

# Discussion Paper for the Third Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and World Reconstruction Conference

*8-13 May 2011, Geneva*

## Introduction

The ISDR Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction is the world's foremost gathering of stakeholders who are committed to reducing disaster risk and building the resilience of communities and nations. The Third Session, convened in conjunction with the World Reconstruction Conference, will build on existing commitments and set priorities and actions that will help to strengthen resilience to disaster at the local level.

The Third Session of the Global Platform will also reflect on the outcomes of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action and start setting priorities and processes for meeting the recommendations. The 2011 Global Assessment Report will provide evidence on which to base disaster risk reduction priorities. The joint World Bank/UN publication *Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters, the Economics of Effective Prevention* (2010) will also contribute to discussions on how to build momentum for risk reduction.

The theme of the Third Session of the Global Platform is: "Invest Today for a Safer Tomorrow—Increased Investment in Local Action." An important component of disaster risk reduction, and an explicit requirement of the Hyogo Framework for Action, is the effective involvement of communities and local authorities in planning integrated, multi-hazard approaches to disasters. A key observation from both the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action and the 2011 Global Assessment Report is that national institutional arrangements are not enough to promote effective action when resources do not reach local communities.

The local level is where the impact of disasters is most felt and where risk reduction impact and results must be realized. More effective support is required to empower local communities. Local authorities (including Mayors, city administrators and other civic leaders) play an essential role in ensuring their cities are made more resilient to disaster. A main objective for the Third Session will be to encourage stronger political commitment to local action. Additionally, the role of the private sector, especially in the local setting, is a key feature at the Global Platform in 2011.

Several other topics have also emerged that deserve attention at the Global Platform including infrastructure and reconstruction; the economics of disaster risk reduction; and building alliances and partnerships in climate adaptation action. Another key outcome for the Global Platform will be to consider how to make progress in the integration of disaster risk reduction into development planning, whether in finance, health, education, public works, agriculture, watershed or forest management.

Finally, this Discussion Paper suggests some areas to guide potential action and outcomes for the Third Session. The suggestions are consistent with the key findings and observations of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action and the 2011 Global Assessment Report.

## Progress and challenges since the Second Session in 2009

The Chair's Summary of the 2009 Global Platform established common directions for disaster risk reduction in areas of climate change adaption, protecting the most vulnerable, and set some targets for financing risk reduction.

### Recalling Commitments from the Second Session of the Global Platform 2009

#### *Setting targets for disaster risk reduction*

- By 2011, national assessments of the safety of existing education and health facilities should be undertaken.
- By 2015, concrete action plans for safer schools and hospitals should be developed and implemented in all disaster prone countries.
- Disaster risk reduction should be included in all school curricula by the same year.
- By 2015, all major cities in disaster-prone areas should include and enforce disaster risk reduction measures in their building and land use codes.
- Targets also proposed for: national risk assessments, municipal disaster recovery plans, early warning systems, water risks and the enforcement of building codes.
- The UN Secretary-General called for a target to halve the losses of lives from disasters by 2015, when the term of the Hyogo Framework for Action ends.

#### *Financing disaster risk reduction*

- 10 per cent of humanitarian relief funds to disaster risk reduction work.
- 10 per cent as a target share of post-disaster reconstruction and recovery projects and national preparedness and response plans.
- At least 1 per cent of all national development funding and all development assistance funding to be allocated to risk reduction measures, with due regard for quality of impact.

### *Progress at regional and national level*

Several regional and sub-regional platforms for disaster risk reduction have convened over the past two years in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Arab States, Europe, and the Americas. The development of regional platforms has contributed to the definition and adoption of important political statements at Ministerial and Heads of State level and culminated in regional disaster risk reduction strategies and plans of action which will play an important role to shape the discussions and outcomes of the Global Platform 2011. In addition, global and regional groupings of parliamentarians have issued declarations of support for the implementation of disaster risk reduction in their countries and regions; coalitions of mayors have assumed new leadership in disaster management and building resilience in communities, and national governments have significantly increased attention to disaster risk reduction and prepared detailed information on their progress, many of which are reflected in the Global Assessment Report.

## *Mid Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action*

The findings of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action will be central to the considerations at the Third Session of the Global Platform. Political momentum for disaster risk reduction, generated over the past five years, reflects the growing impact of the Hyogo Framework of Action. There will be time devoted in the Informal Plenary sessions of the Global Platform to discuss the conclusions of the Mid-Term Review, in order to ensure that outcomes and actions from the Third Session are consistent with the Review's findings and recommendations. The Third Session provides an opportunity to identify immediate paths for action relating to the Mid-Term Review recommendations and start early thinking about a successor to the Hyogo Framework of Action, which is due to expire in 2015.

### **UN General Assembly: Informal Thematic Debate on Disaster Risk Reduction**

A recent example of growing political momentum is the Thematic Debate on disaster risk reduction held on 9 February 2011 by the United Nations General Assembly in New York. In the informal debate, Member States were called on to make use of shared experiences, conduct advanced planning and prevention, engage in community-based participation to mobilize investments and other resources, enhance data collection, scale-up efforts in education, engage in better urban planning, and to share information and technology. There was also a consistent call for continuous awareness-raising to ensure that the needs of victims after specific, high-impact disasters stayed on the international agenda long after it had dropped from the news headlines.

## *Key challenges and messages*

Several messages emerging from consultations, processes and reports will be part of the discussion at the Global Platform.

The first message is to continue striving for a substantial reduction in disaster losses, in terms of lives as well as social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries. One structural obstacle preventing this goal from being reached is that disaster risk reduction is being carried out through relief and humanitarian mechanisms and instruments. Disaster risk reduction should be repositioned as a development activity, and be included in poverty reduction and "sector planning" (e.g. finance, health, education, agriculture, transport, public works, watershed and forest management).

Another key message is that, despite remaining gaps and a lack of universal coverage, investments in early warning systems and preparedness appear to be working. According to the 2011 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction, mortality risk for weather-related hazards such as floods and tropical cyclones is declining, particularly in Asia. The risk of being killed by a major river flood or cyclone in East Asia today is only half of what it was 20 years ago. What is especially encouraging is that this downward trend is happening despite the fact that more people are moving to flood plains and risk-prone coastal areas.

On the other hand, evidence from the Global Assessment Report is pointing to the rapid economic growth in many low and middle income countries resulting in an increase in assets at risk. This means that while the benefits of economic growth are slowly reducing vulnerability, growth that is largely unplanned is exposing an increasing amount of public and private infrastructure to risk. The most dramatic result is large-scale damage to housing, schools, health facilities, critical infrastructure (such as roads, bridges, water management infrastructure) and impacts on businesses in all regions and across income groups. A key consideration may therefore be to reinforce and seek stronger commitments to building safe infrastructure.

Finally, in terms of the post-disaster reconstruction and recovery efforts, there is a growing concern that scarce resources, originally intended for development programs, are all too often diverted. Without institutional capacity, coherent planning and coordination among all parties, the chance for development is lost, funds are wasted and affected populations are left additionally burdened. Increased investment in local action can offer affected communities the tools and means to respond more quickly to disaster events, to mitigate risk after such events occur and to take more responsibility for their own safety.

## Theme of the Third Session: Increased Investment in Local Action

The Third Session of the Global Platform provides the opportunity to further reinforce the resilience of communities. Underpinning this discussion is the 2010-2011 World Disaster Reduction Campaign, “Making Cities Resilient,” which has been focused on addressing issues concerning local governance and urban risk. The campaign draws on previous ISDR campaigns, including the Safer Schools and Hospitals pledging initiative, as well as on the urbanization principles developed by the UN-Habitat World Urban Campaign 2009-2013. The Making Cities Resilient campaign urges cities and local governments to be ready to face challenges posed by natural hazards by reducing risks and becoming resilient to disasters.

The vision behind the campaign is to achieve resilient, sustainable communities. “My city is getting ready!”— is a rallying call for all Mayors and local governments to make as many cities as possible as resilient as possible. It is also a call for local community groups, citizens, planners, academia and the private sector to join these efforts. Mobilizing these important actors in the disaster risk reduction process is essential for making cities resilient.

The Making Cities Resilient Campaign pursues three key objectives:

**Know more** – raise the awareness of citizens and governments at all levels of the benefits of reducing urban risks.

**Invest wisely** – identify budget allocations within local government funding plans to invest in disaster risk reduction activities.

**Build more safely** – include disaster risk reduction in participatory urban development planning processes and protect critical infrastructure.



### Albay Province, Philippines Featured City from the Making City Resilient Campaign

Joey Salceda, Governor of Albay Province, Philippines and the first Campaign Champion pioneered a “zero casualties” policy through pre-emptive evacuation during disasters, and by dedicating 9 per cent of the budget to climate change adaptation and risk reduction.

Governor Salceda is quoted as saying: “Disaster risk reduction is an investment; not a cost. It increases business returns. Albay has seen a surge in investments even after typhoons and volcanic eruption. We want to push ourselves higher and drive ourselves harder on this effort, and to push the envelope on development through disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.”

A study conducted for the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action on financial mechanisms at the national and local level for disaster risk reduction highlighted the case of the Albay Province in the Philippines. Findings indicate that a combination of elements contributed to decisive action at the local level: decentralized responsibilities, and discretionary resources in the form of fiscal grants and the social demand for disaster risk reduction. The study noted that effective action is unlikely unless local voices are sufficiently strong to advocate for a prioritization of resources at the local government level in favor of disaster risk reduction.



In addition, the Global Assessment Report 2011 and the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action has also considered the local dimensions of disaster reduction and identified factors contributing to reduced risk.

### *Understanding risk at the local level*

Information on risk — including on the hazards and vulnerabilities that contribute to risk and knowing the options for reducing risk — is essential for guiding investment decisions that lead to safer infrastructure, early warning and preparedness, and generating public demand for support in building resilience. Yet, according to reports on progress in implementing the Hyogo Framework of Action, Member States have made uneven progress in identifying patterns and drivers of risk, particularly at the local level.

In some provinces, comprehensive assessments are regularly updated, while other localities find it difficult to assess their risk to individual hazards and to ascertain their vulnerabilities and capacities. Most countries report a limited availability of data on local losses and difficulties in connecting local assessments with national loss. In addition, they lack the ability to update data on losses and risk information needs of local communities. Information on risk is seldom sufficiently formulated or easily accessible to those who need it.

### *The balance of responsibility*

Where the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action points to greater acceptance and awareness by national governments of their responsibilities for reducing risk, it also points to a persistent disconnect between national policies and local processes. Local authorities and local multi-stakeholder partnerships continue to search for sustainable sources of financial and technical resources to invest in safe infrastructure, and to promote early warning and preparedness measures best suited to their respective localities.

Some countries seek to build resilience at the local level through decentralizing authority and resources. Forty-eight of the 81 countries that submitted reports in 2010 on their progress in implementing the Hyogo Framework of Action confirmed that legal responsibility for disaster risk reduction is vested in local governments. However, only 24 per cent confirmed budgetary allocation for disaster risk reduction and management. Without adequate resources or technical expertise, it is unlikely that local authorities can fulfill decentralized responsibilities for disaster risk reduction.

As evidence of success, some governments identified disaster risk reduction and management functions that have been decentralized in their country. Owing to economies of scale, some functions are better situated within central planning bodies at the national level or even sub-regional (international) level, particularly those related to public investment in infrastructure such as safe schools and hospitals, or in developing and maintaining certain aspects of early warning systems.

### *Creating public awareness*

Creating public awareness to enable disaster risk reduction at all levels and across all sectors remains a challenge around the world. Legislation, good administration and planning, a free press and active media and social audits can all contribute to improved accountability and to create awareness of rights and obligations on all sides. Supporting the role of women and children in disaster risk reduction is another way to increase visibility and awareness of inherent dangers, while building the capacity of local governments leads to greater transparency of decision-making and resource allocation.

Increasing awareness on the importance of disaster risk reduction, especially at the local level, is closely linked to an effective consultative process and regular involvement of community organizations. Partnerships that bring together networks and consortia of expert institutions and civil society organizations can be a powerful tool to leverage support within government for local level disaster risk reduction and management initiatives. Academic institutions and NGOs play a key role in building the capacity of local governments. For example, the increased political pressure caused by increased awareness of the public in the aftermath of major disasters has often led to a revision of the legal and institutional frameworks for disaster risk reduction in a country.

Countries that experience more disasters have become more safety conscious and have internalized the need to ensure that disaster lessons are not forgotten, as Japan does with its National Day of Earthquake Remembrance and National Disaster Risk Reduction Day. However, a literature review carried out for the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action generally found little evidence of integrated national strategies for public awareness, education, and knowledge management, and the 2011 Global Assessment Report noted extensive gaps in awareness of the gendered aspects of disaster risk reduction.

## **Questions for consideration**

**What** can national governments do to promote public awareness and involvement of local actors in risk reduction?

**What** steps can be taken to ensure that risk information is sufficiently available to guide development investments and risk reduction measures that benefit local action?

**Who** is responsible for ensuring that schools, hospitals and other infrastructure are safe from natural hazards?

These issues and challenges will be examined at the Third Session of the Global Platform and the World Reconstruction Conference in three broad decision making and planning contexts: A) Recovering and reducing risk after disasters; B) Economics of disaster risk reduction; and, C) Alliances with climate change adaptation and development.

## **Topic A**

### **Recovering and Reducing Risks after Natural Disasters - World Reconstruction Conference**

When catastrophic events occur, the response and recovery efforts of the affected country as well as those of the international community often appear to be ad hoc and improvised. Systemic challenges cause the same problems to arise in recovery and reconstruction programmes around the world. While guides and analyses to overcome such challenges do exist at the operational level, they are not necessarily embedded in larger recovery policies and strategy formulations.

These challenges are compounded when resource promises and commitments are not fully delivered. The Second Session of the Global Platform in 2009 called for the allocation of 10 per cent of recovery financing to disaster risk reduction. Some countries have already taken important steps to heed this call. Yet the delivery of promised recovery financing appears challenged by donor fatigue or inefficiencies in the international development architecture.

Once the international community has delivered its support, the effectiveness of that support must be gauged in the context of whether and how local recovery and reconstruction needs are met. The Indian Ocean tsunami experience showed that ownership by, and accountability to, the affected populations, contributed to a sustainable recovery after the disaster. The aim of recovery efforts, therefore, should be to enable and empower countries and local communities to meet their needs based on informed choices and to demand accountability from themselves and their partners. International recovery support is more effective when provided in tandem with local and national initiatives, and works best when local communities and authorities lead, or are involved in, the planning, management and implementation of programmes. An understanding of local context, and collaboration with local and national structures, is all-important.

Further, the possibility of strengthening a local community's resilience to disasters can be achieved through the integration of humanitarian community work in disaster risk reduction and to emphasize the importance of linking humanitarian action to reconstruction and development. Empowering countries and communities can be achieved when national and local authorities take the lead in recovery and reconstruction after major headline disasters, as well as after frequent but less intensive disasters. However, in some cases, authorities may lack the capacity to lead recovery efforts internally, and could find it difficult to coordinate the plethora of international actors and manage resources that arrive following large-scale disasters. The feasibility of delivering effective recovery and reconstruction may, in the end, depend on building local recovery capacity and planning before a disaster strikes.



Opportunities to strengthen and build local capacity for recovery management and to integrate risk reduction into recovery are often missed and inclusive stakeholder consultation limited. It is not simply a question of supplying resources but also of ensuring support is provided in a coherent and coordinated manner that meets needs and improves local capacity. To face these challenges, shared principles and priorities for recovery and reconstruction could be agreed through an international framework and could be investigated fully. At a time of increasing frequency and intensity of disasters, it may be appropriate to explore a common vision that might cover areas such as cooperation among different actors, more efficient coordination efforts and stronger accountability measures, while at the same time supporting the capacities of national and local authorities to lead domestic recovery.

## **Questions for consideration**

**What** are the recovery and reconstruction challenges and lessons of the past and how do we move forward?

**Why** are communities not receiving what they need for sustainable recovery?

**What** is preventing proactive investment to make communities safer?

**What** is needed from the international system for effective, well-resourced and sustainable recovery and reconstruction?

## **Topic B**

### **Economics of Disaster Risk Reduction**

Unsafe infrastructure can turn poverty into disaster risks; lack of access to social protection and risk transfer mechanisms can turn disasters into poverty. Economic choices, investment decisions and the allocation of financial resources in the end have an enormous impact on how to approach risk reduction.

The joint World Bank/UN report *Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters, the Economics of Effective Prevention* (2010) noted that, generally, government expenditures are lower on prevention than on relief spending. The same report recognizes that some interventions such as early warning and preparedness systems, hydro-meteorological forecasts and structural protection require a substantial financial commitment. At the same time, a great deal can be achieved via modest investments in national, sub-national and local capacities in all sectors.

Public sector investments in schools, hospitals and other critical infrastructure constitute a major stream of financial flows. And with more robust risk information, local authorities can identify and implement risk-reducing modifications to their public sector investments. As studies conducted for the 2011 Global Assessment Report show, historical damage and loss information can contribute to recognizing these investments as savings rather than as costs.

Regardless of the specific priorities chosen for implementation, local authorities have become more capable in articulating the urgency of adequate resourcing for risk reduction. Organized through their own networks, local governments increasingly formulate convincing arguments and clear demands, particularly in relation to financing needs to address the challenges of development in a changing climate. At the launch of the Making Cities Resilient Campaign in Bonn in 2010, the Mayor's Adaptation Forum presented a declaration and called for direct access to financing mechanisms and technical resources from all levels — multilateral, national and local — in order to implement strategies and initiatives to manage the changing climate. Responding to the lack of policy and financial support for local implementation recognized at the First Session of the Global Platform in 2007, successful community development resilience funds have been established in India, Guatemala and Honduras to channel funds directly to community-based organizations.

Another factor to increase investment in local action is to make sure that the right mechanisms are being utilized. A literature review carried out for the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action suggests that while there is evidence of greater investment in disaster risk reduction, the problem is that it has not been integrated into the standard business processes of development planning ministries across sectors, and financial institutions. Without such integration, disaster risk reduction investments may not be long-term or sustainable.

Finally, the question is how much financial resources should flow to disaster risk reduction? Several targets have been set (see Box on Recalling Commitments at the Second Session of the Global Platform 2009) and have proven useful in guiding public resources decisions. Significant progress has been made, but it is too early to determine the impact of the targets. Rather than setting new resource targets, it will be more important to seek new opportunities (for example the 2012 World Conference on Sustainable Development Rio + 20) to reaffirm resource targets to achieve development goals in hazard prone areas.

In advancing local action, the private sector is a sorely under-utilized stakeholder group. Notwithstanding important contributions that reflect corporate social responsibility, private sector investment accounts for a good proportion of development financing. The private sector can also offer knowledge and information to help build resilience. Their expertise lies in balancing complex financial flows with multiple stakeholder demands that require constant risk assessment, innovation and solutions, which has clear relevance in disaster risk reduction. For this reason, innovative partnerships between public and private sector institutions are increasingly being sought out and strengthened.

There are several ways through which the private sector plays a direct role in financing the development expenditures of local governments. Business fees and taxes, for example, are often-neglected mechanisms through which the private sector provides resources for local governments. These are not only a source of direct funding for local expenditure, but they also help to generate the revenues necessary to repay local government borrowing.

In this regard, private sector involvement is a means to a better end. The private sector has much to offer in terms of investment in local disaster risk reduction efforts, participating in the development of contingency plans, ensuring the people they employ are aware of potential disaster risks facing their local communities, and cooperating with local leaders to build resilience among local populations.

## **Questions for consideration**

**What** are some examples and new ways of investing smarter in building resilience?

**What** can be done to ensure that local authorities and communities have access to resources for risk reduction?

**How** can we unlock private sector investment in risk reduction?





## Topic C

### Alliances with Climate Adaptation and Development

As the Chair's Summary of the Second Session of the Global Platform in 2009 outlined, climate change increases the risk to disasters at a time where national and international humanitarian capacities are being stretched by the growing scale and frequency of humanitarian emergencies worldwide. Decisions regarding the formulation, financing and implementation of climate change adaptation provide crucial opportunities to build the resilience of communities through risk reduction measures. For this reason the Chair's Summary of the Second Session referenced the need for collaboration, partnerships and coordination.

However, even though the need for integration between climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction is well recognized, functional links in policy and practice remain inadequate at the local and national levels. Resources and implementation mechanisms also remain largely separate. The absence of a common planning instrument will continue to limit efforts to integrate climate change and disaster concerns into development planning processes. Planning for resilience can help sustainable development in hazard prone areas.

Some national governments are already putting in place legal and institutional measures to merge disaster risk reduction and adaptation mechanisms: amongst them, the governments of Viet Nam, Philippines, Colombia and South Africa. Important regional initiatives are also relevant. The Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction adopted by the Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment in December 2010 emphasizes the leadership role taken by the League of Arab States in promoting the integration of disaster risk reduction measures in regional policies on sustainable development, climate change adaptation, environment, and disaster management coordination mechanisms. The Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Incheon, Republic of Korea, in October 2010, also called for joint and integrated action at all levels in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

The latest round of negotiations of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Cancun established clear commitments on financing and implementing climate change adaptation. Disaster risk reduction was identified as central to this work. Where partnerships between climate adaptation authorities and the existing national and local mechanisms for disaster risk reduction have been actively sought out and promoted, real progress has been achieved. The Adaptation Partnership (chaired by Costa Rica, Spain and the United States), for instance has already launched a Community of Practice to Support Implementation and Learning and presents further opportunity for cooperation in disaster reduction.

Similarly, a new Global Framework for Climate Information Services agreed that a stronger alliance is required between providers of risk information, particularly hydro-meteorological agencies, and decision makers responsible for building resilience. Accordingly, the High Level Task Force for the Global Framework for Climate Services has called for greater cooperation in hydro-meteorological observing systems and a greater partnership between the users and producers of climate information.

The use of such climate information has already proven successful. For example, the climate forecast applications programme in Bangladesh has strengthened partnerships among national hydro-meteorological services, agricultural extensions units in rural districts and local farmers associations. The involvement of local players in macro-level climate initiatives is an effective step toward building resilience, and as the 2011 Global Assessment Report notes, effective planning results in a benefit to cost ratio of 3:1. However, as current local level planning processes rarely include disaster or climate risk information, the need to forge partnerships should be pursued and encouraged.

In 2010, UNISDR conducted a review of upcoming challenges for early warning systems. The study recognized that the critical value of early warning could increase further by strengthening the links between disaster risk reduction and climate change, particularly in the context of expanding urban development under stress from environmental changes. Integrating knowledge about forthcoming changes and accounting for scientific, technical and social developments will further strengthen early warning systems as a key component of disaster risk reduction.

Disaster risk reduction directly supports development and can reduce the impact of disaster and the scale of humanitarian interventions required. While the tendency has been to treat these issues in isolation, the experience of risk reduction over the last few years has reinforced the need for harmonizing and integrating frameworks and policies for both climate change adaptation

and disaster risk reduction within the broader context of poverty reduction and sustainable development approaches and in particular with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The conceptual links between disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and development has already been made. The aim for the Third Session of the Global Platform should not be to repeat the need for these links, but to concretely identify and nurture alliances and partnerships that have proved to be effective in order for them to become role models for repetition worldwide.

## **Questions for consideration**

What steps can countries take to harmonize policies for disaster risk reduction with those of climate change and development?

What is the role of local authorities in linking risk reduction, climate change adaptation and development?

What steps can countries take to develop, strengthen and support partnerships between disaster risk reduction authorities and those responsible for climate change adaptation?



## The Way Forward - Potential Outcomes and Actions

In 2009, the Chair's Summary for the Second Session concluded that disaster risk can be readily reduced through practical action. The will to address disaster risk continues to build, driven by communities that recognize the dangers presented by disasters and the need for themselves to play a key role in global efforts to increase resilience. The 2009 Chair's Summary noted that innovative approaches and tools had been developed and applied in many key areas to be discussed at the Third Session of the Global Platform: the cost benefit analysis of risk reduction efforts; community-based and local level strategies; and ensuring the security of facilities such as schools and hospitals, among other issues.

Keeping in mind the recommendations from 2009, findings and consultations from the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework of Action, the 2011 Global Assessment as well as the discussions around the theme and topics of the Third Session of the Global Platform, the following are key areas to guide potential action and outcomes in 2011:

- (i) Commit to investing in local action and protecting the most vulnerable. Implement strategies to support the local level.
- (ii) Prioritize investments in:
  - Compiling national disaster loss information and comprehensive risk assessments;
  - Building safe infrastructure;
  - Increasing public awareness; and
  - Strengthening early warning and preparedness.
- (iii) Scale up advocacy in disaster risk reduction, for example through the Making Cities Resilient campaign.
- (iv) Develop practical guidance on implementing disaster risk reduction.
- (v) Engage and encourage the private sector:
  - Benefit from private sector expertise in building resilience;
  - Launch a business partnership for disaster risk reduction with a focus on investing in local action;
  - Develop a list of essentials for business in disaster risk reduction; and
  - Develop and open-source a risk modeling and planning tool.
- (vi) Acknowledge disaster risk reduction is primarily a development issue. Support national government efforts across different ministries to encourage building back safer and meet risk reduction objectives.
- (vii) Harmonize and develop cooperation in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction.
- (viii) Develop a common resilience plan to support sustainable development in hazard prone areas.
- (ix) Instigate a debate and consultative process on targets for disaster risk reduction and consider defining, implementing, and monitoring targets at national level, to complement the growing commitment at regional level to support the Hyogo Framework of Action.
- (x) Promote effective disaster recovery and reconstruction through:
  - Coordinated, comprehensive, inclusive and transparent processes;
  - A proposed global framework to promote principles and establish priorities for maximizing investments and preventing damage of physical structure; and
  - Innovative mechanisms and instruments that could provide developing countries with access to immediate and reliable reconstruction funds.