

[French DRR Working group: Solidarités International, CARE-France, Action Contre la Faim \(ACF\), The French Red Cross, and Handicap International \(HI\).](#)

## Comments on the pre-zero draft of the post-2015 framework

---

### Section A: Preamble

- The most at-risk groups

The social dimension for more resilient societies should prioritize the most-vulnerable, the poor and especially include the participation of the most at-risk groups such as women, young people and children, persons with disabilities, the elderly, and marginalized groups, in the whole process of disaster risk management. In addition, the document makes mention several times of the 'poor' and 'vulnerable'; these terms should be defined more precisely in the document. The pre-zero draft should also address the underlying causes of poverty for these minorities by increasing access to and control of resources, such as land, water, etc.

- Finance

Existing funds such as Green Fund, Adaptation Fund or the Less Developed Countries Fund are not mentioned in the pre-zero draft but we think they could fund DRR activities. The document should therefore detail how this might come about. The document mentions the UN Trust Fund for Disaster Reduction, but this does not mean that funding available for disaster risk reduction will increase in the following year. How this fund can be credited?

Of overall aid financing over 20 years, the \$13.5 billion spent on DRR accounts for just 0.4% of the total amount spent on international aid. Essentially, for every \$100 spent on development aid, just 40 cents have been invested in defending that aid from the impact of disasters. The allocation of specific resources for disaster risk management should be clearly explained, and a minimum percentage has to be decided on in order to ensure that states are allocated x% of the budget to DRR at local level and to the most vulnerable populations.

- Link with emergency preparedness and response

Disaster risk reduction has to be integrated into emergency operations because it makes good operational sense to better analyse and anticipate a crisis, and contribute to the reduction of the impacts of humanitarian crises on populations.

## **Section B: Purpose, scope, outcome and goals**

- Accountability & monitoring

HFA expected outcomes related to underlying causes are not clearly included. The document explains that the aim is to reduce loss of life, along with losses in social, economic and environmental assets, but it does not describe how to achieve and monitor step by step this aim, nor how to measure the progress made by countries on DRR (point 9).

Five global targets have been identified, but once again these targets are too general and additional targets linked to underlying causes have to be considered. Targets pertaining to the reduction of risk in sectors such as social, health, water, livelihoods, agriculture, ecosystem, etc. are missing. Moreover, there is no mention of indicators. This part must be detailed in order to enhance accountability and ensure adequate monitoring and evaluation of the HFA2. Finally, methodology on how to monitor and evaluate goals, targets and indicators has to be described in order to control or avoid self-monitoring process. A more explicit mention of the need to provide a “basket of indicators” would be important, as would the need to explain how the climate change, DRR and SDG frameworks would be aligned in order to have common targets and indicators. There is no clarity on how often the monitoring will take place, nor who will compile the data (point 10).

## **Section D: Priorities for action**

- Understanding Risks

The notion of risks should not be only limited to disaster, but also integrate climate risks, and be more conflict-sensitive. The concurrence of mortality risks linked to natural hazards, state fragility and climate change vulnerability has to be strengthened (points 14 and 18). Moreover, the understanding of the context should emphasize the understanding of how different risks and vulnerabilities intersect, and how vulnerabilities change before, during and after disaster events. To this end, we will amend point 8 (section B) of the pre-zero draft replacing “disasters caused by natural hazards” by “disasters are caused by a combination of vulnerability, exposure and natural hazards”. Evaluation of non-economic losses (displacement of population, loss of territory and cultural heritage) should be addressed in the paper.

- Management of risks

If indeed one of the objectives of the HFA2 is to reduce risk while strengthening economic resilience, it is missing a paragraph on how, at a national level, governments will link DRR framework with SDG framework and climate change plans (points 15 and 19). At a local level, the HFA2 should emphasize how the disaster risk management plan will be integrated within the development plan, and should be coherent with all existing adaptation plans from local to national level and how these plans will be monitored and evaluated under the disaster risk lens (point 15a).

Furthermore, if allocated resources will be dedicated to the implementation of disaster risk management policies and activities, a percentage of the budget allocated has to be defined and monitored, and it must be ensured that this budget is allocated to the most-at risk areas and to the most vulnerable populations (points 15f, 15h, and 21b).

The draft refers to mechanisms to monitor, assess and report on progress, but what are these mechanisms? Do we need to strengthen the existing ones or rather create new initiatives to ensure transparency and accountability? (Point 15b)

With regards to all-stakeholder coordination, the paper does not elaborate on how these stakeholders might be supported or incentivised to fulfil this coordination at all levels, nor how the system will be put in place at each level. How can we ensure that the most-at risk are recognized and made part of the coordination and decision-making process? (Point 15e and Section III).

- Preparedness for response

Providing early warning information is an important pre-condition to prevent or mitigate crises, but it can be considered as useless if it does not trigger early action. The draft should add a section explaining how early warning systems will be linked to early response mechanisms (point 16).

In order to ensure appropriate and timely responses, the document should promote the integration of disaster risk assessment and actions into the design of humanitarian responses.

- Link with other frameworks: SDG and Climate Negotiations

UNISDR should detail how the HFA2 will interact with the SDG and also how it will be linked with the climate negotiations decided under the UNFCCC. Disaster risk management and disaster resilience are transversal approaches that need to be coordinated with other on-going processes. The language should be stronger than “collaboration should be ensured between climate change and DRR (section 19b)”. We recommend that the post-2015 DRR agreement must work in partnership with other frameworks to strengthen resilience. We could also hope that the DRR framework call for mitigation actions to limit the extent of climate change in order to reduce emissions and keep global warming below 1.5°.

### **Section E: International partnership in the implementation and follow-up process**

- Stakeholders and international partnership

The paper needs to emphasize the strengthening of participative (bottom-up approaches) and differentiated (between the most at-risk populations) evaluation of risks. Sub-national plans and policies need to be co-produced with local stakeholders, recognising the role of local solutions, local expertise and traditional knowledge in developing successful local risk reduction strategies. At the national and international level, DRR platform has to be linked with other development initiatives, and humanitarian clusters, as mentioned; however, the document does not clarify how this might be achieved.

The implementation of the HFA2 has to be considered by all stakeholders and at all levels: public and private sectors, academia and research, media, civil society and social groups, governments, donors, and UN agencies. A specific action plan should be drawn up to describe all interactions, and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders (e.g. determination of strategies, plans and policies; develop quality standards, encourage innovations, support local decision-making, encourage media and civil society for advocacy, etc.).

The pre-zero draft mentions the promotion of free and open availability of and access to information on risk, disasters and loss, but there is no explanation of how these data will be collected nor of what kind of watchdog will be implemented to prevent collected information from being used by the private sector to exclude the most at-risk groups from safety net systems for instance. The pre-zero draft has to provide guidance on standards and methodologies for risk assessment and data sharing.