

IFRC inputs/comments on the pre-zero draft of the Post-2015 Framework for DRR

(Open-ended informal consultative meetings in September-October 2014)

1. General view on Sections C, D, E and F

- Effective disaster risk reduction and management require partnerships at different levels, with a cross-sectoral approach. It is, therefore, more logical to have 'Partnerships (not only at international level) in the implementation and follow-up process' stated earlier in the Framework, such as before 'Guiding Principles'. In this way it could serve as reminder for readers so they can have cooperation and partnership in mind when they continue reading the following sessions on 'Guiding Principles' and 'Priorities for Action'.
- To facilitate the reading of practitioners, there is a need to re-organise the order of sections. After the session describing 'purpose, scope, goals and expected outcome', it would be logical to provide some thoughts on the linkage between the Framework and HFA. It is therefore suggested to have 'Transitional phase' to follow Section B.
- In general, activities need to be rephrased to facilitate the monitoring and be accompanied with measurable targets or indicators.

2. Specific comments on sections C, E, and F

2.1 Section C. Guiding Principles

- To facilitate the Framework's implementation, the guiding principles could be in an order similar to the section of priorities for action, for example by stating them in different levels: individual and community level, local and national, and regional and international.
- For the Guiding Principles to serve their purpose, it is necessary to harmonize the use of verbs throughout the text. Proper verbs need to be selected to get firm commitments from the stakeholders. For instance, 'managing the risk of disasters should also be aimed...' (Paragraph 12. b) suggests that it is optional consideration and thus makes the principle considerably weak.
- The guiding principles should place an enhanced emphasis on the conservation and restoration of ecosystems as well as the sustainable management of natural resources, as requisites for effective disaster risk management.
- Risk should be assessed at the landscape scale (e.g. within a river basin or along a coastline) to design effective disaster risk management interventions.
- Ecosystem considerations should be mainstreamed in national DRR and climate change adaptation strategies, in local, regional and national water management and land-use plan, sectoral plans and national development strategies.

- It is important to underline that for local communities and administrators to obtain full leadership and empowerment, necessary resources and decision making power should be transferred to the local level.
- While each state has the primary responsibility to holistically manage risk, this principle (Paragraph 12. a) needs to be expanded to acknowledge the shared responsibility of individuals and communities alike. We would suggest a revised principle such as *'Consistent with human rights and environmental norms, states have an international legal obligation to take measures to reduce disaster risks to their populations and to protect persons, their livelihoods and property. With support from States, individuals and communities should also consider it their responsibility to contribute to their own safety and resilience.'*
- In line with the guiding principle (Paragraph 12. c), which refers to DRM being an essential component of governance at national at local and central levels, we also propose that specific reference be made to promoting the commensurate allocation of authority and resources at local levels to enhance implementation of DRR measures and build capacities within communities most at risk. Besides, this principle could be stronger by adding that DRM requires not only the full engagement of state institutions but also some level of accountability and responsibility on their side.
- An important, yet missing principle is the multi-sector integrated approach among state institutions and departments and working less in silos. This requires really strong coordination and decision making among the sectors/ministries to make sure that the efforts join-up to a strong chain.
- When spelling out certain population groups (eg. Paragraph 12. d), it often overlooks other marginalized groups. For instance, children, youth, disables and indigenous are mentioned here and there but not consistently. There is one mention of elderly in a different paragraph and there is no mention of minorities affected by religious or cultural discrimination, or socially disenfranchised. Wording in g) *"all groups of society, especially the poor and vulnerable"* seems better wording.
- In Paragraph 12. f), the principle is unclear, especially when it comes to the term "volunteers". Organised and trained volunteer groups such as Red Cross and Red Crescent teams are at the front-line in disasters to save lives and provide relief. Capacitated volunteers that work in coordination with local authorities can reach much further and wider group individuals; which is beyond the capacity of most local authorities (in particular) in developing countries. We suggest the principle requests local authorities to proactively involve and create an enabling environment for civil society organisations and local stakeholders to be involved in the full spectrum of disaster risk management.
- In Paragraph 12. h), there needs to be a reality check on 'accountability for risk creation'. The Framework should make irresponsible investment accountable for disaster risk mismanagement and punitive. After disasters during reconstruction phase, actors should also be held accountable for risk creation and should be given incentives that ensure 'build back better'.
- In Paragraph 12. j), we encourage to promote an explicit reference to the need for DRM to be *'flexible and adaptive towards the changing risk patterns, including and new and more extreme hazard events'*.
- DRM becomes effective when risks are managed in different time scales and with a cross-sectoral approach. With this in mind, we suggest revising the Paragraph 12. k) as

'The sustainability of development depends on the ability to manage disaster risk with a cross-sectoral approach in different time scales. Public and private investments are to be disaster-risk informed.'

- Effective partnership is required at all levels. Highlighting only the global partnership and cooperation (Paragraph 12. m) is misleading.

2.2 Section D. Priorities for Action

- IFRC welcomes the structure of the priorities for action in the order of a) risk understanding; b) governance; c) preparedness; and d) investment. However, the separation of the national and local context from the global and regional context does not reflect the interdependence and complementarity of these actions at different levels. Therefore, we recommend to put the national/local and global/regional contexts under the respective four areas of understanding, governance, preparedness and investment.
- Priorities for action are not supported by targets or indicators, thus hindering the formulation of a comprehensive approach to the subsequent implementation and monitoring of HFA2.
- There is no clarity of roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in implementation of the priorities for action. A performance framework with key actions, targets/indicators, stakeholders and time frame would be useful to guide implementation.
- While accountability is referred to in the guiding principles, there are no references to accountability mechanisms within the activities for the Priorities for Action.
- The activities listed may be strengthened by promoting the adoption of laws or regulations which require the sharing of risk, disaster and loss information by specific institutions, and establishing a legally enforceable right to access disaster information.
- We propose to highlight explicitly within Paragraph 14. b) an action for undertaking regular risk mapping and linking it to land use planning, development and construction.
- We propose amending the last part of Paragraph 14. e) to '*... in order to ensure consistent implementation of disaster risk related laws, policies and plans*' in light of our research findings that the implementation of law and regulation faces many challenges at the local level.
- Sub-items under the Paragraph 17 are too fragmented. It would be more useful if priorities could be listed with an integrated approach, so policies and measures required for effective investment to increase social, economic and environmental resilience could be better understood. For example, investment in youth for their understanding of DRR and climate change is crucial for enhancing social, economic and environmental resilience. We suggest it is added under the this paragraph.
- While HFA identified the strengthening of national legislative frameworks as a key activity, this is no longer expressed clearly in the pre-zero draft. Despite some progress in the adoption of national disaster management laws, our research has shown the need for more work, especially in terms of strengthening of sectoral laws and effective implementation. We suggest the Paragraph 15. g). with reference to legislation be placed above the adoption of national and local plans (currently 15. a), as the development of plans may be a product of effective legislation. We further recommend revising the Paragraph 15. g) as follows to be more comprehensive:

“g) Further develop and strengthen the implementation of national and local frameworks of laws, regulations and public policies that:

- *Establish roles and responsibilities within the public sector for addressing disaster risk in publically owned, managed or regulated services and infrastructure,*
 - *Regulate and provide incentives for actions by households, individuals, communities and businesses, particularly at the local level,*
 - *Establish legal consequences (as appropriate) for public officials, individuals and businesses who fail to comply with their duties or responsibilities,*
 - *Promote integration and coordination between legislation for disaster risk management and sectoral laws, regulations and codes relating to land use and spatial planning, building and construction; environmental management; natural resource management; climate change; and agriculture,*
 - *Promote participation and engagement of communities, civil society and private sector,*
 - *Address gender differences and the needs of people with disabilities and other particularly vulnerable social groups.*
- We recommend reference be made to the need (as set out in the HFA) to strengthen preparedness mechanisms and legal frameworks to ensure a ‘rapid and effective disaster response in situations that exceed national coping capacities’. Related guidance has been given by the “Guidelines for the domestic facilitation and regulation of international disaster relief and initial recovery assistance” (adopted by the state parties to the Geneva Conventions at the 30th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent in 2007 and promoted by the UN General Assembly) to review and strengthen national laws and procedures on international cooperation.
 - Early warning and early action based on timely and comprehensive climate information is key to preparedness for response and can safeguard and add value to development at a local level. We suggest rephrasing the Paragraph 16. b) as *‘Continuing to further strengthen the effective early warning and early action systems that are linked with timely and scientific climate information and meet users’ needs and local requirements’*.
 - Funding and capacity are among the biggest obstacles to effective governance of DRM as shown by the results of the RCRC research and emphasized at consultations at various levels. Activities like the allocation of resources at all level of the administration (Paragraph 17. e) and the review of existing financial and fiscal instruments (Paragraph 17. F) would fall short of achieving the expected results unless they are combined with clear targets. IFRC recommends including clear targets of social, economic and environmental investment in respective activities in Paragraph 17.
 - Paragraph 17 needs to encourage countries to invest in ecosystem-based approaches by emphasizing the importance of environmental impact assessments, giving special attention to water-use (in addition to land-use), and specifically recognizing wetlands and all areas prone to droughts and flooding (not only mountain and coastal floodplains).
 - Paragraph 18 needs to refer to the need for ensuring land and water use management and biodiversity and through multi-lateral environmental agreements. Assessing risk at the transboundary landscape scale is absolutely crucial. Methodologies for risk

assessment (Paragraph 18. a) should also include ecosystem management considerations.

- In Paragraph 19, we propose adding an activity on international collaboration in research and development of standards and recommendations for strengthening disaster risk governance, in particular legal and policy frameworks.
- Paragraph 19. e) needs to specify how the global and regional HFA Monitor will support and complement the national and local monitoring systems.
- Given the role and engagement of National Red Cross Red Crescent Societies and volunteers in DRM and resilience building at various levels and in light of their wide reach and impact, we suggest including them as a stakeholder (eg. 'Social groups, volunteers, National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, civil society and faith-based organisations' (Paragraph 23)).

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

- Aid to developing countries for DRR is essential for their development. In Paragraph 26. b) we suggest a note be added to promote aid for DRR: *'Financial contribution for DRR from developed countries to aid-recipient countries should be recognised in ODA financial flows, recorded and monitored.'*
- IFRC appreciates the mentioning of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in Paragraph 26. c). It is certainly a useful reference for enhancing cooperation at different levels.
- As the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement has already been supporting over 40 governments to strengthen their frameworks for disaster risk management, we recommend including in Paragraph 26. e): *'...including the development of relevant sector policies, laws and standards...'*
- DRR measures should be appropriately mainstreamed into multilateral and bilateral development assistance programmes including those related to poverty reduction, natural resource management, urban development and adaptation to climate change.
- Links with UNFCCC/CoP and SDG process need to be described in this section.

2.4 Section F: Transition phase

- Further clarification is needed on how the HFA priorities will 'remain relevant and for further implementation' once the post-2015 framework for DRR is adopted, and how the new Post-2015 Monitor will be developed to correspond with the text of this framework.