

Guidance Note
on
National Consultations on the Post-HFA Consultation Process

Context

The *Hyogo Framework for Action* (HFA) is approaching the end of its ten-year timeframe (2005-2015). 133 governments reported in 2011, through the *HFA Monitor*, the progress made and challenges encountered in the implementation of the five priority areas of the HFA, altogether national reports represented mixed progress in building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters.

The progress includes an increased number of national policies, strategies, national plans and progress in multi-stakeholder engagement in disaster risk reduction. There are also improved early warning systems, contingency planning and better capacity for disaster response. This has improved the enabling environment for disaster risk reduction at multiple levels, especially at national level.

The challenges reveal that national policy, strategy and development plans for disaster risk reduction have not yet been adequately translated into coherent national action to reduce the underlying factors of disaster risks through risk-sensitive development. While progress is being made in reducing accumulated risk of disasters at national and local level through the HFA implementation, all too often new development continues to create vulnerability and greater risk of natural hazards. Net total disaster risk is therefore continuing to increase in both developed and developing countries. Continuing population growth, rapid urbanization and climate change will make risk reduction even more challenging in the future.

To reverse the current risk trend and reenergize commitment and effort to build the resilience of nations and communities to disasters, the member states of the United Nations requested UNISDR to facilitate development of a *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction* through UNGA Resolution 66/199.

UNISDR has prepared a background paper for a *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*, based on the HFA Mid-Term Review, the 2011 Global Assessment Report and the Chair's Summary of the 3rd Session of the Global Platform. The consultation paper outlined consultation process towards development of the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*.

Initial consultations

The consultation process was jointly launched in March 2012 by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction and the Ambassador for Japan to the International Organizations in Geneva. The background paper for the consultation process towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction has been well received and appreciated (see www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/post-hfa and available in the six UN languages).

A number of initial consultations have started with different stakeholders. This includes the introduction of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction to the UNISDR Support Group; dialogue with representatives of permanent missions to the United Nations in New York; and, a meeting of the Post-HFA Advisory Group. Between March and May 2012, UNISDR has engaged in consultations with the ISDR Asian Partnership Group in Bali; the regional inter-governmental organizations in Africa; the Second Leadership Development Forum on Mainstreaming Adaptation and Disaster Reduction into Development in Incheon; and, with local governments at 2012 Resilient Cities Congress in Bonn.

Initial consultations reconfirm that disaster risk reduction protects socio-economic gains towards sustainable development. To achieve sustainable development, there is a high demand for increased political and economic investment in reducing risks and building resilience. The substantive issues emerging from the consultations include the following:

Growing appreciation of the importance of disaster risk reduction among governments and other stakeholders, but the dominant mindset is still on disaster response. To change this mindset, deeper understanding of risk is needed, along with a rebranding of the key messages for risk reduction in a more positive manner – around development gains and economic growth.

More attention can be made to: applying evidence from the science and technology community, to ensure policy-making is sound; enhancing principles for trans-boundary collaboration for reducing risk and vulnerabilities; better measurement of the success and progress in disaster risk reduction, using well-defined targets and indicators.

Governance matters in risk reduction efforts; for instance, lack of transparency and corruption both substantially increase risk. There is a need to strengthen the governance of disaster risk reduction with an institutional focus. This work can look particularly at mechanisms for the implementation of policy and legislation, engaging finance and economic development ministries and emphasizing accountability. Decentralization of the roles and responsibilities of disaster risk reduction should be accompanied with budgets so that local authorities have sufficient control over the necessary resources.

Disaster risk reduction is not a simple expenditure, but rather a smart investment. The challenge is how to demonstrate the returns on the investment convincingly. The economics of disaster risk reduction should be further debated and researched, particularly at the national level. Existing good practices in smart investment in disaster risk reduction should be documented and widely shared.

Disaster risk reduction is a cross-cutting development issue; more needs to be done to address underlying risk factors through the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development. The Rio+20 and process towards the Post-2015 Development Agenda (post MDGs) provide strategic opportunities for coherence and synergy with the promotion of disaster risk reduction in development.

At the local level, a request for the framework to reflect inputs from people on the ground working in disaster risk reduction and resilience so that solutions are developed and implemented locally, with special attention to make disaster risk reduction gender-sensitive. The international agreement should acknowledge all known methodologies for building resilience including the use of assessment tools and needs to suggest new ways for tracking progress globally, to give all actors a sense that they're involved in something bigger than themselves, focusing on behaviour change and successful methods to facilitate such changes. In addition, the need for an explicit methodology for deciding how to fund what was also emphasized in the *Post-2015 Framework for disaster Risk Reduction*.

Objectives

The national consultations aim to:

1. Increase understanding and knowledge of disaster risk and its potential impact on population and development;
2. Engage stakeholders, especially those who have not yet been engaged in disaster risk reduction, yet whose understanding and action are imperative for reducing risk and building resilience;
3. Provide the main components for developing the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*.

Expected Results

The expected results of national consultations will be:

- An understanding of the impact of increased disaster risk reduction and implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action within the country;
- Key ministries or committees for development– especially those related to education, finance, development planning, land use planning, water resources management, environment, agriculture and urban planning – are engaged process and contribute substantially to its findings.
- Better understanding of the economic consequences of inadequate risk reduction versus smart investment in disaster risk reduction.

- Underlying factors and potential opportunities identified for integrating disaster risk reduction into development overall.
- National inputs provided for the development of the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*.

Questions to facilitate national consultations

The questions provided aims to facilitate national consultations, but not influence the consultation results. The five set of questions are proposed below, arranging from warm-up exercise and substantive issues, which matters for further actions in disaster risk reduction.

The first set of questions aims to warm up the atmosphere for the national consultations and ensure everyone is in a position to participate in the discussion easily.

- What key elements do you think are missing in the consultation process based on the presentation given? Why?
- What are the expectations of your government from the consultation process towards the development of the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*? Why?
- How do national and local entities influence development of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction?
- What are the opportunities and challenges in the national consultation process?

The second set of questions aim to emphasize the linkage between on-going HFA implementation and preparation of the *Post-HFA Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*, aiming to enhance understanding of the major achievements, challenges and opportunities in risk reduction and resilience building in the country.

- What are the key successes (or achievements) in disaster risk reduction since implementation of the HFA in 2005 and what contributed to the successes?
- What are the major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?
- What are the key elements that your government will focus on in the national consultation process towards development of the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*? Why?
- What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction*? Why?

The third set of questions aims to improve understanding between disaster and development, or risk reduction and sustainable development, thus paving the way for further mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and practices.

- Why disasters are not natural, but a consequences of flawed development planning and practices? How?
- What were the annual human and economic losses of disasters, triggered by natural hazards such as floods and earthquakes, accounting for direct and secondary losses, relief and recovery since 2005 in your country?
- Which development sectors have been affected by disasters since the implementation of HFA in 2005? How were these development sectors affected? And why?
- What has been done in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development since the implementation of the HFA began in 2005?
- What was the success or failure in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors, providing examples?

The fourth set of questions aims to promote discussion on the accountability and governance issues, in the hope that participants will provide insight on a potential set of values and principles for the governance of risk reduction.

- Who is accountable for implementation of Hyogo Framework for Action whose overarching goal is to build resilience of nations and communities to disasters? How?
- Who is accountable for integrating disaster risk reduction into development planning and development sector programme? Why?
- What is the national governance structure of disaster risk reduction? What are the key elements of risk reduction governance? What elements are missing?
- How does existing risk reduction governance deal with transparency, accountability and decentralization of disaster risk reduction as part of development policy and strategy?
- What needs to be done to incorporate accountability in disaster risk reduction in development planning and practices at national and local level?

The fifth set of questions aims to deepen understanding of the relationship between disaster risk reduction and development sectors where UNISDR has been advocating for action at national and local level, preparing the ground for further action in other development sectors.

- What progress has the government made in linking disaster risk reduction with climate change adaption? How?

- What has been done in integrating disaster risk assessment into land use and planning? How? What are the good practices and what are the lessons learned?
- What action has your government taken to integrate disaster risk assessment into urban planning and development? How were the actions taken? How much did they contribute to urban risk reduction?
- What has been done in making schools and hospitals resilient to disasters in your country? How were the actions carried out? What percentage of schools and hospitals became disaster resilient due to the action taken?

Reporting on consultations

As mentioned above, national consultations offer a great opportunity to further engage governments and stakeholders in reducing risk and building resilience. In order to understand better the progress and challenges without influencing respondents, five sets of questions were proposed to facilitate national consultations. Each set serves a different purpose and takes the DRR discussion deeper. Reporting on the discussions around the five sets of questions will be a bit challenging. Countries are encouraged to provide their reports **by 28 February 2013** in the following format which will make it possible to consolidate the results before the 4th session of the Global Platform.

- Summary of key points of the national consultation on the *Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction* in the opinion of the majority.
- Introduction of the national consultation, including meeting title, venue, and date in addition to objectives, participation and consultation methods.
- Summary of group discussions of each question given; the summary should reflect the essence of the group discussions, but not a particular individual opinion.
- Annex one: Final agenda.
- Annex two: Participants list.
- Annex three: A set of questions used at the consultation.