In-depth study on the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

Prepared by

Ms. Eva von Oelreich

January 2011

In-depth study on the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

> … The Chile earthquake is yet another tragic reminder that disaster risk is increasing globally. The Hyogo Framework for Action commits all countries to make major efforts to reduce their disaster risk by 2015. The entire UN system is engaged in supporting these efforts. It is clear that much more needs to be done to ensure that disaster risk reduction becomes natural part of our development efforts.
>
> *Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon's remarks to informal plenary meeting of the General Assembly on Chile, 10 March 2010.*

I. Introduction

This in-depth study on the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA) is one of a series undertaken within the Mid-Term Review of the HFA.

The objective is to review actions taken by the United Nations system as a whole and by its specialized agencies, funds and programmes more directly involved in disaster risk reduction, to ascertain how and to what extent the United Nations is undertaking the tasks outlined in the HFA for international organizations; and to suggest ways in which the engagement of the United Nations System and its specialized agencies focusing on disaster risk reduction can be increased, including by looking at other fields where different parts of the UN System have been required to work together on a cross-cutting issue, i.e. HIV/AIDS, mine action, gender issues.

The HFA states that its implementation *"will be appropriately reviewed"* and requests partners (in particular the Inter-Agency Task Force, which in 2007 was replaced by the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction) in the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (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 organizations and other stakeholders ...".*

Anticipating the approaching mid-point of the HFA, in 2008 the Secretary-General indicated to the General Assembly (GA) that the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in June 2009 would initiate the Mid-Term Review of HFA expected by 2010; this was welcomed by the GA.

The second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Reduction, 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".*

II. Disaster risk reduction, its mandate and the United Nations System

II.1 *Milestones prior to the Hyogo Framework for Action*

In 1971, the General Assembly asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to appoint an Emergency Relief Coordinator for assistance in cases of natural disasters (resolution 2816 (XXVI)): it was a concrete step forward in supporting the need for international coordination.

At that time the focus was on relief, warning systems, stock piling and other pre-disaster planning. Prevention was barely mentioned.

During the same period, a separate strand of thinking emanated from the development and environment sides. This led to General Assembly resolution 3345 (XXIX) in 1974, which requested multidisciplinary research to synthesize knowledge on the relationships between population, resources, environment and development, to support efforts to cope with these complex and multidimensional problems in the context of social and economic development. In 1987, the General Assembly[1] could finally refer to the report from the World Commission on Environment and Development, which suggested new national and international approaches in dealing with the various factors affecting the environment, *including natural disasters*. The Assembly decided to designate the 1990s as a decade in which the international community, under the auspices of the United Nations, would pay special attention to fostering international cooperation in the field of natural disaster reduction. The decision also built on the Secretary-General's report on the work of the organization[2] and input from the humanitarian side; contrary to the common view that understanding about the need for reducing disaster risk was largely driven by humanitarian understanding, the ownership was much broader.

In 1989, the General Assembly thus proclaimed the *International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR)*,[3] highlighting that "fatalism about natural disasters is no longer justified". Its International Framework of Action contained broad, comprehensive goals related to natural disaster reduction. Humanitarian, environment and development links were clearly spelt out, as was the need for a collaborative approach of United Nations agencies. Five years later, in 1994, having considered the outcome of the World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction in Yokohama the same year, especially the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World and its Plan of Action, the GA again recognized the close interrelationship between disaster reduction and sustainable development, which had also been pointed out at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio in 1992. With hindsight, a scientific and technological focus in the 1990s came to overshadow some of the broader ambitions of the IDNDR framework, but an important conceptual and policy foundation had nevertheless been constituted.

A decade on, in December 1999, the General Assembly[4] endorsed the swift establishment of future arrangements for disaster reduction as well as functional continuity for the effective implementation of *the international strategy for disaster reduction (ISDR)* as the successor to the IDNDR with an inter-agency secretariat and an inter-agency task force. The GA called on governments to cooperate and coordinate with the United Nations system and partners to implement the strategy and make it comprehensive in order to maximize international cooperation in the field of natural disasters, based on effective division of labour. This covered everything from prevention to early warning, response, mitigation, rehabilitation and reconstruction – including through capacity-building at all levels, and the development and strengthening of global and regional approaches that were to take into account regional, sub-regional, national and local circumstances and needs, as well as the need to strengthen coordination of national emergency response agencies in natural disasters.

In December 2001, the GA[5] stressed that *the ISDR secretariat* should be consolidated and enhanced to perform its functions effectively *to serve as the focal point in the United Nations*

---

[1] A/RES/42/169.
[2] A/RES/42/169.
[3] A/RES/44/236.
[4] A/RES/54/219.
[5] A/RES/54/219.

System for the coordination of disaster reduction, and to ensure synergies among the disaster reduction activities of the United Nations System and regional organizations and activities in socio-economic and humanitarian fields. The multi-sectoral, interdisciplinary and cross-cutting nature of disaster reduction was also emphasized.

During the following years, the General Assembly resolutions on disaster risk reduction further stressed particular parts of the Strategy, for instance the need for disaster risk assessments as an integral component of development plans and poverty eradication programmes, underlining the importance of combining efforts at all levels of the development, humanitarian, scientific and environmental communities as well as the importance of a regional outreach of the inter-agency secretariat. The need to better understand and address socio-economic activities that exacerbate the vulnerability of societies to natural disasters and to build and further strengthen community capability to cope with disaster risks were also highlighted.

If there had been any initial hesitation at organizing yet another UN global conference in 2005, there was also massive evidence from previous decades to support the need for concerted action. When the *World Conference on Disaster Reduction* took place from 18 to 22 January 2005 in Kobe (Hyogo Prefecture), Japan, the world had just been shaken by the overwhelming Indian Ocean tsunami of 26 December, 2004, in which over 200,000 persons lost their lives. Because of the tsunami, the level of attendance at the conference increased further and the outcome was the Hyogo Framework for Action, adopted by 168 governments.

II.2 *Hyogo Framework for Action*

In December 2005, the General Assembly[6] endorsed the *Hyogo Declaration and Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters* adopted by the World Conference on Disaster Reduction earlier that year. The scope of the HFA encompasses disasters caused by hazards of natural origin and related environmental and technological hazards and risks and therefore *reflects a holistic and multi-hazard approach to disaster risk management*. The HFA calls for a more effective integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies, planning and programming; for the development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities to build resilience to hazards and for a systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes.

The Assembly also stressed the importance of further strengthening the capacity of the ISDR system to provide a solid basis for action as mandated by the HFA[7]. In 2005 a number of consultations, reviews and an evaluation were undertaken to ensure that an effective ISDR was supporting the Framework.

II.3 *Hyogo Framework for Action mandated work for the United Nations System*

International organizations
"International organizations, including organizations of the United Nations System and international financial institutions, were called upon to undertake the following tasks within their mandates, priorities and resources:

(a)   Engage fully in supporting and implementing the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, and cooperate to advance integrated approaches to building disaster resilient nations and communities, by encouraging stronger linkages, coherence and integration of

---

[6] A/RES/60/195.
[7] A/RES/60/195.

disaster risk reduction elements into the humanitarian and sustainable development fields as set out in this Framework for Action;

(b) Strengthen the overall capacity of the United Nations system to assist disaster-prone developing countries in disaster risk reduction through appropriate means and coordination and define and implement appropriate measures for regular assessment of their progress towards the achievement of the goals and priorities set out in this Framework for Action, building on the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction;

(c) Identify relevant actions to assist disaster-prone developing countries in the implementation of this Framework for Action; ensure that relevant actions are integrated, as appropriate, into each organization's own scientific, humanitarian and development sectors, policies, programmes and practices and that adequate funding is allocated for their implementation;

(d) Assist disaster-prone developing countries to set up national strategies and plans of action and programmes for disaster risk reduction and to develop their institutional and technical capacities in the field of disaster risk reduction, as identified through the priorities in this Framework for Action;

(e) Integrate actions in support of the implementation of this Framework into relevant coordination mechanisms such as the United Nations Development Group and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (on humanitarian action), including at the national level and through the Resident Coordinator system and the United Nations Country teams. In addition, integrate disaster risk reduction considerations into development assistance frameworks, such as the Common Country Assessments, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and poverty reduction strategies;

(f) In close collaboration with existing networks and platforms, cooperate to support globally consistent data collection and forecasting on natural hazards, vulnerabilities and risks and disaster impacts at all scales. These initiatives should include the development of standards, the maintenance of databases, the development of indicators and indices, support to early warning systems, the full and open exchange of data and the use of in situ and remotely sensed observations;

(g) Support States with the provision of appropriate, timely and well coordinated international relief assistance, upon request of affected countries, and in accordance with agreed guiding principles for emergency relief assistance and coordination arrangements. Provide this assistance with a view to reducing risk and vulnerability, improving capacities and ensuring effective arrangements for international cooperation for urban search and rescue assistance. Ensure that arrangements for prompt international response to reach affected areas are being developed at national and local levels and that appropriate linkages to recovery efforts and risk reduction are strengthened;

(h) Strengthen the international mechanisms with a view to supporting disaster stricken States in the transition phase towards sustainable physical, social and economic recovery and to reducing future risks. This should include support for risk reduction activities in post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes and sharing of good practices, knowledge and technical support with relevant countries, experts and United Nations organizations;

(i) Strengthen and adapt the existing inter-agency disaster management training programme based on a shared, inter-agency strategic vision and framework for disaster risk management that encompasses risk reduction, preparedness, response and recovery".

The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

"The partners in the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, in particular, the Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction and its members, in collaboration with relevant national, regional, international and United Nations bodies and supported by the inter-agency secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, are requested to assist in implementing this Framework for Action as follows, subject to the decisions taken upon completion of the review process[8] of the current mechanism and institutional arrangements:

(a) Develop a matrix of roles and initiatives in support of follow-up to this Framework for Action, involving individual members of the Task Force and other international partners;

(b) Facilitate the coordination of effective and integrated action within the organizations of the United Nations system and among other relevant international and regional entities, in accordance with their respective mandates, to support the implementation of this Framework for Action, identify gaps in implementation and facilitate consultative processes to develop guidelines and policy tools for each priority area, with relevant national, regional and international expertise;

(c) Consult with relevant United Nations agencies and organizations, regional and multilateral organizations and technical and scientific institutions, as well as interested States and civil society, with the view to developing generic, realistic and measurable indicators, keeping in mind available resources of individual States. These indicators could assist States to assess their progress in the implementation of the Framework of Action. The indicators should be in conformity with the internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration;

Once that first stage has been completed, States are encouraged to develop or refine indicators at the national level reflecting their individual disaster risk reduction priorities, drawing upon the generic indicators.

(d) Ensure support to national platforms for disaster reduction, including through the clear articulation of their role and value added, as well as regional coordination, to support the different advocacy and policy needs and priorities set out in this Framework for Action, through coordinated regional facilities for disaster reduction, building on regional programmes and outreach advisors from relevant partners;

(e) Coordinate with the secretariat of the Commission on Sustainable Development to ensure that relevant partnerships contributing to implementation of the Framework for Action are registered in its sustainable development partnership database;

(f) Stimulate the exchange, compilation, analysis, summary and dissemination of best practices, lessons learned, available technologies and programmes, to support disaster risk reduction in its capacity as an international information clearinghouse; maintain a global information platform on disaster risk reduction and a web-based register "portfolio" of disaster risk reduction programmes and initiatives implemented by States and through regional and international partnerships;[9]

(g) Prepare periodic reviews on progress towards achieving the objectives and priorities of this Framework for Action, within the context of the process of integrated and coordinated follow-up and implementation of United Nations conferences and summits as mandated by

---

[8] A review process regarding the institutional arrangements within the United Nations pertaining to disaster reduction is currently being carried out [in 2005] and will be completed, following the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, with an evaluation of the role and performance of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction.

[9] To serve as a tool for sharing experience and methodologies on disaster reduction efforts. States and relevant organizations are invited to actively contribute to the knowledge-building process by registering their own effort on a voluntary basis in consideration of the global progress of the Conference outcomes.

the General Assembly,[10] and provide reports and summaries to the Assembly and other United Nations bodies, as requested or as appropriate, based on information from national platforms, regional and international organizations and other stakeholders, including on the follow-up to the implementation of the recommendations from the Second International Conference on Early Warning (2003).[11]"

III. Findings

III.1 *Methodology*

To identify the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the HFA, two main aspects – *global policy development* and *country level operationalization* were selected as a focus. The study looked at the UN contribution as a system and as separate UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies. The methodology included a desk review and analysis of United Nations resolutions, Secretary-General's reports and main other United Nations documents, related to the HFA. The desk review also included study of individual United Nations funds, programmes, specialized agency policies, frameworks, strategies, other guidance and reports on follow up to HFA support as far as they were available as well as references to disaster risk reduction on agency websites (annex 4). In addition, interviews were undertaken in person and by phone and email on current and (ideas around) future contributions to the implementation of the HFA (annex 3). Finally, a sub-study of characteristics of certain other inter-agency and cross-cutting initiatives, namely UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict, UNAIDS, UN Mine Action, and UN Women was undertaken.

Nineteen United Nations entities were asked to carry out an internal review to ascertain to what extent relevant colleagues are aware of the expectations placed on the organization in the context of the HFA and what internal systems and mechanisms are in place, if any, to ensure that these expectations are actually translated into appropriate policy directives, programming and funding requirements as well as monitoring and evaluation of activities. Eleven UN entities answered the request and the answers were analysed in conjunction with the overall analysis.

III.2 *Global policy level 2005-2010*

111.2.1 *UN resolutions and other documents further emphasizing the HFA*

The HFA was the product of consultations led by the UNISDR secretariat. Since the World Conference in Kobe in January 2005 and its adoption by the General Assembly[12], *the HFA is being increasingly referred to in United Nations documents*.

The Official Document System of the United Nations (ODS) database by early December 2010 identified 407 documents which refer to the HFA; 37 of them are General Assembly resolutions.

If progress were to be measured in relation to references to the HFA in General Assembly resolutions and other overarching UN meeting documents, the HFA is a success story. This is also reflected in the sense that Member States in a number of statements acknowledge disaster risk reduction as an essential issue for a disaster-prone country and HFA as a useful framework

---

[10] General Assembly resolution 57/270B, follow-up to United Nations conferences, and the General Assembly resolutions on Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, which request the Secretary-General to report to the second committee of the General Assembly under "Sustainable development" (54/219, 56/195, 57/256 58/214, 58/215, 59/231).

[11] General Assembly resolution 58/214.

[12] A/RES/60/195.

for implementation. It is also possible to deduce from the character of the statements that disaster risk reduction is an issue on the importance of which, in principle, there is little disagreement amongst Member States.   This gives increasing opportunity for support from the United Nations for HFA implementation, urging to accelerate that support to come through forcefully.

The Secretary-General's Reports to the General Assembly on the Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction during the years 2005-2010 are probably the richest available analytical shortcut to achievements, challenges and recommendations related to the ISDR and to the first five years of the HFA.

Some documents are crucial for the United Nations support to HFA in that they spell out *fundamental links to climate change adaptation* and to the Millennium Development Goals. In December 2007, for example, the General Assembly[13] recognized that certain measures for disaster risk reduction in the context of the Hyogo Framework for Action can also support adaptation to climate change and emphasized the importance of strengthening the resilience of nations and communities to natural disasters through disaster risk-reduction programmes and the importance of coordinating climate change adaptation with relevant natural disaster risk reduction measures. Resolution A/64/695 mentions that the HFA provides the internationally agreed framework for reducing disaster risks and that it is widely acknowledged as an important tool for adaptation to climate change.

The links to the Millennium Development Goals are also being stated more clearly. In the General Assembly outcome document 2010[14] *Keeping the promise*, "we acknowledge that disaster risk reduction and increasing resilience to all type of natural hazard, including geological and hydro-meteorological hazards, in developing countries, in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, can have multiplier effects and accelerate achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Reducing vulnerabilities to these hazards is therefore a high priority for developing countries. We recognize that small island developing states continue to grapple with natural disasters, some of which are of increased intensity, including as the result of the effects of climate change, impeding progress towards sustainable development".

These resolutions act as guidance to understanding essential interrelationships. Sustainable development cannot be achieved without mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into main policies and practices.

Several resolutions refer to the HFA, such as on international cooperation in humanitarian assistance in natural disasters, from relief to development and the strengthening of the coordination of UN emergency humanitarian assistance, those on natural disasters and vulnerability, the follow up to the 2005 World Summit, the implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) and the International Year of Planet Earth in 2008, and all have implications for the support for implementation of the HFA for UN entities.

Other documents pertain to specialized issues such as the United Nations platform for space-based information for disaster management and emergency response, international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, international cooperation to reduce the impact of the El Niño phenomenon and specific disaster situations, such as the reconstruction and prevention in the aftermath of the Indian Ocean tsunami disaster, Pakistan in the aftermath of the South Asian earthquake disaster and Haiti after the 2010 earthquake.

---

[13] A/RES/62/192.
[14] A/65/L.1/13 and 115.

The recent resolution on the Mauritius strategy for the further implementation of the programme of action for the sustainable development of small island developing states recognizes specifically the need to promote the development of regional and national capacities for disaster risk reduction, including through, inter alia, early warning systems, as well as reconstruction and rehabilitation of areas affected by natural disasters, including through further implementation of the internationally agreed framework for disaster risk reduction, the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

Some Boards and Assemblies of UN entities have also expressed their support to the issue. One example is the World Health Assembly, which has called on Member States to strengthen emergency preparedness related to climate change, epidemics and pandemics.

The further emphasizing of the Hyogo Framework for Action in General Assembly resolutions and other main UN documents is a strong indication of Member States of the United Nations underpinning the importance of disaster risk reduction. This needs to be accompanied by decisive and systematic support to country action by the United Nations and its funds, programmes and specialized agencies.

III.2.2. Secretary-General's decisions as well as mechanisms in support of global needs for the implementation of the HFA

Since the HFA was adopted by the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005 and endorsed by the General Assembly the same year, a number of initiatives in accordance with the HFA to facilitate its implementation by the United Nations system have been put in place.

The *Secretary-General's decisions at the UN Policy Committee, in April 2007*, were essential confirmation of UN ownership in disaster risk reduction in that the Secretary-General would take global leadership in articulating the urgent need for systematic action to reduce the exposure and vulnerability of communities, and to build the resilience of nations and communities to natural hazards through a series of high-level advocacy initiatives. The UN was also to take a series of steps to enhance links and ensure synergy between disaster risk reduction and climate change agendas. In addition, disaster risk reduction and the HFA were to be further mainstreamed into the UN System's policies and practices, together with a rights-based approach. The UNDG Executive Committee was to play a more active role in strengthening action on disaster risk reduction, particularly in focusing on national institutional capacity building and establishing stronger collaboration with regional organizations. The UNDG was further to mainstream disaster reduction into development processes and systematically and coherently increase the UN system's support to Member States to implement the HFA, particularly through national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, and the UNDAF process. Finally, the UNDG was to set specific targets for disaster risk reduction goals in selected high-risk low capacity countries.

The Secretary-General's leadership in relation to disaster risk reduction and the Hyogo Framework for Action is crucial. The UNISDR secretariat needs to continue to ensure that the Secretary-General has enough support to be able to provide and further strengthen that leadership to give the issue the political space and profile necessary and the systematic support to implementation that Member States have expressed and the urgency of the issue warrants.

To support the United Nations and broader international community contribution to government implementation of the HFA, the **Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (Global**

Platform) was established as the successor mechanism to the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF)[15] in 2006. The Global Platform is an outcome of political will and provides a dynamic scene for governments and a wide range of other stakeholders to assess progress made in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, to enhance awareness of disaster risk reduction, provide guidance, share experiences and learn from good practice, identify remaining gaps and identify actions to accelerate national and local implementation[16]. Stakeholders include inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, international financial institutions, thematic platforms and scientific and technical bodies covering the social, economic, humanitarian, political, environmental and scientific fields as well as civil society and the private sector. This informal platform is, therefore, unique within the United Nations both in that *it reaches far beyond the United Nations and Member States* into NGOs, networks, scientific bodies, etc. and in that *it has an interactive character*. As such, the Global Platform effectively is a forum in which the United Nations can define its role in interaction with other stakeholders. The outcome document of the Global Platform meetings is a Chair's Summary.

The sheer number of partners is unusual in a UN context. The headline "UNISDR System Partners" on the UNISDR website lists 3,315 organizational contacts. The first Global Platform meeting in 2007 was attended by 124 Member States and 105 regional, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, all in all 1,150 participants. The second Global Platform was attended by 152 governments and 137 organizations, 1,688 participants in total, including heads of states and ministers. Both are massive manifestations of a new and more open, multi-stakeholder mechanism that shows further potential.

Within the UN context, the Global Platform is a unique multi-stakeholder mechanism with much potential. To further enhance the opportunity and usefulness of this forum, the Chair's Summary could be transformed into an inter-platform meeting document for informal, yet systematic follow up and implementation between meetings.

The **ISDR inter-agency secretariat** core areas are coordination within the United Nations on disaster risk reduction, support to the Global Platform and regional coordination mechanisms, partnership development, communications and advocacy, policy development, knowledge management and resource mobilization.

The UNISDR secretariat is doing advocacy and building awareness broadly and the multi-stakeholder character of the ISDR system is evident. In fact, some interviewees suggest that the UNISDR secretariat is better known and appreciated outside the United Nations than within. Documentation, communication and knowledge management related to disaster risk reduction have resulted in products which are easily available, including to partners, according to interviewees. There is a lingering impression, pointed out by some UN colleagues, that the UNISDR as a secretariat is spread thinly, but no evidence of this has been identifiable in this study. Instead, the secretariat is fulfilling its biennial work plan systematically, related to means available. The weakest part of the UNISDR secretariat function has to do with its lack of mandate, namely in providing intra-UN coordination and mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction. Collaboration must rely on other UN entities willing to collaborate, which in turn depends on the Secretary-General's stated prioritization of the issue. Analysing UNISDR's work programme, priorities and working methods, the UNISDR secretariat appears to have systematically identified bottlenecks and has sought ways to overcome unintended blockages, using informal ways to highlight issues in question. Some of these measures facilitate mainstreaming of DRR (i.e. UNDAF guidelines, acquiring observer status in the UN Development Group (UNDG) and in the Executive Committee of Economic and Social Affairs

---

[15] A/RES/61/198.
[16] A/RES/62/192.

(ECESA), willingness to second a support person to the Secretary-General's office).   Another weakness relates to the very limited regional support structure, given financial limitations, which in spite of good individual staff available, needs to invest more in global coherence. In strategic terms, the UNISDR secretariat, however, seems to have got it largely right. .

The UNISDR secretariat has supported the implementation of the HFA strategically, but is partly impeded by the way it can interact within the UN system. In spite of that, it has created working ways to facilitate interaction, but needs stronger support in the future.

To ensure actions that would give further impetus to the implementation of the HFA and to issues of disaster risk reduction, a post of **Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG)** for Disaster Risk Reduction (SRSG), at the Assistant Secretary-General level, was established in 2008. The SRSG leads and oversees the UNISDR secretariat, oversees the Trust Fund, ensures strategic and operational coherence between disaster risk reduction and preparedness and response as well as socio-economic activities and carries out high-level advocacy and resource mobilization. The SRSG function, particularly, aims at mobilizing international support to Member States and all concerned organizations for the implementation of the HFA and is, therefore, especially of use when relating to the international community outside the United Nations. The visible advocacy function of the SRSG provides enhanced opportunities for strengthened implementation of the HFA. The role of the UNISDR SRSG, a tangible upgrading of the executive function and key to creating political will and space for disaster risk reduction, is widely applauded both inside and outside the UN, not least by resident coordinators, who see the SRSG's function as a facilitation of their work.

The SRSG function is seen as positive and strong leadership and has in the short time since it was established shown great value. The multi-stakeholder character of UNISDR makes advocacy and awareness raising more multi-faceted and thus potentially more rewarding.   The function should continue to be utilized strongly to raise the stakes of disaster risk reduction, which by nature is a "silent" issue.

A **Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction** (GAR), produced biannually by the UNISDR secretariat, monitors disaster risk trends and the implementation of the HFA. Many UNISDR partners are providing research, case studies and analysis. The GAR contributes to the achievement of the HFA through monitoring, analysing and presenting risk patterns and trends and progress in disaster risk reduction, whilst providing strategic policy guidance to countries and the international community. The Report seeks to increase political and economic commitment to risk reduction as well as the effectiveness of risk reduction policy and strategies. The web version of the first GAR 2009 had 275,000 copies downloaded by October 2010, and 10,000-15,000 copies are still being downloaded each month, a remarkable uptake of the first GAR. It is based inter alia on the HFA Monitor[17], an online tool to capture information on progress in HFA, generated through a multi-stakeholder review process. Inputs in 2009-2011 will lead to the generation of comprehensive National Progress Reviews for the period 2009-2011, and overall analysis of progress will be published in the second GAR, which will be launched at the third session of the Global Platform in May 2011.

The Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction has been reviewed favourably as an authoritative product by both governments and the international community. The opportunity to reach "the whole" community is especially valuable. The GAR is still testing many of its

---

[17] The HFA Monitor has been designed and coordinated by the ISDR secretariat. The primary purpose of the HFA Monitor is to assist countries to monitor and review their progress and challenges in the implementation of disaster risk reduction and recovery actions at national level.

opportunities to combine the monitoring of trends and HFA progress, analysis, effective policy and strategy guidance.

In an effort to mobilize UN action in disaster risk reduction, in 2005 an informal group, the **Management Oversight Board (MOB),** was convened by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, with membership from the following entities: UNDP (representing the United Nations Development Group (UNDG)), the World Bank, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. These organizations were expected to represent the various critical areas involved in disaster risk reduction: development, economic, technical and forecasting, environmental, humanitarian and civil society. The MOB experience has produced mixed results over the years with agencies' involvement being uneven. The Dalberg UNISDR Secretariat Evaluation in 2010 suggested improvements be made in terms of function and role, namely to align with its function as well as its representation. The MOB mechanism is currently under review and the outcome of the Mid-Term Review will be amongst the processes that will inform such review in the second half of 2011. The UNISDR **Inter-Agency Group (IAG),** composed of working level representatives (mostly Geneva-based) of UN entities, the World Bank, IFRC and the UNISDR secretariat has also been set up. The IAG was intended to be a forum for joint work programming among the participating organizations and to improve coherence and coordination with a view to better support countries to implement the HFA.

Better links between Global Platform meetings are needed to forge effective relationships within the disaster risk reduction community. In spite of UNISDR's own interactive and integrated approach, the UN overall needs to increase its internal coherence and interaction with partners. UNISDR should rethink what kind of inter-platform mechanism it needs in the years ahead, since it is clear that the MOB has outlived its purpose, and what the membership and aim of such body should be.

The establishment of **national platforms for disaster risk reduction** was requested in an ECOSOC resolution in 1999 and in three General Assembly resolutions[18]. The national platforms are country-level mechanisms but are also regional platforms mentioned under this chapter, since they originally emanated from decisions taken at the global level. Further comments are contained in the country chapter. This generic term is used for officially declared national mechanisms for coordination and policy guidance on disaster risk reduction. They are, in the main, multi-sectoral and inter-disciplinary in nature, with public (relevant line ministries and disaster management authorities), private and civil society participation involving all concerned entities within a country, including UN entities present at the national level, as appropriate. National platforms are nationally owned and nationally led forums. They are the UNISDR national mechanisms and now exist in 61 countries.

National platforms can cover all issues and sectors related to disaster risk reduction: agriculture, community development, education, energy, environment, financing for development, housing, infrastructure, planning, science and technology, water and sanitation, etc. A national platform is meant to be the coordination mechanism for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development policies, planning and programmes with a view to full implementation of the HFA. It can be built on existing national coordination mechanisms and can contribute to the establishment of a comprehensive national disaster risk reduction system for the country (for more information see the country level chapter (III.3)).

---

[18] ECOSOC 1999/63, A/RES/56/195, A/RES/58/214 and A/RES/58/215.

Regional or sub-regional **platforms** for disaster risk reduction are being formed and utilised in different regions. They can be convened by concerned entities, whether representatives from States, national platforms, regional offices of UN agencies, regional NGOs, scientific and technical organizations or similar. Between sessions of the Global Platform, regional platforms are convened to address issues of concern to the regions and to provide a link between national platforms and the Global Platform and indeed to prepare for sessions of the Global Platform.

Self-organized **thematic platforms** mainly composed of technical and scientific bodies have been established which participate actively and provide thematic support to the system and the Global Platform.

A **Scientific and Technical Committee** provides advice to the Global Platform. The Committee guides policy and practice related to scientific and technical issues and makes recommendations on priorities for attention, for informed decision making and public awareness and to stimulate dialogue and innovation.

"…natural hazards often turn into disasters as a result of poor policies and practices, such as lack of publicly available information about projected storm surges, or rent-control laws that reduce landlords' incentives to maintain buildings that then crumble in monsoons."

"By 2100, even without climate change, damages from weather-related hazards may triple to $185 billion annually."

"… cost-effective preventive measures can reduce toll of natural disasters, which caused 3.3 million deaths from 1970 to 2008."

World Bank-UN publication "Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention", Nov. 2010.

III.2.3. Contribution of the United Nations Funds, Programmes and Specialized Agencies

"The UN contribution" can mean the system in the sense of the General Assembly of Member States, endorsing the HFA, monitoring its progress as noted in its resolutions, evolving mandates etc, referred to above. It can also mean the UN as funds, programmes and specialized agencies, both as individual entities and as a collective.

So what importance do the different initiatives of *UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies* have and how do they fit into the broader UN disaster risk reduction picture? How do they link to each other and support each other? Which ones are most useful, which programmes are shared and replicated? Where are the overlaps and gaps and is there duplication and competition? What is sector-specific and what needs to be coordinated on a more general level?

Institutional level achievement
At the global, institutional level, progress of UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies is first and foremost manifest in the internalization of DRR into institutional policies, strategies, frameworks and action plans, different tools and training. Organizational strategies, strategic goals or plans with emphasis on DRR now exist within many UN entities as well as guidance, disaster risk reduction policies, various tools for risk assessment, capacity building, and more recently also identification of links between climate change and DRR. Many UN entities also have dedicated units or focal points for disaster risk management and DRR, sometimes including climate change adaptation. Others are still debating the links to climate change adaptation and have organizational separation between them; some have or aim for connecting conflict prevention andDRR. Many UN entities are involved in different mechanisms for DRR at global, regional and sometimes country level. Individual agency action and inter-agency support to each other's meetings and conferences can be a foundation for coherent action.

UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies appear to be prepared for country action on institutional level.

The UN contribution
The UNISDR HFA Monitor mentions UN support, but there is no way to analyse the *overall* UN contribution, its achievements and challenges, and what are the results to date. The comprehensive and cross-cutting character of the HFA and the lack of concrete strategy and plan of action lessen the possibility of drawing a conclusion. Nobody disputes that useful initiatives have taken place, but with the exception of UNISDR's own contribution, the UN seems to be mainly agency-oriented and it is rarely possible to see how initiatives are linked to the bigger picture.

In addition, several UN and non-UN interviewees at the global level claim that the UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies keep the HFA too low-key, rather as a reference than as a guide, rather as optional than essential, that there is not enough ownership outside of UNISDR, and that, therefore, accountability is low.

The lack of data on DRR mainstreaming into development is problematic and needs to be addressed. UNISDR should initiate a study about mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development, which can also help agencies to learn from each other.

The understanding of disaster risk reduction is good, but…
The understanding of disaster risk reduction and the importance of it seems, in general, high. However, looking beneath the surface, there are barriers to that understanding. The most frequent example mentioned by interviewees is the misconception of disaster risk reduction as a technical issue rather than as an *approach* to survival of human beings, livelihoods and assets supporting sustainable development, environment and human rights. If disaster risk reduction is seen as a technical perspective, this leads inter alia to incomplete mainstreaming, given that the introduction of the issue is at too low a level, as a complementary action rather than *as a main determinant for sustainable development*. Examples are given later in this study, related to the CCA/UNDAF framework. Within the main framework disaster risk reduction is presented as a technical area rather than as an approach, and the Common Country Assessment part does not mention risk assessments as a component of the basic assessment initiating an UNDAF process.

Another misunderstanding is that disaster risk reduction in fact often translates into emergency preparedness. Given the need for a major scale up of disaster preparedness, there are advantages of having a strong focus on preparedness, but if emergency preparedness comes as *the only* solution to a multi-sectoral and multi-dimensional need for disaster risk reduction, it can block progress in those other areas. In the CCA/UNDAF framework there is also more reference to disaster preparedness than to disaster risk reduction.

Disaster risk reduction as a term is sometimes used when preparedness is too loaded a concept (i.e. in conflict or post conflict related contexts) and disaster risk reduction has therefore in certain contexts become synonymous to preparedness.

WHO suggests further work on the terminology of the HFA to ensure that there is a *logical relationship* between the terms, such as emergencies and disasters, and among hazards, vulnerabilities, capacities and risks. Disaster risk reduction is not a self-explanatory term. Furthermore, the translation of terms from English to other languages also needs further consideration, although UNISDR has already done much work on terminology. The latest UNISDR "Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction" was published in 2009 in several languages. Though terminology development needs continuous refinement, improved

understanding at this point should probably start with stronger collaboration in practice and sharing of experiences at the country level.

Observations from interviews show that technical staff are usually well aware of disaster risk reduction as a strategic approach, whereas staff on strategic level often perceive disaster risk reduction as a technical issue. A common misconception is also that disaster preparedness is equivalent to disaster risk reduction. These misunderstandings may seem innocuous, but they can delay or distort implementation.

Mainstreaming into development
The value of the HFA in providing a common platform and framework – and a world-wide branding – for governments and the international community to improve action on disaster risk reduction is broadly and repeatedly acknowledged by interviewees. This has allowed more understanding of the need for integration of disaster risk reduction in key areas of action, and equally importantly the development of a more common understanding of gaps and challenges. The HFA three strategic goals and five priorities for action are well-known by now, and activities of individual agencies are already underway. However, the first and most important strategic goal, "the more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels", still needs much more attention.

Mainstreaming within the whole organization is mentioned as a paramount task by UNDP, UNICEF, and now also ILO, related to disaster risk reduction and livelihoods. Specialized agencies, funds and programmes that already have a mandate, which in some form includes prevention, whether related to development, early warning, environment, food or food security, health, livelihoods, shelter, weather and climate, or focused on children, human rights, community-based action, etc, can build on that in the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction. But it is difficult to get to the root of the problem and understand how this is happening, what mainstreaming entails specifically for the agency, and what are the results and lessons learnt. This is not well shared, at least not outside the agency itself. There is also some hesitation among agency staff that mainstreaming per se may lessen opportunities for funding of the disaster risk reduction component, since it is not separate and thus visible to donors. Main approaches to successful mainstreaming as well as barriers to it should be captured in a special study, and lessons learnt and good practice shared.

The lack of data around DRR mainstreaming is problematic and needs to be addressed. UNISDR should initiate a study about mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development, which can also help agencies to learn from each other.

A human rights-based approach
As mentioned earlier in this study, disaster risk reduction is often, wrongly, seen as a technical issue, whereas it is fundamentally an *approach* to human resilience, security and equity, to survival of human beings and management of individual livelihoods, assets and scarce resources. Human security and resilience (as positives to human vulnerability and exposure) can be strengthened by a focus on equity and rights-holders.

In April 2007, the UN Policy Committee decided that "disaster risk reduction and the Hyogo Framework for Action should be further mainstreamed into the UN system's policies and practice together with a rights-based approach…". A rights-based approach does not detract from a risk and vulnerability based approach; it provides another angle.

OHCHR suggests that disaster risk reduction should adopt a human rights-based approach: "Human rights can be integrated in all stages of disaster risk reduction: prevention, mitigation, relief, development, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. Certain human rights-relevant elements

are already explicitly addressed (to varying degrees) in the HFA, including gender, age, vulnerable groups, cultural diversity, livelihoods, and socio-economic structures. Yet some others human rights elements are missing, and should therefore be addressed, among them discrimination and inequalities, economic, social and cultural rights in general, the right to food, housing, and property in particular, displacement/IDPs, disability, older persons, poverty, the impact of climate change, and the need for participation by affected communities".

A human rights-based approach could strengthen disaster risk reduction. A first step could be that OHCHR identifies how disaster risk reduction can be mainstreamed into human rights.

A calibrated global advocacy programme
Global advocacy continues to be needed, according to interviewees at global level. UN-HABITAT suggests "a calibrated global advocacy programme support initiative done at inter-agency level (perhaps joint IASC-UNDG level?), as it brings all humanitarian UN/NGO and development actors together. The calibration is on the basis of need, i.e. rich developed countries, advocacy only either as drivers or as subjects, less developed countries: advocacy plus strategic programme support, etc." Some other UN entities have similar views.

Coordinated, disciplined and strategic approach
The loudest and most repeated input from interviewees at HQ level is that a strongly coordinated, disciplined and strategic approach, a plan of action and division of labour is needed for the coming phase to increase operationalization. Most are clear that UN entities each individually have a strong responsibility and that there needs to be coherence. Some (mainly smaller entities) express the need for more UNISDR leadership and "power", whereas some large UN agencies prefer the *status quo*. From a global perspective there is also hesitation around the current capacity of UN Country Teams in relation to disaster risk reduction.

The analysis has shown that enough institutional elements are in place to serve as a starting point in an effort, which focuses on country level for the coming five years. Global and regional level should be seen in the light of support to country level action. A plan of action and division of labour are among main requirements.

A (far from exhaustive) selection of instruments, mechanisms and tools are mentioned below, which have been produced in the first five years of the HFA's existence. They are already available and need to be further tested and used in collaborative action on country level.

III.3. *Country operational level 2005-2010*

III.3.1. *Selected mechanisms and tools for a more coordinated approach to HFA implementation elaborated during 2005-2010*

The Secretary-General's UN Policy Committee decisions in 2007 set off a number of initiatives including the *inclusion of disaster risk reduction into the Common Country Assessment and UN development assistance frameworks (CCA/UNDAF),* the strategic programme framework for the UN Country Teams (UNCT). Although inclusion of disaster risk reduction as such is a good and necessary step forward, the CCA/UNDAF framework is an example of how DRR is introduced *on a technical level* rather than *as a strategic approach*. This means that it is treated only marginally in the Common Country Assessment part, in which no risk assessment strategies or tools are referred to. The risk dimension is in fact surprisingly absent in the CCA/UNDAF framework. Within the UNDAF itself disaster risk reduction is seen as part of "Other key cross-cutting issues for UNCT consideration" rather than reflected as part of the overarching analysis, which in the CCA/UNDAF builds on five interrelated principles. All five principles – human rights based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, capacity development and

results-based management – are connected to disaster risk reduction, but the connection is not explicit in the framework.

A specific guidance note on disaster risk reduction has also been issued. "Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction into the CCA and UNDAF" is a well-written, comprehensive (80 pages), guidance note. The guidelines can compensate for some omissions in the main framework, but not for the lack of risk framing of the whole CCA/UNDAF exercise.

In the same period, two more closely related UNDAF guidance notes were issued, one on integrating climate change considerations and one on environmental sustainability. Separate sector-based guidelines as well as harmonization of related areas are both needed. To help the UNCT to cope with a plethora of guidelines, one would, therefore, also need to explain how these guidelines are linked and can be used together. Secondly, whereas the one on climate change integrates a human rights approach, the others do not (even though the Policy Committee recommended a rights-based approach for disaster risk reduction in 2007). Moreover, although the DRR note refers to climate change as well as environment, there is no reciprocity, since the two other notes do not refer to DRR.

A Training of Trainers course for use of the guidelines has been developed and the UNDG has established a roster of trained DRR experts to support UN Country Teams in integrating disaster risk reduction into country analysis. There were 46 UNDAF roll-out countries with disaster risk for 2010 and 28 for 2011, so the opportunity is there. The UNISDR Secretariat follows the requests about DRR expertise at the country level and the use of the roster with the Turin UN Staff College. Not all RCs know about the roster, so more information about it is needed.

In the next update of the UNDG guidance note on UNCT engagement in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), there is a need to update references to disaster risk reduction as well, since there are no references too DRR in the current version.

Another achievement at the global level for country use is *the PDNA, the post-disaster needs assessment and recovery framework*, a tripartite agreement between the UN system, World Bank and European Commission. Within the UN system, UNDP has led the process, which involved a collaborative effort by many UN entities. A PDNA is a government-led exercise with integrated support from the United Nations, the European Commission, the World Bank and other national and international actors. A PDNA pulls together information into a single, consolidated report, information on the physical impacts of a disaster, the economic value of the damages and losses, the human impacts as experienced by the affected population, and the resulting early and long-term recovery needs and priorities. More than a dozen PDNAs have been carried out by now, the Haiti Earthquake PDNA 2010 and the Pakistan Floods Preliminary Damage and Needs Assessments 2010 being recent examples.

The Global Risk Identification Programme (GRIP) is a multi-stakeholder (including non-UN entities) initiative that directly aligns with the HFA. It was initiated by the ProVention[19] Consortium and is hosted by UNDP. Dozens of organizations have been involved in its preparation, design and implementation. GRIP's programme design reflects the information and support needs identified by the risk identification community. As one of the key thematic platforms for the implementation of the HFA, GRIP was officially launched in 2007 at the first session of the Global Platform and has been utilized by the ISDR system to support worldwide activities to identify and monitor disaster risk. Its goal is to reduce disaster losses to ensure sustainability.

---

[19] World Bank and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) co-managed initiative, hosted by the IFRC 2003-2009, and now dissolved.

The CRA Toolkit of the ProVention Consortium is an interesting example of a guided approach to a library. A large number of Community Risk Assessment (CRA) Methodologies and Case Studies were collected and analysed in this ProVention project. Guidance notes give a brief overview of the case studies and methodologies and users can identify the most appropriate assessment methodologies and applications for their purpose. A search tool allows users to carry out searches in methodologies and case studies according to a wide range of predetermined categories. A glossary gives brief definitions of key terms used in the guidance notes and in the search tool. The register of methodologies is accompanied by comprehensive manuals, step-by-step manuals, guidelines, training manuals, lessons learnt and case studies. A guided approach to risk assessment methodologies on national and sub-national levels as well as cross-border could be considered in the HFA library in order to aim for a more standardized approach, whenever possible. This could be useful, even if one has to acknowledge that many risk assessment methodologies are highly specialized by sector and should remain so.

IASC (Inter-Agency Standing Committee) Operational Guidelines on Protection of Persons in Situations of Natural Disasters frame disasters from a human rights perspective, again a collaborative effort, and were endorsed by the IASC on 29 October 2010. This is a version building on feedback from a first test version.

The International Law Commission is also carrying out work on *Protection of persons in the event of disasters,* at this point looking into draft articles related inter alia to the definition of disaster, the duty to cooperate, the humanitarian principles on disaster response, human dignity and the primary responsibility of the affected State.

Emergency preparedness has progressed during the period, not least as the most established part of disaster risk reduction processes. *Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response: A Guidance and Indicator Package for Implementing Priority Five of the Hyogo Framework has been issued, coordinated by OCHA* with the collaboration of a large number of other organizations.

Humanitarian cluster[20] guidance related to health and early recovery includes disaster risk reduction perspectives according to the internal reviews. Disaster risk reduction should be mainstreamed within all clusters.

> ... We must recognize that climate change will bring more incidents of extreme weather. That is why we must invest more in reduction of risk of future disasters. The United Nations has made disaster risk reduction a priority. In 2005 the Hyogo Framework offered a pragmatic blueprint for action. Last year, we introduced the first global assessment report on disaster risk reduction…
>
> Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's remarks to a General Assembly meeting, 19 August 2010.

Some UN staff have uncertainties about how best to *link climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction*. Several of them work to strengthen the integration of approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk management, such as by developing common risk assessments. *UNISDR's three briefing notes*, 01 Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction, 02 Adaptation to Climate Change by Reducing Disaster Risks: Country Practices and Lessons and 03 Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation through Effective Disaster Risk Reduction, are clarifying and need to be distributed broadly. The third note shows that climate change

---

[20] The cluster approach in inter-agency humanitarian coordination was introduced within the humanitarian reform in 2005.

adaptation relies on the reduction and management of climate-related disaster risks and why both need to become central to development planning and investment.[21]

Many tools and other resources exist, readily available on UNISDR and other web sites. A systematic and guided approach to major tools and other resources could be considered to further enhance user-friendly utilization of them in the library. This would be particularly desirable for multi-stakeholder tools.

III.3.2. Country-level support to implementation

A UN ISDR recent summary of UN support to implementation[22]
"In the last year alone, specialized agencies, funds and programmes reported many important activities undertaken with government and civil society partners in support of national plans and priorities. Assessments of national capacities in disaster risk reduction have already been carried out in a number of vulnerable countries. To enable informed decision-making processes in risk reduction and climate change adaptation, officials have been trained in development of databases on disaster losses.

Investments in effective early warning systems have served as the foundation for investment priorities in early warning, disaster risk reduction and financing, including disaster risk insurance. UN agencies have been strengthening disaster preparedness measures in more than 50 countries and have carried out inter-agency exercises to strengthen governmental capacities in pre-disaster recovery planning. National capacities for health emergency management have been strengthened as well.

Together with partners, UN agencies have integrated disaster risk reduction into school curricula and safety programmes. New risk assessment methodologies were designed to support national efforts to integrate ecosystem factors in public investment decisions. Local authorities have worked with UN to rehabilitate land through terracing and reforestation to turn dry lands into productive assets. Some of these communities have seen the food security of households increased by 50 per cent."

Some individual agency examples of support to implementation
The UNISDR summary presents a number of examples of collaboration, whereas most examples mentioned on country level are individual agency initiatives. Several entities are involved in policy and programme development, risk and capacity assessments, hazard profiling, vulnerability assessments in different sectors, training and disaster preparedness, capacity development, disaster risk profiling etc., etc. A very limited number of examples are cited below.

OCHA has increased its presence and has been involved in disaster preparedness activities in some 50 countries. OCHA's intent to move from emergency preparedness to pre-disaster and pre-recovery planning residence may require long-term presence in-country.

Disaster risk reduction is a UNDP-wide priority and more than 120countries have been or are involved in disaster reduction activities. Over 50 countries have received support to develop institutional, legislative and/or policy frameworks and support to include risk in development programmes. UNDP has national DRR advisors in a dozen countries as well as communities of

---

[21]   A recent example of good UN cooperation is from the COP 16 climate change meeting in Cancun. Through the Chief Executive Board (CEB), over 50 UN organizations have advanced a common agenda in Cancun to show how adaptation could work.

[22]   UNISDR on COP 16 from a DRR perspective / UN system, 30 Nov. 2010.

practice. In 2005 UNDP started its global mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into national development plans and programmes. With the exception of UNISDR, UNDP is the UN Programme most often mentioned by resident coordinators, but the level of engagement seems to vary significantly between countries.

UNICEF has an integrated, all-hazards matrix approach to disaster risk reduction, which is explained as emphasizing inclusion into development planning. UNICEF wants to strengthen its country-level engagement through full-time (and in two cases part-time) DRR officers now in place in six regional offices. The facilitation by regional DRR officers is envisaged to support government line ministries, especially in health and education (school safety and in some countries disaster risk reduction as a curriculum component), water and sanitation and climate change and by offering more support to national plans and to the development of those plans. UNICEF has made an effort to mobilize and harmonize work with partners active at the municipal and community levels, often in preparedness and education, but also sees it as a general country-level gap and underlines that the UN overall needs to reach civil society.

WFP includes DRR in its strategic plan 2008-2011, has a new DRR policy and works with thousands of communities around the world. In 2009, WFP had projects in 71 countries, 75 per cent of which had a climate change and/or disaster risk reduction activity. Out of almost 160 projects, 45 per cent had a climate change and/or disaster risk reduction component. The projects support agriculture, water conservation, forestry, capacity building and infrastructure. Others support early warning systems and carbon credits. WFP's conclusion is that the specific activities that address disaster risk reduction and climate change are often the same, but the importance of the type of intervention depends on whether the project addresses climate change or disaster risk reduction. WFP wants a strong focus on implementing concrete disaster risk reduction activities on the ground to accelerate the implementation of HFA and flags the need to improve the quality of partnerships on country level, especially on community level.

WHO is mentioned in country interviews mainly for their activities to strengthen national health emergency management systems, including risk and capacity assessments, training and disaster preparedness in 100 countries and for the frameworks and guidance as well as technical support for assessment on safe hospitals.

WMO has carried out disaster risk reduction programmes with other actors in South East Europe, Central America and the Caribbean. Coordinated programming is instrumental to success, according to WMO, and WMO now sees the possibility to learn from the experience and draw conclusions together with other national and international participants. WMO emphasizes the sharing of multi-partner learning and knowledge to build a basis for work in the future.

A further compilation and analyses of individual sector-based initiatives would not be useful here. Instead, the internal reviews of individual funds, programmes and specialized agencies are available for separate reading.

> "The UN Country Team, and in particular the Secretary-General's representatives at a country level (Resident Coordinators, Humanitarian Coordinators, Special Representatives of the Secretary-General as the case may be), within the framework of ISDR, may support the national authorities and civil society in establishing risk reduction strategies and ensure that the UN programmes' strategies are fully in line with the three strategic goals, the five priority areas of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the national development priorities."
>
> Extract from the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015

The role of the Resident Coordinator

At country level, the role of the Resident Coordinator (RC) is the most important and viable entry point. Therefore, although global in its nature, the UNDG update of Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the United Nations RC to also include disaster risk reduction is necessary guidance at the country level[23], and the updated version is a good example of ToRs in respect to disaster risk reduction. The ToRs underline the primary responsibility of the government, the advocacy and support role of the RC to effectively implement the HFA, the obligations to ensure with the UNCT that DRR is effectively incorporated into country-level programming processes such as CCA and UNDAF, sustainable development policies, planning and programming, poverty reduction strategies and relevant climate change adaptation measures. The ToRs also refer to the role to encourage the government to implement preparedness measures, including national disaster risk management plans and pre-disaster recovery plans, based on a national disaster risk assessment, as well as on-going documentation of disaster issues, in close collaboration with UNCT. They encompass the role to initiate with UNCT members and lead international preparedness efforts in support of national efforts, including contingency planning, involving all relevant stakeholders and to lead a disaster management team.

Awareness and understanding
Interviews with 12 RCs show that they are well aware of their responsibilities in relation to disaster risk reduction and have a solid understanding of the issues related to disasters, disaster risk and the UN role in supporting the government. Most of them also refer to the government having a good understanding of what needs to be done and interest in increasing preparedness, safety and resilience. Many comment on better awareness of the general public of the importance of the DRR after mega-disasters such as the tsunami, the Haiti earthquake and the Pakistan flood, but that this awareness and understanding among donor governments, with one or two exceptions, does not necessarily translate into funding.

Appropriate guidance
The RCs interviewed find policy guidance easily available and appropriate for purpose. The HFA is applauded as being extremely useful as a framework. Many also point to the fact that CCA/UNDAF guidelines take DRR into account now, although a couple of them question the volume of guidelines in general and these specifically, as well as the large number of guidelines and priorities that need to be considered in the UNDAF process as a whole. In essence, appropriate guidance is available.

Training
Most RCs see themselves in a convening role, which requires the right attitude and understanding rather than expertise. All RCs interviewed felt they had sufficient induction to DRR and disasters, and only one of them would like more training.

Performance appraisals
Several RCs mention the need to provide incentives differently in performance appraisals to raise the stakes in areas of priority. Funding level is not necessarily a good indicator to measure success in DRR. One suggestion in line with World Bank appraisals, is to include, as part of the appraisal, how the person appraised had incorporated lessons learnt from recent DRR experience into an operational programme.

Resources
RCs generally have no dedicated resources to support the government and to carry out their particular role as a convener of support in disaster risk reduction alongside many other unfunded mandates, unless there is a specific position or team, created in the aftermath of a disaster. UNISDR is non-residential at country level. Any DRR resources available in country therefore

---

[23] UNDG (10 Nov. 2008), Terms of Reference for the United Nations Resident Coordinator.

belong to UN entities, which have DRR activities within their agency agenda and RCs have difficulties using such resources. One RC does not feel he can do anything related to disaster risk reduction before a national risk assessment has been undertaken (which the government would also be in favour of), but he feels it would not happen, unless the UN can provide resources to carry out this basic assessment. Other RCs are more fortunate in that they have a stronger lead from the government and can focus on planning, strategy and monitoring of the UN support, whereas activities are carried out by expertise within the country. In general, RCs are prepared, but as one RC said: "We have strong frameworks on weak platforms."

Overall UN commitment
Because of the lack of resources, *the way* in which the UN *overall* projects its commitment to reduce disaster risk, prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of disaster losses on country level is essential. The RCs in general feel that this commitment, if there, is expressed in agency terms rather than as a common task (examples mentioned of more coherent approaches are disaster response and HIV/AIDS), so with separate DRR initiatives the RCs are not helped in their convening role. RCs appreciate UNISDR's leadership and commitment, but need common commitment from other parts of the UN as well. Coordination as control does not seem to be the issue. It is rather the common approach, the repeated and echoing messages at HQ visits, the statements and feeling of inclusiveness and being part of the HFA as a vision of reducing risk that would be helpful, most of all in relating to the government. The World Bank is also separate in most contexts and a more clear division of labour as well as stronger links with the Bank is wished for. The same is applicable to links to the European Union/ECHO in countries where they are present.

Relationships and continuity
The relationship building is seen as important and the SRSG visits at country level and the way they have been conducted are helpful. Many RCs highlight the need to continue building relationships, to continue "reminder" visits to the countries and governments to keep HFA on the agenda. One suggestion for high-level UN visits to governments is that key players in DRR like UNISDR, OCHA and UNDP compare travel schedules and coordinate messaging to strengthen a common approach. Several RCs would like to see more regular, frequent and direct communication in addition to the SRSG visits, still well aware that UNISDR may not have the resources required for this.

Leadership vital
The Secretary-General's annual reports, press releases and other communications on HFA are valuable support and vital in promoting the agenda at the country level. However, given the disaster situations around the world and the increasing evidence of extreme weather events, many would want HFA to become a more central issue within the UN, even if there is acknowledgement that competition is hard between the many priorities. The sense among most RCs interviewed is that DRR is of particular importance and should be scaled up. Well-formulated statements on global level need to be followed by leadership in action.

Mainstreaming into development
RCs do not see DRR mainstreaming into development happening enough: mainstreaming DRR into development needs to be more strongly reinforced. It is the first strategic goal of the HFA and its implementation is still too slow. Several RCs comment on the need to more strongly point at the links between disaster risk reduction and the fulfilment of the MDGs. One RC suggests adding indicators into the MDGs related to DRR. Mainstreaming DRR into development also means that high-level UN development communications should highlight the links between disaster risk reduction and sustainable development.

Disaster preparedness

Almost everybody mentions the need for scaling up all areas of DRR. In addition to mainstreaming DRR into development, increased effort on disaster preparedness is high on the list of the RCs' priorities. More preparedness initiatives, more capacity building, contingency planning and pre-disaster planning are needed. Preparedness expertise is also said to be in short supply or difficult to identify.

Lessons learnt

In some countries, RCs have resources, even a dedicated team, mainly the result of a disaster in the past, which creates a window of opportunity. Indonesia is a case in point. Government leadership, legislation, risk assessments and capacity building including at provincial level, as well as learning from the tsunami and the Yogyakarta earthquake (and a dedicated donor), have had a tangible impact on recent disasters such as the Merapi volcano eruption last year. Several ask why the lessons learnt from disasters and recovery situations have not been used better in Haiti and other recent disasters. There is s strong demand from many RCs for more focus on lessons learnt, the idea being that UNISDR could coordinate and consolidate UN agency contributions of lessons learnt and that there should be specific advocacy, based on the lessons. Communities of practice have also been mentioned as means to strengthen the sharing of learning.

A strategy or matrix for division of labour

In addition to the HFA, some RCs mention the need for a strategy or plan of action, more related to *how* to get work done, and a matrix for division of labour. This matrix could be used also in areas where agencies need coherence, for national risk assessments, monitoring, and where there is an acute need to learn from and link to each other. Acknowledging that there is an abundance of UNISDR guidelines and manuals, assessment methodologies and agency-specific material readily available, it is about making sense of what is there and identifying good/best practice and lessons learnt at different levels, especially for multi-stakeholder use. A guide or matrix with division of labour, accompanied by a succinct presentation of what agency resources and technical expertise are available for the country team to draw on, is a priority demand from a number of RCs.

Coordination mechanisms

Mechanisms at country level vary (government mechanisms, government and UN, UNCT, technical forums, national platforms, in some countries cluster coordination etc.). Each UNCT needs a good grasp of what mechanisms are available in-country, who is involved in what, for what purpose and how they connect. The 61 National Platforms vary considerably from country to country. Some interviewees see a lot of value in them, others view them less favourably. One RC suggests that the national platform, which could be used as an overall coordination of national coordination bodies, could be replaced by an overarching meeting every two years. Many suggest that national platforms should be analysed and evaluated in relation to country needs for coordination, links between mechanisms and future potential.

Sectoral strategies

Several interviewees indicate the need for sector-specific work to continue and scale up. Non-UN actors from international financial institutions, the private sector, NGOs and Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies, community-based organizations (CBOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) need to link with UN entities to support government action. Some interviewees would like to have designated sector leads, sector policies, sector work (agriculture, education, fishery, health, infrastructure, transport, etc.) and are unsure how non-UN actors are related to coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national level. Several reflect the need to better understand within what country strategies (also on sub-national, i.e. municipal level)

they are operating and would encourage a more common picture of who is doing what, and what concrete timeframes and results are aimed at overall.

Coherence
A few respondents at headquarters level, mainly on the humanitarian side, mention the cluster approach of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee for coordination of humanitarian assistance (IASC) as a possible model for cooperation around disaster risk reduction. The cluster approach was introduced as part of the 2005 reform of the humanitarian system led by the Emergency Relief Coordinator. Eleven clusters and four cross-cutting issues form the basis for sector coordination, which includes development of policy, guidance, tools and training and other resources. However, the RCs and other country representatives do not want to over-emphasize coordination and rather want to see coherence of approach. Instead of a formal cluster approach, the majority view is that a collaborative spirit and common approach would be desirable.

Prioritized support
A few RCs would like to see a list of high-risk countries drawn up to allow a better understanding of where to concentrate efforts. Several interviewees suggest that more coherent, comprehensive, collaborative *and prioritized* initiatives should in the next five years be carried out at national and local level, selected among high-risk countries. These should emanate from countries with governments interested and prepared for implementation, for instance in UNDAF roll-out countries and, if possible, One UN countries to enable more in-depth experience on how to support government efforts together. Even if one high-risk country list could never be agreed on, a couple of lists of particularly disaster-prone countries with different characteristics might be useful.

The community level an afterthought
Many interviewees underline the crucial community and municipal levels and the need to relate better to international and national NGOs and community-based organizations to "go the last mile". This study does not include NGOs and Red Cross and Red Crescent perspectives, but it is evident that those perspectives – and players – are needed. Because of UNISDR's exceptionally inclusive interaction at the Global Platform level, it is expected that this will also provide results for interaction at country level. That is rather ad hoc for the moment, even if a couple of agencies have ample experience of collaboration with NGOs, CBOs and in some cases the Red Cross or Red Crescent. It is desirable that UN ISDR puts more focus on UN collaboration with non-UN partners, when a country agenda is reinforced. The Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction is contributing to the necessary analysis and will launch its "Views from the Frontline" early 2011.

Progress, one by one
With one or two exceptions, all RCs can mention some progress in the region or country concerned. However, progress is happening separately, programme by programme, not as a common responsibility. DRR progress is more visible in response and preparedness, and in specialised approaches to i.e. food security, school safety and hospital safety. This progress is welcome. As mentioned above, development programming and the harmonization between response and development are largely missing. It is also clear that there may be examples of DRR mainstreamed into development programmes that are not being identified, since the programmes do not flag a DRR component which could be integrated.

Gap HQ- country level
It was striking that few interviewees at UN New York level seemed to have sufficient knowledge of what happens at the country level. It is not new that there are gaps between organizational levels. In this case it seems necessary to invest more in understanding what goes on at country level and not only from a particular agency perspective but also from a more integrated

perspective. The common denominator in interviews at a global level was different suggestions for increased overview, but practical proposals were rare. RCs in general have very good ideas about how to increase the total value of disaster risk reduction support. Several interviewees at global level mention the lack of capacity of UN Country Teams and RCs to support disaster risk reduction in practice. Those interviews could give the impression that it is too early to expect UNCT to work on DRR: interviews with RCs, however, indicate that country action is fully possible and already happening.

Post-disaster assessment initiative
Joint activities, which consolidate views among key participating agencies, are helpful in focusing action and creating synergy. An interesting model starts in the heat of the disaster. UNISDR organized an inter-agency mission to the Dominican Republic in early 2010 to carry out a comprehensive assessment, and a similar inter-agency mission took place to Chile in October 2010. In the first case the assessment was handed over to the RC who presented the findings to the government. Interviewees suggest that to support the findings, a letter from the heads of UNISDR, OCHA and UNDP could be signed and presented to the government for discussion. The findings should preferably be a "package of actions" to support the RC to continue the work and feed into the PDNA (the post-disaster needs assessment).

UNDAC missions
UN disaster assessment and coordination (UNDAC) missions could consider including a dedicated specialist in DRR on the team in the future to identify gaps, and suggest approaches and action that include disaster risk reduction. This can also include recovery approaches and initiatives. The assessment should then be handed over to the RCs for follow up. With half a dozen inter-agency missions or more carried out over the next two years, good practice and lessons learnt could be compiled and shared in a leaflet to increase the attention to and understanding of the importance of DRR among UNDAC team members.

Funding
Most comments on funding at the country level concern the need for UN development agencies to use (or negotiate the possibility to use) a percentage of their normal development funding for risk reduction measures, for IASC agencies to negotiate a percentage of humanitarian funding to be used for DRR, and for all to negotiate funding for DRR to be part of both development and humanitarian funding. The views differ regarding climate change adaptation funding. Disaster risk reduction measures can support climate change adaptation, but many recommend keeping advocacy separate from DRR funding at this stage. The aftermath of a disaster is still seen as the most opportune moment to secure funding for DRR.

Most findings point in the same direction. The main need at this point is increased support for country action.

Interviews at country level indicate that many countries are ready for action. Over the next five years, HFA implementation needs to be geared towards support to countries. Guidance and tools are available, but not resources beyond agency resources. Sector initiatives should scale up and collective and coherent action needs to be supported. Lessons learnt should be compiled and shared. Funding needs to be considered also from within already available resources.

HFA division of labour and a strategy or plan of action are needed for a coherent and coordinated approach to supporting a government that wants to take prioritized steps towards a global risk management strategy, based on risk assessments and formulated government policy is needed. 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 DRR.

All this rests on the assumption that the global UN commitment overall increases substantially, that global HFA leadership is supported much better, and that HFA implementation is mainstreamed into development.

Evolving concept of risk
During the 1990s and the first decade of the 21st century, the concept of disaster and risk has evolved. In December 1989 the General Assembly recognized *"that fatalism about natural disasters is no longer justified"* (sic!). The 1990s was the decade for natural disaster reduction, whereas the beginning of the 21st century marked the creation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, dropping "natural" with the understanding that though hazards are often natural, disasters are not.

In the 21st century risk, vulnerability and resilience have been even further underlined as key. *Building the resilience* became part of the title of the Hyogo Framework of Action, reflecting the emphasis on disaster *risk* reduction and management and its positive opposite, resilience, moving the focus from emergency preparedness to processes of increasing resilience, building back better and managing risk.

In the next five years will global risk reduction or *global risk management* be more commonly used with a stronger focus on resilience?

IV. Final reflections

IV.1. *A Focused Plan of Action, linked to the Global Platform*

This study included a sub-study of characteristics of certain other cross-cutting and inter-agency initiatives, namely UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict, UNAIDS, UN Mine Action, and UN Women. One outcome was that commitments from other UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies to these initiatives were expressed not only in a framework or policy but also in an agreed joint strategy and/or action plans, signed specifically by the UN entities involved and with references to other stakeholders. "We insisted that we needed to develop together a policy which all agencies would formally endorse, and a Strategy which set SMART objectives to be achieved over a specified timeframe, with responsibility for each objective clearly assigned to one member of the IACG (the coordination group). These documents were discussed and negotiated over many meetings and then formally endorsed by the executive heads of the agencies[24]." This model should be considered for the remaining five years of the HFA and more particularly for a Focused Plan of Action and Division of Labour. A seamless way to introduce a strategy and/or a plan of action at this point in the life of the HFA might be to link it to the outcome of the bi-annual Global Platform meetings.

Whereas Yokohama of the 1990s was a Strategy and had a Plan of Action, the Hyogo Framework for Action is not. It is a comprehensive framework, and there were reasons why it was designed that way. This is a global framework, where the primary responsibility lies with each government. The breadth of the framework in itself is considerable and the large and diversified contributing international community both inside and outside the UN and all levels of involvement – global, regional, national and sub-national – would make a plan of action huge and unmanageable. However, clarity, prioritizing and focus are needed for the next period.

Already in 2005 an effort was made to get more precise, firm commitments from the UN side and an overview through a matrix of commitment and initiatives to support the implementation

---

[24] Martin Barber, director of the Mine Action Initiative 2000-2005.

of the Hyogo Framework, elaborated by the representatives of the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF). However, when the IATF was discontinued in 2006, the matrix was as well.

The findings show that many interviewees both at global and country level propose more direction: a focused and agreed approach for the UN system in order for each agency to be guided more strategically. Some see the need for one strategy at the global level and specific country action plans linked to it in a number of selected countries; a few even advocate for cluster-like[25] arrangements to get global and country coordination efficient and sector work organized firmly. However, clusters seem too firm and heavy a mechanism. There is also demand for more monitoring and knowledge sharing.

A plan of action at the global level, framing the UN contribution, identifying key issues and priorities on global, regional and country level should be considered. The plan of action might entail concrete division of labour and better information and understanding of individual and common strategies and is an opportunity to agree on, inter alia, further development of tools, standards, focus countries, selection of pre-disaster risk assessments, coordination within sectors, how to include the private sector better, etc., and finally, to monitor and learn from monitoring. Criteria for work in a specific number of countries could be developed, based on government readiness and willingness, risk exposure, risk assessments undertaken, available capacity in country and other data. UNDAF roll-out at-risk countries and One UN countries are other factors that play a role in the selection of countries.

A plan of action will most certainly provide increased visibility and thus the possibility for all stakeholders, whether donor governments, NGOs, private sector, other UN and non-UN entities (such as international financial institutions) to understand how to contribute to the government plans more coherently and effectively.

> The relationships between progress in human development and vulnerability warrant deeper investigation… The pendulum seems to have swung too far in the direction of ignoring insecurity and vulnerability.
>
> UNDP Human Development Report, Nov. 2010.

IV.2 *Global coordination mechanisms for HFA implementation*

In the cross-cutting initiatives studied, coordination mechanisms are logically linked and there is a decision-making level of principals, whereas the HFA *lacks* a mechanism for principals' coordination of the UN contribution to HFA implementation. As interviews show, especially at country level, the UN principals' level strong commitment and coherence is needed to keep momentum during the coming years.

In the last few years, the Secretary-General has used the Chief Executives Board (CEB) to discuss issues related to disaster risk reduction and the HFA, but CEB does not encompass all relevant principals.

For the coming five years, a principals-level mechanism under the auspices of the Secretary-General or his SRSG needs to be considered. The primary reason would be to create a strong basis of support from UN principals for inclusion of disaster risk reduction into UN development programming. Principals from humanitarian, development and environment areas also need to convene to create common ground for HFA implementation.

---

[25] The cluster approach in inter-agency humanitarian coordination was introduced within the humanitarian reform in 2005.

At the working level, there is no inter-platform mechanism between Global Platforms. Ideas from the Chair's summary of the Global Platform need to be captured and followed up more broadly than at present, and the UN overall needs to be able to feed into the preparations of platforms as well. A director-level group could be considered for fulfilling that function. The existing ISDR Management Oversight Body (MOB) does not satisfy the needs neither from a representational nor from purpose point of view. Regarding representation, UN entities with both humanitarian and development work in DRR might need representatives from both areas (UNDP) or a matrix approach (UNICEF) to give input from humanitarian *and* development strands of their own organizations. At a technical level the Inter-Agency Group (IAG), already in existence, could continue as a mechanism.

IV.3 *Financing*

A UN HFA plan of action would need financing for coordinated as well as individual action. Partners at country level also need to be referred to in the plan from the beginning, especially for community-level work. The voices at country level were loud and clear in that the ground is prepared for supporting HFA implementation at country level, but resources are needed to give that support.

Some UN entities want an overview of available and potential financial resources available forDRR. Such an overview is also needed for the continued dialogue with donors. At the Global Platform in 2009 there were calls for percentages, for instance 1% of ODA, 10 % of humanitarian assistance, and 30 % of climate change adaptation funding. Donors also need to be reminded of their commitment in the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles (see box below).

Some experience is already at hand. On the development side, WHO is using a percentage *of its own budget* in parts of Africa, based on the 1% suggestion. This could be a model for other UN development agencies. Would they be open to negotiating the use of 1 % of their own development programme funding for disaster risk reduction?

Access to disaster preparedness funding is currently being discussed within the IASC humanitarian financing group. Some interviewees suggest a disaster reduction fund, based on 10 % of disaster response funding. IASC members wanting to lobby donors for a percentage of humanitarian funding, for instance 10 %, need to decide if it should go to broad disaster risk reduction or on preparedness?

With the exception of one or two donors, most of them are still struggling to find how to finance an area, which bridges humanitarian and development, and they are therefore slow in proactively addressing the issue. Some governments believe financing for DRR should be available from both sides, humanitarian and development, but in reality most dedicated funding still comes from the humanitarian side. Climate change adaptation funding also needs to be factored in, but there are still many uncertainties. At this stage, there should be continuous negotiations with donors for more systematic agreement on financing. A coordinated and comprehensive approach from the UN is needed to identify stable and predictable funding.

> Strengthen the capacity of affected countries and local communities to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to humanitarian crises, with the goal of ensuring that governments and local communities are better able to meet their responsibilities and co-ordinate effectively with humanitarian partners.
> Provide humanitarian assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and long-term development, striving to ensure support, where appropriate, to the maintenance and return of sustainable livelihoods and transitions from humanitarian relief to recovery and development activities.
>
> *Good humanitarian Donorship 2003, General principles 8-9.*

IV.4 *Disaster risk reduction as development*

Disaster risk reduction has long been understood as a development issue conceptually, but in practice it is still associated with disaster response and preparedness rather than with a holistic approach to diminishing risk and vulnerability and increasing resilience.

With the HFA mandate, each UN fund, programme and specialized agency involved in disaster risk reduction has an obligation to convey the disaster risk reduction dimension broadly into development programming practice.

United Nations development processes, not forgetting major development-related conferences and summits, need to utilize the HFA in substantive terms to support mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development and environment. General Assembly resolutions increasingly link disaster risk reduction to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as recently shown in the MDG outcome document 2010. This is a positive step but not sufficient, since no indicators related to DRR have been included in the MDGs. The HFA can also support climate change adaptation, and how to do that it is now better understood. Such connections need to be further pursued and brought into solid practice.

The UNISDR secretariat needs to consider other main development conduits as well, such as the High-Level Panel for Sustainability, in order to provide expertise input about the importance of global risk management in relation to sustainability. This type of input should also be fed into the preparatory process for the UN Earth Summit 2012 (Rio + 20) in order to ensure disaster risk reduction as part of sustainability.

Several interviewees based in New York have expressed the need for increased UNISDR presence and visibility in New York, to be part of discussions, especially about the need for disaster risk reduction to be understood as an issue, which bridges humanitarian, development and environment perspectives. To support mainstreaming into development better, the UNISDR secretariat would need to consider a high-level representation in New York.

The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) audit report 2010 on the UNISDR secretariat noted in its Recommendation No.1 that disaster risk reduction is not included in the overall purpose of the humanitarian assistance programme (programme 22) in the Budget and Programme of Work of the UN secretariat. OIOS recommended the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs to ensure that disaster risk reduction activities are adequately reflected. OIOS also recommended that a reference to the work of the United Nations in disaster risk reduction within the sustainable development programme of the UN should be included.

IV.5 *UNISDR secretariat position in the UN system needs to reflect purpose*

The HFA, as represented in the United Nations system by UNISDR, is still positioned on the humanitarian side. Therefore the UNISDR secretariat needs to use unconventional channels to be part of development processes. This is unsatisfactory. As form follows function, improved understanding over the last few years of the complexity of disaster risk reduction as an issue and further unpacking of some parts of the HFA in relation to development, environment, climate change, disaster risk management and human rights should, in the future, warrant an optimal positioning of UNISDR within the UN system. In the past, it seems to have been useful for UNISDR and HFA to be close to OCHA, as the humanitarian community was early on picking

up the challenge and has advocated strongly for the correlation between disaster impact, disaster risk reduction and resilience. Now that a priority emanating from this study is to support development becoming risk-proof within the UN system, there may be reason for shifting strategy. What *was* a practical positioning in the humanitarian box may later become an impediment. A more independent positioning of UNISDR within the UN secretariat may not only enhance opportunities to fulfil the mandate of HFA, but could also give the impetus to donor governments that policies, strategies and financing of disaster risk reduction should in the future be two-pronged. The United Nations could thereby also further acknowledge and promote the need to bridge the dichotomy between humanitarian and development.

Inclusion of disaster risk reduction into development is too slow and to the detriment of survival of human beings, to sustainability of investment and scarce resources. The UNISDR secretariat can fulfil expectations to be an "honest broker" within the UN system only if it has full access to humanitarian, environment *and* development areas.

The OIOS recommendation of a *compact* between the SRSG and the Secretary-General is a first step to raising the level of attention to the issue. This will strengthen the SRSG's mandate to support development, humanitarian and environment fields and thus facilitate the implementation of the HFA of all relevant UN entities. With that empowerment, accountability can start to be exercised. The conclusion of my analysis is that UNISDR could serve as a resource to all relevant parts of the UN system equally and fully and therefore have an independent position within the UN secretariat. There is an opportunity for that. There is also the question of whether UNISDR is best placed to carry out its mandate from a base in Geneva, when a substantive part of the issues – and focus for the coming years – are related to New York-based funds, programmes and specialized agencies. This needs to be further investigated.

V. Annexes

Annex 1: **Terms of Reference for Consultancy on the role of the UN System and its specialized agencies funds and programmes in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action**

Duration: 6 weeks
Start Date: 1 April 2010

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION
In January 2005, the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR, 18-22 January 2005, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan) took place and represents a landmark in worldwide understanding and commitment to implement a disaster risk reduction agenda. This commitment was captured in the Hyogo Declaration and the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, 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 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 organizations 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 in June 2009 would initiate the mid-term review (MTR) of 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".

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
The consultant will work under the overall guidance of the Senior Coordinator for the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action

Objective:
The objective for this consultancy is two fold: A) to review actions taken by the United Nations system as a whole and by its specialized agencies, funds and programmes more directly involved in disaster risk reduction, to ascertain how and to what extent is the United Nations fulfilling its responsibilities as outlined in the Hyogo Framework for Action; B) to suggest ways in which the engagement of the United Nations System and its specialized agencies focusing on disaster risk reduction can be increased, including by looking at other fields where different parts of the UN System have been required to work together on a cross-cutting issue (i.e. HIV/AIDS, mine action, gender issues).

Output:
An analytical report will be produced by the consultant at the end of the six weeks. This report will include substantive information on point A and options and recommendations on point B as described in the Objective section above.

Proposed timeframe:
The consultancy should start on 1 April, 2010. The final report and presentation will be submitted by 14 May 2010 (or six weeks after the beginning of the consultancy). Travel may be required.

Qualifications:
Education: Postgraduate degree in one of the following areas: Social Science, Economics, International Studies or equivalent experience in Research Analysis and Disaster Risk Reduction

Experience:
At least 7 years of experience at the national and international levels in the field of disaster preparedness, mitigation, risk reduction, research and early warning.
Prior working knowledge of the United Nations System and its specialized agencies funds and programmes
Demonstrated analytical, communication and report writing skills
Fluency in written and spoken English

Language:
English, basic understanding of French and Spanish is a plus.

Annex 2:   Methodology

To identify the United Nations contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, two main aspects – *global policy development* and *country level operationalization* – were selected as a focus. The study looked at the UN contribution as a system and as separate UN funds, programmes and specialized agencies. The methodology included a desk review and analysis of United Nations resolutions, Secretary-General's reports and main other United Nations documents, related to the Hyogo Framework for Action. The desk review also included study of individual United Nations funds, programmes, specialized agency policies, frameworks, strategies, other guidance and reports on follow up to HFA support as far as they were available as well as references to disaster risk reduction on agency websites (annex 4). In addition, interviews face to face, by phone and email, on current and (ideas around) future contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action took place (annex 3). Finally, a sub-study of characteristics of certain other inter-agency and cross-cutting initiatives, namely UN Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict, UNAIDS, UN Mine Action, and UN Women was undertaken.

Nineteen United Nations entities were asked to carry out an internal review to ascertain to what extent relevant colleagues are aware of the expectations placed on the organization in the context of the Hyogo Framework for Action and what internal systems and mechanisms are in place, if any, to ensure that these expectations are actually translated into appropriate policy directives, programming and funding requirements as well as monitoring and evaluation of activities. Eleven UN entities (ESCAP, FAO, ILO, IOM, UNECA, UNEP, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNV, WHO, WMO) answered the request and the answers were analysed in conjunction with the overall analysis. DESA, HABITAT, OCHA, OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP did not respond to the internal review.

Annex 3:   Persons and institutions consulted

Rod Snider, American Red Cross, Senior Technical Advisor
Thomas Stelzer, DESA, Assistant Secretary-General
Adnan Amin, Director, Secretariat of the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB)
Nicholas Haysom, EOSG, Director for Political, Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Affairs,
Kayoko Gotoh, EOSG, Humanitarian Affairs Officer
Janos Pasztor, Director SG's Climate Change Support Team
Marcus Oxley, Chairman Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction
Judy Blanchette, Habitat for Humanity International
Muhammedomer Mukhier, IFRC, Community Preparedness and Risk Reduction Department
Tracy O'Heir, InterAction, Senior Programme Manager
Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, OCHA, Chief Policy Development and Studies Branch
John Holmes, former OCHA USG/ERC, now Ditchley Foundation, Director
Dušan Zupka, OCHA, Deputy Chief, Emergency Preparedness Section, Emergency Services Branch
Oyuna Umuralieva, OHCHR, Human Rights Officer
Barbara Stocking, Oxfam, Director
Görel Bogärde, Save the Children Alliance, UN representative
Marco Baumann, UNDOCO, Policy Analyst
Fabrizio Andreuzzi, UNDP, Programme Specialist
Stan Nkwain, UNDP, Deputy Assistant Administrator
Kamal Kishore, UNDP, Senior Programme Adviser
Bo Asplund, Director, Regional Centre for Eastern & Southern Africa, Johannesburg and
Deputy Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Africa UNDP
Michelle Gyles McDonnaugh, RC Bridgetown, Barbados
Ian King, DRR Programme manager, Barbados
Jorge Chediek, RC Brasilia, Brazil
James Rawley, RC Cairo, Egypt
Knut Ostby, RC Suva, Fiji
El-Mostafa Benlamlih, RC Jakarta, Indonesia
Minh Pham, RC Kingston, Jamaica
Margaret Jones Williams, Environment and Energy Unit, DRR and CC, Jamaica
Aeneas Chuma, RC Nairobi, Kenya,
Beatrice Teya, UNDP DRR unit, Nairobi, Kenya
Adam Abdelmoula, RC Kuwait City, Kuwait
Bishow Parajuli, RC Yangon, Myanmar
Robert Piper, RC Kathmandu Nepal
William Infante, RC Belgrade, Serbia, SEESAC
Ivan Zverzhanski, Programme Officer Belgrade, Serbia, SEESAC, DRR focal point, UNDP
Juanita Castaño, UNEP, Director New York office
Matti Lehtonen, UNEP, Programme Officer, Post-Conflict Issues
Marisol Estrella, UNEP, Programme Coordinator, Post-Conflict and Disaster Management Branch

Matti Lehtonen, UNEP, New York, Programme Officer, Post-Conflict Issues
Muralee Thummarukudy, UNEP, Programme Officer, Post-Conflict and Disaster Management Branch
Philippe Kridelka, UNESCO, New York, Director
Boris Falatar, UNESCO, New York, Liaison Officer
Henia Dakkak, UNFPA, Humanitarian Response Unit, Technical Adviser
Dan Lewis, UN-HABITAT, Chief, Disaster and Post-Conflict Section
Bernard Doyle, UNHCR, Head Inter-Agency Unit
Hilde Johnson, UNICEF, Deputy Executive Director
Kirsi Madi, UNICEF, Deputy Regional Director
James Rogan, UNICEF, EMOPS, Chief Recovery and Risk Reduction
Antony Spalton, UNICEF, EMOPS, Risk Reduction Specialist
Tracy Raczek, UNIFEM UN Women, Partnership Analyst Climate Change Focal Point
Sálvano Briceño, UNISDR, Director
Glenn Dolcemascolo,UNISDR, Head Partnership and Network Unit
Andrew Maskrey, UNISDR, Coordinator of the GAR 2011
Elina Palm, UNISDR, Liaison Officer New York
Praveen Pardeshi, UNISDR, Head Regional Coordination
Marco Toscano-Rivalta, UNISDR, Adviser to the Special Representative of the Secretary General
Margareta Wahlström, UNISDR, SRSG/ASG
Martin Barber, Consultant, former Director of the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS)
Richard Choularton, WFP, Senior Policy Officer, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction
Joanna Syroka, WFF, Senior Programme Advisor Disaster Risk Solutions
Jonathan Abrahams, WHO, Coordinator Risk Reduction & Emergency Preparedness HAC Action in Crisis
Heather Papowitz, WHO, Risk Reduction and Emergency Preparedness HAC
Samir Ben Yahmed, WHO, Director, Health Action in Crisis (HAC)
Maryam Golnaraghi, WMO, Chief of Disaster Risk Reduction Programme
Lauren Heller, Women's Refugee Commission, Programme Officer for Reproductive Health
Samina Qadir, Women's Refugee Commission

Annex 4: References and bibliography

ALNAP (2010) The State of the Humanitarian System pilot study part 3.3.1 and 3.3.2
Dalberg (2010) United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) Secretariat Evaluation Final Report
Commission on Climate Change and Development (2009): Closing the Gaps - Disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change in developing countries
Engfeldt, Lars-Göran (2009): From Stockholm to Johannesburg and beyond: The evolution of the international system for sustainable development governance and its implications
FAO's Medium Term Plan 2010-13
FAO's role in disaster risk reduction (leaflet on FAO website, no date)
General Assembly resolutions relevant to disaster risk reduction, ISDR, HFA
General Assembly, Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Report of the Secretary-General from 2005 to 2010
Global Platform 2007: Chair's Summary
Global Platform 2009: Chair's Summary
Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters
IASC UNCT Self-assessment Tool, 2005
IASC (2007) Joint letter from ERC John Holmes and UNDP Administrator on the launch of the IASC Contingency Planning Guidelines, Nov 2007
IASC Contingency Planning Guidelines, Nov 2007
IASC 78th WG meeting: IASC Humanitarian Financing Group: 2010 Advances and the Way Forward, circulated 27 October 2010
Internal reviews from UN entities
Mine Action and Effective Coordination: The United Nations Inter-Agency Policy (2005)
OCHA, UNDP, UNISDR (2008) Selected UN mechanisms of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
OCHA's disaster response preparedness toolkit (to be revised)
OIOS Audit report (July 2010) Governance and organizational structure of the Inter-agency secretariat to the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)
PDNA (March 2010) Haiti Earthquake (Post Disaster and Needs Assessment)
PDNA (Nov 2010) Pakistan Floods Preliminary Damage and Needs Assessment
Save the Children (2010) At a Crossroads Humanitarianism for the next decade
UNDG UN Resident Coordinator Generic Job Description
UNDG (2003) 2nd guidance note on UNCT engagement in PRSPs
UNDG (2008) Terms of Reference for the United Nations Resident Coordinator

UNDG (2008) UN Country Coordination: Contribution to Development Effectiveness
UNDG (2009) Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction into the CCA and UNDAF
UNDG (2009) CCA and UNDAF Guidelines
UNDG Strategic Priorities for 2010-2011
UNDP On Preparedness
UNDP Human development in a changing climate: a framework for climate finance
UNESCO (2010) Evaluation of UNESCO's contribution to Strategic Programme Objective 5: Disaster Preparedness and Mitigation IOS/EVS/PI/105
UN-HABITAT (2008) Humanitarian affairs, and the role of UN-HABITAT, Strategic Policy on Human Settlement in Crisis and Sustainable Relief and Reconstruction framework
UNHCR (2010) Earth, Wind and Fire, A review of UNHCR's role in recent natural disasters
UNICEF (2005) Emergency Field Handbook: a guide for UNICEF staff
UNICEF TCPR Action Plan
UNICEF (2010) Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action
UNICEF (2010) Report on Regular Resources in 2009
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2010
UNISDR/IATF (2005) Strategic Directions for the ISDR System to Assist the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters
UNISDR/IATF (2005) Progress Report on the matrix of commitment and initiatives to support the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action
UNISDR/IATF Matrix of Commitment and initiatives to support the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005)
UNISDR (2006) Guidelines for Reporting on Progress in the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Measuring Progress in Disaster risk Reduction
UNISDR (2007) Words into Action: A Guide for Implementing the Hyogo Framework
UNISDR (2007) Guidelines: National platforms for disaster risk reduction
UNISDR/OCHA (2008): Disaster Preparedness for Effective Response, Guidance and Indicator Package for Implementing Priority Five of the Hyogo Framework for Action
UNISDR (2008) Policy note: thematic partnerships for disaster risk reduction and the development of ISDR Thematic Platforms
UNISDR (2008) HFA Indicators of Progress: Guidance on Measuring the Reduction of Disaster risks and the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action
UNISDR (2008) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, Briefing Note 01, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction
UNISDR (2008) Mitigating the Adverse Financial Effects of Natural Hazards on the Economies of South Eastern Europe
UNISDR (2008) UN/ISDR services to UN Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams
UNISDR (2009) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, Briefing Note 02, Adaptation to Climate Change by Reducing Disaster Risks: Country Practices and Lessons
UNISDR 2009 Evaluation Management Response
UNISDR (2009) Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR) Risk and poverty in a changing climate Invest today for a safer tomorrow
UNISDR (2009) Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Second Session, Geneva, Switzerland 16-19 June 2009, Proceedings, Creating Linkages for a Safer Tomorrow
UNISDR (2009) Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction
UNISDR (2009) Disaster risk reduction in the United Nations
UNISDR, UNDP, IUCN (2009) Making Disaster Risk Reduction Gender-Sensitive Policy and Practical Guidelines
UNISDR (2010) Disaster Risk Reduction: An Instrument for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals, Advocacy kit for parliamentarians
UNISDR 2010-2011 Biennial Work Programme UNISDR secretariat, Invest today for a safer tomorrow, November 2009
UNISDR (2010) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, Briefing Note 03, Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation through Effective Disaster Risk Reduction
UNISDR Making Cities Resilient, 2010-2011, My City is Getting Ready, World Disaster Reduction Campaign
The secretariat of the ISDR –Fact sheet (googled 2010-11-16)
The financing arrangements for the ISDR secretariat Fact sheet – (googled 2010-11-16)
UNMAS Annual Report 2009
UN secretariat (2009) Proposed program budget for the biennium 2010-2011 of the Secretary-General (A/64/6)
WHO Community resilience in disasters
World Bank MDG note
World Bank-United Nations publication Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention Nov 2010

_____