



International Strategy for Disaster Reduction



HYOGO FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION 2005-2015

Building the Resilience of Nations
and Communities to Disasters

MID-TERM REVIEW
2010-2011



United Nations

Acknowledgements

UNISDR is grateful to all members of the Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review, who dedicated their time and advice to this project free of charge and with great commitment to the cause of disaster risk reduction, including by providing insightful comments on various drafts of this report under time pressure. In particular, we want to thank Susanne Frueh for advising on the methodology of the Mid-Term Review, Mukesh Kapila for facilitating the online debate on a post-2015 framework, Ronald Jackson for initiating the study on disaster risk reduction in the Caribbean, Virginia Murray for spearheading the study on databases for disaster risk reduction, Marco Ferrari for helping in defining the issue of international governance for disaster risk reduction, and Kenzo Oshima for requesting that the Japan International Cooperation Agency conduct an internal review of its contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. Several UN colleagues contributed to the Mid-Term Review throughout 2010. Special thanks are in order to Kamal Kishore of UNDP and David Jackson of UNCDF for dedicating their personal time to this project and contributing with significant pieces of work: the literature review and the study on financial mechanisms at national and local levels for disaster risk reduction. Salvano Briceño has kindly provided valuable advice throughout the Mid-Term Review process. Helena Molin Valdes and Bina Desai of UNISDR and Joern Birkmann at the United Nations University in Bonn facilitated the on-line debates. Marco Toscano-Rivalta contributed on the definition of international governance issues, post-2015 elements, on the study on the UN implementation of HFA, and provided critical advice throughout the process. Thanks are also due to UNISDR colleagues in our regional offices for their help with the organization of regional workshops, facilitation of contacts with national experts and access to national literature. The UNISDR Information Management Unit provided key support in setting up the Mid-Term Review dedicated pages on PreventionWeb and in backstopping the on-line debates. A word of thanks also goes to Mohammed Omer Mukhier at IFRC, Melisa Bodenhamer at World Vision, and Catherine Dennis at Oxfam International for their contributions. Three interns from the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies in Geneva - Nena Nedeljkovic, Luca Corredig, and Carina Strahl - collaborated at different times with the Mid-Term Review project and provided valuable support.

Letizia Rossano was the Senior Coordinator for the Mid-Term Review in UNISDR.

UNISDR also wishes to thank the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation Disaster Management Centre, the United States Subcommittee on Disaster Reduction of the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources National Science and Technology Council and the government of Japan for the organization of thematic sub-regional workshops for the Mid-Term Review as well as the European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA) for hosting a meeting to test the Key Questions developed for the Mid-Term Review. The Italian Civil Protection Department of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers organized and supported the launch of the Mid-Term Review Report.

The governments of Australia, Japan, and Switzerland provided financial contributions to the Mid-Term Review process.

March 2011

United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

Table of Contents

Foreword by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action	9
Executive Summary.....	10
1. Background.....	13
2. The Mid-Term Review methodology and process	17
2.1 Challenges	18
3. Five years into implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action	21
3.1 National level progress.....	21
3.2 Regional level progress	30
3.3 International level progress	32
3.3.1 Progress in HFA implementation by the United Nations	35
3.3.2 Case studies on efforts to implement the HFA by other international organizations	38
4. Strategic areas requiring further attention.....	43
4.1 Implementing the HFA strategically and holistically	43
4.2 Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action.....	46
4.3 Integrating climate change	50
5. Suggestions for accelerating implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action	55
5.1 Enabling and safeguarding development gains: disaster risk reduction is primarily a development issue.....	55
5.2 Governance for disaster risk reduction.....	57
5.3 Accountability for HFA implementation	59
5.4 Agreeing on targets and for whom?	61
5.5 Defining the “how”.....	62
5.6 How the international community can further support HFA implementation	63
5.7 Thinking now about a framework post-2015.....	65
6. Conclusions and recommendations for the way forward	69

List of Annexes

Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Review	80
Conceptual Framework for the Mid-Term Review including Key Questions	84
List of Advisory Group members	95
Bibliography.	99

Annexes included electronically

Literature Review

List of people interviewed for one-on-one interview

External studies commissioned for the Mid-Term Review:

- The Role of Women as a Factor of Social and Behavioral Change
- Financial Mechanisms to Support Disaster Risk Reduction Activities from National To Local Governments
- A Review of Disaster Risk Reduction in the Caribbean
- Study on the use, content and influence of peer-to-peer communication
- Study on how data/information relating to all risks, hazards and disaster management is collected, held and analyzed to facilitate the use of high quality information by decision makers
- Study on the role of the UN in the implementation of the HFA

Internal Reviews on implementation of HFA

- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
- Oxfam International
- World Vision

Summaries from regional and thematic workshops with list of participants

Summaries and transcripts of online debates

Foreword by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

In 2005 the 168 countries that endorsed the Hyogo Framework for Action agreed to achieve by 2015 “the substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries”. An ambitious task to achieve in ten years. Yet, as Henri David Thoreau wrote in 1854, “In the long run, men hit only what they aim at. Therefore, they had better aim at something high”.

The Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action has been a critical step in formulating a clear understanding of some of the key strategic issues that will require our full attention and commitment to ensure the further implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

The Hyogo Framework for Action has been determinant in strengthening and guiding international cooperation efforts, in generating the political momentum necessary to ensure that disaster risk reduction be used as foundation for sound national and international development agendas as well as in giving a common language and a framework of critical actions to follow to which governments have clearly responded.

Whereas it is evident that more efforts are required and that the challenges at hand are complex, we do have the knowledge, the means and the resources to tackle them. In most cases it is a matter of harnessing these resources (financial, institutional, and human) in more creative, integrated and thus effective ways. Strengthening of communities’ resilience requires new and innovative forms of public-private partnerships in the political, economic, financial, and research fields. This report shows that the HFA has been instrumental in embarking on a path of change that is now irreversible, yet our continued commitment is a critical requirement for success. We are still far from having empowered individuals to adopt a disaster risk reduction approach in their daily lives and demand that development, environmental and humanitarian policies and practices be based on sound risk reduction measures.

For the devastating effects in terms of lives lost and impact on the social and economic fabric of the societies brought about by the earthquake in Haiti in January 2010 and New Zealand in September 2010 and February 2011, the floods in Pakistan in July 2010 and in Australia in December 2010 are only the most recent examples of the long way we still have to go – as individuals, as governments and as an international community – in putting in place effective measures to strengthen communities’ resilience to disasters and ensure truly sustainable and resilient development policies and practices.

This report provides a contribution to catalyze discussion and focus attention on some of the most urgent and important activities that can be undertaken if we are to achieve the outcome expected in the Hyogo Framework for Action by 2015 and contribute to the setting of the agenda for the Rio+20 Sustainable Development Conference.

Margareta Wahlström

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) was facilitated by the UNISDR Secretariat through a participatory approach involving stakeholders at international, regional, and national levels, guided by the advice of the 2009 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which requested a broad strategic review of the state of HFA implementation. The information collected, primarily of a qualitative nature, based on self-assessments and perceptions of the stakeholders involved, was complemented by that provided by governments through the HFA monitor reporting mechanism.

The Mid-Term Review highlighted the significant progress that has been made over the past five years in disaster risk reduction and the fact that the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action in 2005 has played a decisive role in promoting this progress across international, regional, and national agendas. The Review confirms that progress achieved in HFA implementation is uneven across the world, reflecting broad economic and institutional differences among regions and countries. An analysis of government reports, through the HFA Monitor, for the 2005-2007, 2007-2009, and the on-going 2009-2011 cycles, indicates that progress is indeed taking place in disaster risk reduction, especially from an institutional point of view, in the passing of national legislation, in setting up early warning systems, and in strengthening disaster preparedness and response. Concerns remain about the lack of systematic multi-hazards risk assessments and early warning systems factoring in social and economic vulnerabilities; the integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning at national and international level, and the still insufficient level of implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action at the local level. It remains difficult to increase resilience to hazards, especially in the most vulnerable segments of society. Regional level implementation of HFA has resulted in cooperation agreements and joint plans of action in all regions of the world, including one legally binding regional instrument. International support resulted in the creation of important tools such as the Global Platform and the Global Assessment Report. Concerns remain about the need to increase coordination and coherence of international efforts in support of HFA implementation, including by the United Nations.

In many places, implementation of HFA does not seem to take place in a holistic way. Avoiding compartmentalizing action according to the HFA's Five Priorities for Action requires a strategic and executive direction for disaster risk reduction at the national level. HFA implementation at local level is a point highlighted throughout the Mid-Term Review and encompasses issues such as decentralizing authority, where capacities exist, and empowering local communities, including at the grassroots level; and creating a social demand for disaster risk reduction so that individuals realize their own share of responsibility in increasing their resilience and in holding governments accountable for the development and implementation of coherent disaster risk reduction plans and investments. The integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction is a necessity that must be addressed at the national and local levels through integrated plans to enhance resilience of communities.

The final sections of the report outline critical elements needed to enhance implementation of the HFA through 2015. Amongst them is the need to ensure that national and international institutions, including bilateral aid organizations and the United Nations, are institutionally set up to deal in the most effective ways with disaster risk reduction. Handling what is primarily a developmental issue with largely relief and humanitarian mechanisms and instruments, while helpful at the beginning, needs to be reconsidered to ensure that disaster risk reduction plays the role that it must in enabling and safeguarding development gains. Cooperation frameworks for the implementation of the HFA at the international and national levels should also be improved. At the international level, there is a need to set up a broadly representative mechanism to ensure follow-through between meetings of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. At the national level, the Mid-Term Review highlights a need to develop and improve synergies to ensure coordinated and coherent action on disaster risk reduction across different sectors of government. There must be a senior, over-arching authority at government level where responsibility, and with it accountability, rests for setting policies, driving processes, and ensuring budget allocations for all the different aspects of disaster risk reduction. The effectiveness of National Platforms in informing and supporting this executive level of decision making can be assessed accordingly. The Mid-Term Review also records a call for the inclusion of accountability mechanisms to measure progress or lack thereof. Setting targets can help in accelerating HFA implementation through 2015. Targets can be nationally or regionally set, and self-monitored. There is a clear recognition that guidance alone is not sufficient and that standards to ensure quality in the delivery of the guidance are necessary. Standards can be developed for the implementation of disaster risk reduction at regional and national levels. There is a need for the international community to support governments in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in a more coherent and integrated fashion. The development of a joint action plan may help generate and crystallize such coherence.

The prevailing views on a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, irrespective of whether it would be of a legally binding nature or not, include the need to ensure solid, structural links with sustainable development and climate change international framework agreements.

1

Background

The adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) by the World Conference on Disaster Reduction and its subsequent endorsement by the General Assembly of the United Nations (A/RES/60/1952) marked the culmination of a process started in 1990 with the declaration of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) (A/RES/42/169).

A pivotal moment in the Decade was the adoption in 1994 of the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World (Yokohama Strategy) at the World Conference on Natural Disasters. The Yokohama Strategy marked the beginning of a significant shift in the political and analytical context within which disaster reduction was being considered: while the IDNDR was largely influenced by scientific and technical approaches, the Yokohama Strategy attributed great importance to socio-economic vulnerability in disaster risk analysis, emphasizing the crucial role of human actions in reducing the vulnerability of societies to natural hazards and disasters. At the end of the period covered by the Yokohama Strategy, in 2004 and 2005, the United Nations Secretariat of the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) carried out a review of the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World. The Yokohama Review found evidence of greater official and public understanding of the effects of disasters on the economic, social, and political fabric of societies, but also stated that “significantly greater commitment in practice is required” and identified challenges and gaps in five main areas: governance; risk identification, assessment, monitoring, and early warning; knowledge management and education; reducing underlying risk factors; and preparedness for effective response and recovery. The Yokohama Review was submitted at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe Japan, in January 2005 and formed the basis for the formulation of the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*.

The Framework states as its expected outcome: ***“The substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries”***.

The following three strategic goals support the achievement of the HFA’s expected outcome:

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction;

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms, and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience¹ to hazards;

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response, and recovery programs in the reconstruction of affected communities.

In addition to the expected outcome and the strategic goals, the HFA also articulates five priorities for action (reflecting the areas identified in the Review of the Yokohama Strategy):

1. Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation;
2. Identify, assess, and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning;
3. Use knowledge, innovation, and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels;
4. Reduce the underlying risk factors;
5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

The HFA includes a section on implementation and follow-up, focusing on some key elements critical to its successful implementation. These include the importance of pursuing a multi-stakeholder approach; a strong call on States and international and regional organizations, including the financial institutions, to integrate disaster risk reduction considerations into sustainable development policies, planning, and programming at all levels and in support of least developed countries for the implementation of the Framework. The HFA goes into some detail in identifying specific tasks for States, regional organizations and institutions, and international organizations. The HFA outlines specific requests for the partners of the ISDR for the Framework's implementation and suggests ways in which resources could be mobilized to support its implementation.

2

The Mid-Term Review

methodology and process

The HFA states that its implementation “will be appropriately reviewed” and requests the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) to “prepare periodic reviews on progress towards achieving [its] objectives and priorities.” The Mid-Term Review was conducted through a participatory approach involving disaster risk reduction stakeholders at regional, and, when feasible, national levels. It was guided by the 2009 Global Platform, which discussed Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Review in three informal plenary sessions.² In accordance with this guidance, the Mid-Term Review became a broad strategic review of the HFA as an instrument; it was not meant to be an evaluation of the state of disaster risk reduction worldwide or a quantitative evaluation of the implementation of the HFA to date.³ The information collected is therefore primarily of a qualitative nature, based on self-assessments and perceptions of the stakeholders involved. The Review process was facilitated over a twelve-month period by the UNISDR secretariat.

An **Advisory Group** comprising senior disaster risk reduction experts, representatives from donor and low-income, disaster-prone countries, civil society, and grass-root organizations, as well as evaluation experts, was convened by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (SRSG) to provide technical and strategic advice throughout the Mid-Term Review process.⁴

Based on the guidance received at the 2009 Global Platform, a set of key questions and sub-questions was formulated to help the reviewers to understand which elements had been obstacles to success and which had encouraged success, as well as to identify ways in which countries and communities could best ensure the “substantial reduction of losses” in the evolving global context for disaster risk reduction. Five analytical tools were employed to address the Mid-Term Review questions:

- A Literature Review;
- Outcomes of structured workshops held at regional and national level;
- Selected in-depth studies;
- One-on-one interviews with key policy makers;
- On-line debates.

The **literature review** was conducted to generate a stand-alone report, which provided a broad overview of available information on HFA implementation in the disaster risk reduction literature.⁵

Nine structured **workshops** were held at regional and sub-regional levels to focus on the key questions identified for the Mid-Term Review to obtain strategic input from senior government

and civil society key players⁶. Thematic discussions were also held on HFA implementation at the local level in South Asia; on integration of climate change with disaster risk reduction in the ASEAN workshop; on the role of the international community in support of HFA implementation in the European workshop, and on opportunities for cross-border collaboration and strategies to reduce urban risk in the North America Workshop.

In consultation with the Advisory Group, 10 topics for **in-depth studies** to further inform the Review were identified to help reviewers understand elements that over the past five years had proved either difficult to implement or worthy of further investigation. In the end, six studies were completed⁷.

Senior policy makers and administrators with personal experience in HFA implementation were approached by UNISDR for **one-on-one interviews** to obtain more personal perspectives of HFA implementation from now through 2015 and beyond. These interviews were based on a structured set of questions common to the whole Review.

Four **on-line debates** were held on the following topics: HFA's role in informing decision making and priority setting at the national and regional levels; less effective elements of the HFA; integration of climate change in HFA implementation; and what kind of instrument might be needed post-HFA. Each debate was moderated by an expert on the specific topic. Over 300 people subscribed and contributed to the online debates⁸.

2.1 Challenges

Measuring progress against the expected outcome of reducing the loss of lives and assets due to disasters is difficult in the absence of a commonly agreed baseline at the time of HFA adoption and of regular, standardized data collection by governments on disaster losses.⁹

The development of HFA-related instruments such as the HFA Monitor, the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction, regional disaster risk reduction platforms, and national platforms, among others, do provide a measure of progress. However, the HFA Progress Monitor reports progress on the measures taken by countries in strengthening their capacities in dealing with disaster risk; it does not assess those capacities¹⁰.

Depending on the perspective of the assessor, there are **different perceptions of achievements** in HFA implementation. For example, the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2009 (GAR) found most progress in making disaster risk reduction a national and local priority and in strengthening disaster preparedness at all levels (HFA Priorities for Action 1&5); the *Views from the Front Line* 2009 report indicated most progress in reducing underlying risks and strengthening disaster preparedness at all levels (HFA Priorities 4&5), and Child Focused Groups indicated most progress in using knowledge, innovation, and education, and reducing underlying risk (Priorities 3&4). Within each of these studies there was a lot of variation among different respondent groups. The *Views from the Front Line* report offered an average score of 2.38 on progress on the Priorities and the Cross-cutting Issues, where a 2 is progress “to a very limited extent” and 3 is “some activity but significant scope for improvement.” Their report notes that the average score by the GAR was 2.95. These variations point to the limitations of a method that attempts to quantify progress on a five-point scale, based on assessment by diverse stakeholder groups. They also seem to point to the need to do assessments that go beyond quantitative methods and attempt to understand the underlying social, economic, and political processes that cause increases or decreases in disaster risk¹¹.

Progress in HFA implementation is uneven across the world and reflects broader economic and institutional differences among regions and countries, highlighting the reality that progress takes place against very different initial baselines and capacities and reflecting obvious differences in the institutional, political, and economic situations of countries. Various examples of the added value of the HFA cited during the Mid-Term Review by experts from different countries included: helping to shift focus from traditional preparedness and relief-centric approaches to disaster risk reduction; incorporating DRR in national development and poverty reduction policies¹² and helping shape international assistance programmes for those countries that were more advanced in their DRR approaches at the domestic level but appreciated the HFA guidance for their bilateral and multilateral efforts¹³.

3

Five years into HFA Implementation

The Hyogo Framework for Action provides a clear set of critical tasks that should be performed at the national, regional, and international levels to ensure its implementation and follow-up. These include establishing national baseline assessments of the status of disaster risk reduction in a country or region; publishing and updating a summary of national programs for disaster risk reduction, and developing internal procedures for reviewing national progress, including systems for cost-benefit analyses.

This section provides a brief synthesis of progress made over the past five years at the national level in implementing the HFA, based on reports submitted by governments through the HFA Monitor for the 2005-2007, 2007-2009, and 2009-2011 reporting cycles, a review of the literature, and findings from the Mid-Term Review process¹⁴. The section further describes regional and international level progress to support governments in the overall implementation of the HFA.

3.1 National level progress

As mandated in the HFA, governments have been conducting since early 2007 national progress reviews to report on implementation of the Framework along specific guidelines. The reporting process was subsequently developed over biennial cycles, with UNISDR support, into an on-line reporting tool supported by a multilingual function and a series of key questions and indicators in 2009, including a focus on local-level implementation and a regional level reporting tool for the cycle ending in 2011.

The steady growth in the number of countries that reported on HFA implementation over the years is itself an indicator of increasing commitment to disaster risk reduction. During the first reporting cycle ending in 2007, 27 governments completed reports on HFA implementation. The number grew to 77 during the second reporting cycle, ending in 2009. For the cycle ending in 2011, more than 100 reports have been initiated nationally. The data from the 2009-2011 HFA Progress Report¹⁵ shows an overall improvement in the quality of the reports received, confirming a continued and increased interest in, and commitment to, achieving the HFA objectives. Other telling indicators of the growing commitment to disaster risk reduction over the past five years which can be directly associated with the guidance provided in the HFA are the legislation on disaster risk reduction, the number of HFA Focal Points in country, and the number of National Platforms.

Priority for Action 1 - Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation

There is clear and documented progress in the achievement of this Priority for Action over the past five years, especially in the development of policy and legislation and in strengthening multi-sectoral institutional systems and platforms. Less evident is improvement in the decentralization of responsibilities and financial resources for disaster risk reduction, as well as the systematic involvement of communities in the development of strategic plans for disaster risk reduction.

Several countries have enacted **national legislation on disaster risk management**, beginning in the mid-1990s, and an increasing number of countries have been adopting or updating existing legislation modelled on HFA principles. Countries with new or updated laws include India and Sri Lanka in 2005; El Salvador, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and Grenadines in 2006; Anguilla (UK) and Gambia in 2007; Indonesia in 2008; Egypt and Philippines in 2009; Zambia and Papua New Guinea in 2010.¹⁶ However, some of the new laws addressing disaster risk were not harmonized with pre-existing legislative frameworks in other sectors (such as water resources, agriculture, and energy) that have a direct bearing on how disaster risk is managed. It is worth noting that the Swedish National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction commissioned in 2009 an examination of all Swedish laws related to “natural disasters”. This report highlighted the responsibilities of specific government agencies, as well as municipal, county, and national authorities, in all aspects of disaster risk reduction and management. The findings of this exercise generated an important internal debate, which resulted in identification of gaps and clearer definitions of responsibilities.¹⁸

The increase in the number of **National Platforms**¹⁹ across the world is a clear indication of the push generated by the HFA towards increased action in terms of one of its main principles: a multi-stakeholder approach. The number of officially recorded National Platforms steadily increased from 38 in 2007, to 45 in 2008, and 73 as of February 2011. The effectiveness and membership of National Platforms are topics that have emerged throughout the Mid-Term Review as needing further discussion, and are addressed later in this report.

The number of national **HFA Focal Points**²⁰ for HFA implementation has also grown significantly over the past five years, demonstrating a clear interest by governments in complying with and implementing the provisions of this instrument. In August 2006, the Secretary-General reported to the United Nations General Assembly (A/61/229) that 63 governments had officially designated focal points for HFA implementation. Today, with 192 HFA Focal Points, virtually all countries, with a few notable exceptions, have made an express commitment to the Hyogo Framework for Action.²¹

In 2007, the Global Review noted that few countries reported on local-level disaster risk reduction activities that went beyond building capacities for early warning preparedness and

response; it inferred that national governments and NGOs were doing much work in disaster risk reduction at the local level without this effort being reported. By 2009 a substantial number of governments were reporting on community-based risk reduction initiatives, but these initiatives did not seem to be linked to wider risk reduction systems. Decentralization processes, which were identified as a key success factor in strengthening and sustaining disaster risk reduction activities at the local level, were reported mostly in high-income countries. Initial data from the 2009-2011 HFA Monitor indicated that only 20 countries reported dedicated budget allocations to local governments; these include most Caribbean countries. While there are few examples of budget allocations to local governments, many countries (65% of all reporting countries and 80% of lower-middle income countries) report that local governments have a legal responsibility for disaster risk reduction management. However, some governments, especially of high-income countries or those with very decentralized systems, may have not reported budget allocations to local governments because local administrations have independent revenue sources from direct taxation and receive limited amounts of funding from the national level.

Priority for Action 2- Identify, assess, and monitor disaster risk and enhance early warning

Few countries reported in 2007 the completion of comprehensive risk assessments, and even fewer reported on the use of risk information in the development of disaster risk reduction policies, strategies, and plans. Several of these countries ascribed lack of progress to a lack of the necessary technical, financial, and human resources. In 2009, several countries reported progress on risk assessment, but the reports highlighted challenges in conducting such assessments in a comprehensive, multi-hazard way that could inform disaster risk reduction policies, link early warning with preparedness and response, and use the information to plan action at the local level.²² This trend was confirmed in the initial data submitted for the 2009-2011 reporting cycle, where 46 out of 83 countries reported having multi-hazard risk assessments that could inform planning and development decisions. However, many countries also report that there are major challenges in linking them to development processes at the national and local levels, the latter being the level where progress on risk assessments seems to have been more limited.²⁴ The difficulties in connecting scientifically-based risk assessments with local level community-based vulnerability and capacity assessments (VCA) have been confirmed in the literature.²⁵ At present, there are numerous initiatives underway to undertake risk assessment at the national and regional levels.²⁶ There are also examples of territorial risk assessments (particularly in high-risk urban areas) being commissioned by national and sub-national authorities.²⁷ The 2009-2011 reporting cycle notes that there are still very few countries reporting on risk assessments for schools and health facilities.

In 2006, a global survey of early warning systems found that while some warning systems were well advanced, there were many gaps and shortcomings, especially in developing countries and in terms of effectively reaching and serving the needs of those at risk.²⁸ In 2007, many countries reported good progress in developing early warning systems. However, the reports submitted

showed gaps between the development of regional and national hazard warning capacities and the development of effective local capacities to receive and use early warnings to save lives. In 2009, progress was most evident in this area from reporting countries in Asia, where all indicated institutional commitment to the development of end-to-end early warning systems for major and frequent hazards. The same difficulties noted in 2007 were also highlighted in 2009. The initial data submitted for the 2009-2011 HFA Monitor reporting cycle indicates that in most countries (64 out of 83), risk-prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events. New technologies have been a key driver in the advancement of early warning; however the literature seems to indicate that there has been greater progress in improving early warning systems for high visibility hazards (often with low frequency, high impact events), such as volcanoes and tsunamis, and less progress on more frequent but less spectacular hazards.²⁹

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

While responsibility for HFA implementation rests with national governments and regional and international organizations, it is often through individual actions of informed and aware citizens that disaster losses are minimized. Broad public awareness and action are critical in demanding and bringing about change at the political and national levels, as well as for effectively reducing risk.

Amongst the 27 countries that reported on HFA implementation progress in 2007, there was a large number that indicated progress in developing school-based programmes, including the inclusion of disaster risk reduction in school curricula and in the production and dissemination of public information material. However, not many countries reported progress in capturing and using local knowledge. In the following reporting cycle, ending in 2009, as the number of reporting countries increased the picture became more nuanced. The average global progress was considered weak across most areas relating to this priority for action, particularly in the development and application of research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments, the inclusion of disaster risk reduction concepts and practices in school curricula and educational material, and the development of nationwide public awareness strategies to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience.³⁰ Initial data from the 2009-2011 HFA Progress Report indicated very little progress in the field of education for disaster risk reduction: according to the interim country reports, 24 countries out of 70 reported substantial progress, whereas 43 indicated only weak or average progress. Data related to the inclusion of disaster risk reduction in the national educational curriculum indicated that just over half of the reporting countries included it, albeit this has been mainly centred at the primary level, and very few countries report on including disaster risk reduction in university and professional training.

Even when public awareness of natural hazards increases, there is no clear evidence that enhanced awareness translates into concerted action.³¹ Moreover, public awareness generation does not seem to be part of a strategic national effort and is rather the result of single projects. There is little

Women's Views of Disaster Risk Reduction

"Women's Views from the Frontline" is action-oriented research on the local implementation of HFA initiated by the Huairou Commission and undertaken in partnership with the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations. In total, 23 grassroots organizations from 13 countries participated through focus group discussions and interviews, reaching out to 1,181 people. The survey was instrumental in introducing the HFA to **grassroots women, who learned that governments have signed global agreements to take action to prevent disasters.** As a result, the Lumanti Support Group in Nepal convened a training workshop that included NGO stakeholders, community leaders, and government and local authorities for a local-to-local dialogue. Similarly, in the Philippines local authorities in Manila began a dialogue with DAMPA, a federation of 95 grassroots organizations of urban poor, to identify a collaborative initiative to address disaster risk reduction in urban poor communities. In India, grassroots women's groups reported that the survey gave women an opportunity to critically evaluate their own efforts to build resilience and plan ways forward. They identified the need to reduce deforestation, diversify and upgrade livelihoods, and strengthen village level response teams as key priorities.

evidence in the literature that increased public awareness necessarily leads to more responsive governance in terms of risk reduction. There are few examples of campaigns where enhanced awareness has translated into public action and greater accountability.³² These include examples from Central America and the Caribbean, where the media played an important role in increasing public awareness, including the use of radio soap-operas. However, the workshops carried out for the Mid-Term Review found a pervasive and high level of risk acceptance, even among communities demonstrating heightened risk awareness. In some cultures, the spreading of alarming or negative news – such as information on disaster risks – is frowned upon.³³

The literature review found examples of public awareness programs, but did not find studies that systematically assessed the effectiveness of various public awareness generation strategies in actually reducing risk. It found only one example³⁴ where links between using knowledge, education, and innovation to build a safety culture (HFA Priority for Action 3) and ensuring that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority (Priority for Action 1) are explored, i.e., how greater public awareness can translate into greater accountability of governance systems for risk reduction. The literature review did not come across integrated national strategies for public awareness, education, and knowledge management. In this connection, it must be noted that evidence indicates that it can take up to two generations in this field to translate awareness into changes in behaviour. The UNISDR Safe School campaign launched in 2006-2007 is only now, five years later, beginning to show signs of making an impact.

Initial data from the 2009-2011 HFA Progress Monitor indicated that 47 out of 83 countries reported having no established mechanisms for accessing disaster risk information in the country. Communities at risk are not adequately aware of their entitlements, rights, and responsibilities in the context of risk reduction.

Countries that experience more disasters have become more safety conscious and have, to a higher degree, internalized the need to ensure that disaster lessons are not forgotten, as Japan does with its National Disaster Reduction Day in remembrance of the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. Similar examples were quoted with regard to other countries such as Bangladesh, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mexico, Mozambique, and Vietnam. Even in a country such as Japan that has made disaster risk reduction management a national priority, risk awareness varies significantly depending on social differences and levels of education, as well as on geographic location in the country (the higher the risk in a geographic area, the higher the level of awareness).³⁵ A review of the evolution of disaster management policy in Japan over the past 80 years shows that each major step that contributed to shape the current legal and institutional framework for disaster risk reduction and response in the country, and that raised the level of public awareness, is linked to a major disaster that brought about new legislation and institutional arrangements. The most important events were the Kanto earthquake in 1923, the major typhoon in 1959, and the Kobe Hanshin earthquake in 1995.

It is important to recognize that following major disasters, the public becomes naturally more aware of the need to address social vulnerability and usually puts greater pressure on governments to undertake measures. This has led in many cases to improved governance and accountability by local and national authorities, Colombia and India being two cases in point.

The idea of incorporating **disaster reduction in school curricula** has been pursued with great enthusiasm over the past decade. A perception survey of children and young people undertaken in 10 countries indicates that these groups think that most progress has been made in this area.³⁶ However, there is little evidence in the literature to suggest that this has been done within the framework of strategic educational planning at national levels. The complexity of incorporating new material in school curricula is often underestimated. A study in the Asia Pacific region observed that this requires “strong national political will, a systematic approach and sustained action” and that “the institutional and technical capacity in many countries [to do this] is still weak, and the financial resources needed to build these capacities are limited.” There are few examples that address disaster risk reduction education needs in a systematic manner.³⁸ School safety has received a lot of political support. However, political will in this area is not necessarily translated into practical strategies for implementation, as shown by allocation of local and national resources for school safety and the number of schools that collapsed and were damaged in disasters, killing children and teachers.

The study commissioned for the Mid-Term Review on the role of women as agents of change in social behaviour notes that one area that has been overlooked when it comes to knowledge and education in disaster risk reduction is **social learning in communities**.³⁹ It quotes an example from Guatemala, where the National Disaster Management Agency (CONRED), impressed by grassroots women’s organizations that had conducted their own risk mapping, asked grassroots women to train government officials responsible for advising local authorities.

CONRED agreed to include grassroots women in emergency preparedness and response training and formally certify them as trainers.

Another element critical to effective disaster risk reduction is knowledge not only of HFA, but also of good prevention and mitigation practice on the part of local administrators and public officials. Knowledge of the subject matter and continuity in the senior ranks of the Office for Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management in Jamaica were credited with being key elements in the development and implementation, over several years, of effective disaster risk reduction programmes in the country.⁴⁰ Understanding and knowledge of good disaster risk reduction practice amongst administrators and senior levels of the bureaucracy are especially relevant for a field where gains are not immediately visible and the focus for action is harder for politicians, whose horizon often reaches only as far as the following election. In this connection, it would be important to ensure that higher education institutes of government and public administration include disaster risk reduction as part of the curriculum. An example is offered by the establishment in June 2009 of the Centre for Disaster Risk Management and Development Studies at the Federal University of Technology, Minna, in Nigeria.⁴²

While there is a proliferation of documentation on ‘lessons learned’, ‘comparative experiences’, and ‘good practices’, there are relatively few examples of turning these into established ways of doing the business of development. There seems to be little practical disaster risk reduction guidance to inform the work of national and international development agencies. Progress in this area varies greatly from region to region. Europe shows more progress in access to information and awareness strategies and relatively less in school curricula and research methods⁴³. In regions such as Asia⁴⁴, greater progress has been made in incorporating disaster risk reduction in the school curricula⁴⁵. In Africa, the need for including disaster risk reduction in school curricula is well recognized, but resources for this are said to be lacking⁴⁶.

The importance of the **private sector** in contributing to reducing and sharing risk as well as increasing and sustaining a culture of safety in business is also critical. In Turkey, disaster risk campaigns run by private insurance companies resulted in doubling the amount of insured people⁴⁷. The European Mid-Term Review workshop highlighted the close connection between enforcement of national laws and building codes, which in turn develop, over a several year span, a culture of safety amongst the general public.

Priority for Action 4 – Reduce the underlying risk factors

Efforts to reduce underlying risk factors account for the least progress in terms of the HFA, but this is hardly surprising given that the underlying risk factors include some of the biggest challenges facing the world today: poverty, rapid urbanization, and climate change.

Progress reported in 2007 on reducing underlying risk factors was limited, with a smaller number of countries across regions emphasizing results relevant to this priority area. There was also little mention of successfully reducing risk through sustainable natural resource

management and the incorporation of disaster risk reduction measures into environment planning and management. The reports said little of efforts by the private sector and by international financial institutions to increase access to risk transfer measures such as insurance. The subsequent reporting cycle, ending in 2009, indicated that many countries had difficulties addressing underlying risk drivers such as poor urban and local governance, vulnerable rural livelihoods, and ecosystem decline in ways that led to reduced risk of damages and economic loss. Reports also seemed to indicate that governance arrangements for disaster risk reduction did not facilitate the integration of risk considerations into development.⁴⁸

The difficulty reflected in the 2009 HFA Monitor for most countries in integrating risk reduction into public investment planning and urban development, in building local risk reduction capacity, and making key social and economic development sectors risk sensitive is confirmed in the initial data from the 2009-2011 HFA Progress Report, where country reports indicate that little additional progress has been made over the past two years. In fact only 28% of countries rate their progress in addressing underlying risk drivers at a level of 4 or 5. While lower-middle income countries report most progress in integrating disaster risk reduction into national development plans, climate change policies, and poverty reduction strategies, they also report less substantial progress in getting risk reduction into those sector strategies that address the underlying drivers of risk. Difficulties in addressing the underlying risk drivers embedded in the different development sectors, as reported by several countries, explain why disaster loss and impacts are continuing to increase, with the notable exception of reduced weather-related mortality risk.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, according to the draft GAR 2011, unless development planning and investments incorporate risk reduction, the overall stock of risk will continue to grow, and the impact of this unaddressed risk will result in increased poverty and inequalities. Initial reports from the 2009-2011 HFA Progress Report seem to indicate that the more governments are coming to understand the challenge of addressing the drivers of risk, the lower the score they assign to themselves in this area.⁵⁰

The mainstream planning processes of many governments are beginning to reflect disaster risk reduction concerns.⁵¹ However, there are very few examples in the literature where economic and productive sectoral policies have incorporated risk reduction in an explicit manner.⁵² Many of these inclusions seem to be more an “add-on” rather than “hard wired” into the key development sectors. While development practice routinely includes risk management practices, these are rarely focused on disaster risk. At the **local level** there is an increasing recognition of links between natural resource management and disaster risk reduction issues.⁵³ The role of spatial planning and land use control in shaping risk patterns is recognized, but there are other powerful drivers that overshadow risk reduction concerns.

The integration of risk reduction in infrastructure projects is an area that requires urgent attention, but most of the action on this has been very one-dimensional. For example, a highways project might take into account the risk that the project itself is exposed to, but may not adequately take into account how it is likely to reconfigure risk territorially.

The last five years have seen innovation in developing new products for risk transfer at different levels (ranging from weather-indexed insurance for small farmers⁵⁴ to catastrophic risk financing for nation states⁵⁵). However, this area of work is still work in progress without a clear set of well proven mechanisms.

Oxfam International and reducing the underlying risk factors⁵⁶

HFA Priority Action 4 is fundamental in reducing poverty and inequality and thus is central to Oxfam's Economic Justice strategy.

For many years Oxfam's work in disaster risk reduction has sought to address vulnerable livelihoods in situations of chronic risk, such as through pioneering work on Drought Cycle Management in the Horn of Africa, where Oxfam is also exploring micro-insurance projects to decrease risk. Food security and livelihoods are a key focus of Oxfam's work, and it has developed expertise in social protection, in both rural (e.g., northern provinces in Kenya) and urban (e.g., Gaza, Nairobi) situations.

There is now an explicit commitment by some affiliates⁵⁷ to fully integrate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into all livelihoods promotion work as Oxfam seeks to achieve transformation in poverty and risk reduction/adaptation at scale. Oxfam International is looking to expand this across its affiliate organizations.

Priority for Action 5 – Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Preparedness and response to disasters have been traditionally the strongest areas of focus of national governments in dealing with disaster risk reduction.

The reports submitted by governments for the reporting cycle ending in 2007 indicated that, across regions, this was the Priority for Action where governments had achieved the most “success”. Evidence of this was noted in the reduction of mortality losses due to weather-related hazards in both high-income and developing countries. A challenge noted in 2007 was that contingency plans in many countries did not include recovery and rehabilitation elements. The positive trend was confirmed in the reporting cycle ending in 2009, where all reporting countries noted progress in strengthening their capacities to manage disaster risk.⁵⁸ Initial data submitted for the 2009-2011 HFA Progress report confirms this trend: more than 80% of the reporting countries indicated that there are contingency plans and procedures in place to deal with major disasters and reported the existence of operations and communication centres, search and rescue teams, stockpiling of relief supplies, and shelters. However, financial allocations, especially at the local level, for managing response remain uneven across countries.⁵⁹ A review of the literature indicates that not many countries have established well-defined emergency funding mechanisms at all administrative levels. Many countries have national or sub-national mechanisms, but at the local level there is no funding allocation for emergency response.

3.2 Regional level progress

The HFA has brought about a significant momentum for change at the **regional level**. In fact, it has been observed that given the relatively uncontroversial nature of the topic, regional and sub-regional cooperation around disaster risk reduction has been easier, compared to other fields, and has had an indirect positive impact on countries’ relationships⁶⁰ at the sub-regional and regional levels, where initiatives are critical to the development of national policy and practice, as well as supporting broader South-South cooperation initiatives. Regional cooperation is not only critical to support and enhance national level HFA implementation, but also – equally important – to address cross-boundary risks in a joint, coordinated manner. Regional and sub-regional platforms for disaster risk reduction that have facilitated the implementation of the HFA have been set up and regularly convened over the past five years in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Arab States, Europe, and the Americas. These Regional Platforms have contributed to the definition and adoption of important political statements at Ministerial and Heads of State level, which have culminated in the definition of regional disaster risk reduction strategies and plans of action.

These include the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction, endorsed by the African Union; the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action: 2005-2010 (the Madang Framework), explicitly modelled on the Hyogo Framework; the Medium Term Plan 2007-2011 adopted by the Ministerial Session of the European and

Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA), also modelled on the Hyogo Framework; the European Union strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries (2009); the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2010-2020, adopted by the League of Arab States Council of Ministries Responsible for the Environment, and finally the entry into force in 2009 of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER). AADMER is a regional agreement that legally binds ASEAN Member States to promote regional cooperation and collaboration in reducing disaster losses and intensifying joint emergency response to disasters in the region, and is evidence of a clear affirmation of ASEAN countries' commitment to the HFA.

The production of these policy statements and agreements in response to the call of the HFA has generated close and frequent collaborations and exchanges at regional and sub-regional levels, which have been positive in and by themselves, in addition to having contributed to encouraging governments to adapt national strategies and policies in line with their international and regional commitments. Joint collaborative efforts have been developed in critical areas such as early warning systems in all regions⁶¹, the development of regionally based databases of hazards and risk, piloting partnership initiatives to enhance NGO participation in building community resilience, the development of sub-regional work plans, the political and programmatic support of regional organizations to mainstream disaster risk reduction within broader development agendas, and systematic exchanges of technical capacities and knowledge.⁶²

A study on the Caribbean Implementation of the HFA Mid-Term Review

A study on the Caribbean Implementation of the HFA was conducted in 2011 by the United Nations Development Programme (through the support of the Spain-UNDP Trust Fund “Towards an integrated and inclusive development in Latin America and the Caribbean”), in order to contribute to the Mid-Term Review of the HFA.

Although the geology, tectonic setting, location and topography of Caribbean countries expose them to a myriad of hazards, studies have shown that there has been an increasing trend of loss of life and damage from natural hazards over the last 30 years. The recognition of the Caribbean’s vulnerability to these hazards led to national and regional initiatives dating back to the 1960s, including the establishment of regional and national institutional and legislative frameworks, and the development of programmes to initially address preparedness and response and mitigation, then prevention and recovery. In fact, in 2001, the Anglophone islands, led by the Caribbean Disaster and Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), adopted the regional Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) approach and developed it into a strategy (enhanced in 2007). Clearly, even prior to the adoption of the HFA within the Caribbean, the region was already familiar with or even practicing the key elements of preparedness, prevention, mitigation, response and recovery; the advent of the Framework provided needed support for national disaster risk management programmes and other ongoing efforts.

The study concluded that the Caribbean: a) recognizes and accepts the HFA as a global framework for adaptation into national contexts and b) it has made good progress in disaster risk management. Achievements have been made in the following areas: hazard mapping and its application to development planning; monitoring and warning systems and preparedness; development of institutional and legal frameworks; community-based disaster management programmes; public information and dissemination; and recognition of the importance of forecasting climate change effects to disaster risk management.

The key drivers of success were identified as regional leadership and consistency of approach, strong national leadership, policy-level support, cross-disciplinary linkages, analysis and quantification of impacts, committed personnel and availability of technical skills.

In light of the synergies between the CDM approach and the HFA, the Caribbean countries have been able to include elements of the HFA in their initiatives and, even if most of the countries covered by the study have not based their national disaster risk management programs on the HFA, they have sought to achieve the HFA’s Priorities for Action in their own particular contexts.

3.3 International Level Progress

On the **broad international level**, the HFA has provided governments with a single disaster risk 'language' and approach, which is also important in supporting international and regional cooperation in disaster risk reduction.⁶³ The very "structure" of the HFA, organized by Expected Outcome, Strategic Goals, and Priorities for Action, along with a definition of roles and tasks for its implementation, seems to have been very helpful in supporting the development of similar frameworks at regional and national levels. However, as is discussed in more detail below, the HFA may have also induced some compartmentalization in its implementation across different areas of government, precisely due to its clear-cut structure and division of activities.

A growing political momentum for disaster risk reduction has been generated over the past five years and is a clear reflection of the HFA's impact in catalyzing concerted efforts on this topic at the international level. A recent and most important example of this growing political momentum is the **General Assembly Thematic Debate** on disaster risk reduction convened by the President of the General Assembly on 9 February 2011 in New York. This informal debate consisted of two panel sessions: one on investing in disaster risk reduction and the other on addressing the challenges of disaster risk in cities. Member states called for more awareness-raising activities, better use of shared experiences, advance planning and prevention, community-based participation and investments, including the means to mobilize resources as well as the enhancement of data collection and scaling-up of investments in education, better urban planning, the sharing of information and technology, and the raising of awareness, especially to ensure that specific disasters and the needs of victims remained high on the international agenda long after they had dropped from the news headlines.

Progress has also been achieved over the first five years of HFA implementation by the **International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR)**. The HFA represented a shift in focus for UNISDR and the Inter-agency Task Force⁶⁴. From having been mainly a coordination body within the UN, focusing on awareness raising, policy support, and information management, the Inter-Agency Task Force after the HFA adoption shifted towards becoming a broker at global and regional levels to cater for and monitor the implementation of HFA among all stakeholders. The task force prepared the *Strategic directions for the ISDR system to assist the implementing the HFA*, including initiatives and tools in the areas of institutional commitments, planning and programming, awareness and advocacy, reporting on progress and monitoring, and the modification of roles and modalities of the ISDR system. Several institutional reviews and evaluations, complemented with a multi-stakeholder consultation process, triggered a shift in the disaster risk reduction governance and ISDR as a system.

The main result was to replace the Inter-agency Task Force with a multi-stakeholder forum in 2007: the **Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction**. The Global Platform grew into an international forum for disaster risk reduction involving Governments, United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, regional organizations, and civil society organizations. The first session of the Global Platform was held in June 2007, the second in 2009, and a third is planned for May

2011. The Global Platforms' outcomes are captured in a Chair's Summary, which has become key guidance for disaster risk reduction stakeholders in their own priority setting. The Global Platform is complemented by **national, regional, and thematic platforms**: HFA reinforced the call for "national platforms" for disaster risk reduction as designated forums for coordination at the national level, with appropriate links to the UN Country Teams, where applicable. "Regional platforms" for disaster risk reduction provide an arena for networks of national platforms to coordinate action and integrate disaster risk reduction in regional settings. As noted earlier, these have now become, in most regions, established formal mechanisms, including regular ministerial-level meetings. "Thematic platforms" are networks of expertise grouped in support of priority areas identified in the Hyogo Framework, and are self-organized groups that provide guidance and reporting on specific HFA priority areas. Additional stakeholder platforms have been developed to facilitate additional promotion of disaster risk reduction among the private sector, media, academia, parliamentarians, and NGOs.

Several milestone events have helped accelerate HFA implementation in recent years. In partnership with UNISDR and donors, the World Bank established the **Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery** (GFDRR) in 2006 to support HFA implementation, which represented a breakthrough in the field. It is built on a three-track approach of global-regional coordination and coherence, administered by the UNISDR; national mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction, administered by the World Bank; and a standby facility to undertake quick post-disaster recovery and reconstruction, also administered by the Bank.

The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) suggested, and the Third World Climate Conference in 2009 agreed to, the establishment of a **climate service framework** to significantly improve data availability, climate information services, and early warning capacities, as set out in the HFA to increase disaster prevention efforts. International efforts have also been significant in the area of early warning, as shown by the work conducted in the Third International Conference of March 2006 and the WMO Symposium on Multi-Hazard Early warning Systems for integrated disaster risk management of May 2006.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) adopted a framework for community safety and resilience linked to the five priorities for action of the HFA has published annexes on HFA monitoring in its annual **World Disaster Report**, which in 2010 focused on urban risk as a contribution to the UNISDR world campaign on making cities resilient.

Civil society organizations and community practitioners have increasingly become involved in supporting HFA implementation. A Global Network for non-governmental organizations on disaster risk reduction was facilitated by UNISDR in 2005 and evolved into a very active and independent network, complementing national reporting on HFA implementation with View from the Frontline reporting. In addition, a community practitioners' platform was launched after the second Global Platform, coordinated by the Huairou Commission, a network of grassroots women's organizations. UNISDR established a private sector advisory panel on disaster risk reduction in 2010.

Communications and raising public awareness, leading to action, have been a strong focus of UNISDR support for HFA implementation. Global campaigns were launched on safe schools and increased education on disaster risk reduction, with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UNICEF, and the Thematic Platform on Education and Knowledge from 2006-2007, and on safe hospitals, in partnership with the World Health Organization and the World Bank in 2008-2009. In 2010, UNISDR launched the “Making Cities Resilient” campaign with the slogan “My city is getting ready!” The targets on safer schools and hospitals have been cemented in the Global Platform and remain a critical priority. The focus on urban risk and making cities resilient will remain a campaign focus until 2015 to ensure stronger leadership and participation by local governments and leaders in reducing risk. The campaign on making cities resilient was designed to galvanize local leadership. Further capacities are provided through partnerships with the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI of UNDP, OCHA and UNISDR); UN-HABITAT, in their regional programmes; the International Labour Organization International Training Centre in Turin; and Kyoto University and others in Asia and Latin America. The Global Education and Training Institute (GETI) in Incheon, Republic of Korea, under UNISDR will support the coordination and focus of these and other initiatives.

Recognising the importance of scientific and technical information for disaster risk reduction UNISDR established a Scientific and Technical Committee in 2008 to address policy matters of a scientific and technical nature, where science is considered in its widest sense to include the natural, environmental, social, economic, health and engineering sciences, and the term ‘technical’ includes relevant matters of technology, engineering practice and implementation.⁶⁵ In its report – Reducing Disaster Risks through Science – issues and actions⁶⁶, to the Global Platform 2009, the committee concentrated on addressing: climate change; changing institutional and public behaviour to early warnings; incorporating knowledge of the wide health impacts of disasters; improving resilience to disasters through social and economic understanding. The Scientific and Technical Committee made the following recommendations: promote knowledge into action; use a problem-solving approach that integrates all hazards and disciplines; Support systematic science programmes; guide good practice in scientific and technical aspects of disaster risk reduction.

3.3.1 Progress in HFA implementation by the United Nations

Within the context of the tasks outlined in the HFA by the international community, the Mid-Term Review has taken an in-depth look at the role played by the United Nations as a whole and through its specialized agencies, funds, and programmes in furthering HFA implementation.⁶⁷

Following the General Assembly’s endorsement of the HFA,⁶⁸ the Framework has been emphasized in a number of General Assembly resolutions and other main UN documents, indicating member states’ recognition of the importance of disaster risk reduction to sustainable development and, equally important, placing an explicit expectation on the UN System for seamless connections between the two. The Secretary-General confirmed his leadership of high-level advocacy for reducing vulnerability of communities and building resilience. Following the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and

Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)⁶⁹, a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General created in 2008 the post of **Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action** and Assistant Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction to ensure strategic and operational coherence between disaster reduction, humanitarian disaster preparedness and response as well as socio-economic activities of the United Nations system and regional organizations, including monitor and support the implementation of the policy directions set out by the Secretary-General; to carry out high-level advocacy and resource mobilization for disaster risk reduction and the implementation of the HFA; to chair the ISDR Management Oversight Board; to lead and oversee the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction secretariat in the execution of its functions as entrusted to it by relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, ECOSOC, and the HFA; to lead and coordinate the Mid-Term Review process of the HFA. In addition, the function was expected to guide coherent action between climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction stakeholders. Consultations held in the course of the Mid-Term Review have underscored the critical contribution made by this function in leveraging international cooperation and increasing political focus for disaster risk reduction. The General Assembly noted with appreciation the important role of the Secretary-General's Special Representative for the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in strengthening the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction system, in enhancing system-wide high-level leadership, and in coordinating disaster risk reduction.⁷⁰

A significant effort was made to support governments' own reporting on progress in HFA implementation towards the formulation of Indicators for assessing progress on disaster risk reduction, which was published in 2005-2006, and the development of a practical on-line tool for national reporting and monitoring of HFA (with 22 indicators), which was finalized for the second reporting cycle for Governments and national platforms.

The **Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction**, published by UNISDR, has become an important reference document on risk information, trends, and summary of progress and policy challenges on risk reduction as set out in the HFA. The report helps set the agenda and serves as input to the biennial Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction sessions. The first Global Assessment report was published in 2009, and the second will be launched at the Global Platform third session in May 2011. A precursor to the Global Assessment report was the Global Review, published by UNISDR in 2007.

Additional **guidelines** have been produced by ISDR partners and thematic platforms, including a Guidance Note on Disaster Risk Reduction for UN Common Country Assessments and Development Assistance Framework⁷¹; guidelines on school safety,⁷² a guidance note on environment and risk reduction⁷³, a hospital safety index⁷⁴, a library of sectoral guidance notes on recovery⁷⁵ and on gender.⁷⁶ Moreover, UNISDR published a series of Good Practices in Disaster Risk Reduction, available in print and through the web, focusing on national platforms

and institutional systems, community-based practice, private sector, gender aspects and poverty reduction, education and school safety, local governments, indigenous knowledge, and early warning, among others; as well as Briefing Notes on climate change and disaster risk reduction.

Launched in 2008, **PreventionWeb** serves the information needs of the disaster reduction community by making it easier to find and share information, connect, and collaborate on disaster risk reduction issues. The site averages 55,000 monthly users - with an estimated 25,000 weekly repeat visitors - and 150,000 page views per month. Some 125 public networks are promoted, with an average of 20 private workspaces hosted by PreventionWeb in support of various ongoing or time-bound processes in support of HFA implementation, such as preparations for the Global Platform, consultative processes related to the HFA Mid-Term Review, the Global Assessment Report peer review, and various thematic partnership workspaces. It has published over 12,000 items in conjunction with the UNISDR Library from nearly 3,500 multi-stakeholder sources across various content collections, including policy, news, documents, events, and educational materials.

Useful initiatives have taken place at country level, and UN entities in many countries are ready for action in terms of having tools, guidance, and project activities in place, albeit agency-oriented. There is also an overall significant level of understanding for disaster risk reduction and its importance. However, the study highlighted a common misconception about disaster risk reduction being a technical issue as opposed to an approach to the survival of human beings, livelihoods, and assets underpinning development, environment, and human rights. In this connection, it would seem that technical staff tend to consider disaster risk reduction as a strategic approach, whereas staff at the strategic level often perceive disaster risk reduction as a technical issue. This is consistent with the overall observation that emerged from the interviews with the United Nations Resident Coordinators that at the country level there is clarity about the role that the United Nations should be playing in support to governments in furthering the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. The same did not seem to apply at the Headquarters level, where the study noted several calls for more integrated and better coordinated action.

The study noted a problematic **lack of data about mainstreaming** disaster risk reduction in the agencies and organizations approached. Resident Coordinators interviewed agreed on the need to scale up on all aspects of disaster risk reduction, emphasizing a closer link with the Millennium Development Goals, a common UN message on disaster risk reduction, and lessons learned on how to implement it effectively.

Given the level of understanding of the issue within UN agencies and the institutional elements already in place, the study recommends focusing the next five years of HFA implementation by

the United Nations at the **country level** and gearing all efforts at the global and regional level to this effort. In addition, the study suggests the **development of a plan of action**, inclusive of division of labour amongst various partners, as an important requirement to ensure effective and coherent action in support to governments that are ready to scale up their efforts towards a global risk management strategy, based on risk assessments and an explicitly formulated government policy. In-country coordination platforms need to be studied to understand how they relate to each other. Collaborative assessments in the aftermath of a disaster can give good ground for coherent approaches to disaster risk reduction.

There are clearly **opportunities** to link action in support of HFA substantively into UN development processes, to support mainstreaming, and to link disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals. In this connection, the study suggested considering the possibility of having higher-level representation for UNISDR in New York to facilitate higher visibility and improve its ability to participate in discussions bridging humanitarian, development, and environmental perspectives.

3.3.2 Case studies on efforts to implement the HFA by other international organizations

The UNISDR Secretariat approached key bilateral and multilateral **international organizations** involved in supporting and/or implementing disaster risk reduction and development programmes in an attempt to gain an insight about the understanding within these organizations of the role that they are expected to play in the implementation of the HFA and to what extent they are fulfilling this role, as well as to ascertain their level of formal commitment to, and actual engagement in, the implementation of the Hyogo Framework.

The **Japan International Cooperation Agency** (JICA) contributed a detailed report on the assessment of its contribution to the HFA⁷⁷. The international non-governmental organizations OXFAM and World Vision also submitted reports, as did the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Several United Nations organizations contributed assessments.⁷⁸ These reports were also analyzed and discussed in the study on the role of the United Nations in HFA implementation.

Taking the opportunity of the Mid-Term Review of the HFA, the Japan International Cooperation Agency conducted in 2010 an assessment of its bilateral aid activities to identify good practices and lessons learned towards defining future cooperation plans. The assessment will contribute to a broader reflection within JICA for the formulation of its future bilateral cooperation in disaster risk reduction. Based on Japan's experience as a disaster-prone country, JICA supports all levels of engagement, but with a strong focus on local level activities to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters.

In 2008, JICA defined issue-specific guidelines for disaster risk reduction and set out three main objectives for its assistance work in this field:

- i. Contributing to the improvement of human security;
- ii. Contributing to sustainable development in developing countries;
- iii. Contributing to the promotion of international cooperation in the field of disaster risk management as a nation deeply experienced in disaster management.

The assessment found that JICA's assistance in the disaster risk reduction and management sector is shifting from prevention by structural measures to non-structural or "softer" measures. Capacity development of national government institutions, local governments, research institutions, and NGOs involved in disaster risk reduction receives important attention in JICA's assistance programmes, and great emphasis is placed on the enhancement of the disaster risk management capacity of local communities.

A breakdown of JICA's interventions in the past 10 years according to the HFA's five Priorities for Action indicates that the highest area of JICA's focus is on reducing underlying risk factors, with over 44% of its contribution for disaster risk reduction going to this area, both through structural and non-structural projects. The second most important area of focus, at over 26%, is the achievement of Priority Action 2, to identify, assess, and monitor disaster risk and enhance early warning systems. JICA's support has also been focused on strengthening disaster preparedness, Priority Action 5, which has accounted for 15% of its efforts in disaster risk reduction over the past 10 years; over 11% has goes to the use of knowledge, innovation, and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels, Priority Action 3, and, to a lesser extent, to the achievement of Priority Action 1, ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation

The **International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies** conducted an internal review and noted how the HFA has served as a reference for programme planning and review, staff development, and capacity building at the institutional and community levels. The IFRC contribution to the Mid-Term Review, in addition to its comments on HFA implementation gathered from several of its national societies, included some ideas about the next five years of HFA implementation, which include a need for stronger coordination at the international level and clearer definition of roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders involved in disaster risk reduction and focusing the international system on supporting national governments to create enabling environments for community empowerment⁷⁹.

World Vision (WV) indicated in its internal analysis that the HFA has had a major policy influence in shaping how the organization envisions and practices risk reduction in the field, with disaster risk reduction being incorporated into nearly 50% of WV country programmes. These shifts came in part through partnerships of influence, built at key HFA networking meetings, and continue to expand public engagement through networks (notably the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Risk Reduction). WV also acknowledges the important leadership in this regard by UNISDR, which it credits with creating an environment of trust and cooperation that can be the foundation for the paradigmatic change that is

required within aid organizations at the policy planning and implementation levels. WV analysis emphasized the importance of ensuring continuity in UNISDR leadership and placing increasing emphasis on working towards tangible outcomes for partnerships.⁸⁰

In terms of **funding for disaster risk reduction**, WV's analysis suggested building on the reflections made on this point at the Global Platform in 2009 and the plans underway to comprehensively address this issue at the 2011 Global Platform. WV's report noted how an example from history can be useful in providing a perspective on how the question of investment within the context of national policy objectives and international cooperation could be advanced for disaster risk reduction. After the recession in the early 1990s, a series of high-profile international conferences boosted official development assistance (ODA) flows. In 2002, the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico, set firm targets for each donor and marked the upturn of ODA after a decade of decline⁸¹. A similar approach WV's report suggests could be undertaken for funding in support of the HFA by setting firm targets commensurate with ODA goals and degree of risk, and laying out a mechanism for accountability for these goals. Without this level of guidance and commitment, countries will not be able to measure progress, and institutions that provide aid will have no benchmarks.

Oxfam International contributed a report highlighting Oxfam's current and future approach to disaster risk reduction and how the HFA relates to the Oxfam's approach, as well as providing recommendations for the next five years of HFA implementation.⁸² Oxfam International is working towards a common approach across its affiliates to strengthen action and ensure coherence in disaster risk reduction. It recently carried out an external review across all affiliates to support the process of agreeing a Common Approach to Disaster Risk Reduction. The draft commitments (see box on page 41) are an excellent example of how complex organizations can work towards ensuring a coherent, principled approach to mainstreaming disaster risk reduction. They include specific targets for internal funding of disaster risk reduction, interesting references to its human resources and the competencies it should possess when dealing with disaster risk reduction, as well as extensive references to programming and monitoring functions.

Draft commitments for a common approach to disaster risk reduction (DRR) across Oxfam

- Institutional mainstreaming of disaster risk analysis and risk reduction into programmes in contexts of high and chronic vulnerability to natural hazards and epidemical outbreaks. This should be made explicit in strategic plans, programme cycle management processes, individual programme objectives, relevant staff performance objectives and contracts with partners.
- Staff with DRR-related responsibilities should be able to work across humanitarian, development and campaigns departments.
- Aiming to allocate at least 10% of their funding on identifiable DRR measures and should seek to increase sustainable sources of funding.
- Working towards an integrated rather than stand-alone approach to DRR – adopting frameworks to promote understanding and application of DRR within sectoral or thematic programmes.
- Ensuring that political and social conflict is included in risk analysis as a potential factor of vulnerability.
- Regarding DRR as central to climate change adaptation (and vice versa), and put in place internal mechanisms and/or structures to ensure coherence between CCA and DRR programming and advocacy. Programme analysis and design should include consideration of the predicted, long-term effects and impacts of climate change and adopt a no-regrets approach.
- Ensuring that linkages exist between local-level programmes and engagement at other levels, to maximize impact.
- Conceptualising and presenting work according to the HFA Priorities for Action, in particular to frame their advocacy.
- Using a participatory tool for analysing risk, vulnerability and capacity at community-level as standard practice in programmes seeking to contribute to work in contexts of high and chronic disaster risk.
- Ensuring that impact indicators for programming in contexts of high and chronic vulnerability to natural hazards and epidemical outbreaks include indicators of resilience and risk reduction. Monitoring systems/tools will need to be designed or adjusted.
- Ensuring that DRR work promotes and protects gender equity. Concretely this means undertaking a rigorous and context-specific gender analysis, creating an enabling environment for women to define and express their risk reduction priorities, ensuring that impact is measured in a gender sensitive way.
- Reducing future vulnerability through humanitarian action – through analysis of disaster risks, vulnerabilities and capacities, appropriate design of sectoral interventions and technical inputs, fostering of partnerships and alliances, applying learning generated by the disaster and the response to inform the design of preparedness planning and longer-term programming.

4

Strategic areas requiring further attention

This section covers in more detail three issues that have emerged from the above analysis: the need for a more coherent and holistic approach to HFA implementation at the national level; the case – as advocated throughout the Mid-Term Review – for implementation of the HFA at the local level; and the importance of integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction actions.

4.1 Implementing The HFA strategically and holistically

During the Mid-Term Review process there was much discussion about what elements of the Framework have worked less well. However, the core of this debate, given the relative newness of the HFA, was more about which HFA elements had not yet been put in place as firmly as they should be or have just been put in place and are not yet fully realized. In this connection, the largest feedback was received on elements linked to the HFA Strategic Goals about the integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning, and the development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms, and capacities to build resilience to hazards.

A significant element of concern observed throughout the Review was that in several countries it is not clear **who “owns” disaster risk reduction**, and therefore it is hard to grasp who is in charge of what at the national level. This in turn leads to serious questions of institutional overlap, coordination, and ultimately accountability. National-level coordination for disaster risk reduction was mentioned by developing and donor countries alike, suggesting that it is not necessarily linked to the availability of resources but is more likely a function of the inherent multi-disciplinary nature of disaster risk reduction⁸³. Initial data from the 2009-2011 HFA Monitor indicates that a number of countries reported major coordination challenges where disaster risk reduction responsibilities were distributed across sectoral bodies. It was also pointed out that the adoption of new laws and strategies may not help address the situation, as these are usually super-imposed on pre-existing sets of statutes and policies within each of the sectoral departments. The Global Assessment Report 2011 quotes the example of Morocco, where a working group in the Ministry of Interior was set up to conduct a joint revision of outdated laws and policies.

Closely related to the topic of governance for disaster risk reduction is the observation that there may be a **risk of compartmentalizing HFA implementation**, which appears to be more focused on specific Priorities for Action than on the Expected Outcome and Strategic Goals. This observation, noted often in workshops and on-line debates, is also noted in the literature, where a review of national level documents found little reference to how disaster risk reduction activities contribute to the strategic goals and ultimately to reducing disaster fatalities, injuries, and damage. Activities can be labelled as contributing to a particular HFA Priority for Action

without reflecting an adequate understanding of the significance of that Priority, particularly in the case of the need to reduce underlying risk factors. In some cases, links between different HFA Priorities for Action are not fully articulated in the design and implementation of disaster risk reduction initiatives. For example, under HFA Priority for Action 3, information, education and communication initiatives have been framed to enhance public awareness, but there is little or no emphasis on how enhanced awareness can make governments more accountable for disaster risk reduction issues. This is a pattern that tends to repeat at the national, regional, and global levels, and a number of reports allude to this tendency.⁸⁴

The **link between HFA Priority for Action 4**, addressing the underlying risk factors, and **Priority for Action 1**, setting up of institutional mechanisms, is critical to ensure a holistic and strategic approach to reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience. However, as noted earlier, governance arrangements do not facilitate integrated management of risk drivers, especially when responsibilities for critical issues such as environment policy, social protection mechanisms, disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, land tenure and rural development policy, housing, and urban development policy are entrusted to different governmental entities. The HFA indicates specific sets of actions that ought to be taken in fields such as education, agriculture, and economic and urban development. A certain degree of compartmentalization is not only inevitable but is actually desirable if programmes are to be implemented with the necessary level of expertise and depth. However, this puts an even greater responsibility on central level authorities to ensure that there is a broad strategic understanding, and ownership, of the national disaster risk reduction agenda of which the separate sectoral programmes need to be coherent components.

Similarly, another element where progress was noted as still lagging is on the **implementation of cross-cutting issues** in the HFA: multi-hazard approach, gender perspective and cultural diversity, community and volunteer participation, and capacity building and technology transfer. Inclusion of a gender perspective and effective community participation are the areas where the least progress seems to have been made. Both these points were discussed in the in-depth study commissioned by the Mid-Term Review on the Role of Women as Factor of Change in Disaster Risk Reduction and will be dealt with in the following section on local level HFA implementation.

Initial data from the 2009-2011 HFA Monitor indicate that an impressively high number of countries (62 out of 70) do not collect gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity information. The application of the label “vulnerable” to women effectively excludes them from many decision-making processes, and therefore it is necessary to create incentives to promote programs and organizations formally engaging grassroots women as partners in disaster risk reduction, starting with programmes to empower them precisely to overcome their socially-created vulnerability. As noted in the Huairou Commission study, grassroots women’s organizations with strong track records in advancing community development are excluded and disconnected from national disaster risk reduction and recovery programmes despite successful

track records of reducing everyday risks for their families and acting as innovative agents of community resilience. Women's organizations represent untapped potential for implementation of the HFA in terms of ideas and experience.

The need for more **cost-benefit analysis** of disaster risk reduction and the need to ensure that this analysis is produced in a way that can effectively inform policy and decision makers have been emphasized throughout the Review, especially in workshops, one-on-one interviews, and the on-line debate. The literature review suggests that there is not enough evidence to suggest that risk reduction is getting hardwired into the "business processes" of the development sectors, planning ministries, financial institutions, etc. There is evidence of greater investment in disaster risk reduction, but most of the funding is still going to response preparedness type of activities. It was noted in the on-line debate that some risk drivers turn poverty into disaster risks (e.g., poor land use planning in flood prone areas); and others turn disasters into poverty (such as lack of access to social protection and risk transfer); to manage both, it is necessary to stop thinking of disaster risk reduction as "a sector in itself...but more as a way to undertake development in hazard-prone areas." This in turn underscores the difficulty in pushing for increased investments in disaster risk reduction while at the same time demanding greater integration of disaster risk reduction into development efforts. The World Bank United Nations report *Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters, the Economics of Effective Prevention* (2010) noted that, generally, government expenditures are lower on prevention than on relief spending, which rises after a disaster and remains high for several subsequent years. The report also noted that benefits of weather-related information and forecasts exceed costs sometimes more than tenfold: an estimate in China from 1994–96 found a cost-benefit ratio between 35 and 40, and meteorological services in Mozambique were estimated to have a cost-benefit ratio of 70. Many countries, however, are not taking advantage of the technological improvements in weather and related forecasting. As shown, even modest increases in spending - if supplemented by international data sharing - can have enormous benefits, especially to warn people of impending hazards. Several countries, some very poor, have found large and quick gains from such spending. The gains can also spill beyond borders, enhancing regional cooperation. The World Bank United Nations study provides useful insights into the topic of government spending for prevention instead of relief.

The Mid-Term Review highlighted a broad consensus that more research and analytical studies should be conducted as a regular component of policy planning at the government level and made available to decision makers, focusing on the extent to which disaster risk reduction initiatives actually reduce damage and losses. Cost-benefit analysis is another issue that bridges the HFA Priorities for Action; it is directly related to the question of risk assessments and research (Priority for Action 2), while creating awareness and making a strong case for action at the political level (Priority for Action 2 and 3). Interestingly, it is not listed amongst the important steps to take under any of these Priorities for Action in the HFA.

As noted, the question of cost-benefit analysis is closely linked to the inherent difficulties of measuring aspects of disaster risk reduction and of doing so with common, or at least comparable, **assessment tools**. For example, measuring the reduction of underlying risk factors is hard because successes may fall under the radar for many reasons: distribution of risk management across sectors and administrative units, lack of disaster risk reduction awareness and capacity, and lack of multi-stakeholder engagement for HFA reporting. The HFA Monitoring tool does offer a set of indicators and collects a wealth of knowledge about the status of HFA implementation in a country according to government self-assessment. The point, though, is not only to have a common system to assess progress in disaster risk reduction, but also to assess disaster impact and losses in a comparable way. As noted in the study commissioned for the Mid-Term Review Report on the use of databases for disaster risk reduction: “much of the existing operational research related to emergencies and disasters lacks consistency, is of poor reliability and validity and is of limited use for establishing baselines, defining standards, making comparisons or tracking trends.”⁸⁵

While there is, as noted earlier, a proliferation of documentation on lessons learned and good practices, there are relatively few examples of turning these into established ways of doing development.⁸⁶ Beyond the high level guidance (such as guidance for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in CCA/UNDAF), the literature surveyed for the Mid-Term Review pointed to a knowledge gap on practical (and binding) guidance in disaster risk reduction to inform the work of national and international development agencies. This lack of guidance noted in the literature may indicate a need to go beyond “what is good practice” to focus more on hands-on ways to describe “how to achieve” the good practice.

Cost-benefit analysis, reliable and standardized data collection, and development of standards all seem to point to a need for a broader and more strategic consideration of HFA implementation, especially at the national level.

4.2 Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

Implementation of the HFA at local level, or lack thereof, and the capacity of governments to coordinate it with other efforts, such as socio-economic development plans at local level, were also raised consistently throughout the Mid-Term Review. The brief review of national-level progress suggests that action at local level was consistently noted as in need of improvement, especially under Priorities for Action 1 to 4. The Views from the Frontline report, based largely on interviews at the local level, found “a significant gap between national and local level action. Reports of progress fade as activities get closer to vulnerable people – overall progress at community level is very limited.”⁸⁷ Institutional structures are often put in place but are not connected to local and community processes.⁸⁸ The notion of differential vulnerability among different societal groups is not adequately addressed by the new institutional and legislative arrangements, and there are few examples of local knowledge informing policy. However, there is an expanding body of knowledge on locally rooted strategies, particularly in the case of climate change adaptation, in which disaster risk reduction activities are gradually taking an increasingly larger portion.⁸⁹

A number of European countries noted disaster risk reduction efforts at the local level going back generations.⁹⁰ Those countries with more years of work on disaster risk reduction were seen to be significantly more advanced in decentralizing local action on disaster risk reduction, possibly indicating a phased process whereby disaster risk reduction was first addressed at the central level and seems to have been applied in an institutionalized way at the local level only later. A possible “phased approach” from national to local level of HFA implementation was also mentioned during some of the Mid-Term Review workshops. Participants noted that there is a process in the making in applying HFA guidance whereby several governments had recently approved, or were in the process of doing so, disaster risk reduction national policies and/or frameworks, in which decentralization of disaster risk reduction to the local level was an important component that would logically follow in the implementation phase.

⁹¹This is consistent with the observation that the HFA has brought about positive changes within national institutions but that the process is still very much in the making, as would be reasonable to expect for a framework five years into its implementation.

It was also noted that the HFA is not as well understood as a tool at the country-level as it is understood at the international level. This may be a function of the fact that the dissemination of HFA has been too targeted towards specific actors in countries. The HFA has been translated in all the official languages of the United Nations, but is not available in other languages, making it harder for local administrators to become familiar with it, understand best practices of disaster risk reduction, and, most importantly, be in a position to interface with national counterparts from a position of knowledge of commitments of national authorities.⁹² It should be clarified that lack of knowledge about the HFA does not necessarily mean a lack of knowledge of prevention and mitigation practices.

Earlier in this report under a discussion of HFA Priority Action 1, it was noted that a number of countries had passed laws assigning local governments legal responsibility for disaster risk reduction management without passing budget allocations for this responsibility. Thus the problem of local level action for disaster risk reduction remains a serious concern and is further discussed in the following section of this report.

The Mid-Term Review often heard that despite many **National Platforms** or similar coordination mechanisms having been developed, many are still not as effective as they should be in ensuring multi-stakeholder consultations and sharing of knowledge at national and local level. The study conducted for the Mid-Term Review on effective financial mechanisms at the national and local levels for disaster risk reduction highlighted some of the structural factors within resource allocation mechanisms to explain why national budgets and financial allocations at the local level remain stubbornly difficult to influence when it comes to disaster risk reduction. In addition to identifying specific fiscal and regulatory opportunities for improving and increasing the allocation of funding for disaster risk reduction at the local level, the study recommends decentralizing authority and resources to appropriate administrative levels in support of local multi-stakeholder partnerships (including equitable representation

from the most vulnerable) to coordinate and manage policy execution on risk reduction, poverty alleviation, development, and climate change adaptation.⁹³ The study, referring to the case of the Albay Province in the Philippines, indicated that it was the combination of important elements that contributed to decisive action at the local level: decentralized responsibilities and discretionary resources in the form of fiscal grants and citizens' voices for action, the social demand for disaster risk reduction. The study emphasizes that the latter could be the decisive element, noting that when central coordinating and regulatory plans exist, ministries will receive some resources for disaster risk reduction at local level. However, the study concludes that in the absence of a fiscal grant system that explicitly puts disaster risk reduction on the agenda of local governments, it is unlikely to achieve the mainstreaming required for effective action unless local voices are sufficiently strong to advocate for a prioritization of resources at the local government level in favour of disaster risk reduction. An interesting example of the impact of the social demand for disaster risk reduction comes from Peru, where, as a result of negotiations between grassroots women's network GROOTS Peru and local authorities of El Agustino in Lima, the municipality was able to access approximately USD43,000 from national funds to build an embankment to reduce flooding. Grassroots women will oversee the construction of this embankment.⁹⁵

Social demand for disaster risk reduction, especially at the local level, is closely linked to an effective use of truly **multi-stakeholder consultative mechanisms** and the involvement of community organizations. It was observed in several workshops that the role of National Platforms could be further examined with a view to understanding better how they can facilitate a trickling down process from the national to the district and local level, which would include not only all the relevant branches of local government but also communities and civil society organizations. Consistent with this demand is one of the main conclusions from the case study on the breaking of the Spanish Tous Dam in 1982 carried out for the Mid-Term Review to explore the different factors that affect crisis communication as one part of development capacities for long-term resilience. The study suggested that in order to enhance local capacities as well as to foster both vertical and horizontal communication to deal with disaster risk reduction, resources should be devoted not so much to technical means, but to long-term institutional innovation and learning. In particular, it was suggested that a **local platform** is required for engaging actors in developing disaster risk reduction strategies, capable of deciding what new instruments are needed to deal with local demands and needs, and to support new kinds of interactions and communication channels between relevant stakeholders. Such a platform, if well designed, could also support social learning by the creation of a 'collective memory' based on the accumulation of knowledge and lessons learned from past disaster experience into preventative strategies.⁹⁶

An important component of disaster risk reduction, and an explicit requirement of the HFA, is the effective **involvement of communities** and local authorities in planning integrated, multi-hazard approaches to disasters triggered by natural hazards. This point was repeatedly noted throughout the Mid-Term Review as in need of further attention. The contribution of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies to the Mid-Term Review noted

that national planning and decision-making often does not take into consideration the needs and capacities of the most vulnerable, so resources and support are not provided to enable and empower those who need it most. On a positive note, the Mid-Term Review observed that over the past five years there has been stocktaking of indigenous knowledge and practice in some regions, much of it encouraged by the explicit requirements included to this effect in the HFA.

During the on-line debate on local level action, participants noted that governments take specific disaster risk reduction actions, but complained of failures to join up actions either across governments or from the national to the local and community level. A few noted that effective action must link regional, national, sub-national, and local levels. It was observed that national institutional arrangements are not enough to promote effective action when resources do not reach local communities. A nation can adopt “marvellous laws, national platforms, plans, and all the things that the HFA recommended” without truly affecting the grassroots in either city or countryside. The study commissioned by the Mid-Term Review on the impact of social mobilization in generating risk reduction behaviour, in particular the role of women as agents of change, noted that not enough has been done to create institutional incentives to engage grassroots women’s organizations in all areas of emergency response, disaster relief, rehabilitation, and risk reduction. The prevailing focus on emergency response rather than disaster risk reduction, observed the study, fails to address systemic challenges of poverty and disaster, positioning women in communities as victims rather than agents of change. Too often, disaster risk reduction and disaster recovery programmes simply deliver aid or training to women in ways that reproduce rather than challenge their marginalization and vulnerabilities. It is important for women to renegotiate their status with decision makers and advance their strategic interests for them to be considered equal actors in disaster risk reduction and sustainable development.

The Mid-Term Review workshop in the Pacific agreed that experience has shown that the greatest success can be achieved when initiatives start small and are in harmony with a country’s own policies and systems. This provides opportunities for improvement that are consistent with the capacity of under-resourced government departments. The meeting offered examples of efficient local-level activity. In one country, seed banks were spread across the country, decreasing the vulnerability of farmers by allowing seed production to continue despite the flooding of one or two of the banks. After a tsunami in another country, communities themselves - and not the government - decided to move to less hazardous locations on higher ground. The fact that most households had access to safe lands was a key to success. In this connection, the internal review conducted for the Mid-Term Review by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies noted that a culture of safety and resilience has to a limited degree been established, with greatest progress in communities targeted by local-level disaster risk reduction efforts. People often have more pressing needs, even though they know actions to meet such needs may make them less safe in the future. If development policies and programmes are designed based on self-identified and prioritised needs of vulnerable communities, underlying risks will by necessity be addressed through a multi-sectoral, integrated approach. In support, community participation and empowerment,

education, awareness raising, institutionalised but flexible partnerships, leadership, ownership, and political will are all needed.⁹⁷

A relevant point highlighted by the case study on the Tous Dam break is the issue of **credibility**, and with it that of trust, which is very much dependent on the capacity of key individuals, especially at senior level in the local and national administrations, to provide very clear, strong messages. However, this ability in the case of the Tous Dam break was constrained by the lack of adequate means and resources for informing the right populations in time. To gain credibility, messages need to be made in a way that resonates with agents close to the affected population, and therefore proximity is crucial in gaining and transmitting credibility.⁹⁸

4.3 Integrating climate change

The HFA acknowledged the importance of promoting the integration of risk reduction associated with climate change into strategies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation although in 2005 it was not possible to make this link any more specific than it was in the agreed text of the Hyogo Framework⁹⁹

Integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction was discussed extensively in the Mid-Term Review and one of the points most frequently raised was the importance of **harmonizing and integrating frameworks and policies** for the two fields within the broader context of poverty reduction and sustainable development. Some called for a **common resilience framework**, including the development of unified tools supporting greater coherence and coordination among different approaches; a reduction in the duplication of efforts, leading to the optimized use of available resources; an increased potential for collaborative alliances and joint actions among the different disciplines; and the ability to provide better guidance for policy makers and practitioners in program design, implementation, and evaluation.¹⁰⁰ This was the conclusion also reached by an evaluation commissioned by the Government of Finland to review in 2010 its development cooperation policies, programmes, and projects from a perspective of poverty reduction. The evaluation noted that “only when the diverse interventions in development aid are connected in a strategic manner can they be effective in making a difference in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework at a community level.”¹⁰¹

As noted before while discussing the need for a holistic approach to HFA implementation, states struggle in promoting integrated, multi-sectoral strategies, as the agencies and ministries in charge of these issues sometimes compete rather than cooperate.¹⁰²

Even though the need for **integration between climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction** is well-recognized, functional links in policy and practice remain inadequate at the local and national levels. Resources and implementation mechanisms also remain largely separate.¹⁰³ The literature review quoted very few examples of integrated risk assessments¹⁰⁴: taking into account risks emanating from natural climate variability (based on

Views on climate change and disaster risk reduction from the Mid-Term Review workshop held in Suva, Fiji

Given that the Pacific island countries are on the front lines of climate change and sea level rise, their workshop was the most vocal about ways to integrate climate change adaptation into disaster risk reduction over the next five years. They suggested that the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission, ISDR, and selected representatives of national governments set up a steering committee to identify common priorities and provide consistent technical inputs to link disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation throughout the region. The meeting called for establishing panels of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation experts to guide policy and strategic planning.

historical records), observed climate change trends, and projected climate change to direct risk management practices. In the context of risks emanating from a changing climate, there seem to be three kinds of practices: vulnerability reduction, adjustment of risk management practices over time, and diversifying the risk. Most of the current emphasis is on the first type. At the same time, at the local level there is a proliferation of small-scale projects that attempt to address underlying factors. These include small slope stabilization projects and community infrastructure projects.¹⁰⁵ It is nevertheless critical to ensure that disaster risk reduction and adaptation are placed at the centre of national development planning.¹⁰⁶

Cooperation between UNISDR and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) over the past several years produced significant results towards ensuring consideration of disaster risk reduction as an important instrument for climate change adaptation strategies. In this context, an IPCC special report on **Managing the Risk of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX)** is being prepared by a group of government and technical experts and is expected to be published later in 2011.

The relevance of reducing and managing climate-related disaster risks is being increasingly recognized at the **international political level**. The negotiating text for the post-2012 agreement on climate change specifically refers to the HFA in enhancing climate change related disaster risk reduction strategies. It should also be noted that some national governments are already putting in place legal and institutional measures to harmonize disaster risk reduction and adaptation mechanisms; these include the governments of Vietnam, Philippines, Colombia, and South Africa.¹⁰⁷ Important regional initiatives are also relevant. The Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction adopted by the Council of Arab Ministries Responsible for the

Environment in December 2010 emphasized the leadership role taken by the League of Arab States in promoting the integration of disaster risk reduction measures in regional policies on sustainable development, climate change adaptation, environment, and disaster management coordination mechanisms. The Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Incheon, Republic of Korea, in October 2010, comprising fifty governments from the Asian and Pacific region, approved a five-year road map to establish climate-resilient disaster risk management system which explicitly called for joint and integrated action at all levels in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.¹⁰⁸

Pending more structural reform at the national level, some of the more **practical suggestions** offered in the course of the on-line debate on this issue included the involvement of ministries or government officials responsible for climate change adaptation in disaster risk reduction national platforms and the inclusion of climate change adaptation initiatives in the HFA Monitor. The latter, it was felt, could also help strengthen the visibility of climate change adaptation in the HFA and ISDR frameworks.

5

Suggestions for accelerating implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

The Mid-Term Review noted that **significant progress** has been made over the past five years in disaster risk reduction and that the adoption of the HFA in 2005 has played a determinant role in pushing this progress across international, regional, and national agendas.

This section discusses issues identified in the course of the Review that are critical to an accelerated HFA implementation over the next five years and forms the basis for the formulation of the conclusions discussed in the following section of the report. It highlights areas in need of attention and proposals put forward by the Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review. A series of regional consultations will follow the publication of this Review in the lead-up to the 2011 Global Platform to provide substantive input to the discussion of follow-up action that will take place at the Global Platform in May 2011.

5.1 Enabling and safeguarding development gains - disaster risk reduction is primarily a development issue

The United Nations General Assembly has repeatedly asserted through many resolutions the need for disaster risk reduction to be an integral component of development plans and poverty eradication programmes. This point is well understood and accepted among disaster risk reduction experts and has been emphasized throughout the Mid-Term Review during workshops, online debates, and one-on-one interviews. The Review has also shown that important connections are constantly being made about the inextricable links between disaster risk reduction and sustainable development at the international policy level, as exemplified by several regional Ministerial Statements, the outcome document from the Summit on the Review of the Millennium Development Goals, and several country statements made during the General Assembly Thematic Debate on disaster risk reduction.

However, the Mid-Term Review has also highlighted the fact that these connections, strongly driven by the disaster risk reduction community, have not been fully internalized in the ways in which international development assistance agencies, some government institutions, and the United Nations are institutionally and financially organized to manage disaster risk reduction. This is making it difficult to mainstream disaster risk reduction as a critical component of sustainable development. Above it was noted that Finland's evaluation of its development cooperation policies, programmes, and projects from a perspective of poverty reduction found that the lack of a coherent strategy in disaster risk reduction limited the effectiveness of Finland's poverty reduction efforts.¹⁰⁹

The study of the UN impact in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework suggests that more needs to be done to mainstream disaster risk reduction in the development work of the Organisation and to ensure its reflection in the relevant parts of UN Strategic Framework and Programme Budget documents. The internal reviews conducted by the Japan International Cooperation Agency and Oxfam International both pointed to a need to sharpen the way in which disaster risk reduction is addressed within their respective organizations at the strategic as well as programmatic level.

The Mid-Term Review highlighted the fact that while a recommendation to mainstream disaster risk reduction is often made in policy documents, this does not translate into a mandate to do so in the implementation of national and local development programmes, and as such is not fully reflected in national development strategies and plans, either domestically and internationally.

Five years into the implementation of the HFA, there is a **need for a comprehensive institutional re-assessment** of where disaster risk reduction is placed within international national and regional agencies to ensure that critical functions such as mainstreaming for sustainable development, strategic advice, monitoring of implementation, and reporting on impacts can effectively influence development policies and plans.

The work on disaster risk reduction begun under the auspices of the emergency response community in the 1990s. However, as this work continued, it became increasingly clearer that the framing of disaster risk reduction as a humanitarian question nearly exclusively related to emergency management and humanitarian action was insufficient. Whereas the humanitarian community has played an important role in driving the disaster risk reduction agenda throughout the 1990s and in helping to raise awareness and to advocate for better preparedness and prevention to save lives, this strong link is now showing its limits and is indeed now seen as a major challenge to making disaster risk reduction an integral component of environmental, economic, and social development, and to the understanding of the full implication and potentials of disaster risk reduction across sectors other than humanitarian. As HFA implementation progresses, it is time to consider whether the institutions responsible for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into all aspects of sustainable development are doing so from the best positions within their organizations.

The General Assembly has regularly called for a more effective integration and, by acknowledging the significant impacts of disaster risk reduction on social, economic, cultural, and environmental systems, underlined the need for a close interrelation of disaster risk reduction with development. The Secretary-General too stressed the firm link of disaster risk reduction with development, and by declaring it a core function of the United Nations, asked for a full incorporation of disaster risk reduction into both the humanitarian and the development, agendas (A/59/228).

In order to substantially enhance the visibility and global importance of disaster risk reduction as a core function of the UN and to consequently anchor disaster risk reduction issues in all relevant sectors, including internationally agreed framework documents, the Mid-Term Review Advisory Group advocated for **full integration and reflection of disaster risk reduction in the development, humanitarian and environmental work of the UN, including in its Strategic Framework and Programme Budget documents.**

5.2 Governance for disaster risk reduction

Governance issues were discussed often during the Mid-Term Review process. This reflects the cross-cutting nature of disaster risk reduction, and it points to the need, at all levels, to clearly define responsibilities for setting strategic guidance through multi-stakeholder processes, for driving policy and planning, for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into the development agenda, and ultimately for the effective implementation of these plans. It is a question of coordination and ultimately of accountability. The need for effective disaster risk reduction governance is discussed in this section, focusing on the international, national, and local levels.

International Level: In order for different stakeholders to address disaster risk reduction in a multi-sectoral approach, including the development sector, as called for by the HFA, the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction has evolved into the main global forum for continued and concerted emphasis on disaster reduction. This was meant to provide at the highest possible level a solid basis for the successful implementation of the Hyogo Framework, and it focused on increased commitment and engagement by States, intergovernmental organizations, international financial institutions, UN and other international agencies, regional entities, and civil society organizations. It was introduced with the perception that only through more, and more effective, partnerships among all these important stakeholders can disaster risk reduction become an integral component of environmental, economic, and social development. Thus the Global Platform's aim is to serve as the global forum for disaster reduction and for sharing experiences and expertise among all its stakeholders, and it is meant to provide strategic guidance and coherence for implementing the Hyogo Framework.

However, the principal decision-making body for governance of the ISDR, including the endorsement of policies related to disaster risk reduction, is not the Global Platform but the United Nations General Assembly, via its Second Committee. This formula excludes non-governmental stakeholders from governance; therefore after the 2005 Kobe Conference some supporting mechanisms, additional to the Global Platform, were created to more closely involve non-government actors in the strengthening of the ISDR system, such as the Management Oversight Board (MOB) thematic and scientific platforms and consultations with agencies in the various regions. Whereas these mechanisms have strengthened international dialogue and cooperation on disaster risk reduction, more efforts are necessary to ensure the effective engagement of other critical actors in the preparation of the Global Platform, the implementation of its deliberations, provision of advice to the ISDR secretariat, the elaboration and implementation of disaster risk reduction programmes and related financial considerations. The Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review suggested that the implementation of the ISDR

and the HFA would be better served by **the creation of an inter-Global-Platform mechanism** with full engagement of all relevant actors and stakeholders. By substituting some of the existing support mechanisms, this new body should have the participation of a broad range of ISDR partners while nevertheless remaining small (15–20 members only). It could take the lead in ensuring the necessary follow-up to the Global Platform deliberations and formulate advisory guidance for all relevant stakeholders' action. Its term should be limited to the interface between two sessions of the Global Platform. Its members would act in an open and participative process, be elected or nominated at each Global Platform, and should, as a commonly responsible body, report to the Global Platform. Such an approach would be more flexible and transparent, and could at the same time more effectively develop and coordinate short and long-term disaster risk reduction policies as well as help accelerating the implementation of the Hyogo Framework.

National Level: The Mid-Term Review highlighted the need for governments to identify and develop synergies at national levels to ensure coordinated and coherent action on disaster risk reduction across different sectors of government. As noted above, this would help to clarify who is in charge of driving processes, setting policies, seeking budget allocations, etc. This is also related to the issue of accountability: if nobody is in charge then nobody is effectively responsible for making things happen. This includes the building and reinforcing of a strong sense of ownership of disaster risk reduction within populations and the shaping of local governments' capacities. It equally includes the conceiving of mechanisms that allow bottom-up disaster risk reduction initiatives, originating at the community level and contributing to the shaping of disaster risk reduction policy and programmes at all levels. The literature review observed that there is not enough evidence of the effectiveness of different governance systems for disaster risk reduction; so options must be explored and adapted to specific national contexts.¹¹⁰

National Platforms can be an important element of national institutional mechanisms for disaster risk reduction, but the composition and focus of National Platforms vary widely, depending on how they have developed in different country contexts. For example, the participation of civil society and the private sector varies greatly across countries. Complaints about lack of transparency in the membership of National Platforms and lack of involvement of community level representatives were heard often during the Mid-Term Review. Literature is beginning to emerge on what works and what does not, and on the characteristics of an effective National Platform¹¹¹.

The Mid-Term Review Advisory Group discussed National Platforms during its meeting in January 2011 and reiterated that the primary responsibility for HFA implementation rests with national governments, and that a discussion of consultative mechanisms for effective disaster risk reduction should not divert attention from this fundamental point. The Group also observed that countries have wide scope in how they design and develop the consultative mechanisms that are most appropriate to their specific contexts.

The Mid-Term Review Advisory Group recommended that **National Platforms should include representatives from the economic and development sectors** in a country, as it had observed that this did not occur even in the more representative Platforms. This gap creates a missed opportunity for effectively proving the cost-benefit of disaster risk reduction with the ministries responsible for economic development, planning, and finance.

The Advisory Group recognized that **National Platforms need to evolve significantly** in the coming years, improving their abilities to bridge and multiply synergies at the national level, as well as between the national and local levels. In this connection, suggestions included defining a role for National Platforms in the accountability field as well as considering the development of national “thematic” platforms, which could address specific topics such as education, infrastructure development, etc.

The Mid-Term Review Advisory Group noted that the time was ripe for a comprehensive **discussion on the role and function of National Platforms**, a discussion informed by the available literature on their effectiveness. If needed, further review could be undertaken to substantiate the development of new guidance on effective national consultative and decision-making mechanisms for disaster reduction at the national level.

Local level: Repeated calls were heard during the Mid-Term Review for replicating multi-stakeholder consultative and decision-making mechanisms at local level to ensure community participation and also to achieve a holistic approach to addressing resilience.

The Advisory Group advocated for an inclusion of **risk and vulnerability reduction at the centre of a disaster reduction approach**. They emphasized that at the household perception, understanding and management of risk does not make a distinction among a wide range of hazards, including climate related, biological and geological hazards as well as socio-economic hazards such as price fluctuations and crime and corruption, and they noted therefore the importance of developing a more holistic approach towards increasing resilience. Such an approach would lead to the development a common resilience framework and would require the definition of resilience indicators to allow for data collection, programme development, implementation, and monitoring in a credible and comparable way. Governance mechanisms at the local level would need to take this into account. The Advisory Group emphasized the importance, as noted earlier in this report, of generating a local demand for disaster risk reduction, which in turn may bring about a higher level of accountability for action.

5.3 Accountability for HFA implementation

Accountability for effective disaster risk reduction policy planning and implementation was raised often during the Mid-Term Review. Earlier in this report the weaknesses in tackling issues of accountability, transparency, and participation in administrative and decision-making processes at the local and national levels were noted. **Disaster risk reduction law** at the national level could help set frameworks for promoting, monitoring, and accountability

mechanisms. As noted in the study on the Tous Dam break, the lack of a clear sanctioning regime, especially with respect to compliance by local authorities with legislation on risk prevention (floods), was identified as a critical weakness.

The Advisory Group reflected extensively on this issue, emphasizing, amongst other issues, **governments' responsibility for conducting comprehensive risk assessments**. Understanding a problem is the first step towards managing it. Governments across the board are still not achieving the level of consistency required in terms of comprehensive risk assessments that take into account underlying risk factors and social and economic vulnerabilities in the context of structural hazards. Countries continue to report difficulties in assessing their risk stock and in factoring that information into national planning, investment decisions, and development sectors. In fact, while 30 countries reported in the initial data on the 2009-2011 HFA Monitor on the availability of national multi-hazard risk assessments that could potentially inform planning and development decisions, several others reported major challenges in linking these to development processes at the national and local levels.

Once a problem is understood and plans developed to address it, **accountability mechanisms become a measure of progress** in implementing the plans. Reporting and **monitoring mechanisms** therefore can be viewed as measures to increase government and public awareness of, and support for, implementation of the HFA. Regular reporting, such as that encouraged for the HFA Progress Monitor Report, helps keep disaster risk reduction high on national agendas. In this connection, it was suggested that reporting should be done annually, rather than biannually, as is the case at present. The HFA monitoring system was appreciated because, though based on self-reporting, it offers an opportunity for governments to exercise internal quality control. Workshop discussions held throughout the Mid-Term Review noted that the current reporting system, albeit complex and detailed, generates a consultative process amongst all disaster risk reduction stakeholders in a given country, which is in and by itself positive. The current HFA monitoring system, however, does not include questions to governments about internal accountability mechanisms. Given the widespread interest during the Mid-Term Review on accountability mechanisms, the time is ripe to include such questions in the HFA Monitor so as to track such mechanisms at national levels as well as - most importantly - encourage governments to establish them in the context of multi-stakeholder strategies for disaster risk reduction.

Japan offers an interesting example of **government accountability** for disaster risk reduction. The Government of Japan has since 1963 submitted to the National Diet an annual White Paper on disaster risk management. The paper's publication is called for by the Disaster Countermeasures Basic Act, and it covers the Government's programmes conducted in the previous year on disaster management and risk reduction as well as programmes planned for the following year.¹¹² Another example can be found in Colombia, where officials are liable to serve jail time if one of their constituents is found to have died needlessly due to a disaster¹¹³. At the regional level, the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction for 2010-2020 sets out a series of specific measures geared towards "improving accountability for disaster risk management

at sub national and local level”.¹¹⁴ These include the requirement that disaster risk reduction at sub national and local level be matched by dedicated and adequate allocation of budgets, that planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes, and that legislation and assessment procedures be instituted to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects.

The Mid-Term Review found that there is a need to define mechanisms and levels of application for effective accountability in HFA implementation at the international (including regional), national, and local levels. As noted in this section, effective accountability is about transparent and responsible action. Accountability measures that are jointly defined and monitored stand a greater chance of bringing about the action required to raise the level of priority for disaster risk reduction in the national agenda.

The Advisory Group recommended supporting governments in defining and developing appropriate **accountability measures for disaster risk reduction**. An international system for global accountability for disaster risk reduction was also discussed by the Advisory Group, and it was noted that an explicit inclusion of disaster risk reduction in the Millennium Development Goals would help in making governments accountable to report on action taken in this connection.

5.4 Agreeing on targets and for whom?

Closely related to the question of accountability is the one of targets. “Targets are absolutely necessary, otherwise you can’t measure progress,” argued one of the participants in the fourth on-line debate. Throughout the Mid-Term Review there was a wide consensus that targets would be helpful in encouraging governments, civil society, the private sector, and the United Nations towards a more accelerated implementation of the Hyogo Framework. The Advisory Group discussed the issue of setting targets for disaster risk reduction, and, while recognizing the inherent challenges related to a target regime, it agreed that there was political momentum in favour of disaster risk reduction and that the time was ripe for such a discussion.

The Advisory Group for the Mid-Term Review advocated for the adoption of the targets contained in the **Chair’s Summary of the 2009 Global Platform**, as a way to challenge governments and multilateral and bilateral aid organizations towards their implementation in the coming years. The targets in question were:

- National assessments of the safety of existing education and health facilities by 2011;
- Development and implementation of concrete action plans for safer schools and hospitals in all disaster prone countries by 2015;
- Inclusion of disaster risk reduction in all school curricula by 2015;
- Inclusion and enforcement of disaster risk reduction measures in the building and land use codes of all major cities in disaster-prone areas by 2015.

The Chair's Summary noted that targets were also proposed for such things as national risk assessments, municipal disaster recovery plans, early warning systems, water risks, and the enforcement of building codes. The Chair's Summary proposed that the equivalent of 10% of humanitarian relief funds should be devoted to disaster risk reduction work. Similarly, a 10% figure has been proposed as a target share for post-disaster reconstruction and recovery projects and national preparedness and response plans. Calls also were made for at least 1% of all national development funding and all development assistance funding to be allocated to risk reduction measures, with due regard for quality of impact. The fourth on-line debate conducted for the Mid-Term Review, which discussed the issue of targets, noted that there is great value in setting specific, nationally-owned targets on the basis of national contexts of risks, hazard, and vulnerabilities.

The Mid-Term Review highlighted the importance of beginning a concrete **consultative debate on targets** for disaster risk reduction. A suggestion was made to consider defining, implementing, and monitoring targets at national level as part of the growing institutional commitment at regional level in support of HFA implementation. A regional approach to targets would allow easier accounting for the great discrepancies that exist in the implementation of the HFA across the world, as well as fostering stronger regional and sub-regional cooperation on transboundary issues.

5.5 Defining the “how”

The Mid-Term Review highlighted a call for **guidance tools** to facilitate action at national and local levels. Much is known about what good practice is and what works, but not enough about *how* good practice is achieved. Common tools (or specific guidance) are needed for risk assessments so that we would eventually arrive at a common definition of disaster and risk; for integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction; and for ensuring effective vertical synergies between national and local levels. In this connection and as highlighted earlier in this report under progress at the international level, a significant body of guidance has already been developed in disaster risk reduction. This widespread call for more guidance may point to a need to assess the accessibility and usefulness of the current guidance in order to be fully responsive in providing additional guidance instruments.

Given the critical importance of managing underlying risk factors, the development of tools to effectively inform on the extent to which underlying risk factors impact vulnerabilities of communities most exposed to hazards could also be considered.¹¹⁵ The Advisory Group advised that it would be important to define a common method for developing, in the aftermath of a disaster, an in-depth understanding of the elements that over the years contributed to the disaster itself.¹¹⁶ The immediate cause of a bridge collapsing may be a mudslide. But the underlying cause may be deforestation or poor urban planning. However, as the World Bank notes, symptoms may be mistaken for causes: and deforestation may be the result of poor people needing timber for their survival or of logging concessions that encourage cutting and not replanting.¹¹⁷ A common **analytical tool to trace back and unpack the actual causes of a**

disaster would go a long way in supporting future evidence-based decision making as well as increasing accountability for responsible policy making in disaster risk reduction.

The Advisory Group endorsed the call for the **development of standards** for disaster risk reduction, which was consistent with a call for stronger accountability measures and in line with the definition of targets for disaster risk reduction. There is a clear awareness that guidance alone is not sufficient and that standards to ensure quality in the delivery of the guidance are necessary. As in other international cross-cutting fields, the development of international standards could help support the implementation of high-quality practice, especially in a field as complex as disaster risk reduction.¹¹⁸ Specific areas of intervention would need to be identified to prioritize those areas in most need of high-quality and urgent intervention. The target points noted in the section above could be a possible starting point. The wide body of knowledge, especially of a technical nature around building codes, land use planning, etc, already available could be effectively compiled and centres of excellence at the regional level could be entrusted with the consolidation and upkeep of this knowledge.

The Advisory Group also suggested reviewing and expanding on the current UNISDR publication on **terminology** in order to account for recent developments and recognize the wide, cross-cutting nature of disaster risk reduction. Similarly, the 2007 UNISDR publication *Words into Action, A guide for implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action* could also be expanded to include more detailed guidance on specific tools.

5.6 How the international community can further support HFA implementation

Given that an enabling international environment is vital to stimulate and develop the knowledge, capacities, and motivation needed to build disaster resilient communities and nations, how can the international community make the next five years of disaster risk reduction even more successful?

A need for the international community to promote a **more integrated approach**, at the country as well as global level, encompassing and connecting different actors, such as UN agencies, NGOs, and civil society networks, is another element that clearly emerged throughout the Mid-Term Review.

The Mid-Term Review highlighted a general agreement that the international community should support disaster risk reduction implementation in various thematic areas with a strong focus on working with governments to ensure more emphasis on **local level implementation of the HFA**. The areas discussed during the Review included: mapping local dimensions of hazards and vulnerabilities; supporting the establishment of effective two-way communication between local and national levels; linking disaster risk reduction to local livelihoods so that disaster risk reduction is recognized by policy makers as a priority; working with national governments to recognize the importance of creating methodology and building the capacity of local authorities, communities, and civil society; and strengthening participatory planning approaches.

There was agreement during the Mid-Term Review that funding should be more reliable, and thus existing **financial instruments** should be revised and funds possibly reallocated to avoid the pitfalls inherent in funding for an activity that has a very strong sustainable development focus with funding from humanitarian aid portfolios including ensuring that it be of a sustainable nature in the medium and longer-term. The type of support participants in several workshops discussed as required at the national level includes: funding support to ensure the long-term sustainability of disaster risk reduction interventions to allow practitioners to move away from separate disaster risk reduction programs and towards a more integrated and comprehensive approach to risk sensitive development; technical assistance in key thematic areas; and support for the development of tools and technologies, as well as more flexibility to allow small funding to directly reach communities and grassroots organizations.

There were several suggestions that **donors** should investigate avenues within their own institutions for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in their development funding, for example by including disaster risk reduction criteria in funding guidelines. Several experts voiced the need to make development investment more resilient to the impacts of natural hazards. In this connection it was mentioned that it was important to consider how to integrate disaster risk reduction into general investments, how to best use “innovative instruments” to fund action for disaster risk reduction, and how to work with the private sector and insurance companies. A growing number of donors are introducing specific policy guidance to link their disaster risk reduction efforts to poverty reduction and sustainable development programmes. Amongst them, the UK Department for International Development noted in 2004 the links between disaster risk reduction, poverty, and development in a scoping study that framed disaster risk reduction as a clear development issue; the government of Australia launched in 2009 *Investing in a Safer Future*, a policy that articulates Australia’s commitment to the HFA and recognises that disaster risk reduction is essential for achieving sustainable development, including the Millennium Development Goals; the European Union issued in 2009 the *Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries* to help support HFA implementation and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

A significant role identified for the international community, especially bilateral and multilateral aid organizations and NGOs, was **support of national level mechanisms** for the implementation of integrated and more flexible humanitarian, environmental, disaster risk reduction, and development programmes. In this connection, support for the development of technical tools to standardize risk assessment methodologies, and therefore allow comparison between different types of intervention, was consistently raised. In spite of the efforts of several international, regional, and national entities, data sharing, harmonization of data management systems, and inter-operability of various systems remain major challenges. There are few examples of integration of datasets held by different agencies of the government and the private sector. Some regions have begun to make progress in this area (e.g., in the Pacific, the Pacific Cities Project has brought together datasets on infrastructure, critical facilities, building locations and characteristics, seismic microzonation, topography, and bathymetry).¹¹⁹ The European Union is

in the process of developing guidelines for risk assessment to be completed in 2011 and there is a directive in place on flooding and flood risk management that is implemented in national legislation¹²⁰.

5.7 Thinking now about a post-2015 framework

Views on a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, irrespective of whether it would be of a legally binding nature or not, included the need to ensure solid and structural links with sustainable development and climate change international framework agreements. There was also recognition that the international momentum building around disaster risk reduction might make it possible to define targets for achievements, if not at the global level, at least at the regional level. Recalling the broad consultative nature that brought about the definition of the HFA, the Mid-Term Review saw a strong call for similar broad-based, early consultations to define any future course of action for a disaster risk reduction framework post-2015.

Should a post-2015 international instrument on disaster risk reduction be of a voluntary nature? Or is there sufficient interest and international momentum to build a campaign to advocate for, and successfully negotiate, a legally binding instrument? Should other options, such as the development of broad guiding principles, also be considered?

The Mid-Term Review recorded a range of opinions on this question. Those who came from a government background or had government affiliation were reluctant to envisage a legally binding framework. Academic and civil society representatives argued for a legal base as offering a chance to make progress in meeting the needs of under-served or most vulnerable people.

There was, however, a clear consensus that there should be a post-2015 instrument, one that offers approaches and incentives that would enable the scaling-up of disaster risk reduction efforts and would emphasize greater reach to local and community levels, as well as more specificity in relation to interventions in sectors of importance to human, social, and physical development. A new instrument would find new opportunities: the economic case for greater investment in disaster risk reduction is getting stronger, and scientific innovation and technological progress will open up better and more cost-effective means to tackle disaster risk. Yet some argued that considering that disaster risk reduction is primarily a development issue, far greater leverage is likely to be obtained by ensuring the **inclusion of disaster risk reduction as a mainstreamed element of** development plans, goals, and targets in the successor framework to the Millennium Development Goals, rather than going it alone as a “new HFA”. A more nuanced approach was that expressed by those who felt that it is probably desirable to maintain a strong focus on disaster risk reduction as a subset of new development goals so as to ensure that mainstreaming does not mean invisibility for disaster risk reduction and that targeted disaster risk reduction investments are catalyzed where that is the best way to reduce disaster risk.

The agreement currently under negotiation for climate change, which may emerge later in 2011 or 2012, includes an explicit reference to the HFA and as such, once agreed upon and ratified, might create an obligation for countries to implement the HFA provisions. It must be noted however, that by the time this process is concluded, the 2015 deadline would be very close indeed.

As noted in the Moderators' Reflection following the on-line debate on a possible post-2015 framework, a lesson learnt from other endeavours (e.g., human rights and international humanitarian law, refugee protection and guiding principles for assistance to internally displaced people and, conversely, the failure to negotiate climate change agreements so far) is that a consensus on underlying values and principles is vital to develop any agreement. Thus a global consensus on underlying principles and values for disaster risk reduction may be helpful to sustain meaningful cooperation over the longer term. There is unlikely to be universal agreement on them unless principles based on equity and justice are addressed in a way that all governments can accept.

It was also noted that it may be worthwhile to study what norms already exist at the international level that may apply to disaster risk reduction to produce a better understanding of the gaps an international instrument would need to address, as well as – equally important – producing a clearer understanding of what provisions and obligations may already be in place for governments vis-à-vis disaster risk reduction under other international agreements covering economic, social, and cultural matters.¹²¹

The HFA does not have targets, but appropriately set targets are necessary to ensure confidence and credibility, and to guide sensible investment decisions, it was argued. The tracking of targets is essential to accountability, learning, and motivating greater buy-in of stakeholders and obtaining their investment in a common disaster risk reduction enterprise.

The Hyogo Framework for Action was the product of an extensive consultation process that was initiated well ahead of the actual conference that adopted it. At least as inclusive an approach to the design of any future framework is necessary, and additional processes that allow more authentic expression of the voices of the poor and vulnerable would enrich the outcome and give it additional weight and legitimacy. The ISDR system and its secretariat were identified as the most feasible way to manage the process.

6

Conclusions and recommendations for the way forward

The Mid-Term Review highlighted the fact that the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action over the past five years has generated significant international and national political momentum and action around disaster risk reduction. The analysis presented in this report underscored areas where further work is necessary to ensure that the positive gains of the past five years can be consolidated and built upon to achieve the expected outcome of “substantial reduction of disaster losses, in the lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries”. Paying attention to areas in need of adjustments and accelerating the overall implementation of the HFA is now critical to ensure that the ambitious agenda set out in the Hyogo Framework for Action can come to full fruition by 2015.

This section summarizes information contained in section 5 above to lay out more incisively the consensus gathered throughout the Mid-Term Review on elements that would help accelerate the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. It also outlines the consultative process on the outcome of the Mid-Term Review in the lead-up to the 2011 Global Platform.

National and international institutions, including bilateral aid organizations and the United Nations, must integrate disaster risk reduction in their development, climate change adaptation, environmental and humanitarian planning, execution and accountability frameworks to safeguard development gains and investments.

Governance for the implementation of the HFA at the national and international level should be improved. The Mid-Term Review highlighted a need at the national level to develop and improve synergies to ensure coordinated and coherent action on disaster risk reduction across different sectors of government. There must be a senior over-arching authority at government level where responsibility, and with it accountability, can rest for setting policies, driving processes, and ensuring budget allocations for all the different aspects of disaster risk reduction. At the international level, there is a need to set up a broadly representative mechanism to ensure follow-through between meetings of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.

The effectiveness of National Platforms in informing and supporting the executive level of decision making should be assessed. Across countries, there are great variations in the composition and focus of National Platforms and in the participation of civil society and the private sector. The effective elements that constitute truly representative national and local level consultative mechanism for disaster risk reduction should be documented and made widely available.

International, national and local level accountability mechanisms should be encouraged and developed to help measure action taken and progress achieved in disaster risk reduction.

Mechanisms and levels of application for effective accountability in HFA implementation at the international (including regional), national, and local levels should be identified and their application strongly encouraged. Accountability measures that are defined and applied following a multi-stakeholder approach stand a greater chance of bringing about the action required to raise the level of priority for disaster risk reduction in the national agenda.

Setting targets will help in accelerating HFA implementation through 2015. Targets, at least for the next five years, can be nationally or regionally set, and self-monitored, but would be helpful nevertheless in focusing national and international agendas around common, measurable goals for disaster risk reduction.

Common tools and guidance should be further developed and translated in local languages. This needs to be done especially for risk assessments, for integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, for cost-benefit analysis, and for ensuring effective vertical synergies between national and local levels.

Standards to ensure quality in the delivery of the guidance could be developed at regional and national levels. The request for the collection of standards, where already available, or the development of standards for disaster risk reduction is consistent with a call for stronger accountability measures and in line with the application of targets for disaster risk reduction.

The international community should develop a more coherent and integrated approach to support HFA implementation. The development of a joint plan of action to support HFA implementation at the country and local levels connecting the work of different actors, such as UN agencies, donors, NGOs, and civil society networks, could help achieve a higher level of coherence and stronger impact of available resources.

The prevailing views on a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, irrespective of whether it would be of a legally binding nature or not, underscored the need to ensure solid and structural links with sustainable development and climate change international framework agreements and called for a broad consultative process, similar to the one that brought about the Hyogo Framework for Action in 2005.

It is hoped that this Mid-Term Review will generate a debate amongst and within governments on the most immediate and necessary actions to achieve the expected outcome of the Hyogo Framework for Action by 2015. In this connection, a series of regional-level discussions will take place before the 2011 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction to forge the awareness and consensus required to push this process further and allow the 2011 Global Platform to give clear guidance on the most urgent areas of focus for the next five years of HFA implementation.

ENDNOTES

¹ Resilience: “The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure. This is determined by the degree to which the social system is capable of organising itself to increase this capacity for learning from past disasters for better future protection and to improve risk reduction measures.” UNISDR. Geneva 2004.

² Informal plenary sessions were held on Tuesday 16 June 2009 co-chaired by Mr. Kasidis Rochanakorn, Director, OCHA Geneva; on Wednesday 17 June 2009 co-chaired by Mr. Michel Jarraud, Secretary General of World Meteorological Organization; and on Thursday 18 June 2009, co-chaired by Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery of UNDP. SRSG Wahlstrom co-chaired the three debates.

³ These evaluations can be found in UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/report/index.php?id=9413>, as well as in: UNISDR. 2011. *Global Assessment Report* (unpublished draft).

⁴ The Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review included: Ms. Fatma El Mallah, Dr. Marianne Fay, Dr. Marco Ferrari, Ms. Susanne Frueh, Mr. Ronald Jackson, Dr. Mukesh Kapila, Ms. Mette Lindahl-Olsson, Prof. Virginia Murray, Mr. Kenzo Oshima, Mr. Marcus Oxley, Dr. Yeon-Soo Park, Ms. Tumusiime Rhoda Peace, Ms. Jan Petersen, Ms. Lisa Staruszkiewicz, Dr. Benjamin Wisner, Mr. Ricardo Zapata-Marti. For further information on each Advisory Member please consult the bios annexed to this report.

⁵ The literature review was conducted by Mr. Kamal Kishore, a senior staff member in the UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery who has worked on disaster risk reduction issues for many years.

⁶ The Mid-Term Review workshops were held in the context of *1st Meeting of the ISDR Asia Partnership (IAP) 2010* in Bangkok, Thailand (24 March 2010); *The Hyogo Framework for Action: Progress review & reporting framework for the Arab States Region* in Cairo, Egypt (13 April 2010); *Biennial progress review cycle of the regional DRM Framework for Action (RFA) and the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)* in Suva, Fiji (13 April 2010); *II encuentro hemisférico mecanismos y redes para la reducción del riesgo* in Santa Marta, Colombia (14 April 2010); *Second ministerial conference on disaster risk reduction in Africa* in Nairobi, Kenya (15 April 2010); *One day workshop on the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) Mid-Term Review (MTR)* organised by SAARC Disaster Management Centre (SDMC) in New Delhi, India (10 June 2010); *European meeting on the mid-term review of the Hyogo Framework for Action* in Geneva, Switzerland (15 June 2010); *ASEAN+3 international conference on disaster management* in Tokyo, Japan (31 August 2010); and *North American Workshop on the Mid-Term Review* in Washington, D.C., USA (3 November 2010).

⁷ The full list of studies was made available on PreventionWeb.net with a public call to research institutions, governments, and think tanks to express interest in conducting them. The following six studies were completed and are annexed electronically to this report:

Carby, B. et al. 2011. *Caribbean Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. University of the West Indies, UNDP. (What added value HFA-like instruments brought to the reduction of disaster losses in the Caribbean countries; this study evolved from a suggestion by a member of the Mid-Term Review Advisory Group, Ronald Jackson, the Director General of the Office for Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management in Jamaica, obtained the financial support of the UNDP Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean, and was conducted by Dr. Barbara Carby at the Disaster Risk Reduction Center at the University of West Indies. The use, content, and influence of peer-to-peer communication conducted by Prof. Ilan Chibay, Prof. Anna Serra, and Prof. Joan David Tabara in a joint collaboration between the Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain, and Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden).

Chabay, I. et al. 2011. *Assessing the role of vertical and horizontal communication in disaster risk reduction learning and planning: The case of the Spanish Tous dam-break, 1982*. Barcelona: Integrated Risk Governance Project.

Gupta, S. and Leung, I. 2011. *Turning Good Practice into Institutional Mechanisms: Investing in grassroots women's leadership to scale up local implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Huairou Commission and Groots International. (The impact of social mobilization in generating risk reduction behavior, in particular the role of women as agents of change (conducted by the Huairou Commission with financial support from UNISDR).

Jackson, D. 2011. *Effective Financial Mechanisms at the national and local level for Disaster Risk Reduction. United Nations Capital Development Fund*. (The financial instruments helpful in increasing disaster risk reduction action at the national and community level (conducted by David Jackson through a collaborative agreement with the UN Capital Development Fund Country Office for Asia and the Pacific).

Murray, V. 2011. *Evidence for Disaster Risk Management –Information and knowledge needs for policy makers and field practitioners*. (How data/information relating to all risks, hazards, and disaster management is collected, held, and analyzed, in order to facilitate the use of high quality information by decision makers at all levels. Undertaken by Professor Virginia Murray of the Centre for Radiation, Chemicals and Environmental Hazards at the London Health Protection Agency, with advice from colleagues in UNISDR Science and Technical Committee Sub Committee on Data Collection, and Health Protection Agency staffers Dr Ishani Kar-Purkayastha, Dr Delphine Grynspan; Jonathan Abrahams of Health Action in Crises, World Health Organization, and Dr Altaf Musani, World Health Organization Mediterranean Center for Health Risk Reduction).

Von Oerleisch, E. 2011. In-depth study on the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. (The contribution of the UN system to HFA implementation. Conducted by Eva von Oerleisch, independent consultant, commissioned by UNISDR).

⁸ PreventionWeb. 2011. Online Debates. Available at: <http://groups.preventionweb.net/scripts/wa-PREVENTIONWEB.exe?A0=MTR-HFA-L&pid:221&pif:3> The debates were widely advertised amongst the disaster risk reduction community on PreventionWeb.net, which averaged 55,000 monthly users in 2010 and through the contact lists of each of the UNISDR regional and sub-regional offices, as well as specific disaster reduction networks such as the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction and the Geneva-based Support Group, which includes all Permanent Missions to the United Nations.

⁹ Much of the existing operational research related to emergencies and disasters lacks consistency, is of poor reliability and validity, and is of limited use for establishing baselines, defining standards, making comparisons, or tracking trends. (Murray, V. 2011. *Evidence for Disaster Risk Management – Information and knowledge needs for policy makers and field practitioners*, p. 2)

¹⁰ UNISDR. 2011. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction* (unpublished draft).

¹¹ Kishore, K. 2010 *Literature Review: Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva: United Nations. (See electronic annex).

¹² Bangkok and Suva workshops: Disaster risk management is not yet reflected in all National Development Strategies. Workshop participants also noted that to make development investment more resilient to the impact of natural hazards donors should recognize the absence of disaster risk reduction in socio-economic development.

¹³ European workshop: The difference in domestic and international approaches to disaster risk reduction amongst donor countries is explained by the fact that disaster risk reduction is handled, domestically and internationally, by different parts of government which do not traditionally interface with each other from a substantive point of view (namely, humanitarian and development aid).

¹⁴ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/report/index.php?id=9413>. UNISDR. 2011. *Global Assessment Report* (unpublished draft).

¹⁵ Data from the Hyogo Framework for Action Monitor reports for the 2009-2011 period included in this report refer to information provided by governments as of January 2011.

¹⁶ UNISDR internal analysis based on statistics about Key National Documents published on PreventionWeb.

¹⁷ Kishore, K. 2010 *Literature Review: Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva, based on a number of unpublished reports from countries that have enacted disaster risk reduction legislation in recent years and UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

¹⁸ See comment made by Janet Edwards (Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency, Risk and Vulnerability Reduction Department Natural Hazards and Critical Infrastructure Section) in Online Debate 4.

¹⁹ A national platform is defined as “a multi-stakeholder national mechanism that serves as an advocate of disaster risk reduction at different levels. It provides coordination, analysis and advice on areas of priority requiring concerted action. But for a National Platform for disaster risk reduction to succeed, it should be based on a number of major principles, the cardinal one being national ownership and leadership of the disaster risk reduction process.” (UNISDR. *National platforms for DRR*. Available at: http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/National_platforms#What_is_a_national_platform.3F).

²⁰ HFA focal point is defined as “person officially designated by the State as the primary contact for the implementation of the HFA” (UNISDR. *Hyogo Framework for Action*. Available at: [http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/Hyogo_Framework_for_Action_\(HFA\)](http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/Hyogo_Framework_for_Action_(HFA)))

²¹ There are 40 “countries” that have not yet designated an HFA Focal Point. The HFA Focal Points are listed according to the ISO 3166 list of “countries”, which actually includes geographically separate territories that are legally portions or dependencies of other countries. Thus the total number of “countries” against which the HFA Focal Points are listed is higher than the number of the United Nations member states. The 40 that have not designated an HFA Focal Point include Belarus, Belgium, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Estonia, Ireland, Israel, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Netherlands, and Turkmenistan.

²² *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction: Report of the Secretary-General*. A/64/280; UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

²³ UNISDR *Global Assessment Report 2011* (unpublished draft).

²⁴ Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

²⁵ Mercer, J. et al. 2009. “Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction”, *Disasters*. Vol. 34 (1): pp. 214-39.

²⁶ Examples include regional level assessments of varying scope and technical rigour in Central America, South Asia, Southeastern Europe, and Central Asia, as well as numerous national level risk assessments supported by initiatives such as the Central American Probabilistic Risk Assessment (CAPRA) and the Global Risk Identification Programme (GRIP).

²⁷ Examples include city-level, multi-hazard risk assessments commissioned by the cities of Amman and Aqaba in Jordan and Delhi in India.

²⁸ A/C.2/61/CRP.1 Global Survey of Early Warning Systems (September 2006).

²⁹ Kishore, K. 2010 *Literature Review: Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva,

³⁰ A/64/280 Report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on the Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction. 2009

³¹ Kishore 2010, quoting the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

³² Christian Aid's work on "Community-led policy monitoring for disaster risk reduction" is one of the few examples in the literature that presents guidance to help civil society organisations and communities to better monitor, influence, and secure commitment to the HFA.

³³ This point emerged during the Arab States workshop held in Cairo.

³⁴ Christian Aid. 2007. *Community-led Policy Monitoring for Disaster Risk Reduction: A Collection of Practice Notes*.

³⁵ Interview with Tomoya Nagai, Director for Disaster Preparedness, Public Relations and International Cooperation Cabinet Office of Japan.

³⁶ Plan International, World Vision International. 2009. *Children on the Frontline: Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction*. Page 18.

³⁷ Tran, H. P. for UNISDR. 2009. *Regional Analysis on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Education in the Asia Pacific Region: In the Context of Priority of Action 3 of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Page 25.

³⁸ A collaborative multi-country effort led by Kyoto University in partnership with University of Madras (India), Institute of Technology Bandung (Indonesia), and University of Peradeniya (Sri Lanka) is one of the few examples in the literature where a systematic effort has been made to identify the education needs of a variety of target groups, including school teachers, local government planners, NGOs, and community leaders.

³⁹ Gupta, S. and Leung, I. 2011. *Turning Good Practice into Institutional Mechanisms: Investing in grassroots women's leadership to scale up local implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Huairou Commission and Groots International.

⁴⁰ Carby, B. et al. 2011. *Caribbean Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. University of the West Indies, UNDP (see electronic annex). This point was also mentioned by Ronald Jackson during a presentation at the Mid-Term Review Advisory Group meeting in January 2011.

⁴¹ This suggestion was made by several participants at the North America Workshop held in Washington.

⁴² One-on-one interview on 9 February 2011 with Dr. Olusegun E. Ojo, Chief Executive Officer African Centre for Environmental Development and Information, Nigeria

⁴³ Council of Europe, German Committee for Disaster Reduction, UNISDR. 2009. *Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action in Europe: Advances and Challenges*.

⁴⁴ Based on "Key Progress Made on the Hyogo Framework for Action –Focusing on HFA Priority 3", presentation by Jerry Velasquez, Senior Regional Coordinator for UNISDR Asia and Pacific. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/4/43683917.pdf>.

⁴⁵ Tran, H. P. 2009. *Regional Analysis on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Education in the Asia Pacific Region: In the Context of Priority of Action 3 of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Bangkok: UNISDR.

⁴⁶ International Institute for Sustainable Development. 2009. "ARC Briefing Note on the Second Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Consultative Meeting". *IISD Reporting Services*. Volume 19 (1).

⁴⁷ At the European workshop held in Geneva it was mentioned that in Turkey awareness rising campaigns of insurance companies have led to an increase of insured people from 20 to 40%.

⁴⁸ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. A/64/280 *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction*. Report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly, 2009.

⁴⁹ UNISDR 2011. *Global Assessment Report* (unpublished draft), Chapter 4.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

⁵² UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Page 131.

⁵³ Plan International, World Vision International. 2009. *Children on the Frontline: Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction*.

⁵⁴ Weather Risk Management Association. "Weather Risk and Agriculture", http://www.wrma.org/risk_agriculture.html. Accessed 24/11/2010.

⁵⁵ Cummins, J. D. Mahul, O. for The World Bank. 2008. *Catastrophe Risk Financing in Developing Countries Principles for Public Intervention*. Washington: The World Bank.

⁵⁶ Oxfam International. 2010. *Response to the UN ISDR Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. London: Oxfam.

⁵⁷ For example, Oxfam Great Britain and Oxfam Hong Kong.

⁵⁸ A/64/280 *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction* Report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly, 2009.

⁵⁹ Based on various regional reports and Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

⁶⁰ Interview with Mr. Kenzo Oshima, Senior Vice President, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Tokyo, 2 September 2010.

⁶¹ UNISDR. 2010. *Early Warning Practices Can Save Lives: Selected Examples*. Bonn: United Nations.

⁶² For a detailed list of initiatives at regional level please see the 2009 Global Assessment Report and the Secretary-General Report to the General Assembly on the Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction A/64/280.

⁶³ An example in this connection is the fact that all the 168 governments and many international and regional organizations that negotiated the HFA agreed to avoid using the term "natural" disasters, thereby showing an increased level of awareness of the need to focus on the reduction of social vulnerabilities as the main cause of disasters.

⁶⁴ The Inter-Agency Task force was established through two resolutions by the UN General Assembly in 1999 and 2001 to implement the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. It was to serve as the main forum within the UN for devising strategies and policies for the reduction of natural hazards; identifying gaps in disaster reduction policies and programmes, and recommending remedial action; providing policy guidance to the ISDR secretariat; and convening *ad hoc* meetings of experts on issues related to disaster reduction.

⁶⁵ UNISDR (2008), *International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Scientific and Technical Committee, Report of the First Meeting, Paris, 31 January - 1 February 2008*. UNISDR, Geneva, 14pp.

⁶⁶ UNISDR "Reducing Disaster Risks through Science: Issues and Actions, The full report of the ISDR Scientific and Technical Committee 2009".

⁶⁷ Von Oerleisch, E. 2011. In-depth study on the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (see electronic annex).

⁶⁸ General Assembly Resolution adopted in 2006: A/RES/60/195.

⁶⁹ Letter to the Secretary-General from the Chairman of the ACABQ of 25 June 2008.

⁷⁰ General Assembly Resolution A/65/157.

⁷¹ United Nations Development Group. 2009: *Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction into the CCA and UNDAF: A Guide for UN Country Teams*

⁷² Developed by UNISDR, World Bank, and Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) under the umbrella of the Thematic Platform on Knowledge and Education.

⁷³ Developed by UNISDR Partnership on Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), led by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

⁷⁴ Developed by the Pan American Health Organization's Disaster Mitigation Advisory Group (DiMAG) with input from specialists in Latin America and the Caribbean.

⁷⁵ Developed by the International Recovery Platform (2010-2011).

⁷⁶ UNISDR, UNDP and IUCN. 2009. *Making Disaster Risk Reduction Gender-Sensitive: Policy and Practical Guidelines*. Geneva: United Nations.

⁷⁷ A draft report was made available to UNISDR for consultation. The final JICA report was not available at the time of printing and will be added to the annexes of this report on PreventionWeb.net.

⁷⁸ As part of the effort conducted in the Mid-Term Review to study the UN role in disaster risk reduction, the SRSG for Disaster Risk Reduction approached 19 organizations, at the Head of Agency level, asking them to carry out an internal review to ascertain to what extent relevant staff were aware of the expectations placed on the organization in the context of the HFA and what internal systems and mechanisms were in place, if any, to ensure that these expectations were actually translated into appropriate policy directives, programming, and funding requirements, as well as monitoring and evaluation of activities. About half of the organizations approached responded, showing that organizational strategies and guidance on disaster risk reduction exist within many UN entities, and many have dedicated units or focal points. Some agencies, including ILO, UNDP, UNICEF, World Bank, and WFP, have prioritized disaster risk reduction mainstreaming, but, in general, UN entities have a low-key approach to the HFA, using it as reference rather than guide.

⁷⁹ Hyogo Framework for Action Red Cross Red Crescent Mid-Term Review October 2010. (See electronic annex).

⁸⁰ The Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action, *An Internal Analysis of Key Findings Submitted to the UNISDR by World Vision International*. Melisa Bodenhamer, Senior Advisor, Disaster Risk Reduction and Community Resilience.

⁸¹ OECD. 50 years of official development assistance. Available at: http://www.oecd.org/document/41/0,3746,en_2649_34447_46195625_1_1_1_1,00.html.

⁸² Oxfam International. 2010. *Response to the UN ISDR Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. London: Oxfam. (See electronic annex)

⁸³ The issue of internal coordination was raised in the North America and European workshops (amongst others), where the difficulty in enabling horizontal collaboration across multiple jurisdictions and sectors was noted.

⁸⁴ Kishore, K. 2010 *Literature Review: Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva: United Nations. (See electronic annex).

⁸⁵ Murray, V. 2011. *Evidence for Disaster Risk Management –Information and knowledge needs for policy makers and field practitioners*.

⁸⁶ Kishore, K. 2010 *Literature Review: Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva: United Nations. (See electronic annex).

⁸⁷ Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. pp. iv-v.

⁸⁸ Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

⁸⁹ Roberts, D. 2008. "Thinking globally, acting locally — institutionalizing climate change at the local government level in Durban, South Africa", *Environment and Urbanization*. Vol. 20 (2): pp. 521-537.

⁹⁰ At the European Workshop held in Geneva it was noted that in Switzerland laws for flood protection and prevention have existed for 106 years, and hail insurance for farmers is more than 100 years old.

⁹¹ At the African Workshop held in Nairobi many countries noted that national disaster risk reduction policies, which address horizontal and vertical coordination of disaster risk reduction, are in the process of being endorsed. For this, countries argued, funds at local sub-national level are required. It was also noted that for local HFA implementation, partnerships with local NGOs are important.

At the Pacific Islands workshop held in Suva the importance of having a focal point to ensure local and community participation was emphasised.

⁹² This point was forcefully brought about during the official launch of the Making Cities Resilient campaign in New Delhi, attended by over 50 mayors from the SAARC region.

⁹³ Jackson, D. 2011. Effective Financial Mechanisms at the national and local level for Disaster Risk Reduction. United Nations Capital Development Fund. (Annexed electronically to this report).

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Gupta, S. and Leung, I. 2011. Turning Good Practice into Institutional Mechanisms: Investing in grassroots women's leadership to scale up local implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. Huairou Commission and Groots International. (See electronic annex).

⁹⁶ Serra, A. and Ilan Chibay 2011. *Assessing the role of vertical and horizontal communication in disaster risk reduction learning and planning: The case of the Spanish Tous dam-break, 1982*. Barcelona: Integrated Risk Governance Project. (See electronic annex).

⁹⁷ IFRC. *Hyogo Framework for Action, Red Cross Red Crescent Mid Term Review*, October 2010.

⁹⁸ Chabay, I. et al. 2011. *Assessing the role of vertical and horizontal communication in disaster risk reduction learning and planning: The case of the Spanish Tous dam-break, 1982*. Barcelona: Integrated Risk Governance Project. (See electronic annex).

⁹⁹ Marco Ferrari, during the Advisory Group meeting of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action, Geneva, 11 and 12 January 2011.

¹⁰⁰ The World Bank developed a common framework for understanding a wide range of risks and integrating this understanding into development policy and planning in its World Bank Development Report 2000-2001.

¹⁰¹ Srinivasan G, Lehtonen T, Munive A, Subbiah A, Reis A, Kontro M & Niskanen L 2009 *Evaluation of Natural Disasters and Climate Change in Finnish Aid from the Perspective of Poverty Reduction*. Evaluation report 2009:8. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki.

¹⁰² UNISDR. 2011. Strengthening climate change adaptation through effective disaster risk reduction, *Briefing Note 03*

¹⁰³ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

¹⁰⁴ Examples include World Bank supported risk assessment in Madagascar and UNDP supported

assessments in Armenia, Ecuador, Indonesia and Mozambique.

¹⁰⁵ One such example is from Nepal, where localization of HFA has largely led to bio-engineering/ small scale mitigation projects. Based on Gautam, D. R. Khanal, S. 2009. *Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction: Contribution to Hyogo Framework of Action – Case Study*. Lalitpur: Mercy Corps Nepal.

¹⁰⁶ UNISDR. 2011. Strengthening climate change adaptation through effective disaster risk reduction, *Briefing Note 03*

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Incheon Declaration on Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and the Pacific*. Incheon, Republic of Korea, 25-28 October.

¹⁰⁹ Srinivasan G, Lehtonen T, Munive A, Subbiah A, Reis A, Kontro M & Niskanen L 2009 *Evaluation of Natural Disasters and Climate Change in Finnish Aid from the Perspective of Poverty Reduction*. Evaluation report 2009:8. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki.

¹¹⁰ Gebrekiros, A. et al. 2009. *Baseline Report: Africa Community Resilience Project*. Medford: Feinstein International Center.

¹¹¹ Sanahuja, H. E. for IFRC & UNISDR. 2010. *National Platforms for Disaster Risk reduction in the Americas: A critical analysis of these processes five years after the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Unpublished. UNISDR. 2007 *Guidelines: National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction*.

¹¹² In 2004 the White Paper stressed the importance of results-based disaster risk management and proposed the development of clear disaster risk reduction targets against major earthquakes that were predicted to hit the country in the near future. Responding to this, the Government developed a series of disaster risk reduction strategies against earthquakes, with numerical targets and related programmes.

¹¹³ Scott, Z. & Tarazona, M. 2011. *Decentralization and Disaster Risk Reduction*, UNISDR Geneva, Switzerland.

¹¹⁴ *The Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2020*. The Strategy was developed by the League of Arab States through its Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment (CAMRE) and endorsed by the 2nd Arab Summit of Heads of State for Socio Economic Development, held in Egypt in January 2011.

¹¹⁵ See also B. Wisner, J.C. Gaillard, and I. Kelman *Handbook of Hazards and Disaster Risk Reduction* Chapter 3 Framing Disaster: Theories and Stories Seeking to Understand Hazards, Vulnerability and Risk. London: Routledge (publication expected July 2011).

¹¹⁶ The Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review advocated in its 11 and 12 January 2011 meeting analyses of disasters to unpack in details the contributing elements of a disaster.

¹¹⁷ The World Bank: 2010 Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

¹¹⁸ The International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) provide an interesting example of the development of standards in a complex technical field through a multi stakeholder process. IMAS were endorsed by the Inter-Agency Coordination Group on Mine Action in 2001 and since then have been regularly expanded and updated. IMAS are translated in local languages and cover very different fields ranging, by way of example, from mine awareness education, mine action technology, establishment of a mine action programme, mine action assessments and surveys. The SPHERE Standards are also an interesting example: launched in 1997 by a group of humanitarian NGOs and the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, The Sphere Project is an initiative to define and uphold the standards by which the global community responds to the plight of people affected by disasters, principally through a set of guidelines that are set out in the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response (commonly referred to as the Sphere Handbook).

¹¹⁹ SOPAC Secretariat. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015*. Suva: SOPAC. Page 26.

¹²⁰ Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks.

¹²¹ An initial analysis in this connection can be found in B. Wisner, J.C. Gaillard and I. Kelman eds. *Handbook of Hazards and Disaster Risk Reduction* Chapter 6 Human Rights and Disasters by Jean Connolly Carmalt & Claudine Haenni Dale London: Routledge (publication expected July 2011).

SCOPE OF WORK AND MODALITIES FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HYOGO FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION 2005-2015

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The World Conference on Disaster Reduction¹ was held by decision of the United National General Assembly², in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan on 18-22 January 2005. It adopted the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015* (HFA) that was then endorsed by member states in the UN General Assembly³ as the systematic, strategic blueprint to guide national and international efforts to reduce vulnerabilities and risks induced by naturally occurring hazards and human made processes.

1.2 The Hyogo Framework states that its implementation “will be appropriately reviewed”⁴ and requests the ISDR to “prepare periodic reviews on progress towards achieving [its] objectives and priorities....and provide reports and summaries to the [General] Assembly and other United Nations bodies...based on information from national platforms, regional and international organisations and other stakeholders...”⁵. Anticipating the approaching mid-point of the HFA, the UN Secretary General indicated⁶ to the General Assembly in 2008 that the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in June 2009 would initiate the mid-term review (MTR) of HFA expected by 2010; this was welcomed by the General Assembly⁷.

1.3 The second session of the Global Platform held in Geneva on 16-19 June 2009 discussed the scope and modalities for the mid-term review and concluded that it should “address strategic and fundamental matters concerning its implementation to 2015 and beyond”⁸. This scope of work and modalities are drafted accordingly.

2. APPROACH TO THE MTR

2.1 The original structure⁹ of HFA is the logical, expected basis for its review. The HFA specifies an overarching expected outcome for delivery through the progression of three strategic goals, realised through five priorities for action. The associated implementation

¹ Official report of the WCDR. UN document A/CONF 206/6, 15 March 2005

² UNGA Resolution 58/214 of 23 December 2003

³ UNGA Resolution 60/1952 of 2 March 2006

⁴ Para 29 of HFA

⁵ Para 33(g) of HFA

⁶ UNGA A/63/351. Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. Report of the Secretary General, 10 September 2008 (para 17)

⁷ UNGA A/RES/63/216. Resolution on International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 25 February 2009 (para 16)

⁸ Outcome Document: Chair's Summary of the Second Session Global Platform for Disaster Risk reduction, 16-19 June 2009 (para 20).

⁹ Summary of the HFA 2005-2015. *ISDR, 2005*

and follow-up framework sets out a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach with recommended actions by key actors (states, regional institutions, international organisations, and ISDR partners and secretariat, with civil society included) who are asked to give due consideration to stated cross cutting issues and critical tasks. There is additional explicit emphasis on resource mobilisation.

2.2 During the initial period of HFA implementation, there have been other developments of relevance that the MTR will consider. These include the growing interest in integrating disaster risk reduction into areas such as climate change, sustainable development¹⁰ and, as disasters are perceived to have increased in magnitude, humanitarian action. There is greater concern on the particular vulnerabilities of the least developed countries and small island states. Other global commitments on the same timescale to 2015 such as the *Millennium Development Goals*, *International Water Decade*, and *Education for All* are recognising the importance of disaster risk reduction in the achievement of their own set targets.

2.3 The HFA is founded on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement that has been widened by the inclusion of other groups. Accordingly, the suggested modalities for conducting the MTR seek to maximise participation by all HFA “key actors”. Thus the MTR will be **driven by HFA stakeholders themselves** i.e. governments (national and local authorities), civil society and NGOs working at country level, and national, regional, and international institutions that support them within the ISDR system framework.

2.4 An independent review will be commissioned to provide an overview and ‘outsider’ view of the HFA progress. The Review will be guided by the HFA mid term review advisory board.

3. SCOPE OF THE MTR

3.1 The overall **objective** of the MTR is to assess the extent to which the HFA has been progressed so far and to help countries and their institutional partners at all levels identify practical measures to boost commitment, resourcing, and effort in its further implementation, recognising the evolving global context for disaster risk reduction.

3.2 The MTR is conceptualised in two parts: first, a retrospective examination of the period 2005-2010, and second, a prospective scan of 2010-2015 and, to some extent, the horizon beyond. The following **strategic questions define the scope of the MTR**:

- i. What is the overall progress on HFA implementation and what are the prospects, on prevailing trend, for achieving the desired outcome of a “substantial reduction in losses”?
- ii. What have countries done to progress HFA and what do national authorities and other stakeholders consider as their big achievements, major constraints, and main lessons learnt?
- iii. What have been the promoters and barriers to investment in disaster risk reduction and how can funding be placed on a more predictable and sustained footing?

¹⁰ The 11th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (2003) adopted the themes of disaster management and vulnerability, to be reviewed in its fifth cycle (2014-15) in the CSD’s multi-year programme of work.

- iv. What adjusting or strengthening is needed of the international architecture including the roles of ISDR institutional partners, to help accelerate HFA implementation?
- v. What adjustment of directions and priorities are needed to take up new opportunities for disaster risk reduction in relation to climate change and any other emerging issues?
- vi. What types of key deliverables would make the biggest impact during the remaining period of HFA, and what key policy and strategic orientations should be taken up as we move towards and beyond 2015?

3.3 In tackling these strategic questions, a core set of cross-cutting topics will focus the MTR: These are as follows:

a) **The risk reduction landscape.** This guides the HFA, the ISDR system and the Global Platform, a rapidly growing constellation of international, regional and thematic institutions and mechanisms, and most importantly the numerous initiatives of governments and national organizations. Recognition in the UN General Assembly and in other intergovernmental organizations is growing and so are the resources for investment in disaster risk reduction. A monitoring and reporting system is now in place. Is this landscape sufficient to the task? Are the roles of the major parties clear and being met? What gaps and shortcomings are there? Can these be dealt with within the existing capacities and mechanisms, or are major changes required?

b) **Setting targets.** The HFA was agreed in 2005 on the basis of qualitative, and not quantitative, reductions of disaster risk. But as the HFA implementation proceeds, there is a growing need for quantitative targets, both for achievement in risk-related factors (outputs) and for investment in disaster risk reduction (inputs). This was emphasized at the 2009 session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. What is the state of play on quantifying the different aspects of risk and risk reduction action? Are the numbers available for policy formation? Are they good enough for public investment analysis? What mechanisms and tools need to be developed and put in place to quantify demands, needs, expenditure, progress, etc?

c) **Vertical synergies.** The primary responsibility for implementing the HFA lies with Governments, but many other levels of action are underway at international, regional, national, sub-national, and community levels, but reports indicate that they are not systematically vertically integrated, resulting in poor impact on the populations at risk. Community involvement in risk reduction and resilience building is fundamental, as is sectoral ownership and leadership. What institutional arrangements are needed to define, interlink and resource the necessary responsible action at all levels? What specific actions need to be taken by governments and the main international and regional bodies to stimulate and support this objective?

d) **Root causes of risk.** Progress to date on addressing HFA Priority 4, concerning the root causes of disaster risk such as unplanned settlements, environmental degradation, and lack of rural livelihoods, are reported to be very limited. These are difficult areas that involve powerful forces of development and enterprise on the one hand and the capacities of Governments to lead the political processes to control the externalities involved. Is the significance of this area significantly recognized? Will it be the prime obstacle to achieving the HFA outcome? What needs to be done to substantially increase action on root causes of risk? What are the economic factors and arguments involved?

e) **Climate Change.** Climate change is a key area of public and government

according to a standardised checklist of questions and to produce their MTR reports according to a standardised format

- Issuing a general invitation to national, regional, and international organisations (including UN agencies, International Financial Institutions, Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, NGOs, academic bodies, and other civil society groups, to submit their own reflections on progress according to a standardised format.
- Commissioning special sub-studies on key topics eg on financing, and on the interface with climate change.
- Contributions from ISDR stakeholder organisations on specific topics related to the MTR are welcomed.
- Conducting special consultations with key stakeholder groups eg. donor governments in relation to financing strategies; or, among countries sharing common exposure to certain hazards; civil society and community perspectives; research bodies; financial and private sector.
- Utilising modern social communications technology to hold global e-conferencing forums on selected topics. The intention here is to inform and learn, and to popularise and establish a supportive public climate which ultimately impacts on government policies.

4.3 An **Mid Term Review Advisory Board** with members selected in their personal capacity as well as independent experts will provide guidance and professional oversight. The **UNISDR secretariat** will use its normal structure and systems, strengthened with a full time project coordinator to support the Advisory Board and to facilitate the MTR process through coordinating the review efforts of stakeholders and providing a harmonised framework of guidance and standards to enable valid comparisons, analyses, and syntheses to be made in a timely manner. A shared electronic workspace will be made available through the ISDR and Prevention websites where all documentation, reports and studies will be posted as available.

Conceptual Framework for the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action

Background

The World Conference on Disaster Reduction was held by decision of the United Nations General Assembly in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan on 18-22 January 2005¹. It adopted the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015* (HFA) as a systematic, strategic blueprint to guide national and international efforts to reduce vulnerabilities and risks induced by naturally occurring hazards and human-made processes. The Hyogo Framework states that its implementation “will be appropriately reviewed” and requests the UNISDR to “prepare periodic reviews on progress towards achieving [its] objectives and priorities....and provide reports and summaries to the [General] Assembly and other United Nations bodies...based on information from national platforms, regional and international organisations and other stakeholders...”. Anticipating the approaching mid-point of the HFA, the UN Secretary General indicated to the General Assembly in 2008 that the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in June 2009 would initiate the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the HFA expected by 2010; this was welcomed by the General Assembly. The second session of the Global Platform held in Geneva on 16-19 June 2009 discussed the scope and modalities for the Mid-Term Review and concluded that it should “address strategic and fundamental matters concerning its implementation to 2015 and beyond”.

This document briefly describes the questions that the Mid-Term Review will seek to answer, the methodological tools that will be used to seek answers to these questions and the timeline within which this process is expected to be completed.

Objective

The Mid-Term Review’s main objective is to provide a critical analysis of HFA implementation over the first five years of its existence with a view to inform its continued implementation through 2015 and to provide initial thinking about any future international framework on disaster risk reduction that would follow it beyond 2015.

Methodology

The Review will be coordinated by the UNISDR secretariat which will be responsible for seeking inputs from relevant stakeholders, including through the use of on-line resources; the contracting of consultants; the compilation and analysis of the information received and the publication of a comprehensive Mid-Term Review Report by early 2011.

A set of broad strategic questions, with relevant sub-questions, has been formulated with a view to provide information about the extent to which the HFA has progressed so far: what elements have been of obstacle and what of success to its implementation, how can countries and communities further their commitments and action to ensure “substantial reduction of losses” in the evolving global context for disaster risk reduction, and what elements emerge at this stage as relevant to ensure continued focus and action at the international and national level in DRR beyond 2015.

In order to ensure that the qualitative process used for this Review is as thorough and reliable as possible, different analytical tools will be employed. This will ensure a broad outreach of stakeholders involved, allow for cross-validation of the findings as the Review progresses and, equally important, eventually contribute to a higher buy-in of the Review findings by all stakeholders involved.

¹ General Assembly Resolution 58/214

The Review will therefore be informed by:

- a) Review of existing reports and studies
- b) Outcomes of structured workshops held at regional and national level
- c) In-depth studies
- d) One-on-one interviews with key informants
- e) On-line debates

a) Review of existing reports and studies

A desk review will be conducted by a dedicated consultant with a view to generate a stand-alone study which will serve as a baseline of the disaster risk reduction landscape at the time of the HFA adoption. In conducting the desk review, special attention will be paid to the following documents: national and regional HFA progress reports from 2007 and 2009; UNISDR reviews and evaluations; the 2009 Global Assessment Report; national and regional Millennium Development Goals report; Global Platform outcomes from 2007 and 2009; thematic reports, including on cross-cutting issues; reports at community, national and regional levels. The desk review will also provide useful information about global trends and issues that have emerged in the course of the past five years. In addition, special attention will be paid to existing reports and studies at the national and community levels which could provide focused insight on specific thematic issues. UNISDR Regional Offices will contribute to identifying such studies.

Action by: *UNISDR secretariat, independent consultant for the stand-alone Literature Review*

When: *Study to be commissioned by February 2010 and completed by April 2010;*

Review of local thematic studies on-going between February 2010 and December 2010

b) Outcomes of structured regional and national workshops (including thematic workshops)

Structured workshops will be held at regional and, where feasible, national level, to focus on the key questions identified for the Review with a view to obtain strategic input from senior key players. The planning and organization of these workshops will be facilitated by the Senior Review Coordinator or by the UNISDR Regional Offices. National meetings will be facilitated by national stakeholders on the basis of structured guideline provided by UNISDR. A thematic workshop may also be organized in conjunction with regional workshops to focus on a specific thematic issue of relevance to the region.

Action by: *UNISDR secretariat, UNISDR Regional Offices, Regional and National Platform*

When: *February 2010 through August 2010*

c) In-depth studies

Topics for specific thematic studies, of a limited number, will be identified by UNISDR and independent consultants, member states, as well as national institutions will be invited to undertake these studies with an aim to obtain a more analytical and in-depth view on specific issues of central importance to HFA progress. A list of topics for these studies will be available in early February 2010.

Action by: *UNISDR secretariat, independent consultants, member states and think tanks*

When: *Studies to be conducted between April and December 2010*

d) One-on-one interviews

Key individuals will be approached by UNISDR for one-on-one interviews with a view to obtain specific historical perspective as well as insights on the future implementation of the HFA through 2015 and beyond. These interviews will take place according to a structured set of questions, common to the whole Review.

Action by: *UNISDR secretariat*

When: *April 2010 through August 2010*

e) On-line debates

A few on-line debates will be organized by UNISDR against the same set of key questions common to the whole Review, and moderated by a senior official to reach as wide an audience as possible and capture insights that may have been otherwise missed through the other methodologies above.

Action by: *UNISDR Secretariat and senior official to be identified*

When: *May 2010 through July 2010*

Timeline Focus of the Review

The methodological tools above will focus on two inter-connected time phases. A key set of questions are identified for each phase. It should be noted that these questions are closely inter-connected and that the investigation on one will inform the other.

- | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2005 - 2010 | This phase will have a retrospective focus and will seek to identify areas of success and potential for improvement at the thematic and geographic level. |
| 2010 – 2015 | This phase will have a prospective focus and will seek to ensure that new developments in the disaster risk reduction scene since the adoption of the HFA can be appropriately featured in the next five year cycle of the HFA implementation. It will also include a strategic long-term focus that will seek to identify key issues that the disaster risk reduction community may wish to keep in mind while beginning to plan future multilateral instruments for disaster risk reduction. |

Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review

An Advisory Group for the Mid-Term Review has been appointed by the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Disaster Risk Reduction to provide advice that will enhance the relevance, quality and utility of the outcome of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action. It is expected that the Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review for the Hyogo Framework for Action will provide technical and strategic guidance to the Review process and will contribute to its outreach, buy-in and follow-up.

Timeline for the Review Implementation

The core substantive informative work of the Review will be conducted between January and August 2010 in order to report meaningfully about its main findings in the next Secretary-General's Report to the General Assembly on the Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction which will be due in early August 2010. A comprehensive publication on the Mid-term Review will be published as a stand-alone document at the conclusion of the MTR, most likely in early 2011.

This timeline will allow the disaster risk reduction community to participate with an influential voice in the debate on the Review of the Millennium Development Goals that will take place in the autumn of 2010 and will provide a unique opportunity to work towards further mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development work.

Key Questions and Sub-questions with Timeline Focus

2005-2010 Focus

HFA Expected Outcome

Key Question 1

In your experience has the HFA been instrumental over the past five years in reducing disaster losses in communities and countries in country X/region Y?

Rationale: *Disaster risk continues to increase due to, amongst others, inappropriate socio-economic development practices and inadequate investments in disaster risk reduction. This question aims at exploring whether there is a perception that the HFA has been instrumental in achieving its intended outcome, and to what degree factors outside the realm of the HFA, such as development policies, national priorities and multilateral assistance, amongst others, can derail, delay or prevent HFA implementation.*

Target: *This question will be explored with senior experts and politicians involved in DRR implementation through one-on-one interviews, as well as with multi-stakeholders through regional and, when feasible, national workshops.*

Sub-questions

- 1.1 What are the three most important achievements that contributed to reducing disaster losses through the HFA implementation in country X/region Y?
- 1.2 What are the three most important elements that prevented the HFA from achieving its intended outcome i.e. the reduction of disaster losses?

HFA Strategic Goals

Key Question 2

How has the HFA informed decision making or priority setting in country X/region Y?

Rationale: *The HFA provides a clear set of critical tasks that should be performed at the national and regional level to ensure its implementation and follow-up. This question aims at exploring to what extent HFA prescribed tasks and the information they generate are kept into consideration by policy and decision makers at the national level, and to a broader degree, at the regional level. Such tasks include: establishing national baseline assessments of the status of disaster risk reduction in a country/region; publishing and updating a summary of national programmes for disaster risk reduction, and; developing internal procedures for reviewing national progress, including systems for cost-benefit analysis.*

Target: *This question will be explored through regional, and when feasible, national workshops, one-on-one interviews and on-line debate*

Sub-question

- 2.1 How are HFA reporting mechanisms supporting its implementation?

Key Question 3

What elements of the HFA have worked less well in reducing disaster risk in country X/region Y and why?

Rationale: *A significant amount of information about actions taken in implementing the HFA is available through the HFA Monitor and ad hoc specific studies. What is less clear is what is hindering HFA implementation in certain countries and regions as well as certain thematic areas? What are the main constraints and how can they be overcome?*

Target: *This question will be explored through regional, and when feasible, national workshops and one-on-one interviews and an on-line debate.*

Sub-questions

- 3.1 What were the three most critical factors that prevented effectiveness in the areas identified in question 3 above?
- 3.2 What are the specific constraints to start or increase investments in disaster risk reduction in country X/region Y?

HFA Priorities for Action

Key Question 4

In your experience, does the HFA sufficiently encourage community participation and the utilization of local knowledge to reduce disaster risk? I.e. in country X/region Y, have communities and local authorities been empowered and is local knowledge and community action being useful/tapped into to manage and reduce disaster risk? If so, how? If not, why not?

Rationale: *An important paradigm of disaster risk reduction is the effective involvement of communities and local authorities in planning integrated, multi-hazard approaches to natural disasters. Studies and HFA Monitor reports indicate however that this is not happening with the necessary consistency and across the board. This question aims at identifying the reasons why vertical synergies are so difficult to obtain and what have proven to be successful practices in overcoming this problem.*

Target: *This question will be explored with senior experts, community leaders and politicians involved in DRR implementation through one-on-one interviews, regional and, when feasible, national workshops, an in-depth study and a thematic workshop.*

Sub-questions

- 4.1 How has the central government communicated HFA suggestions and commitments to local government? Are local governments empowered through ad hoc legislation and budget allocations to implement appropriate disaster risk reduction plans?
- 4.2 Which institutional mechanisms at the national level are responsible for ensuring this link with local governments and community organizations?

Key Question 5

In your experience is there in country X/region Y a culture of safety and resilience at the level of the general public? For example, do people in country X/region Y seek information about land safety, building structures, etc. prior to building or purchasing properties? Do they expect politicians to have national and local disaster risk reduction plans in place? Do they acquire, or are required by law to acquire, insurance for their properties, crops and livelihoods if they live in disaster prone areas? Are they fully informed, trained if necessary, and equipped about what needs to be done in case of a disaster?

Rationale: *Whilst responsibility for HFA implementation rests with national governments, regional and international organizations, it is often through individual actions of informed and aware citizens that disaster losses are minimized. Broad public awareness and action is also critical in demanding and bringing about change at the political and national level. This question aims at investigating how is such public awareness generated and sustained? Who are the most influential stakeholders in generating such public awareness? In this connection, what role could women have as agents of change?*

Target: *This question will be explored with community leaders and organizations through one-on-one interviews, regional and, when feasible, national workshops and an in-depth study.*

Sub-questions

- 5.1 If you answered YES to question 5 above: What do you think are the three main elements that contributed to creating such a culture at the level of the general public? How long did it take for such a culture to develop and for the related behaviours to be in place in the general public?
- 5.2 If you answered NO to question 5 above: What do you think are the three main elements, at any level (government, media, public institutions, community organizations, international cooperation etc.) that should be in place in order to develop such a culture?

Key Question 6

How can implementation of HFA Priority Action 4, reducing the underlying risk factors, be strengthened?

Rationale: *There is a wealth of literature, including the Global Assessment Report and the Report “Clouds but little rain...Views from the Frontline” indicating that reducing the underlying risk factors of disasters remains the most challenging area of HFA implementation. This question aims at exploring the reasons behind this difficulty with a view to identify ways in which implementation of Priority Action 4 could receive more attention at the national and international level.*

Target: *This question will be explored with community leaders and organizations through one-on-one interviews as well as through regional and, when feasible, national workshops.*

Sub-questions

- 6.1 In your experience, what has been the best way to integrate DRR into development policies and programmes?
- 6.2 How can the importance of addressing the root causes of disaster risk be further brought to the forefront of the international agenda?

2010-2015 Focus
HFA Future Implementation**Key Question 7**

What are the three most important things now that country X/region Y would benefit from, from the international community, in furthering the implementation of the HFA at the national and local level?

Rationale: *The HFA recognized an enabling international environment was vital to stimulate and develop the knowledge, capacities and motivation needed to build disaster resilient communities and nations. This question aims at exploring what still needs to happen for states and communities to increase their resilience to national disasters?*

Target: *This question will be explored through one-on-one interviews, regional and, when feasible, national workshops, a thematic workshop and an in-depth study.*

Sub-questions

- 7.1 What adjustments, if any, would be helpful in the international structures of disaster risk reduction to help accelerate the implementation of the HFA?
- 7.2 What kind of financial instruments, as well as monitoring mechanisms, would be helpful in support of DRR action at the national, local and community level?

Key Question 8

How should climate change adaptation be integrated in the next five years of the HFA implementation?

Rationale: *Although the HFA recognized the importance of promoting the integration of risk reduction associated with climate change into strategies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, this issue has come to the forefront of the international debate only in more recent years. This question aims at exploring ways in which climate change adaptation programming and funding should be integrated in the next five years of HFA implementation and beyond.*

Target: *This question will be explored through an on-line debate, one-on-one interviews and an in-depth study.*

Sub-questions

- 8.1 What kind of policy and programmatic linkages have proven to be helpful for the integration of DRR and climate change adaptation?
- 8.2 What would be the most conducive institutional arrangements at the national level to realize stronger integration between DRR and climate change adaptation?

Key Question 9

What kind of international instrument/tool do you think would be most useful in furthering DRR to follow-up to the HFA beyond 2015?

Rationale: *This question aims at exploring whether an international instrument on disaster risk reduction post-HFA should also be of a voluntary nature; whether there is sufficient interest and international momentum to build up a campaign to advocate for, and successfully negotiate, a legally binding instrument.*

Target: *This question will be explored through one-on-one interviews, regional and, when feasible, national workshops and an on-line debate.*

Sub-questions

- 9.1 Would setting up specific international and national targets help improving DRR impact at the national and local level?
- 9.2 What kind of international institutional structures/instruments/mechanisms would be most helpful to continue to accelerate and support risk reduction work?
- 9.3 The HFA is a voluntary international instrument. Has the voluntary nature of the HFA played a positive or negative role in its implementation and buy-in at the international and national level?

Key Questions for the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action Annex 1

	Literature Review	Regional Workshops	Thematic Workshops	In-Depth Studies	One-on-One Interviews	On-line Debates
<p>Key Question 1:</p> <p>In your experience has the HFA been instrumental over the past five years in reducing disaster losses in communities and countries in country X/region Y?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>1.1 What are the three most important achievements that contributed to reducing disaster losses through the HFA implementation in country X/region Y?</p> <p>1.2 What are the three most important elements that prevented the HFA from achieving its intended outcome i.e. the reduction of disaster losses?</p>	✓	✓			✓	
<p>Key Question 2:</p> <p>How has the HFA informed decision making or priority setting in country X/region Y?</p> <p>Sub-question:</p> <p>2.1 How are HFA reporting mechanisms supporting its implementation?</p>		✓			✓	✓
<p>Key Question 3:</p> <p>What elements of the HFA have worked less well in reducing disaster risk in country X/region Y and why?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>3.1 What were the three most critical factors that prevented effectiveness in the areas identified in question 3 above?</p> <p>3.2 What are the specific constraints to start or increase investments in disaster risk reduction in country X/region Y?</p>		✓			✓	✓
<p>Key Question 4:</p> <p>In your experience, does the HFA sufficiently encourage community participation and the utilization of local knowledge to reduce disaster risk? I.e. in country X/region Y, have communities and local authorities been empowered and is local knowledge and community action being useful/tapped into to manage and reduce disaster risk? If so, how? If not, why not?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>4.1 How has the central government communicated HFA suggestions and commitments to local government? Are local governments empowered through ad hoc legislation and budget allocations to implement appropriate disaster risk reduction plans?</p> <p>4.2 Which institutional mechanisms at the national level are responsible for ensuring this link with local governments and community organizations?</p>		✓	✓	✓	✓	

	Literature Review	Regional Workshops	Thematic Workshops	In-Depth Studies	One-on-One Interviews	On-line Debates
<p>Key Question 5:</p> <p>In your experience is there in country X/region Y a culture of safety and resilience at the level of the general public? For example, do people in country X/region Y seek information about land safety, building structures, etc. prior to building or purchasing properties? Do they expect politicians to have national and local disaster risk reduction plans in place? Do they acquire, or are required by law to acquire, insurance for their properties, crops and livelihoods if they live in disaster prone areas? Are they fully informed, trained if necessary, and equipped about what needs to be done in case of a disaster?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>5.1 If you answered YES to question 5 above: What do you think are the three main elements that contributed to creating such a culture at the level of the general public? How long did it take for such a culture to develop and for the related behaviours to be in place in the general public?</p> <p>5.2 If you answered NO to question 5 above: What do you think are the three main elements, at any level (government, media, public institutions, community organizations, international cooperation etc.) that should be in place in order to develop such a culture?</p>		✓		✓	✓	
<p>Key Question 6:</p> <p>How can implementation of HFA Priority Action 4, reducing the underlying risk factors, be strengthened?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>6.1 In your experience, what has been the best way to integrate DRR into development policies and programmes?</p> <p>6.2 How can the importance of addressing the root causes of disaster risk be further brought to the forefront of the international agenda?</p>		✓			✓	
<p>Key Question 7:</p> <p>What are the three most important things now that country X/region Y would benefit from, from the international community, in furthering the implementation of the HFA at the national and local level?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>7.1 What adjustments, if any, would be helpful in the international structures of disaster risk reduction to help accelerate the implementation of the HFA?</p> <p>7.2 What kind of financial instruments, as well as monitoring mechanisms, would be helpful in support of DRR action at the national, local and community level?</p>		✓	✓	✓	✓	

	Literature Review	Regional Workshops	Thematic Workshops	In-Depth Studies	One-on-One Interviews	On-line Debates
<p>Key Question 5:</p> <p>In your experience is there in country X/region Y a culture of safety and resilience at the level of the general public? For example, do people in country X/region Y seek information about land safety, building structures, etc. prior to building or purchasing properties? Do they expect politicians to have national and local disaster risk reduction plans in place? Do they acquire, or are required by law to acquire, insurance for their properties, crops and livelihoods if they live in disaster prone areas? Are they fully informed, trained if necessary, and equipped about what needs to be done in case of a disaster?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>5.1 If you answered YES to question 5 above: What do you think are the three main elements that contributed to creating such a culture at the level of the general public? How long did it take for such a culture to develop and for the related behaviours to be in place in the general public?</p> <p>5.2 If you answered NO to question 5 above: What do you think are the three main elements, at any level (government, media, public institutions, community organizations, international cooperation etc.) that should be in place in order to develop such a culture?</p>		✓		✓	✓	
<p>Key Question 6:</p> <p>How can implementation of HFA Priority Action 4, reducing the underlying risk factors, be strengthened?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>6.1 In your experience, what has been the best way to integrate DRR into development policies and programmes?</p> <p>6.2 How can the importance of addressing the root causes of disaster risk be further brought to the forefront of the international agenda?</p>		✓			✓	
<p>Key Question 7:</p> <p>What are the three most important things now that country X/region Y would benefit from, from the international community, in furthering the implementation of the HFA at the national and local level?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>7.1 What adjustments, if any, would be helpful in the international structures of disaster risk reduction to help accelerate the implementation of the HFA?</p> <p>7.2 What kind of financial instruments, as well as monitoring mechanisms, would be helpful in support of DRR action at the national, local and community level?</p>		✓	✓	✓	✓	

	Literature Review	Regional Workshops	Thematic Workshops	In-Depth Studies	One-on-One Interviews	On-line Debates
<p>Key Question 8:</p> <p>How should climate change adaptation be integrated in the next five years of the HFA implementation?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>8.1 What kind of policy and programmatic linkages have proven to be helpful for the integration of DRR and climate change adaptation?</p> <p>8.2 What would be the most conducive institutional arrangements at the national level to realize stronger integration between DRR and climate change?</p>				✓	✓	✓
<p>Key Question 9:</p> <p>What kind of international instrument/tool do you think would be most useful in furthering DRR to follow-up to the HFA beyond 2015?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>9.1 Would setting up specific international and national targets help improving DRR impact at the national and local level?</p> <p>9.2 What kind of international institutional structures/instruments would be most helpful to continue to accelerate and support risk reduction work?</p> <p>9.3 The HFA is a voluntary international instrument. Has the voluntary nature of the HFA played a positive or negative role in its implementation and buy-in at the international and national level?</p>		✓			✓	✓

Advisory Group of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action

MS. FATMA EL MALLAH

Advisor to the Secretary General of the League of Arab States on Climate Change

Ms. Fatma El Mallah has been Director of Environment, Housing and Sustainable Development as well as Director of the Technical Secretariat of the Council of Arab Ministries Responsible for the Environment (CAMRE) for the period 1994-2009. Since December 2009 she has been appointed Advisor to the Secretary General of the League of Arab States on Climate Change.

DR. MARIANNE FAY

*Chief Economist for the Sustainable Development Network of the World Bank
Co-Director, World Development Report 2010*

Dr. Marianne Fay is the incoming Chief Economist of the Sustainable Development Network and the co-director of the World Development Report 2010 on climate change. She has held positions in different regions of the World Bank working on infrastructure, urbanization, and more recently, adaptation to climate change. Her research has mostly focused on the role of infrastructure and urbanization in development, with a particular interest in issues related to urban poverty. She is the author of a number of articles and books on these topics. Ms Fay has recently been appointed as the new Chief Economist for the Sustainable Development Network of the World Bank — a position she will take after finishing the World Development Report, in the Fall of 2009.

DR. MARCO FERRARI

Independent consultant

Dr. Marco Ferrari served as the Chair of the Main Committee of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in January 2005 which led to the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action. Since 1975, he has played an active role in development and cooperation and has worked for the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs) as Deputy Head of the Humanitarian Aid Department. He also served as the Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He is presently Member of the Board of the Global Risk Forum GRF Davos.

MS. SUSANNE FRUEH

Executive Secretary, Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations

Ms. Susanne Frueh has over 25 years work experience in international development covering development assistance, humanitarian assistance as well as post conflict situations. Formerly, Ms. Frueh was Chair of the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition and Head of Evaluation for the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. She has held numerous positions within the United Nations.

MR. RONALD JACKSON

*Co-Chair of the Inter-American Disaster Mitigation Network of the OAS
Director-General, Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management*

As Director General for the Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management, Mr. Ronald Jackson plays an integral role in shaping Jamaican national policy in the areas of disaster preparedness and emergency response. Mr. Jackson is an urban planner and environmentalist by training. He has also worked with Alcan Jamaica Ltd., the Urban Development Corporation and the Green Island Planning Authority.

DR. MUKESH KAPILA

*Under Secretary General, National Society and Knowledge Development
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*

Dr. Mukesh Kapila served as the Head of Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs at the UK Government Department for International Development before joining the United Nations as Special Adviser, first, in Afghanistan and then at the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva. He was also the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator and United Nations Development Programme Resident Representative for the Sudan, before coming to the World Health Organization as Director in the Department of Health Action in Crises and, subsequently, IFRC as Special Representative of the Secretary General.

MS. METTE LINDAHL-OLSSON

*Chair of the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction
Head of Natural Hazards and Critical Infrastructure Section, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)*

Ms. Mette Lindahl Olsson is a Fire Protection Engineer by training and has over twenty years experience in the field of civil protection, prevention and natural disasters. She has been the Head of Planning for the Construction and Environment section (Accident Prevention Department) at the Swedish Rescue Services Agency. Presently, she is the Swedish National Focal Point for the Hyogo Framework for Action and during 2010 she serves as the Chair of the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction.

PROF. VIRGINIA MURRAY

Head of Extreme Events and Health Protection, CRCE/ Health Protection Agency, United Kingdom

Prof. Virginia Murray is an expert in preparation and management of chemical incidents. Additionally, she is a member of the Science and Technical Committee for UN-ISDR and professor of Clinical Toxicology at Guys Hospital Poisons Unit. In the past she has been an advisor to government and academic bodies on chemical incidents and toxicological issues.

MR. KENZO OSHIMA

Senior Vice President, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Mr. Kenzo Oshima served as the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations in New York (2005-2007) and was appointed the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and

MR. KENZO OSHIMA

Senior Vice President, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Mr. Kenzo Oshima served as the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations in New York (2005-2007) and was appointed the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator for the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs between January 2001 and June 2003. He also served as Ambassador of Japan to Australia (2003-2007).

MR. MARCUS OXLEY

Chairman, Global Network of CSO for Disaster Reduction

Mr. Marcus Oxley was appointed Chairman of the Global Network in June 2007. He has over 20 years disaster management experience through work in the NGO sector where he managed and implemented a range of disaster response and recovery, preparedness and mitigation programs across Africa, Asia and Europe. Prior to his appointment, he was the Disaster Management Director of Tearfund.

DR. YEON-SOO PARK

*Chair of the Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction
Administrator, Korean National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)*

Dr. Yeon-Soo Park has held many notable positions throughout his career including President of the Local Government Officials Development Institute and Deputy Minister on Local Finance and Taxation of the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs, Korea. He was also Deputy Mayor of Incheon Metropolitan City. The Incheon International Airport and Songdo International City are among his achievements during his position in the city.

MS. TUMUSIIME RHODA PEACE

*Chair of the African Regional Platform
Commissioner for Rural Economy and Agriculture, African Union Commission*

In January 2010, Ms. Tumusiime Rhoda Peace accepted a three-year appointment to the board of directors of IFDC – a non-profit international public organization for agricultural sustainability. In the past, Ms. Peace has been Commissioner for Agricultural Planning and Development and Commissioner for Women and Development for the federal government of Uganda.

MS. JAN PETERSEN

Chair Huairou Commission

Ms. Jan Petersen is the founder and chair of the Huairou Commission – a global coalition network that links grassroots women's community development organizations. She is also the founder of GROOTS International (a network member of the Huairou Commission) as well as founder and former executive director of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women.

MS LISA STARUSZKIEWICZ

Manager, Disaster Risk Reduction, AusAID

Ms Lisa Staruszkiewicz is currently the Manager of the disaster risk reduction programme at AusAID, and was a core member of the team that developed the disaster risk reduction policy for the Australian aid programme. Before taking up that position she worked with CARE International in Viet Nam and was engaged with a number of disaster risk reduction and response initiatives. She has also managed several strategic partnerships with NGOs on behalf of AusAID.

DR. BENJAMIN WISNER

Independent Consultant

Having held numerous teaching positions and research affiliations around the world, Dr. Benjamin Wisner is an expert on international sustainable development, disaster reduction and hazard vulnerability. He is also the author of a number of books, including *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters* and *Disaster Risk Reduction: Cases from Urban Africa*. He is a research associate of the Aon-Benfield Hazard Research Centre, University College London, and is currently engaged in research on links between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in northern Tanzania.

MR. RICARDO ZAPATA-MARTI

Regional Advisor / Focal Point

Mr. Ricardo Zapata-Marti, economist, has worked as editor, researcher and assistant professor. In 1975, Mr. Zapata-Marti joined the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean where he has been Trade Officer, Economic Affairs Officer, Chief of the International Trade Unit at the Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean and Central America; and, for the last ten years, Regional Focal Point for Disaster Assessments. As a researcher he was a lead author in chapter 7 of the Fourth IPCC Report (Group II), for which he shared with all the IPCC members the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize.

Bibliography

- ActionAid International. 2006. *Disaster Risk Reduction: Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8847_AImplementinghyogo.pdf>.
- African Union Commission, The World Bank, UNISDR. 2009. *Status Report on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-Saharan Africa: Contributing to the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the African Regional Strategy*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12061_UpdatedAfricaStatusReport17Sept09.pdf>.
- Asian Conference on Disaster Reduction. 2007. *Summary Report 25-27 June 2007*. Available at <http://www.adrc.asia/acdr/2007_summary.html>.
- Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Asian Disaster Reduction Center, UNISDR. 2007. *Regional Synthesis Report on HFA Implementation in Asia and Pacific: An Overview of Reports by Countries up to 2007*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10503_RegionalSynthesisReportFinalVersion.pdf>.
- Asian Disaster Reduction Center. 2008. *Total Disaster Risk Management: Good Practices 2008*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9052_TDRM08.pdf>.
- Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana, UNDP. 2009. *Lessons Learned: Disaster Management Legal Reform – The Indonesian Experience*. Jakarta: UNDP. Available at <[http://www.undp.or.id/pubs/docs/Lessons%20Learned %20Disaster%20Management%20Legal%20Reform.pdf](http://www.undp.or.id/pubs/docs/Lessons%20Learned%20Disaster%20Management%20Legal%20Reform.pdf)>.
- HRH Prince Turki Bin Nasser Bin Abdul Aziz Al-Saud. 2009. *Address In the Special Session to review the Regional and International progress*. Second Global Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction Geneva 16-19 June. Available at <[http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/AbdulAzizAlSaud\[1\].pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/AbdulAzizAlSaud[1].pdf)>.
- Carby, B. et al. 2011. *Caribbean Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. University of the West Indies, UNDP.
- Chabay, I. et al. 2011. *Assessing the role of vertical and horizontal communication in disaster risk reduction learning and planning: The case of the Spanish Tous dam-break, 1982*. Barcelona: Integrated Risk Governance Project.
- Christian Aid. 2007. *Community-led Policy Monitoring for Disaster Risk Reduction: A Collection of Practice Notes*. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=1055>>.
- Collymore, J. 2009. *Regional progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009-2011) – interim*. Available at <[http://www.preventionweb.net/files/17512_RegionalHFAprogress-CDEMA\(2009-2011\).pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/17512_RegionalHFAprogress-CDEMA(2009-2011).pdf)>.
- Consultative Meeting for West African Parliamentarians on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Parliamentarians' Plan of Action for Making Millennium Development Goal Programmes Disaster Resilient*. Dakar, Senegal, 2 June 2010. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/14285_PlanofActionDakarEnglish.pdf>.
- Council of Europe, EUR-OPA, UNISDR. 2008. *Twinning of National Platforms - A European Perspective: Concept Note*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8902_200830EN1.pdf>.

- Council of Europe, German Committee for Disaster Reduction, UNISDR. *Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action in Europe: Advances and Challenges*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9452_V114.05HFABLEU7.pdf>.
- Council of Europe, German Committee for Disaster Reduction, UNISDR. 2008. *Disaster risk reduction in Europe: Overview of European national platforms, Hyogo Framework for Action focal points and regional organizations/institutions*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7651_DRRin_europe1.pdf>.
- Cummins, J. D. Mahul, O. for The World Bank. 2008. *Catastrophe Risk Financing in Developing Countries Principles for Public Intervention*. Washington: The World Bank. Available at <http://gfdr.org/docs/Track-II_Catrisk_financing_Overview_booklet.pdf>.
- ESCAP. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in Asia and the Pacific: Follow-up to the Outcome of the Third Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction – From the Regional to the Global Platform*. Bangkok: ESCAP. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8729_CDRINF41.pdf>.
- European Commission Humanitarian Aid, UNISDR. 2006. *Disaster Risk Reduction: 20 Examples of Good Practices from Central Asia*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2300_20GoodExamplesofGoodPractice.pdf>.
- European Parliament. 2010. *European Parliament resolution of 21 September 2010 on the Commission communication: A Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters* (HYPERLINK “<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/FindByProcnum.do?lang=en&procnum=INI/2009/2151>” 2009/2151(INI)). Available at <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2010-0326+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>>.
- European Union and Islamic Relief. 2008. *Witnesses account, contributing towards Hyogo Framework for Action: community-based disaster preparedness – Bangladesh*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8728_IslamicreliefBGDCaseStudytowardsHFA1.pdf>.
- Fernández-Galiano, E. 2009. HYPERLINK “<http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/GP09Fernandez.pdf>” Statement of the Council of Europe to the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. Global Platform 16-19 June. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/GP09Fernandez.pdf>>.
- First Meeting of the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Outcome Summary: Decisions Made and the Way Forward*. Stenungsund, Sweden, 6-8 October.
- Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Incheon Declaration on Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and the Pacific*. Incheon, Republic of Korea, 25-28 October.
- Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Incheon Regional Roadmap on DRR through CCA in Asia and Pacific*. Songdo, Republic of Korea, 25-28 October.
- Gabriel, A. Ha. 2009. HYPERLINK “<http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/StatementbyAUCItem3RegionalProgress.pdf>” Regional Achievements and Challenges in Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action. Statement, Global Platform, 16-19 June. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/StatementbyAUCItem3RegionalProgress.pdf>>.

- Galperin, A. for UNISDR. 2009. *Regional Synthesis Report on Implementation of the HFA in Asia and Pacific 2007 – 2008/09*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11776_HFAasia.pdf>.
- Gautam, D. R. Khanal, S. 2009. *Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction: Contribution to Hyogo Framework for Action – Case Study*. Latipur: Mercy Corps Nepal. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10365_casestudynepal.pdf>.
- Gebrekiros, A. Hailu, S. Maxwell, D. Mukwavi, M. Tadesse, G. Zewold, W. G. 2009. *Baseline Report: Africa Community Resilience Project*. Medford: Feinstein International Center. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12233_baselinereport.pdf>.
- GFMC. 2010. *UNISDR Hyogo Framework for Action – Midterm Review: Questions answered by GFMC, June 2010*.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2008. *Visión de primera línea: manual para 2008-2009*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7842_manualproyectovisiondeprimeralineaabreviado1.pdf>.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9822_9822VFLfullreport06091.pdf>.
- Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. 2009. *Recommendations of National Platforms to the Chair and participants of the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10265_NPRRecommendationsFinalEnglish.pdf>.
- Global Risk Forum, UNISDR. 2009. *IDRC Davos 2008: “100 Ideas for Action” to support the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Davos: Global Risk Forum. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10642_Brochure100Ideas.pdf>.
- González, P. 2009. *HYPERLINK “http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/GP09RegionalPerspectiveAmericas.pdf” Assessment of Progress in the Implementation of the HFA: a Regional Perspective from the Americas*. Statement, Global Platform, 16-19 June. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/GP09RegionalPerspectiveAmericas.pdf>>.
- Government of Timor Leste. *Programme of the 4th Constitutional Government*, Available at <<http://timor-leste.gov.tl/?p=16&lang=en>>.
- Greerley, M. 2010. “Priorities for Accelerating Progress on the MDGs”. *In Focus Policy Briefing*. Institute of Development Studies, September.
- Gupta, S. and Leung, I. 2011. *Turning Good Practice into Institutional Mechanisms: Investing in grassroots women’s leadership to scale up local implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Huairu Commission and Groots International.
- Houghton, R. 2006. *Joint Evaluation of the International Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami: Synthesis Report*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2097_VL108905.pdfY>.

- Husak, T. 2009. HYPERLINK "<http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/EUStatementonDisasterRiskReductionb.pdf>" EU Statement on Disaster Risk Reduction: intervention by the Czech Presidency on behalf of the EU. Statement, Global Platform 16-19 June. Available at < <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/EUStatementonDisasterRiskReductionb.pdf>>.
- IFRC. 2010. *Hyogo Framework for Action: Red Cross Red Crescent Mid-Term Review October 2010*.
- Indonesian Red Cross (PMI). 2008. *Light up: Indonesian Red Cross Contribution towards the Hyogo Framework of Action*.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. 2006. *The Hyogo Framework for Action and the International Federation*. Geneva: IFRC. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8323_hyogoframework_federationen1.pdf>.
- International Institute for Sustainable Development. 2009. "ARC Briefing Note on the Second Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Consultative Meeting". *IISD Reporting Services*. Volume 19 (1). Available at <<http://www.iisd.ca/africa/brief/briefing1901e.pdf>>.
- Jackson, D. 2011. *Effective Financial Mechanisms at the national and local level for Disaster Risk Reduction*. United Nations Capital Development Fund.
- Kamal, A. 2009. *Progress of the HFA Implementation in the ASEAN Region*. Paper presented at the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction 2009. Available at: < <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/globalplatform/ASEANreportforGP.pdf>>.
- Kishore, K. 2010 *Literature Review: Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Llosa, S. and Zodrow, I. *Disaster risk reduction as a basis for effective adaptation*. Available at <http://www.uibk.ac.at/alpiner-raum/seminar/zodrow_llosa_eale_ga_2011-.pdf>.
- Maalouf, S. for World Vision. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: Country Report for Lebanon*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10263_Lebanon_countryreport.pdf>.
- Matin, N. & Taher, M. 2002. "The Changing Emphasis of Disasters in Bangladesh NGOs", *Disasters*. Vol. 25 (3): pp. 227-239.
- Mercer, J. Kelman, I. Taranis, L. and Suchet-Pearson, S. 2009. "Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction", *Disasters*. Vol. 34 (1): pp. 214-39.
- Ministry of Communication and Information Technology, Government of India. "Land Records", <<http://www.mit.gov.in/content/land-records>>. Accessed 24/11/2010.
- Murray, V. 2011. *Evidence for Disaster Risk Management –Information and knowledge needs for policy makers and field practitioners*
- National Agency for Disaster Management Indonesia. 2008. *Profile & Directory Disaster Risk Reduction Organisations in Indonesia 2008*. Available at <http://digilib-ampl.net/detail/detail.php?kode=2875&row=6&tp=pustaka&ktg=buku&kd_link=>>.

- OECD. 2011. *50 Years of Official Development Assistance*. Available at: < HYPERLINK “http://www.oecd.org/document/41/0,3746,en_2649_34447_46195625_1_1_1_1,00.html” http://www.oecd.org/document/41/0,3746,en_2649_34447_46195625_1_1_1_1,00.html>.
- OIOS.2010. *Audit Report: Governance and organizational structure of the inter-agency secretariat to the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ISDR)*.
- Oxfam International.2010. *Reponse to the UN ISDR Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. London: Oxfam.
- Parlamento Latinoamericano. 2010. *Proyecto de Declaracion*. Buenos Aires, 4-5 March. Available at < <http://parlatino.org/es/comisiones-permanentes/medio-ambiente-y-turismo/declaraciones-y-resoluciones/declaracion/1728.html>>.
- Plan International, World Vision International. 2009. *Children on the Frontline: Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10576_13121ChildrenontheFrontlineGPreport.pdf>.
- Pratt, C. 2009. *Implementation of the HFA and Pacific Regional DRM Framework for Action: Achievements and Challenges*. Statement, Global Platform 16-19 June. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/globalplatform/2009/programme/statements/>>.
- PreventionWeb. 2011. *Online Debates*. Available at: < HYPERLINK “<http://groups.preventionweb.net/scripts/wa-PREVENTIONWEB.exe?A0=MTR-HFA-L&pid:221&pif:3>” <http://groups.preventionweb.net/scripts/wa-PREVENTIONWEB.exe?A0=MTR-HFA-L&pid:221&pif:3>>.
- Roberts, D. 2008. “Thinking globally, acting locally — institutionalizing climate change at the local government level in Durban, South Africa”, *Environent and Urbanization*. Vol. 20 (2): pp. 521-537.
- Sanahuja, H. E. for IFRC & UNISDR. 2010. *National Platforms for Disaster Risk reduction in the Americas: A critical analysis of these processes five years after the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Unpublished.
- Second African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Draft Decision*. Available at <http://www.unisdr.org/preventionweb/files/13655_ExecutiveDecisioninEnglishadopedNb%5B1%5D.pdf>.
- Second African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2010. *Ministerial Declaration*. Available at <http://www.unisdr.org/preventionweb/files/13655_MinisterialDeclarationinEnglishadopedNb%5B1%5D.pdf>.
- Scott, Z. & Tarazona, M. 2011. *Decentralization and Disaster Risk Reduction*, UNISDR Geneva, Switzerland.
- Sharma, A. 2009. *Progress Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in the Asia and Pacific Region*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12082_ProgressReviewofNationalPlatformsfo.pdf>.
- Shaw, R. 2009. *Building Resilience to Tsunami in the Indian Ocean: Action Research, IEC and Practices*. Kyoto: Kyoto University Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10910_BuildingResilience.pdf>.
- SOPAC. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for action 2005-2015*. Suva: SOPAC. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10641_MR06741.pdf>.

- SOPAC. 2010. *Statement of Outcomes*. Sixteenth Regional Disaster Managers Meeting.. Suva, Fiji, 9-11 August. Available at <http://www.pacificdisaster.net/pdnadmin/data/original/PP_16_DRM_meeting_outcomes_20100811.pdf>.
- South East European Cooperation Process. 2010. Declaration. Ministerial and Experts Meeting on Disaster and Emergency Management. 13 May, Antalya, Turkey. Available at <<http://prezentacije.mup.gov.rs/svs/2010-05-13%20Deklaracija%20ENG.pdf>>.
- Srinivasan, G. et al. 2009. *Evaluation of Natural Disasters and Climate Change in Finnish Aid from the Perspective of Poverty Reduction*. Evaluation report 2009-8. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki.
- Sustainable Environmental and Ecological Development Society. 2006. *SEEDS Annual Report 2005-06*. New Delhi: SEEDS. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2696_1annual20report20050620with20pics.pdf>.
- Tearfund, UNISDR. 2007. *Institutional Donor Progress with Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1199_DRR20donor20progress2020071.pdf>.
- Tearfund. 2008. *Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2012 Framework*. Bonn Climate Change Talks 2-13 June. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8936_DRR20post201229thMay1.pdf>.
- The World Bank, UNISDR. 2009. *GFDRR Track 1: Building Global and Regional Partnership – FY08 Mid-Term Report to the World Bank Development Grant Facility*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7760_GFDRRTrack1MidTermReport.pdf>.
- The World Bank, UNISDR. 2009. *GFDRR Track 1: Building Global and Regional Partnership – Giving Risk Reduction a Regional Dimension*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9923_GFDRRTrack1GivingRiskReductionaRegi.pdf>.
- The World Bank: 2010. *Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank
- Third World Conference of Speakers of Parliament. 2010. *Presentation of Reports on Progress Since the 2005 Speakers' Conference*. United Nations, Geneva, 19-21 July. Available at <http://www.ipu.org/splz-e/speakers10/3c.pdf>.
- Tran, H. P. for UNISDR. 2009. *Regional Analysis on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Education in the Asia Pacific Region: In the Context of Priority of Action 3 of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12081_RegionalAnalysisonDRREducationinthe.pdf>.
- UNDP. 2004. *Reducing Disaster Risk: a Challenge for Development*. New York: UNDP. Available at <http://www.undp.org/cpr/whats_new/rdr_english.pdf>.
- UNISDR. *Hyogo Framework for Action*. Available at: < HYPERLINK "[http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/Hyogo_Framework_for_Action_\(HFA\)](http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/Hyogo_Framework_for_Action_(HFA))" [http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/Hyogo_Framework_for_Action_\(HFA\)](http://www.eird.org/wikien/index.php/Hyogo_Framework_for_Action_(HFA))>.

- UNISDR. *National platforms for DRR*. Available at: < HYPERLINK “http://www.eird.org/wiki/index.php/National_platforms#What_is_a_national_platform.3F” http://www.eird.org/wiki/index.php/National_platforms#What_is_a_national_platform.3F>.
- UNISDR. 2005. *Progress Report on the Matrix of Commitment and Initiatives to Support the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1039_inf11progressreportmatrixcommitmentIATF12.doc>.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Acting with Common Purpose: Proceedings of the first session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva, 5-7 June 2007*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1464_GPActingwithcommonpurpose.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Evaluation and Strengthening of Early Warning Systems in Countries Affected by the 26 December 2004 Tsunami*. Bonn: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/3609_TEWSdonorreport.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Disaster Risk Reduction: 2007 Global Review*. Geneva: UNISDR.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2008. *Indicators of Progress: Guidance on Measuring the Reduction of Disaster Risks and the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2259_IndicatorsofProgressHFA.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2008. *La Gestión del Riesgo de Desastres Hoy: Contextos Globales, Herramientas Locales*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2280_gestiondelriesgo.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2008. *Policy Note: Thematic partnerships for disaster risk reduction and the development of ISDR Thematic Platforms*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2764_ThematicPlatforms020608.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2008. *The Manila Call for Action of Parliamentarians on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation*. Manila, Philippines, 17-18 October. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=8868>>.
- UNISDR. 2008. *United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction activities in Central Asia*. Dushanbe: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10834_10834UNISDRactivitiesinCAeng1.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/report/index.php?id=9413>>.
- UNISDR. 2009. *Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Creating linkages for a Safer Tomorrow*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11963_GP09Proceedings.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2009. *Progress in reducing disaster risk and implementing Hyogo Framework for Action in the Arab Region. Executive Summary*. Available at < HYPERLINK “http://www.unisdr.org/preventionweb/files/14463_ImplementationoftheHyogoFrameworkEn.pdf” http://www.unisdr.org/preventionweb/files/14463_ImplementationoftheHyogoFrameworkEn.pdf>.

- UNISDR, Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean. 2009. *The Malta Declaration of the Commitment by Parliamentarians to COP15 and Beyond*. St. Julians, Malta, 24 November. Available at: http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11841_MaltadeclarationFINALADOPTEDEnglish%5B1%5D.pdf
- UNISDR, UNDP, IUCN. 2009. *Making Disaster Risk Reduction Gender-Sensitive: Policy and Practical Guidelines*. Geneva: United Nations.
- UNISDR. 2010. *Early Warning Practices Can Save Lives: Selected Examples*. Bonn: United Nations.
- UNISDR. 2010. *Protecting Development Gains: 2008-2009 Biennial Report and 2010-2011 Work Plan Highlights*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at http://www.preventionweb.net/files/13210_ISDRAP0809reportreduced1.pdf.
- UNISDR, SOPAC. 2010. *Mid-Term Review: Pacific Regional DRM Framework for Action – Regional Consultations of 13 April and 13 August 2010*.
- UNISDR. 2011. *Global Assessment Report* (unpublished draft).
- UNISDR. 2011. "Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Through Effective Disaster Risk Reduction". *Briefing Note 03*. Geneva: United Nations.
- United Nations Development Group. 2009. *Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction into the CCA and UNDAF: A Guide for UN Country Teams*
- United Nations General Assembly. 2005. 60th Session, Item 54(c). *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/60/180). Available at <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/hfa/isdr/SG-report-60-180-eng.pdf>.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2006. 60th Session, Item 52(c) *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly*. Available at http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/basic_docs/GA-resolution/a-res-60-195-eng.pdf.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2008. 61st Session, Item 52(c). *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/61/229). Available at http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/basic_docs/SG-report/SG-report-61-229-eng.pdf.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2006. 61st Session, Item 53(c) *Global Survey of Early Warning Systems*. (A/C.2/61/CRP.1). Available at <http://www.un.org/ga/61/second/ac261crp1.pdf>.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2008. 62nd Session, Item 56(c). *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/62/320). Available at <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/496/37/PDF/N0749637.pdf?OpenElement>.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2008. 63rd Session, Item 52(c) *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/63/351). Available at http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/basic_docs/SG-report/SG-report-63-351-eng.pdf.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2009. 64th Session, Item 55(c). *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/64/280). Available at http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11127_SGReportonISDReng09.pdf.

- United Nations General Assembly. 2010. 65th Session, Item 20(c). *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/65/388). Available at <http://www.unisdr.org/preventionweb/files/16112_sgisd2010en.pdf>.
- Velasquez, J. *Key Progress Made on the Hyogo Framework for Action – Focusing on HFA Priority 3*, presentation by the Senior Regional Coordinator for UNISDR Asia and Pacific. Available at <<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/4/43683917.pdf>>.
- von Oerleisch, E. 2011. *In-depth study on the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.
- Walker, P. Wisner, B. 2005. *Beyond Kobe: A Proactive Look at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction - 18-22 January 2005, Kobe, Japan*. Medford: Feinstein International Famine Center. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2609_BeyondKobe.pdf>.
- Weather Risk Management Association. *Weather Risk and Agriculture*. Available at <<http://www.wrma>>.
- World Vision (2011) Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action: An Internal Analysis of Key Findings Submitted to the UNISDR by M. Bodenhamer.



International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

UNISDR Geneva

Tel.: +41 22 917 8908/8907

Fax: +41 22 917 8964

isdr@un.org

www.unisdr.org

www.preventionweb.net

UNISDR also has offices in North America, Africa, Asia and Pacific, the Americas, Europe, Central Asia and the Arab States.