



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## UNDP'S CONSIDERATION ON THE PRE-ZERO DRAFT OF THE HFA2

### BACKGROUND

This document outlines UNDP's considerations on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, otherwise known as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2). In particular it reflects upon the pre-zero draft from the perspective of UNDP, particularly in light of its country-level role in building national capacity to govern disaster risk. The purpose of this document is to contribute to the ongoing development of HFA2, a process that is supported at the highest levels within UNDP. Please note this document does not represent an official policy position on the new framework by UNDP, but rather as a contribution to the ongoing negotiation, based on the organization's role, responsibility and long-standing work at a country-level.

### OVERALL THOUGHTS ON THE PRE-ZERO DRAFT

UNDP welcomes the current draft and congratulates the co-chairs, bureau members and UNISDR for making it as coherent and comprehensive as it is, especially given the short time period allowed for its preparation.

There are many elements of the draft that UNDP agrees with. We are particularly happy with the emphasis on a broader development agenda, rather on disaster risk itself. Greater focus on avoiding the creation of new risk is a welcome feature of the pre-zero draft. Poorly planned development and weak governance in many countries not only leaves the accumulation of risk unchecked, it also exacerbates the problem. UNDP is also happy to see a considerable emphasis on the need to build national capacity to lead on DRR, and for risk governance to be integrated throughout development practices. The higher profile for recovery, preparedness for recovery, as well as actual post-disaster recovery, is also welcome, as it recognizes how recovery is a dynamic process for reducing future disaster risk. We also welcome specific references to the need for particular assistance to countries that most require additional development support, and UNDP stands ready to extend its work to supporting these countries in their commitment to the new framework.

Aside from these important inclusions, there are areas in the draft where UNDP suggests further clarification or strengthening, and we have broken these down into two broad areas: 'strategy' and 'implementation'. Underpinning these considerations is the suggestion that, early in the document, the focus is firmly placed on the urgency of the situation at hand, reflecting the rapidly increasing exposure and vulnerability to natural hazards, particularly in light of a changing climate.

### NOTES ON STRATEGY

#### Linking DRR to Sustainable Development, and HFA2 to SDGs

UNDP suggests that there is a need for a greater integration between DRR and sustainable development. This is partly an issue of the reality of the risk/development relationship, where disaster risk is achieved through risk-informed development, but it is also because HFA2 represents an opportunity to practically make such a risk/development relationship 'real' through integration with other frameworks. A few possible considerations:

- (1) A stronger and more practical risk and development relationship. Priority must be given to supporting sustained mainstreaming of risk throughout development and recovery processes, whether at national, regional or local levels. This requires articulating precisely what integration means and how it is done, prioritizing the development of tools and guidance for practical implementation at a country level, and finally by heightened advocacy for this integration at local to national levels, and to the global level via the post-2015 development agenda.
- (2) Practical steps are needed to ensure the integration of DRR into other development frameworks. The HFA outcomes and goals should reflect the language used in the SDG framework, helping align global risk reduction efforts with those designed to govern development as a whole. It should state that disaster-resilient communities and countries are able to proactively prevent, mitigate, reduce, prepare for and manage disaster risk, and that equitable disaster resilience, where DRR is built into sustainable development, is the goal. It is suggested that outcome targets should be rationalized, focusing on three key aspects: a reduction in the impact of disasters on mortality, economic growth, and poverty. These targets and their related indicators should be used consistently to formulate strategies and activities both within and beyond the HFA2. Crucially, they should also be fully complementary with targets and indicators that are being developed across both the SDG and climate agreements.
- (3) HFA2 can influence the SDGs. In addition to substantive connections between the frameworks, HFA2 has a prime opportunity, as the first to be released, to influence development of the SDGs and other global agreements. It should seize the opportunity to articulate ways in which broader development frameworks need to incorporate disaster risk.

In essence HFA2 needs to be presented as the detailed implementation (roadmap) of the ‘risk-element’ of broader sustainable development.

#### **Integrating poverty and inequality as key risk drivers**

Poverty drives much of disaster risk through increased vulnerability (which itself is often deepened and widened by disasters). A lack of attention to the social and cultural dimensions of disaster, including gender, age, disability, poverty, and social and cultural marginalization, undermines risk reduction and recovery. HFA2 needs to articulate how the most vulnerable, most marginalized communities are likely to be more frequently and more severely affected by disasters. Poverty reduction should be headlined in the outcomes, goals and targets. (Note that the reduction of disaster risk is made a target in the first goal of the SDGs on poverty reduction, as recommended by the Open Working Group). For instance, HFA2 targets should include an explicit reference to reducing losses for the poorest or most vulnerable, at all levels. This would help recognize the fact that the numbers of affected people, levels of economic loss, and disaster damage, might be reduced at national level, but not necessarily among the poorest.

#### **Represent the complexity of risk**

UNDP recommends the HFA2, whilst focusing on what needs to be done across contexts to reduce disaster risk, also articulates what DRR in complex environments means. This should include the relationship between humanitarian and development interventions, the way in which some hazards (natural, biological and societal) contribute to similar risks, as well as the competing nature of some risks in conflict and fragile affected states in particular.

### **NOTES ON IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **Reinforcing risk governance, transparency and accountability:**

References to the need for risk governance to be integrated in development are made in the text, but not systematically. For instance, risk governance, along with requirements for transparency in communicating disaster

risk information and accountability for risk creation, are listed as guiding principles, however these are not detailed under the corresponding priorities for action. One strategic improvement would be to include the notion of ‘risk disclosure from all development interventions’ as a priority action under risk governance.

HFA2 should be a demonstrably useful tool for both transparency and accountability. This requires investment in clarity, especially at country level, in the usage of basic terminology, descriptions of activities and programmes, and the tracking of financing, especially when risk reduction is integrated within sectors and ministries. At the country level, UNDP supports the establishment of a strong national peer review process, embedded in future reporting on progress.

#### **Match policy commitments with financial commitments:**

The current draft says very little about the complex world of financing for DRR. There is only marginable references to national commitments to finance, whether directly through DRR-marked financing or through broader risk-informed development. There is little said on the role that national governments have, through enforced legislation, on financing outside of the public sector, such as private sector investments. Similarly, references to international sources are limited to a stand-alone ISDR trust fund for DRR. The time is right for a fundamental examination of the range of financial possibilities to fund DRR, including from significant sources such as the Green Climate Fund (which could be disbursing as much as \$100 billion a year by 2020.) A detailed examination of the role of already-existing financing channels and mechanisms should inform this part of HFA2.

#### **Specifying the means of implementation:**

The HFA2 should include a detailed indication of the means of implementation. For the international system, the focus should be on making the most of existing capacities and mandates, while strengthening interagency cooperation and coordination. For national governments, clarity on roles and responsibilities, and knowing what to expect as support from the international system, is essential.

The means of implementation need to be customized and flexible. The future framework must be flexible, conceptualizing and supporting risk reduction across diverse contexts. Income status, governance models, levels of decentralization and state fragility all affect how different countries could undertake risk reduction. HFA2 needs to articulate how different levels of institutional stability and maturity affect risk reduction, tailoring support to the development of DRR efforts across many more varieties and maturities of governance. The same principle applies to regional contexts, and is especially important given that natural hazards do not recognize borders; HFA2 should recognize regional distinctions and support different regions in appropriate ways. One key practical implication of this flexible implementation is that countries (and, where appropriate, regions) should set their own targets and goals for implementing the future DRR framework, rather than having them dictated at the global level.

#### **‘Global targets’ need national contextualization:**

HFA2 outlines five ‘global targets’, on mortality, affected population, economic loss, damage to health/education facilities, and national/local strategies. As noted earlier, UNDP would recommend both a rationalization of targets to three, one of which should be on poverty, and the use of targets to help align global development frameworks. In addition to this, HFA2 should include guiding elements on how these targets should be contextualized and disaggregated (i.e. for the poorest) at the national level.

### **A FINAL NOTE ON STRUCTURE**

UNDP agrees with Member States who suggest that the layers within the structure could be simplified to focus attention better on what has to be done – a streamlined theory of change would be of considerable benefit.

Of existing structural components, beyond those indicated above, UNDP suggests that area four requires a considerable review. UNDP's view is that the priority area should not exist in its current format. Rather all of the aspects of development referenced under this priority area are best served by integrating them within the three, more tightly focused, priority areas: understanding disaster risk, strengthening governance, and preparedness. Rather than having a selection of elements of sectoral development identified within a too-broad fourth pillar, they would best be brought under these three core priority areas, as they are all essentially actions that can (and should) be implemented through the first three priority areas.

This, complemented with a stronger cross-reference to the SDG framework, as indicated above, would simplify, streamline and focus the framework, making resilience a part of the purpose of the framework, rather than a priority area.

## UNDP COMMITMENT TO DELIVER ON THE SUCCESSOR TO THE HFA

### Direct and sustained risk reduction through development

UNDP offers the following commitments towards the implementation of disaster risk reduction at country level over the next five years:

1. **Comprehensive programmes of risk governance**, moving away from stand-alone programming and towards long-term engagements at country level;
2. An **understanding of the complexity of country level risk reduction**, bringing experience from contexts of conflict, poverty and climate change;
3. A **focus on evidence and innovation**. UNDP will invest heavily in developing and sharing innovative solutions for the reduction of disaster risk at country level, supporting it by the robust use of evidence for not only the reduction of losses from DRR, but also the substantial and wide benefits for development;
4. A **renewed emphasis on local level implementation**, building sustained capacity for risk reduction for all actors where it most counts; and
5. Building on our ongoing engagement and recognizing that different countries are at different stages of their DRR practices, UNDP will **assist governments in making the successor to the HFA both a national and local priority**.

Central to UNDP's work in DRR is the leveraging of the organization's sustained investment in human development, US\$5 billion per year, building resilience and driving change throughout its 177 country offices.

As part of its commitment to supporting the implementation of the successor to the HFA, UNDP is currently developing a programme of comprehensive disaster and climate risk governance across a range of the most vulnerable countries.

## FURTHER READING

UNDP'S VISION FOR THE HFA: <http://bit.ly/1n7MVNd>

CALL TO ACTION: DRR MAKES DEVELOPMENT SUSTAINABLE <http://bit.ly/1t2OW5r>

## CONTACTS

In Geneva contact Jan Kellett, [jan.kellett@undp.org](mailto:jan.kellett@undp.org)

In New York, contact Kamal Kishore, [kamal.kishore@undp.org](mailto:kamal.kishore@undp.org)