

**Towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**  
***Considerations on its possible elements and characteristics***  
14 November 2013

*Purpose*

1. The purpose of this paper is to provide an introductory chapeau to the questions concerning the development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction addressed in the following papers:
  - a) Toward the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Prospective Retrospective
  - b) Toward the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Countries' Guidance
  - c) Tackling Future Risks, Economic Losses and Exposure
  - d) The Future of Disaster Risk Management
  - e) Toward a comprehensive indicator system

*Context*

2. The international frameworks concerning disasters and disaster risk management over the past 40 years have always called for the need to ensure that they be considered and implemented not in isolation, rather in close connection with sustainable development and environmental policies and programs. With an increasing degree of clarity disaster risk management has been considered as an indispensable ingredient of “sustainability”.
3. Whereas there has been progress toward this rapprochement – as lately evidenced by the references to HFA and disaster risk reduction in the 2010 Cancun Adaptation Framework, the 2011 Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, the 2012 outcome of the World Conference on Sustainable Development – year 2015 represents a major opportunity to finally produce a close integration at policy, monitoring system, and formal periodic review mechanisms levels.
4. There is a clear call for the post-2015 frameworks and agreements on sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk reduction to allow for an integrated development of future policies, plans, and programs – including financing – at international, national and local levels.

5. An integrated system of frameworks is a *conditio sine qua non* for effective accountability, the establishment of partnerships across the public and the private sectors, and the optimization in the use of resources.
6. Therefore, two broad questions may guide the considerations toward the development and adoption of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction: A) what is the core and nature of that which can and needs to be agreed at the 3<sup>rd</sup> World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction through the specific means of a new international policy framework? B) What are the essential characteristics and elements that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction needs to have in order to support, if not ensure, the integration across development, climate change, environment and disaster risk reduction?

*A) What can and does need to be agreed at the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction?*

7. The reduction of disaster risk by the means of reducing the existing risk and pre-empting the creation of new risk requires action across all areas of private and public planning, and at all levels (global, regional, national, local). It requires a harmonisation of micro and macro policies, programs and actions.
8. Over the past 40 years a lot of knowledge, science, practice and experience have been generated. In addition, the nature and characteristics of the challenges, including the way risk is generated, have changed driven by the existing development models, strategies, plans, and investments. Therefore, some adjustments to the current frameworks for disaster risk management at national, regional and global levels are necessary.
9. The existing experience and knowledge needs to be brought to bear on the future post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Its pragmatism, utility and effectiveness is inherently determined by its content. In developing its content, it is key to bear in mind the nature of the instrument: an internationally agreed policy framework. Not everything that is “good” and “necessary” to reduce disaster risk may need to be contained in an international agreement of a non-legally binding nature. In other words, the nature of the instrument needs to be carefully kept in mind in order not to overload it with unattainable expectation or plethora of content elements which may indeed render the determination of effective and practical guidance, the setting of accountability mechanisms and frameworks, and thus its overall implementation a challenge.
10. What is that can and needs to be agreed upon through an intergovernmental process, with the active engagement of all other stakeholders, that have the effective

capacity to alter the thinking, planning, programming and financing to reduce disaster risk at global, regional, national and local levels?

11. The consultation process has already provided some guidance to address this question. Key expected characteristics of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction are:

a) Fostering accountability

(Practical, specific, and focused; measurable in progress; stimulate stakeholders' assumption of commitments; standard setting and certification);

b) Enhancing risk governance

(Risk authority; coordination; public-private partnerships; science-informed decision making; local government/communities;)

c) Addressing the underlying causes of increase in disaster losses and risk

(Loss accounting; loss and risk modelling; exposure; extensive risk)

d) Continuing vulnerability reduction

(Insurance scheme development; training and information; social protection schemes and safety nets; enhanced preparedness and response; retrofitting)

e) Enhancing resource mobilization

(Guiding public and private investments, as well as development assistance).

12. The consultations have also indicated that the future framework needs to build on, and extends where appropriate, the HFA. This guidance requires a careful consideration of whether the HFA's "Expected Outcome", three "Strategic Goals", and five "Priorities for Actions 2005-2015" still stands as they are, or require some enhancement. In other words, we collectively need to determine whether the identified necessary innovations call for changes in any of those core elements and levels.

13. Against this background, the elements of the intergovernmental agreement (post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction) may include:

a) Reconfirmed parts of HFA;

b) Enhanced parts of HFA;

c) New areas/elements not present in HFA;

d) An enhanced monitoring mechanism, which incorporate all the innovations and allow for effective measurement of impact.

14. An element not for an intergovernmental agreement, yet indispensable for implementation and thus in need of intergovernmental "recognition" and inclusion in the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction's overall outcome, is the

expression of commitments by all stakeholder groups present at the World Conference. These commitments will represent key guidance in implementing the new framework, including the enhancement of accountability mechanisms. The expected political declaration of the World Conference will be a key instrument to frame the overall outcome of the Conference in all its constituting elements; as such, careful consideration needs to be given to its development as from now.

*B) What are potential elements to support, if not ensure, integration?*

15. The past frameworks for disaster risk reduction have called for integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development. However, it seems that the effective integration was left to something/somebody else – development actors and mechanisms – thus de facto leaving a vacuum in leadership and hampering the effective and practical realization of this objective.
16. In order to ensure an effective integration, it now seems necessary that the disaster risk reduction “converts” take a more proactive approach and give concrete guidance on how this integration can really take place. The integration can be fostered through three complementary means: policies, monitoring mechanisms, and formal periodic review processes.
17. At the policy level a lot of work has been done that points to the need and possibility to integrate climate change, environment and ecosystem management, development, and disaster risk reduction. It is also expected that more work will be done as research and practice progress.
18. The monitoring of implementation of the MDGs and HFA has been carried out through different mechanisms based on different targets and indicators. The current discussions on targets and indicators for the post-2015 sustainable development paradigm (agenda and goals) as well as those for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction offer an opportunity to develop targets and indicators, which are at least compatible. In particular, some targets and indicators for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction could be developed in a way to be instrumental and of direct relevance – and thus of interest – to what needs to be measured also under the post-2015 sustainable development agenda/goals.
19. Finally, in the past the International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction was within the purview of ECOSOC. However, the HFA did not include a formal periodic review which was then carried out through the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, while the MDGs have been periodically reviewed by the UN GA and ECOSOC – as such two distinct processes with extremely limited cross-fertilization. The establishment of the new High Level Political Forum (HLPF) as the mechanism to periodically review progress on sustainable

development, represent an opportunity for the World Conference to request that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction be brought within the HLPF's purview in order to ensure a synchronised and harmonised review process and deliberations for the two agendas.