



02 Consultation note on the Mid-Term Review of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015

Introduction

1. The World Conference on Disaster Reduction¹ was held by decision of the United Nations General Assembly², in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan on 18-22 January 2005. It adopted the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters* (HFA) that was endorsed by member states in UN General Assembly³ as the systematic, strategic blueprint to guide national and international efforts to reduce vulnerabilities and risks induced by naturally occurring hazards and human made processes.
2. The Hyogo Framework states in paragraph 29 that its implementation “will be appropriately reviewed” and in paragraph 33(g) requests the ISDR to “prepare periodic reviews on progress toward 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..”
3. Bearing in mind that the halfway point in the decade term of the Framework is approaching, the United Nations Secretary-General stated in his 2008 report to the General Assembly⁴ that “The second session of the Global Platform, to be held in June 2009, will serve to initiate the mid-term review of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action expected by 2010.” The General Assembly welcomed this move and requested the Secretary-General to include information on the Global Platform in his next report⁵.
4. This note by the UNISDR Secretariat sets out a number of issues and questions concerning the purposes and conduct of the Mid-Term Review as a basis for discussion at the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster risk Reduction, Geneva, 16-19 June 2009. The note is intended to foster discussion and the evolution of a wider consensus on the review among ISDR system partners.

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

² UNGA, Resolution 58/214 of 23 December 2003

³ UNGA, Resolution 60/1952 of 2 March 2006

⁴ UNGA, A/63/351. Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, Report of the Secretary-General, 10 September 2008 (see paragraph 17).

⁵ UNGA, A/RES/63/216. Resolution on International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 25 February 2009 (see paragraph 16).

Potential scope of the Mid-Term Review

5. It is proposed that the Mid-Term Review should address strategic and fundamental matters of implementation, based on experience since 2005 and with a view to 2015 and beyond. It would draw on but not replicate the existing ongoing processes of monitoring and review, including the Global Assessment Report, that have been established by the UNISDR, Governments and other ISDR system partners.
6. Similarly, it is proposed that the locus of ownership of the Mid-Term Review should lie with the key actors identified as responsible for and active in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework. This would involve multiple stakeholders, with principal leadership from Governments. It would be organized as a UNISDR supported process, not a UNISDR-driven process.
7. The review's outputs and outcome should be commensurate with the issues and problems faced and with the effort of undertaking the review. Accordingly, it is suggested that significant and concrete deliverables should be sought, and that these should comprise more than just a written report and conference.

Specific questions of a strategic type that might be considered include:

- i. What is the **overall progress on implementation** and what are the prospects for achieving the desired outcome of “a substantial reduction in losses”?
- ii. Are we satisfied with the tools and indicators developed for the assessment of risk reduction outcomes? How can assessment of progress against the indicators be made more precise/ quantifiable?
- iii. What do national authorities and other stakeholders consider as their **big achievements, major constraints and main lessons learned**?
- iv. What have been the **promoters and barriers to investment** in disaster risk reduction and how can funding be placed on a more predictable and sustained footing?
- v. What needs to be done to strengthen **linkages with climate change** policies and programmes?
- vi. Are the **expectations of the different stakeholders** set out in the Hyogo Framework being met, and is there any need for strengthening or adjusting roles?
- vii. Are there **other emerging issues** that provide new opportunities for disaster risk reduction or that require adjustment of directions or priorities?
- viii. What are the main issues that require the formulation and advocacy of **new or stronger messages**?
- ix. What types of deliverable would make **the biggest impact** on the second five years of the Hyogo Framework's implementation?
- x. What **new strategic or policy orientations** should be taken as we move towards and beyond 2015?

Potential approaches to conducting the review

8. The key stakeholders and their roles in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework are laid out in the Framework. Principally these are States, regional organizations and institutions, international organisations, and the ISDR partners. **How can the principal stakeholders themselves drive the review process, and what should be the role of the UNISDR secretariat?**
9. It is suggested that the well-understood layout of the HFA⁶ should provide the main framework for conducting the review. Similarly, it seems sensible to make use of the specific indicators of progress designed and promoted by the ISDR system⁷ and to use as the baseline the information available at the time of the World Conference in early 2005. Consideration could also be given to a formal assessment process that would analyse progress in terms of inputs, outputs and outcomes. Possibly, additional reviews and studies could be commissioned. **What level of detailed research and analysis would be appropriate to support the review?**
10. The consultations and preparations for the review can use existing ISDR system processes and mechanisms such as national platforms, regional and sub-regional platforms, international organizations and meetings, supported by the UNISDR web facilities. It can also draw on monitoring processes in other policy areas outside the ISDR system. Perhaps special consultations among key stakeholder groups may be needed, e.g. with donor governments in relation to financing strategies; or among countries sharing common exposure or vulnerability to certain hazards. **What would be the most effective and participative review process? What other relevant reporting and monitoring systems and opportunities could be drawn on.**
11. The review will need to draw on diverse sources of information, analysis and judgement – from Governmental, as well as national, regional, and international agencies, including UN agencies, international financial institutions, Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, NGOs, academic bodies, private sector organizations, and other civil society groups. **How can all relevant parties be encouraged to submit their information and reflections on progress?**
12. Consideration will need to be given to how changing contexts since 2005 may have affected disaster risk and disaster risk reduction efforts, and also to possible changes in future. These contexts could include matters such as shifting public awareness and expectations, scientific and technical advances, global climate change policy agreements, and the current financial and economic crisis. **To what extent should the review take a forward viewpoint and consider risk reduction beyond 2015?**

⁶ The HFA specifies an overarching *expected outcome* for delivery through the progression of *three strategic goals*, realised through *five priorities for action*. The associated implementation and follow-up framework sets out a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach with recommended actions by *key actors* (states, regional institutions, international organisations, and ISDR partners and secretariat, with civil society included) who are asked to give due consideration to stated *cross cutting issues* and *critical tasks*. There is additional explicit emphasis on *resource mobilisation*. (From Summary of the HFA 2005-2015, *ISDR, 2005*)

⁷ Indicators of progress: Guidance on measuring the reduction of disaster risks and the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. *UNISDR, 2008*, and online *HFA-Monitor*: www.preventionweb.net

13. **Timeline:** It is envisioned that the review would advance from the 2nd Session of the Global Platform in June 2009 through a step-by-step approach that would generate a stream of preparatory and draft materials, including interim reporting via the Secretary-General to the General Assembly in 2010, and then drawing to a conclusion and informing the preparations for the 3rd Session of the Global Platform in 2011. Specific events would be linked where possible with other important global events and processes. **Is this a reasonable timetable to achieve a substantive and timely result?**
-