



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Fédération internationale des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge et du Croissant-Rouge
Federación Internacional de Sociedades de la Cruz Roja y de la Media Luna Roja
الاتحاد الدولي لجمعيات الصليب الأحمر والهلال الأحمر

Hyogo Framework for Action

Red Cross Red Crescent Consultation on Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

November 2012

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Community Preparedness and Risk Reduction Department
P.O. Box 372
CH-1211 Geneva 19
Switzerland
Tel.: +41 22 730 4222
www.ifrc.org

Executive Summary

Introduction & Methodology

In accordance with the UN General Assembly Resolution 66/199, the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) is facilitating the development of a post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) through a consultation process involving many stakeholders. To contribute its substantial experience and valuable input to this consultation process, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) commissioned a Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) consultation on post-2015 Framework for DRR, by distributing a questionnaire with key questions to its member National Societies (NS's) and relevant groups. The IFRC has consolidated the RCRC responses to the questionnaire to support NS's in their participation and contribution for the first phase of national consultations for development of a post-2015 framework for DRR.

Successes, challenges, opportunities

The implementation of HFA since 2005 has witnessed the key successes which include an increased collaboration between the different DRR stakeholders, the strengthening of the national legal and institutional frameworks and progress in integrating DRR into development planning. However, there have been challenges, too, like limited coordination amongst DRR stakeholders and a low level of DRR awareness. Due to the increasing number of disasters and their impact, resources have been invested more in disaster response than in DRR. In the future, priority will have to be given to building resilience at the community and national level, strengthening the role of communities and developing comprehensive DRR plans, policies and legislation.

Mainstreaming DRR into development

The failure to integrate DRR into development planning leads to the occurrence of more disasters annually around the world. The number of disasters is rising as well as the number of affected people and economic losses. The sectors mostly affected by disasters since 2005 are agriculture, infrastructure, health, education, commerce and trade and urban development. It is important to mainstream DRR into development planning by enacting the appropriate legislation and plans, creating national DRR institutions and conducting relevant awareness raising activities.

Accountability & governance

National governments are primarily accountable for the implementation of the HFA and for integrating DRR into development. A comprehensive and clear structure of the DRR governance guarantees transparency, accountability and decentralization of DRR as part of development policy and strategy. Strengthening monitoring and reporting mechanisms is also important in order to incorporate accountability in DRR in development at the national and local level.

DRR and development

In order to link DRR with climate change adaptation (CCA) it is important to develop appropriate legislation, policies and action plans. Appropriate legislation and plans also need to be developed in order to integrate disaster risk assessment into land use and planning and into urban planning and development. It is equally important to ensure the enforcement of that legislation, as very often the lack of respect of legislation leads to disasters, losses of human lives and economic damages.

Introduction

The World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) convened in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan in 2005, adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)¹ which set the following five priorities for action in disaster risk reduction (DRR) till 2015:

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 IFRC fully supported the outcomes of the WCDR and, while it has urged the States to deliver their commitments made at the conference, it has actively worked, through its member NS's and in partnership with the UN, governments, donors and civil society, to meet the objectives of the HFA.

As the HFA is approaching the end of its ten-year timeframe, the member states of the United Nations, through the UN General Assembly Resolution 66/199², requested the UNISDR to facilitate the development of a post-2015 framework for DRR in order to reverse the current risk trend and reenergize the commitment and efforts to build the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. To this end, UNISDR has initiated the consultative process involving all stakeholders concerned to produce a draft post-2015 HFA to be adopted at the WCDR in 2015. The consultative process has two phases. The first phase, which started in March 2012 and will finish in May 2013 with the Fourth Session of the Global Platform on DRR (GPDRR), is focusing on challenges, trends and solutions while exploring the linkages with CCA, sustainable development and poverty eradication. The second phase, which will finish with the WCDR in 2015, will move the discussions towards the identification of key priorities and the concrete form of the post-2015 HFA, which is expected to be formally endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 2015.

To facilitate the participation of NS's in national consultation on post-HFA and help them make active contribution to the consultation process, the IFRC has commissioned its own survey with a list of questions concerning the HFA.

Methodology

UNISDR has developed broad strategic questions with relevant sub-questions in order to stimulate further discussions around the substantive areas of focus for a post-2015 framework. As a key actor in the ISDR system committed to the HFA, the Red Cross Red Crescent aims to contribute its substantial experience and valuable input to this consultation process, ensuring that the perspectives and needs of the RCRC and vulnerable people are properly reflected in a post-2015 framework for DRR.

The IFRC has slightly modified UNISDR's questions to reflect the perspectives and needs of the RCRC and vulnerable people. These questions were circulated to RCRC NS's, the DRR Support Group of the Geneva Secretariat and the Disaster Preparedness and Risk Reduction (DPRR) Working Group of Partner National Societies (PNS's).

This report has consolidated the responses received from 29 NS's in Africa, the Americas, Asia Pacific, Europe and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), the DRR Support Group and the DPRR Working Group. Where

¹ Official HFA website <http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa>

² UN General Assembly Resolution 66/199, International Strategy on Disaster Risk Reduction, 28 February 2012, available online at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/resolutions/N1147076.pdf>

relevant, the results of the RCRC Mid-Term Review of the HFA³ conducted in October 2010 were also taken into account. Key messages have been developed for every set of questions based on the responses.

Acknowledgments

The IFRC expresses its deep thanks to the following DRR groups and NS's that provided answers to the post-HFA 2015 questionnaire:

- DRR Support Group
- DPRR Working Group
- National Societies

Africa	Americas	Asia Pacific	Europe	MENA
Cameroon Gambia Ghana Madagascar Namibia Uganda	Colombia Grenada Guatemala Nicaragua Trinidad and Tobago	Bangladesh Cambodia Myanmar Nepal Pakistan Sri Lanka	Finland Kyrgyzstan Macedonia Netherlands Switzerland Tajikistan Turkmenistan	Egypt Lebanon Morocco Yemen

³ Hyogo Framework for Action, RCRC Mid-Term Review, 2010, available in FedNet at <https://fednet.ifrc.org/PageFiles/96938/RCRC%20HFA%20Mid-Term%20Review.pdf>

RCRC Responses to the Questions

1. Key successes, challenges and opportunities

KEY MESSAGES

Successes

- *Increased collaboration between different DRR stakeholders*
- *Strengthening of the national legal and institutional frameworks for DRR*
- *Recognized need for integration of DRR into development planning*

Challenges

- *Limited coordination amongst DRR stakeholders, despite progress*
- *Need for increased awareness of DRR issues amongst stakeholders and the general public*
- *Increasing number of disasters and their impact diverts the attention from DRR to disaster response*
- *Lack of predictable and long-term funding for DRR*

Need to focus on:

- *Resilience building at community and national level*
- *Increased role of communities*
- *Developing comprehensive DRR plans, policies and legislation*

1.1 What are the key successes in DRR since implementation of the HFA in 2005 and what contributed to the successes?

Since the implementation of HFA in 2005, the efforts to reduce disaster risk have noticeably increased at all levels, i.e. local, national, regional and global. National and local governments, international and regional organizations, civil society and many other stakeholders have strengthened their commitment to DRR and the partnership amongst them. The HFA Monitoring and Progress Review process has facilitated the monitoring, evaluation and reporting on the implementation of DRR measures at the national, regional and global levels. It has helped capture key trends, progress and challenges in implementing the HFA. The mid-term review of the HFA⁴ highlighted the significant progress made in DRR from 2005 to 2010 and proved that the adoption of the HFA played a decisive role in promoting this progress across the globe.

One of specific successes is the increased collaboration between different DRR actors, especially between national and community authorities, civil society organizations and the RCRC NS's, all working in line with the HFA guidance. In Trinidad and Tobago, for instance, the DRR actors are using the HFA as a guiding tool for DRR in the country and they are all working towards achieving the same goals. The cooperation between NS's and governments and national institutions has improved and the support from governments to NS's on DRR issues has increased.

The national legal and institutional frameworks for DRR have been strengthened. National DRR platforms have been created to include many different actors and NS's and local DRR committees have been established in some cases as well. For example, 186 Local Disaster Committees were established in Tajikistan in the most disaster prone areas and vulnerable communities. In Uganda, a National DRR platform was established in the Prime Minister's Office, which serves as a multi-sectoral and multidisciplinary body that

⁴ See the HFA 2005-2015 Mid-Term Review here <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=18197>

brings together all actors in DRR, including government ministries, UN agencies, NGO's and development partners. It promotes coordination, networking, joint planning and information sharing in DRR. The development of national DRR plans and policies targeting vulnerable communities and the enactment or revision of disaster related legislation (e.g. building codes) is also an important success to be noted.

The integration of DRR and HFA priorities into development planning is another important success. The government of Cambodia is integrally merging the HFA and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) with its own strategy for the creation of the national development plan. The HFA has supported both institutional and community preparedness to be strengthened in an integrated manner. Improvement has been noted in vertical integration between international, national and community actors and in horizontal integration of preparedness as part of sustainable development. Contingency plans and early warning systems now tend to incorporate links to community mechanisms and capacity, and the integration of DRR into sustainable development has been fostered through better programme planning.

The increased number of DRR projects/programmes implemented is also an important success. They include public education and public awareness, mitigation, community-based disaster risk management, early warning and contingency plans. CCA is being included in DRR programming and integrated with health and gender issues. For example, the Government of Bangladesh has initiated a long term development plan entitled "Bangladesh Perspective Plan" for 2012-2021 which integrates DRR & CCA in all development policies and plans, including the Agriculture Policy 2011, Coastal Zone Policy 2012, Health Policy 2011, Environment Policy 2011, Cyclone Shelter Construction Maintenance and Management Policy 2011. DRR projects/programmes now rely on IT tools and databases that collect information on disaster losses, risk mappings, evacuation plans, vulnerability and capacity assessments and climate change impacts.

Multiple factors have contributed to the successes mentioned above. Most importantly, the increased awareness of DRR issues amongst authorities and the wider public has significantly contributed to the key successes in DRR since 2005. Information campaigns and public education organized by governments and the civil society played an important part in raising public awareness. In Nicaragua and Guatemala, for example, DRR issues have been integrated into schools' under the guidance of the HFA. At the global, regional and national levels, the HFA has contributed greatly to ensuring the shared recognition of DRR importance and priority among governments, international and national organisations. At the community level, participatory assessments and information campaigns such as the RCRC's vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) and public education and public awareness have greatly contributed to the public's enhanced awareness of their local disaster risks and coping mechanisms. Other success factors include the DRR legislation and the establishment of national DRR coordination mechanisms like National Platforms and in some cases the adoption of national strategies for DRR. All this has helped move the DRR agenda forward.

1.2 What are the major challenges for DRR? What are the underlying factors of these challenges?

A main challenge is the limited coordination amongst the responsible actors including authorities and other stakeholders in national and regional levels. This had been further impacted by the poor political commitment to ensure coordination. In Ghana, the commitment of the government and community leaders has been poor because of the limited political support from respective voters. Despite some progress in the creation of coordination mechanisms, as mentioned previously, there still remains a gap in coordination between the national and local setups. The needs and capacities of the most vulnerable are often not taken into account and in many countries the existing legislation fails to ensure the prioritization and coordination of DRR activities, in particular, with regard to the allocation of resources.

Another challenge is the lack of awareness and information on DRR. This includes not only the awareness of the national and local authorities but also the lack of education of and information for the vulnerable people. In addition, there is a lack of evidence that DRR actually leads to reduced impact of disasters. Such evidence will be useful to articulate DRR successes and thus raise awareness over and above anecdotes. In

Sri Lanka, there is a lack of knowledge and interest in DRR among the people and institutions. It is important to develop a culture of prevention amongst the vulnerable population. In Trinidad and Tobago, there is a need to raise awareness amongst governmental institutions, of the importance of DRR plans, policies and legislation. DRR legislation is needed in order to define clear roles and responsibilities of each institution and to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in disaster preparedness and response.

In addition, the increasing number of disasters and their impact has resulted in shifting a focus from DRR to disaster response. For example, the disasters recorded in Kyrgyzstan in 2005-2012 caused economic losses of US\$ 75 million. The number of disasters and affected population is increasing in Kyrgyzstan from year to year. The change of disaster patterns, mainly due to the effects of climate change, is also impacting on the ability of people to prepare for and reduce the related risks. Likewise, the economic damage caused by disasters is affecting the capacity of countries and National Societies to prepare for and respond to future disasters.

The underlying factor of these challenges is, first and foremost, that DRR has not become a national and local priority yet in many countries and communities. Another factor is the lack of resources for DRR activities. Limited financial, material and human resources hinder the collection and analysis of the data on disasters and the capacity to prepare for and respond to disasters. Despite some progress, there is still a lack of convincing evidence that DRR is more effective and economic than disaster response. Such evidence would encourage governments and decision makers to give firm priority to DRR and help allocate more resources to this end. Due to limited material and human resources in Gambia, it was not possible to conduct regular data collection, review and mapping information on disaster risks, climate change impact and the use of traditional and scientific knowledge to inform local DRR actions. In Madagascar where about 80 per cent of the population lives with less than US\$ 1 per day, it has been difficult to prioritize DRR activities.

1.3 What are the key elements you want your government to focus on in the national consultation process towards development of the *Post-2015 Framework for DRR*? Why?

It is important for governments to focus on their strengths, weaknesses; opportunities and threats (SWOT) in their implementation of HFA. This will help them identify their successes, failures and challenges and agree on the way forward. Since the SWOT analysis will reveal both internal and external factors that have influenced or will influence the future HFA implementation, the results would undoubtedly help change their mind set and priorities.

Governments should also focus on prioritizing these identified factors. A potential focus area should be the building of resilience at national and community level. A relevant priority in Gambia, for example, concerns the increase of community resilience through capacity development at the community level by using low investment strategies in order to ensure the sustainability of actions. In addition, further emphasis needs to be placed on discussing and agreeing on how to improve coordination among the different actors working in DRR. For example, putting strong National DRR platforms in place with the participation of all DRR stakeholders can lead to increased coordination. More focus on communities is also crucial. In Bangladesh, for example, there is a need to establish a systematic approach on community based risk reduction initiatives involving community people from vulnerability assessment to implementation of plans of action. It is important to develop a mechanism to strengthen communities' plans of actions through the development of strong and effective networks with governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Due attention should be given to how to strengthen DRR institutional bases to implement the HFA. By including the NS's and humanitarian NGO's in national DRR platforms, Governments will be better prepared to decide on DRR objectives and provide timely and effective disaster assistance. National DRR platforms will be strengthened through relevant national policies, plans and legislation. This includes the development of such policies through a broad consultation and their effective monitoring and enforcement.

1.4 What are the top three significant elements for DRR that should be addressed in the *Post-2015 Framework for DRR? Why?*

The first is to ensure the development of comprehensive DRR plans, policies and legislation at all levels. The national plans should be kept updated and include the clear roles and responsibilities of all relevant ministries and agencies while the legislation should contain all DRR-related elements. The framework should also specify how the mainstreaming of DRR into the national planning and legislation should be done and monitored. The second is the role of communities in building community safety and resilience and the involvement of communities and volunteers in DRR initiatives at all levels. The third is to ensure the integration of DRR into development planning and programmes and the post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation, with the ultimate goal of community resilience. This is essential as DRR does not stand alone and a holistic approach is necessary to ensure minimum losses after disasters. Even though the current HFA calls for the integration of DRR into national legislation and institutions, this has not yet been achieved to a satisfactory level. Setting targets and indicators could improve the periodical review of the framework. Other elements to be addressed in the post-2015 framework for DRR are to address newly-emerging DRR issues like urban risk and resilience and the linkage with the new MDG's and provides a mechanism to mobilize predictable and long-term resources to support DRR.

2. Mainstreaming DRR into development

KEY MESSAGES

- *Disasters are not natural, but a consequence of flawed development planning and practices.*
- *The failure of integrating DRR into development planning leads to more disasters around the world.*
- *The number of disasters around the world is rising as well as the number of affected people. While the number of human losses as a result of disasters is decreasing, the economic losses are increasing. For example, in 2011, economic losses caused by natural disasters amounted to more than 350 billion US\$.*
- *The sectors mostly affected by disasters since 2005 are agriculture, infrastructure, health, education, commerce and trade and urban development.*
- *In order to mainstream DRR into development planning it is important (1) to develop and/or revise appropriately the relevant plans, policies and legislation and include the DRR component in all of them, (2) establish a National DRR Platform or a similar national body responsible for coordinating all DRR-related activities together with other DRR stakeholders, and (3) focus on raising awareness amongst governmental authorities, civil society and the general public.*

2.1 Why are disasters not natural, but a consequence of flawed development planning and practices? How?

Hazards, such as floods and earthquakes, translate to disasters only to the extent that the population is unprepared to respond, unable to cope, and, consequently, severely affected. The vulnerability of humans to the impact of hazards is largely determined by human action or inaction. Even the occurrence of recent climatic anomalies attributed to global climate change is traced to human activities. With today's advancements in science and technology, including early warning and forecasting of natural phenomena, together with innovative approaches and strategies for enhancing local capacities, the impact of natural

hazards could be predicted and mitigated, its detrimental effects on populations reduced, and the communities adequately protected.

People can be more vulnerable because of failing development planning and practices, such as marginalization. Effective development planning and practices, on the other hand, can lead to less disasters taking place around the world. Therefore, development planning and practices are closely related to the occurrence of disasters. An aggravating factor is the failure to properly integrate DRR into development planning and programmes. Development projects need to include assessment of natural hazard risks as well as mechanisms to address those risks. The involvement of the local population is very important. In addition, it is necessary to encourage the revision of legislation, e.g. building codes and construction standards as well as laws protecting the environment.

Development mostly involves the use of natural resources. When development is planned with an excessive use of natural resources, this will cause greater vulnerability to disasters. The physical environment and resource availability are being affected by climate change, which in turn is being driven by human development and growth. Unsystematic urbanization is also a factor that increases vulnerability.

The lack of information on DRR, information on factors causing disaster and flawed education systems, result not only in flawed development planning and practices but also increased vulnerability of the affected population.

2.2 What were the annual human and economic losses of disasters, accounting for direct and secondary losses, relief and recovery since 2005 in your country?

In many countries, there is a lack of data collection or unavailability of public information on disasters and relevant losses in the country. For example, such data are not publicly available in Lebanon. In Sri Lanka the relevant data are collected by different national authorities but are not centrally consolidated.

In Africa and Asia Pacific, the losses concern human lives, infrastructure, community livelihoods and livestock, lost properties and also general economic losses. In Ghana disasters affect about 1% of the annual GDP. In Myanmar, the cyclone Nargis in 2008 resulted in 2.8 million life losses and 1 billion USD economic losses. In general, the country sees an average of 1,005 households and 6,300 persons affected per year and 1.2 million USD economic losses. In Bangladesh, natural disasters resulted in 505 million USD per year (2006-2010) in economic losses and the death of 946 people per year (2001-2010).

In the Americas, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL) estimated a loss of 120 million US\$ until 2007 for Nicaragua. In Colombia, 17,171 persons were affected from disasters from 2005-2012 while approximately 5.3 US\$ millions were lost. Economic losses were also noted particularly in the Middle East and the Caucasus countries. In Tajikistan, disasters that occurred from 2005-2012 led to the loss of 1,154 lives and to damages amounting to approximately 2.15 billion Tajikistani Somoni (450.7 million US\$).

2.3 Which development sectors have been affected by disasters since the implementation of HFA in 2005? How were they affected? And why?

Agriculture has been more affected by disasters than others since 2005 because of increasing impacts of climate change. The impact of disasters on the infrastructure of a country has also been severe, with enormous damages to roads, buildings and electricity supplies. Equally important is the impact on the sectors of health, education, water resources, commerce and trade and urban development. These sectors have been directly affected by disasters such as cyclones, floods, droughts and earthquakes because DRR has not been properly mainstreamed into these sectors. The lack of DRR awareness as well as the peoples' negligence is other reasons why these sectors have been affected by disasters.

Bangladesh experiences severe floods just before and after the monsoon. Cyclone Sidr (2007) affected 33 districts and resulted in huge loss of crops, livestock and fishery. At the time of the passage of cyclone SIDR, the main 2007 “aman” rice crop, accounting for about 70% of the annual production in the most affected area, was nearing harvest. According to the estimate by the Department of Agricultural Extension of Bangladesh, the loss in rice equivalent is at some 1.23 million tonnes, with 535,707 tonnes in the four severely affected districts, 555,997 tonnes in badly affected 9 districts and 203,600 tonnes in moderately affected 17 districts in Bangladesh.

2.4 What has been done in mainstreaming DRR into development since the implementation of the HFA in 2005?

Guidelines for mainstreaming DRR into development have been developed by various governments and international and national organizations. Related training has been provided to people concerned and advocacy has been done for them. The IFRC, the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) have developed a pilot version of the Model Act for the Facilitation and Regulation of International Disaster Relief and Initial Recovery Assistance released at the 31st International Conference of Red Cross and Red Crescent in December 2011. The Model Act aims to help states address some of the legal and regulatory issues that commonly arise concerning international assistance during disaster response.

National legislation and policies have been enacted or revised in order to mainstream DRR into development. Such examples are Disaster Management Acts including the DRR component and Disaster Risk Management Acts. National policies on DRR and national strategic plans have also been developed and some of them have included both the DRR and the climate change adaptation component. In 2009, Myanmar launched, through a consultative and partnership approach, the Myanmar Action Plan on DRR (MAPDRR) 2009-2015 aiming to help make Myanmar disaster resilient. MAPDRR has identified projects to be implemented in order to meet the HFA and the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) commitments. National DRR policies have also been developed, for example, in Pakistan and Guatemala. In Namibia, a national disaster risk management plan has been developed (based on the DRM policy and DRM Act) as well as regional multi-hazard contingency plans aiming at increasing DRR mainstreaming.

In addition, the establishment of National DRR platforms that include not only governmental authorities but sometimes also civil society and RCRC representatives has also contributed to mainstreaming DRR into development. The establishment of community-based DRR committees has also facilitated this mainstreaming process by developing disaster preparedness plans and early warning systems. National DRR Platforms were formed and a plan of action was developed in Gambia and Morocco. However, much remains to be done to make them functional

Relying on its mandate and strength, the RCRC has focused on public awareness and public education activities in its efforts to ensure the mainstreaming of DRR into development. Such activities have been conducted at regional, national and community level in order to improve the DRR knowledge of governmental authorities, civil society and the general public. Specific trainings of governmental officials and school pupils were also organized while DRR has in certain cases been included in schools’ curriculum. The Red Cross Society of Cameroon, for example, is organizing DRR trainings of communities, including pupils, taxi drivers and drivers in general. In Sri Lanka, efforts were made to mainstream DRR into development through advocacy campaigns, awareness sessions, training and reviews. Red Cross Societies of Nicaragua and Guatemala have also included DRR in the curricula of the education system.

The collaboration and coordination between regional networks, national authorities, international organizations, RCRC National Societies and the civil society is also vital in mainstreaming DRR into development.

2.5 What was the success or failure in mainstreaming DRR into development? Please provide examples.

The successes in mainstreaming DRR into development concern primarily the enactment and revision of DRR legislation, policies and plans. This includes the development of national DRR strategies, policies and action plans that sometimes integrate climate change adaptation. In some cases DRR and CCA have been included in various national policies such as health policy or agriculture policy. Such examples are a National Strategy on DRR adopted in Tajikistan and a National Strategic Plan on DRR and CCA adopted in Gambia by the government together with other partners.

Another success is the establishment of national DRR institutions. The creation of national DRR platforms is important in that regard as their work concerns mainly the development of effective disaster risk management mechanisms in the country. In Kyrgyzstan, for example, a DRR National Platform was established to develop an effective disaster risk management mechanism in the country. It involves all parties, including national and local authorities, international organizations and civil society.

DRR awareness raising has contributed to achieving successes in mainstreaming DRR into development. This has helped governmental authorities have a better understanding of the relationship between development and risk reduction. The process has been supported by the public awareness raising promoted through educational materials for schools, universities, general public and media. Awareness raising was part of the community preparedness activities carried out in Huila, Colombia, where an eruption in 1994 of the volcano Nevado del Huila had resulted in 650 victims. Through these activities and the establishment of early warning systems the communities could reduce the number of victims to ten in 2008 when a similar volcano eruption took place.

The failure in mainstreaming DRR into development is mainly related to the lack of political will and understanding among national and local authorities. Another factor contributing to this failure is a lack of mechanism to monitor and ensure the strict implementation of the policies and legislation enacted. In some countries laws regulating building codes have not been respected. In addition, national DRR policies and plans are not communicated to people at community level. Bangladesh is an example of unplanned urbanization and non compliance with building codes.

The inefficiency of national DRR platforms also contributes to failure. Some of them are still unable to mainstream DRR into development sectors in a successful way as they fail to coordinate professionally with other departments and stakeholders. In Sri Lanka, for example, many agencies are not able to successfully integrate and mainstream DRR into the development sectors.

3. Accountability and governance

KEY MESSAGES

- *National governments are primarily accountable for the implementation of the HFA and for integrating DRR into development.*
- *In order to ensure accountability it is important to have clearly defined roles and responsibilities of different DRR actors and to encourage the partnerships amongst them.*
- *A comprehensive and clear structure of the DRR governance guarantees transparency, accountability and decentralization of DRR as part of development policy and strategy.*
- *Strengthening monitoring and reporting mechanisms is important to incorporate DRR accountability in development at the national and local level.*

3.1 Who is accountable for implementation of HFA? How?

The national government is primarily accountable for the implementation of the HFA. In many countries there is a national committee for disaster management or DRR that brings together different government ministries responsible for implementing DRR plans and coordinating the activities amongst the different actors. This National Committee is ultimately accountable for the implementation of the HFA. For example, in Uganda and Morocco the National DRR Platform is accountable for the HFA implementation while in Cambodia the National Disaster Management Committee is in charge. In countries without such a committee, the national authority responsible for disaster management (e.g. emergency state commission, directorate of disaster risk management, national disaster management agency, and civil protection directorate) is accountable for the HFA implementation. The accountable authority in Macedonia, for example, is the Crisis Management Center, in Yemen the Ministry of Water and Environment and in Cameroon the Director of the Civil Protection under the Authority of the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralization.

The civil society and international organizations are also accountable as per their commitments to the HFA and as members of the national committees on DRR. Municipalities and local authorities are accountable in some cases as well as they are in charge of local governance and development.

The national DRR committees or the authority responsible for disaster management are accountable for the HFA implementation by ensuring coordination on DRR issues in regional and national level. They develop national DRR strategies and plans and work to integrate DRR in development. They also conduct risk assessments to implement HFA. Regular reporting, such as that encouraged for the HFA Progress Monitor Report, helps keep disaster risk reduction high on national agendas.

3.2 Who is accountable for integrating DRR into development? Why?

The government is mainly accountable for integrating DRR into development as it is an area under its responsibility and it is the government that endorsed the HFA which calls for the integration of DRR into development. The government performs such a function through the national DRR platform or through the ministry or governmental authority responsible for DRR or disaster management. This can be, for example, the emergency state commission, national disaster management authority, national bureau for disaster risk management, disaster preparedness agency etc. In Gambia, for example, the accountable authority is the National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA). In Turkmenistan, the State Commission on Emergency is the responsible body at the state level. In Nepal, development planning is conducted by the government and it involves all concerned agencies and departments.

Development and humanitarian agencies are also accountable for integrating DRR into development as they support governments in their development activities and have made commitments to the HFA.

3.3 What is the national governance structure of DRR? What are the key elements of risk reduction governance? What elements are missing?

In many countries, national DRR platforms represent the national governance structure of DRR; they develop DRR strategies and plans while integrating DRR activities into national developments plans and programs. These platforms are usually responsible for coordination between the different governmental authorities, international organizations, civil society and RCRC National Societies. In case of non existence of such a platform, there is usually a disaster management authority (e.g. state commission on emergencies, national council of DM, Ministry of DM, etc.) that has been given DRR responsibilities. Sometimes these authorities are directly under the Prime Minister's Office. Egypt, for example, responding to its HFA commitment, created the National Committee for Crisis Management and Disaster Risk Reduction (NCCMDRR) in 2006. This National Committee has several mandates corresponding to the goals and priorities of actions outlines

in the HFA and as DRR is a cross-cutting issue, the NCCMDRR is a multi-stakeholder mechanism providing coordination and facilitating the integration of DRR and DRM into national policies, planning and programmes. Apart from a National DRR platform, inter-ministerial committees are sometimes formed that gather all ministries and national committees working on disaster management and DRR.

The key elements of risk reduction governance are primarily the enactment of the appropriate DRR legislation and the establishment of an institutional framework that includes all DRR stakeholders. Additional elements for effective risk reduction governance include the coordination on DRR issues at all levels and mainstreaming DRR into development. In Guatemala, for example, the National Coordinator for DRR (CONRED) is a structure consisting of all public and private institutions, civil society and private sector working on DRR.

The main element missing is the lack of resources supporting DRR governance and a clear focus on DRR. In addition, the lack of effective coordination between the different DRR actors and between the different sectors is an issue that still has not been fully addressed.

3.4 How does the existing risk reduction governance deal with transparency, accountability and decentralization of DRR as part of development policy and strategy?

A comprehensive and clear structure of the DRR governance itself guarantees transparency, accountability and decentralization of DRR as part of development policy and strategy. An example is the existence of a National DRR Committee comprised of different governmental agencies, international and national organizations and the civil society together with the existence of a similar structure at the local level. Transparency seems thus to be guaranteed by the structure and the defined roles and responsibilities of all DRR actors. In some cases the National DRR platform created further working groups with the participation of local administrations, international organizations and civil society to ensure decentralization. In Trinidad and Tobago, the national governance structure follows the recommended HFA implementation plan by having a national platform headed by the national disaster office (ODPM). The ODPM has established a national stakeholder committee with four sub-committees with the responsibility of ensuring the accomplishment of the five HAF priority areas. Accountability is further guaranteed by a hierarchical structure that allows the government to supervise and monitor the DM or DRR authority.

Inter-agency coordination and organisation at all levels also contributed to transparency, accountability and decentralization as well as the application of the participatory approach with beneficiaries. An example of decentralization in Ghana is the National Disaster Management Organization (NADMO) which is responsible for the HFA implementation and for the coordination of the management of disasters and other emergencies. NADMO has its headquarters in Accra and its offices in ten Regions, 170 Districts and 900 Zonal capitals.

3.5 What needs to be done to incorporate accountability in DRR in development at national and local level?

In order to incorporate accountability in DRR in development at national and local level, due attention should be given to some specific areas. First of all, the roles and responsibilities of the different DRR actors need to be clearly defined and partnerships amongst them have to be developed. Both at the national and local level it is vital to clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of the different DRR stakeholders in order to incorporate accountability in DRR in development. It is important to clarify who is responsible for what, who establishes policies, seeks funding, implements projects, etc. This issue is directly related to the accountability of the different actors for the tasks they are assigned to. At the local level, in particular, it is important to ensure that the responsibilities of the local actors on DRR are strengthened and that they involve community participation that leads to a holistic approach in building resilience. After the clarification

of roles and responsibilities, the creation of partnerships is necessary to ensure complementarity in the different DRR actions.

Moreover, it is important to enact, revise and consequently enforce the DRR related legislation and policies. The need for accountability needs to be clearly reflected in DRR legislation, plans and policies. However, even when accountability mechanisms are in place, the implementation and enforcement of those is not always guaranteed, thus particular attention needs to be paid here.

Strengthening reporting mechanisms is also crucial to incorporate accountability in DRR in development at national and local level. There is a need for a coordinated system of reporting on DRR at all levels. The responsible national authorities need to report to the body supervising them but also to external mechanisms. Monitoring and evaluation is important as well in that regard. The HFA monitoring and review mechanism⁵ has been helpful in capturing the key trends and areas of progress and challenges at all levels in achieving the strategic goals of the HFA.

KEY MESSAGES

- *In order to link DRR with climate change adaptation it is important to develop appropriate legislation, policies and action plans.*
- *Appropriate legislation and plans also need to be developed in order to integrate disaster risk assessment into land use and planning and into urban planning and development. It is equally important to ensure the enforcement of that legislation, as very often the lack of respect of legislation leads to disasters, losses of human lives and economic damages.*
- *It is important to make schools and hospitals resilient to disasters. This can be done, primarily by the enforcement of the appropriate legislation together with trainings and awareness raising initiatives on DRR in these locations.*

4. Relationship between DRR and development sectors

4.1 What progress has the government made in linking DRR with climate change adaption? How?

First of all, relevant legislation, policies and action plans have been developed to link DRR with CCA. Uganda's Climate Change Policy has put a good emphasis on risk reduction and ecosystem management and restoration. A National Climate Change Policy was also adopted in Trinidad and Tobago. Gambia has put a National Strategic Plan on DRR and CCA in place. However, even though there are climate change mechanisms in place, they sometimes do not relate to DRR. In Cambodia, for example, there is a CCA and clean environment mechanism in place, but there is no linkage with DRR. Another good example can be found in Namibia, where a CCA policy has been developed with a CCA fund that supports DRR initiatives through the Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

The establishment of pertinent institutions has also proved useful in linking CCA with DRR. Such institutions include climate change agencies, forums and secretariats. In Uganda, there is a Climate Change Unit which is also participating in the National DRR Platform. The Ugandan Government has also introduced a parliamentary forum for climate change and another one for DRR to pursue these issues. In Sri Lanka, there is a separate secretariat formed under the Ministry of Environment dealing with climate change issues. The

⁵ See <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/?pid:222&pil:1>

Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief (DMRD) of Bangladesh is piloting joint projects with 13 departments of 12 sectoral ministries and with a range of other technical institutions through the Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP) in order to support and facilitate DRR and CCA inclusion in sectoral policies, planning and programming at all levels.

In addition, public awareness and public education and trainings have played an important role in linking DRR with CCA. Meetings, trainings, workshops and awareness campaigns have been conducted to raise public awareness of climate change risks and establish DRR and CCA linkages. In Myanmar the Department of Meteorology and Hydrology under the Ministry of Transport is the focal point for climate change. It conducts forums and workshops to create linkages with other departments, UN agencies, civil society and international organizations. In other cases, CCA forms part of school and military academies' curricula. Governments are also making efforts to inform the general public of CCA and DRR linkages. In Turkmenistan, the government has developed two national messages to inform the people of CCA and DRR activities at the territory of Turkmenistan. However, these messages have not been sufficiently published and have not been made easily available to the broader public.

Communities have also an important role to play in linking DRR and CCA. Sensitization of communities on DRR and CCA is very important. More and more disaster-prone communities are participating in DRR and CCA programmes by putting in place early warning systems and undertaking reforestation activities.

4.2 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?

In order to integrate disaster risk assessment into land use and planning, there is first of all a need to ensure the enforcement of the relevant legislation. In Nepal, for example, even though building codes are enacted, they are not properly implemented. In general, it is important to enforce municipal and urban planning regulations. There should also be legislation relating to land use and land conservation. A land use policy is in force in Grenada, for example.

In some cases, there are institutions in place, such as the Ministry of Land or Ministry of Agriculture, that initiate land use planning, guides on land utilization or strategic environment assessments in order to incorporate DRR into regional planning.

Communities have also an important role to play in integrating disaster risk assessment into land use and planning. It is necessary, however, to sensitize communities in order to involve them as much as possible. Ghana, for example, has established monthly community clean-up exercises in urban areas in order to ensure low flooding in the usual perennial flooding areas. The private sector can also play a part at the disaster risk assessment in land use and planning.

Examples of good practices include the current land mapping for proprietorship of land for communities in Cambodia (currently in progress) in order to eliminate illegal land owning. In Myanmar, mangrove plantations have taken place as well as environmental conservation practices between people and local NGOs. In Sri Lanka, strategic environment assessments were carried out in certain areas and they are being used as a basis in incorporating DRR into regional planning and land use planning. In Lebanon, even though the Council of Development and Reconstruction updated the final synthetic report of the National Physical Master Plan for Lebanon in 2008, it did not integrate disaster risk assessment in it.

4.3 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?

The enactment and revision of legislation is an important factor in integrating disaster risk assessment into urban planning and development. Regulations are in place in certain cases for urban planning and

development, building codes have or are in the process of being enacted and revised. National Disaster Risk Management plans might also include provisions on how to integrate disaster risk assessment into urban planning and development and how to ensure such integration also from other stakeholders. The development of specific building codes for seismic zones and floodplains as well as codes for urban areas is also very useful. In Macedonia, for example, there are legal regulations and procedures concerning urban planning and development and the government is responsible for implementing those. In Ghana there are plans to review the act establishing the National Disaster Management Organization (NADMO) by the parliament which will incorporate disaster risk assessment in development and urban planning. In Sri Lanka, actions were taken to incorporate DRR into urban planning and a pilot project is being implemented in three urban councils under the Resilience City Programme.

Certain governmental instructions are developing programmes that contribute to the integration of disaster risk assessment into urban planning. For example, in Bangladesh, the Capital City Development Authority has proposed the Detailed Area Plan for Dhaka City to facilitate safe urban settlement and micro land zoning and to protect wetlands. In Uganda, climate smart assessment was conducted in education institutions in urban areas, e.g. flood assessments in Kampala.

4.4 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?

Governmental bodies, international organizations (e.g. UNICEF) and other DRR stakeholders, including NS's, are conducting DRR trainings and awareness raising activities in schools. However, they are not well coordinated in many cases. DRR has in some cases been or will be soon incorporated into schools and medicine and nursing faculties' curricula. In Ghana, disaster clubs have been set up in schools and universities to sensitize students on DRR. First aid trainings and evacuation plans are also often taking place in schools. In Lebanon, for example, first aid trainings and evacuation plans have been conducted in eight schools in the south of the country by the Lebanese Red Crescent in collaboration with UNDP and UNRCO while there are plans to work on other areas as well. "Safe Schools" programmes were conducted at the local government level in Trinidad and Tobago and Grenada. In Trinidad and Tobago, a "Safe Hospital Index" programme was also developed by PAHO/WHO and as a result each Regional Health Authority has a DM Coordinator whose responsibility is to ensure that hospitals under their jurisdiction have the necessary plans for DRR. The Safe Hospital Index is a risk matrix assessment of these critical infrastructures, specifically the ability to conduct an evacuation and the time needed to restore these critical infrastructures to a normal level of operations. Evacuations drills are also performed in hospitals. Bangladesh noted that activities such as earthquake risks assessments in schools and hospitals resulted in 20% of schools and hospitals being resilient in three major cities (Dhaka, Chittagong and Sylhet).

In addition, legislation, policies and plans have been developed in some cases dealing with the resilience of schools and hospitals. These include all DRR-relevant legislation, safer building codes, disaster preparedness plans for schools and hospitals, action plans for health response in case of disaster etc. In Sri Lanka, a model of a resilient building was developed and shared with the Ministries of Health and Education along with guidelines to be considered in future constructions.