster risk. Altogether, 28 countries, the Council of Europe, the European Commission, the Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative for South Eastern Europe and UNISDR participate in the EFDRR.

93. The EFDRR shaped its contribution towards the development of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction in the form of two publications that captured good practices and recommendations. The EFDRR working group on local level implementation of the HFA made recommendations on the relevance of experience-sharing among municipalities, such as twinning activities, integrating disaster risk reduction in land-use and urban planning, and using the Local Government Self-Assessment Tool (LGSAT) to evaluate local progress in disaster risk reduction. The EFDRR working group on governance and accountability focused on recommendations on the peer review, national strategies on disaster risk reduction, and economics of disasters.

94. EFDRR has advocated for disaster risk reduction initiatives and has raised awareness of successful work in this area through a number of means, such as the support of the European “Champion of Local Change,” which recognizes individual achievement towards creating a safer, more resilient society. The EFDRR has also improved the quality of information associated with the HFA Monitor.
