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Chapter 4 Progress against the Hyogo Framework for Action

National governments report major progress against the objectives and goals of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), particularly in strengthening disaster management and the institutional and legislative arrangements and mechanisms that underpin it. Significant momentum in the implementation of the HFA is also being generated through the development of regional and sub-regional strategies, frameworks, plans and programmes. Although early warning systems can be further improved, investments in enhancing preparedness and response are paying off. As highlighted in Chapter 2, weather-related disaster mortality is now declining.

In contrast, many governments and regional organizations find it difficult to address the underlying risk drivers. Despite a manifest commitment to disaster risk management (DRM), few countries systematically account for disaster losses and impacts or comprehensively assess their risks. The political and economic imperative to invest in DRM remains weak, with few countries reporting dedicated national budget lines or adequate financing for risk reduction.

Factoring DRM into national and sector planning and public investment is a particular challenge for many countries, as is the use of social protection to help vulnerable households and communities. Whereas many countries reported improvements in their legislative and institutional arrangements and have decentralized functions to local government, this is not necessarily leading to more effective implementation. In addition, gender considerations must be better incorporated into DRM across all geographic and income regions.

This chapter is based on reports submitted by national governments as part of the HFA Progress Review process through the HFA Monitor. It does not present any additional information or attempt to triangulate the information provided by countries, but demonstrates how governments perceive their country’s progress and the challenges they face. Moreover, it is a representation of countries’ inputs into the risk reduction and management process rather than a reflection of outcomes, which to a large extent will only be measured against reduced losses in the future.
4.1 The 2009–2011 HFA Progress Review

The HFA Progress Review enables countries to reflect on past efforts, future challenges and opportunities in DRM. By offering a framework for analysis, it catalyzes both strategic and action-oriented planning.

The HFA is a comprehensive set of actions that a country can take to strengthen its risk governance capacities. The HFA Progress Review allows countries to reflect on their efforts to strengthen their capacities and to identify strengths and gaps (Box 4.1). By offering a framework for analysis, it catalyzes both strategic and action-oriented planning.

Where governments have made serious efforts to engage key public, civil society and academic stakeholders in the review process, communication and consensus building have improved (see Box 4.2). Most importantly, the discussion of indicators helps generate a common language and understanding, thus fostering real dialogue.

Although the HFA Monitor does not measure risk governance capacities directly, it identifies successes and highlights challenges, irrespective of a country’s starting point. The national reports do not provide in-depth reasons for progress or lack thereof, though a number of countries provide information on the underlying drivers and barriers to progress. It is also important to note that countries are addressing the HFA from very different baselines.

Box 4.1 The HFA Monitor

In 2005, 168 member states endorsed the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), which aims to achieve a substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of countries and communities by 2015.

The HFA Monitor is a multi-tier online tool for regional, national and local progress review, facilitated by UNISDR and led by country governments. Achievements in each core indicator are rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing ‘minor’ achievement and 5 indicating ‘comprehensive’ achievement.1 For the current review period, several questions have been added to allow more in-depth analysis. It also gives governments the opportunity to assess their achievements and challenges, and to upload relevant documents, such as legislation and reports.

More than 100 countries and territories used the HFA Monitor in 2007–2009, and 133 are participating in the 2009–2011 review. The process is led and owned by inter-governmental organizations, governments and local government institutions at regional, national and local levels, respectively. Many governments are engaged in consultation across key sectors, including agriculture, water, transport, health and education. For example, the review in Panama involved more than 43 actors from different ministries, including external relations, economic planning, education, housing and land management; the private sector; and civil society, including universities. In Cuba, the national statistics department, the ministry of information and communication, and the transport ministry are all involved in the process.

The quantitative and qualitative data in this section are derived from the HFA Monitor and are based on the 82 reports submitted up to February 2011 by the relevant authorities for the period June 2009 to May 2011.
for example, the risk governance capacities of Switzerland or New Zealand and Afghanistan or Haiti (see Box 4.6).

Regionally, 58 percent of the countries and territories in the Americas, 72 percent in Asia, 61 percent in Africa, 53 percent in Europe, and 28 percent in Oceania participated in the HFA Progress Review (Figure 4.1).

The number and quality of the reports and associated documentation indicate continued and increased commitment to the HFA, which now constitutes the single most important source of information on DRM at the country level. It also provides a unique insight into where governments themselves see significant achievements and identify remaining gaps.

For this review period, local and regional monitoring frameworks, with attendant indicators, have also been developed. In light of the fact that local governments often have widely differing risk governance capacities, the national averages reported by the HFA Monitor hide large discrepancies in capacities among different areas within a country. For example, there are often dramatic differences between the capacities in a strong municipal administration in a capital or large city and those in weakly resourced localities in remote rural areas. The local monitoring framework factors local government contributions and community perspectives into national planning.

Municipalities and cities that have signed up to the ‘Making Cities Resilient’ campaign have access to the Ten Essentials – a checklist that helps them monitor their progress in managing disaster risks. The Ten Essentials are aligned to the local indicators, thus allowing local progress to be highlighted (Box 4.3). The regional framework has also aided reporting by regional inter-governmental organizations.

Box 4.2 Using the HFA Monitor to reflect on the past and plan for the future in Indonesia

In Indonesia, the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (NPDRR) is an independent forum that was established to support and facilitate cooperation among stakeholders in the HFA Progress Review. During the 2007–2009 review period, the role of the NPDRR remained limited because of its relatively weak status as a new organization. During the 2009–2011 review period, however, the National Platform was able to lead in the process.

Using the HFA Monitor tools provided by UNISDR, the NPDRR accommodated many different actors working in disaster risk management, and began a series of activities in support of the review process. With the HFA Monitor template as a starting point, the NPDRR organized focus-group discussions and national workshops to review progress.

Coordination among local platforms, international NGOs, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and UN agencies allowed a final draft report to be completed and submitted to UNISDR. Many stakeholders contributed to this process by providing in-kind and financial support for meetings and facilitation. The report has led to three major outcomes:

1. A HFA Monitor report that has generated a better understanding of the HFA and its relevance to DRM and development in Indonesia.
2. A multi-stakeholder dialogue that brings together different government departments, NGOs and international organizations, the media and business sector. The NPDRR aims to involve even more government stakeholders in the next review.
3. A common language, vision and understanding of the responsibility for disaster risk reduction in Indonesia.
Box 4.3 Using the HFA Monitor at the local level in the Philippines

Albay Province in the Philippines applied the local-level HFA Monitor indicators in 2010 and assessed its progress as a province at 4.6 (with 1 representing minor achievement and 5 indicating comprehensive achievement). A good example of Albay’s commitment to DRM is its allocation of more than 4.5 percent of its 2010 budget to risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

Albay was used as a model for the Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010, which requires a Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office in every local government unit. The province has 25 permanent emergency research and disaster specialists, and risk mapping is a common and essential tool for all existing hazards. Early warning systems are in place and communications chains are clarified and tested. Safe schools and hospitals are a major priority.

Whereas Albay is exposed to multiple hazards (typhoons, volcanic eruptions, landslides and floods), its governor, Joey Salceda, pioneered the ‘zero casualty policy’ with pre-emptive evacuation and a clear business-continuity plan for both government and the private sector.

Governor Salceda states that “disaster risk reduction is an investment, not a cost. It increases business returns”, particularly where critical infrastructure is effectively protected. Albay has seen a surge in investments in recent years, despite typhoons Reming and Milenyo, and the Mayon Volcano eruption. The Province is currently developing a Framework Plan that will emphasize reducing risks to its infrastructure.
4.2 Global overview of disaster risk reduction efforts at national and regional levels

Most countries find it difficult to comprehensively assess their disaster risks and to factor risk assessment information into national planning, investment and development decisions. At the same time, they highlight achievements and innovative practices that can drive change and provide political and economic incentives for DRM.

The global overview is based on the analysis of the interim review reports shared by the participating governments as of 7 January 2011. A total of 133 countries and territories carried out the review process, 82 of which shared their interim reports.5

The 2009 Global Assessment Report (GAR09) (UNISDR, 2009) indicated that although many countries’ disaster management capacities were increasing, far less progress was being made towards addressing the underlying drivers that are increasing countries’ stock of risk. The evidence to support this finding is even stronger in 2011. With notable exceptions, countries find it difficult to comprehensively assess their disaster risks and to factor risk assessment information into national planning, investment and development decisions. However, they also highlight achievements and innovative practices that can drive change and provide political and economic incentives for DRM.

4.2.1 An overview of global trends

GAR09 highlighted that national efforts were mainly focused on strengthening policy, legislation and institutional frameworks, along with boosting capacities for risk assessments, early warning and disaster preparedness and response (HFA Priority Areas 1, 2 and 5). In contrast, countries reported limited progress in using knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of resilience, as well as to address the underlying drivers of risk (HFA Priority Areas 3 and 4).

The 2009–2011 Progress Review indicates improvement across all priority areas. However, progress in HFA Priority Area 4 (underlying risk) continues to be particularly challenging, as highlighted in Figure 4.2 (GNDRR, 2009; UNISDR, 2009, 2011).

The global overview and more detailed analysis provided in this chapter do not account for the significant linkages between the different HFA Priority Areas. The HFA itself, while outlining three strategic goals and five priority areas, highlights the need to ensure that progress in one area supports efforts in others. These
synergies can be found in practice, but progress in some areas, such as policy development, does not automatically trigger improvements in others, such as the ability to address the underlying drivers of risk. Although global averages do not give an accurate picture of progress in any particular country, mapping global progress does highlight areas in which more effort is required (Figure 4.3).

Progress in HFA Priority Area 1 (Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation) has been consistent across the world. More than 42 of the 82 reporting countries and territories reported substantial or comprehensive achievement in this priority area. Specifically, 48 countries reported substantial achievement developing national policy and legal frameworks. Importantly, almost half of these are low- or lower-middle-income countries. However, a number of countries also highlighted that this progress does not necessarily translate into effective DRM. This is consistent with the findings from the HFA Mid-term Review, which reported notable progress setting up institutional structures and developing plans, but limited improvements in adequate resourcing and local implementation (UNISDR, 2011).

The institutional arrangements for DRM in many countries have certainly evolved, from traditional single-agency ‘civil protection of defence’ structures to multi-sector systems and platforms. However, finding appropriate institutional arrangements to ease the incorporation of DRM into development planning and public investment remains a challenge.

Currently 73 national platforms for coordination of DRM exist globally (as of February 2011). These platforms vary widely in terms of their authority, membership and history. In some cases existing disaster management organizations have been nominated as national platforms; in other cases they are an advisory or consultative mechanism to foster cross-sector coordination and to involve civil society and academic organizations. Only 55 countries confirm that civil society and relevant development sectors are represented in their national platforms, and only 37 scored level 4 or 5 on the functioning of national multi-sector platforms for DRM.

For HFA Priority Area 2 (Knowledge of risk at national and local level), comprehensive risk assessments remain elusive, particularly at the local level. More than half (46) of the reporting countries have undertaken national multi-hazard risk assessments that could hypothetically inform planning and development decisions. However, many countries faced major challenges linking these to development processes at the national and local levels. The HFA Mid-term Review also reflects that scientific assessments, useful as they are, rarely connect with assessments of community-level vulnerability and capacity.
Unfortunately, countries that reported substantial progress in this area also highlight an absence of national standards for assessing both disaster losses and risks. In particular, few countries carry out risk assessments of schools and health facilities. The overwhelming majority of countries (65 out of 82) do not collect gender-disaggregated vulnerability and capacity information.

The use of new technologies has been a key driver in the substantial progress reported on early warning. However, difficulties with all components of the early warning system or chain potentially limit corresponding improvements at the local level. The HFA Mid-term Review also indicated that more progress has been made on warning for major hazards than on developing relevant local systems and communicating early warning of recurrent extensive risks through appropriate channels.

HFA Priority Area 3 (Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels) continues to show limited progress. Identifying and further developing methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost–benefit analyses remains a particularly weak area, with only 19 of 82 countries scoring level 4 or 5. Less than a third of reporting countries rated as substantial or comprehensive their efforts to integrate risk reduction into school curricula and relevant formal training. The majority of countries reported significant gaps in developing public awareness strategies for, and communicating risk to, vulnerable urban and rural communities.

Progress in HFA Priority Area 4 (Reduce the underlying risk factors) is even lower. Although countries reported a greater awareness of the need to factor DRM into planning and investment, less than a third (28 percent) rated their progress towards addressing the underlying risk drivers at 4 or 5. Countries reported difficulties addressing the risks internalized in the different development sectors; as highlighted in the previous chapter, this explains why economic loss and damage continue to increase. Only 40 percent of countries, including only a quarter of low-income countries, invested in retrofitting critical public infrastructure such as schools and hospitals.

HFA Priority Area 5 (Strengthening disaster preparedness for effective response) has been the dominant focus of national governments for decades. This area encompasses disaster preparedness and contingency plans at all administrative levels, financial reserves and contingency mechanisms, and well-established procedures for information exchange during emergencies. More than half (46 of 82) of the countries reported substantial or comprehensive achievement developing policy, technical and institutional capacities (Figure 4.4). It is clear that effective disaster management has contributed to the decline in weather-related disaster mortality highlighted in Chapter 2.
More than 80 percent of countries indicated that they have contingency plans and procedures to deal with major disasters. Around the same proportion also have operations and communication centres, search-and-rescue teams, stockpiles of relief supplies, and shelters. More than two-thirds (58 of 82) of the reporting countries possess agreed methodology and procedures for assessing damage, loss and needs when disasters occur. Almost two-thirds (53) of the countries boast national programmes and policies for making schools and health facilities safe in emergencies.

Despite this partial success, much more needs to be done. Financial mechanisms for managing disasters remain weak, fragmented and uneven. As also confirmed by the HFA Mid-term Review, few countries have contingency funding mechanisms in place, particularly at the local level. Even though 58 countries have financial mechanisms for managing disasters, and 46 have contingency funds, more than half (46) of the countries indicated only weak or average overall progress in this area.

4.3 Gaps and challenges in early warning systems

Translating warning into concrete local action is crucial, even in countries with effective capacities for forecasting, detecting and monitoring hazards and suitable technologies for disseminating advance warnings. In many countries, even accurate, timely early warnings were often not acted upon effectively.

Good overall progress in disaster management is one of the HFA’s major achievements, but challenges remain in the implementation of effective early warning systems. For such systems to be effective, four elements must be in place: accurate hazard warning; an assessment of likely risks and impacts associated with the hazard; a timely and understandable communication of the warning; and the capacity to act on the warning, particularly at the local level. Countries do not report progress on early warning for specific hazards. Results predominantly reflect progress reporting on early warning for fast-onset events such as cyclones, certain types of floods and landslides.

Overall, half of the countries reported substantial achievements (Figure 4.5), but most of these included limitations in capacities and resources (level 4). A small number reported comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels (level 5). Since the last reporting period (2007–2009), progress has been made across all regions and income classes. Significantly, in 2011 only 8 percent of the countries reported minor or some progress (levels 1 and 2), compared with 18 percent in 2009.

Although 75 percent of countries reported that communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazards, they also highlight a lack of communication systems and arrangements for ensuring that early warnings are acted on successfully. Forty percent of the countries indicated that two or more of the four elements of an effective early warning system are missing; 55 percent reported that at least one element is missing (Figure 4.6). These findings make it clear that most countries must strengthen their capacities in this area.
Many countries reported a need to strengthen national plans, coordination mechanisms and legislation for effective early warning systems, thus echoing the findings of earlier studies (WMO, 2009). For example, although authorities may be capable of disseminating early warnings, the warning dissemination chain is often not enforced through policy or legislation. Countries also reported difficulties in coordination, such as a lack of clarity about roles and responsibilities across institutions with responsibility for early warning for different hazards.

Perhaps the key challenge for all countries is translating warning into concrete local action, even for those with effective capacities for forecasting, detecting and monitoring hazards and suitable technologies for disseminating advance warnings. In many countries, even accurate, timely early warnings were often not acted upon effectively.

Countries reporting some progress but continued low levels of early warning capacity include Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Lesotho, the Republic of Moldova, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Yemen. Most of these countries also reported low levels of operational capacity, insufficient coverage of different hazard types, low institutional capacity, lack of resources, and difficulty issuing warnings to the very local level. Conversely, there were also several examples of countries developing innovative ways to communicate warnings to communities. Finland is developing digital radio networks for sharing information and data in emergencies, and also reaches 80 percent of its population with outdoor sirens. Australia and Madagascar are using mobile telephones to communicate warnings.

4.4 Understanding risks

Countries from all geographic and income regions reported three main obstacles to undertaking comprehensive risk assessments: limited financial resources; lack of technical capacity; and a lack of harmonization among the instruments, tools and institutions involved. Most countries also reported limited availability of data on localized losses, and difficulties connecting local disaster impact assessments with national monitoring systems and loss databases.

Disaster loss data is a prerequisite for understanding risk. Unless a country systematically records its disaster losses, measures the impacts and assesses its risks, then
justifying investments in risk reduction will be difficult. The majority of countries (62 out of 82) did report having mechanisms in place to systematically report disaster loss and impacts. However, the associated challenges indicate that these mechanisms do not generate sufficient data, and suffer from fragmentation and limited accessibility. Where data-sharing protocols and mechanisms still do not exist, information remains scattered across various departments within the sector and does not provide a complete picture of national losses.

Producing reliable loss and impact information remains a challenge, especially after large disasters or in difficult environments, such as those encountered in Haiti and Myanmar. Moreover, this problem extends to localized losses, where most countries also reported limited data availability and difficulties connecting local disaster impact assessments with national monitoring systems and loss databases. For example, despite confirming that it systematically records disaster losses, Mauritius reported it had no quantitative data on the extent of damages caused by all hazards.

Also, as highlighted above, fewer than half of the countries undertook comprehensive multi-hazard risk assessments and less than a quarter did so in any sort of standardized way. Many high-risk countries, such as Armenia, Colombia, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Turkey and Viet Nam, reported little progress on multi-hazard risk assessment and identification. There are two reasons for this: in some of these countries such initiatives may have just begun; in others, such as Turkey and Colombia, it more likely reflects a growing and sophisticated understanding of the complexity of the challenge.

The European Commission has recognized this complexity and has developed and adopted guidelines for mapping and assessing risk, based on a multi-hazard and multi-risk approach. Canada is currently developing an all-hazards risk assessment framework that will become part of the country’s emergency planning system. Romania has plans for an East European Multi-Risk Management Centre. A number of countries also made efforts to integrate risk assessments into a range of sectors, including health, education, agriculture, transport and water management.

Countries from all geographic and income regions reported three main obstacles to undertaking comprehensive risk assessments: limited financial resources; lack of technical capacity; and a lack of harmonization among the instruments, tools and institutions involved. These challenges were also reported by regional and sub-regional intergovernmental organizations.

In many countries a wide range of institutions are engaged in institute- and sector-specific assessments. Data on individual hazards and vulnerabilities are scattered across many organizations. This creates problems for the coordination and compatibility of data, and the harmonization of data collection and storage. Encouragingly, some countries are starting to overcome this fragmentation by finding new ways to organize (see, for example, the case of Barbados in Box 4.4).

In general, the practice of systematically incorporating risk assessments into recovery programmes has failed to take root overall, with only limited progress since the last reporting period. Most advances have occurred in low-income countries, where 42 percent report substantial progress (level 4 or 5) in 2011, compared with 29 percent in 2009.

Where responsibility for risk assessment has been decentralized, countries reported an uneven level of progress depending on technical capacities and resources. Some provinces and districts regularly update comprehensive assessments, while others had difficulty assessing even individual hazards. China provides one such example, reporting substantial progress against this indicator with successful disaster loss and hazard monitoring at national, provincial and city levels. At the same time, it had significant trouble setting up similar systems at the county level.
Most countries across all geographical and income regions reported relatively little progress toward dedicating resources to strengthening their risk governance capacities. Resources allocated for DRM in individual sectors or for local governments are even more limited.

Unsurprisingly, given their difficulty in assessing risks and accounting for losses, countries have difficulty justifying investments in DRM. GAR09 showed that low- and middle-income countries require several hundred billion dollars of development investment per year to upgrade informal human settlements, to restore damaged ecosystems and to provide basic needs. Furthermore, they require specific resources to strengthen risk governance capacities and thus ensure that such investment does indeed reduce risks. The assignment of dedicated resources for this purpose provides a clear indication that countries are really following through on their stated political commitment to the HFA.

In 2009–2011, many countries recognized that development investments in poverty reduction, food security and public health reduce risks. However, they find it difficult to quantify these investments, which are provided through diverse instruments including sector budgeting, environmental protection funds, social solidarity and development funds, compensation funds, civil society and, in some countries (Algeria, for example), the private sector.

Most countries across all geographical and income regions reported relatively little progress towards assigning dedicated resources to strengthen their risk governance capacities (Figure 4.7).

Less than one country in five could describe the percentage of their national budgets assigned to DRM, indicating that allocating dedicated resources remains the exception and not the norm. The figures provided vary from 0.005 percent (Lesotho) to 2.58 percent (Sri Lanka). Even countries such as Viet Nam (Box 4.5) and India, which have both passed legislation to allocate financial resources, found it difficult to quantify their investments.

Resources allocated for DRM within sectors and for local governments are even more limited. India’s 2005 DRM law requires that...
progress in ensuring dedicated and available resources for disaster risk reduction

Box 4.5 Viet Nam: legislation on resource allocation for disaster risk management

Viet Nam has passed legislation to allocate sufficient human and financial resources for implementing DRM, including structural and non-structural measures, from the national level to individual communities. With the approval of the National Disaster Risk Management Strategy, the National Target Program to respond to Climate Change (NTP on CCA) and the Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) Plan, significant resources have been budgeted to implement these priorities and activities.

The three main funding sources include the state (central and local), international contributors, and civil society and individual contributors. For example, to implement the CBDRM plan from now to 2020 will require 988 billion VND (US$48 million), of which the state will cover 55 percent, individuals 5 percent and official development assistance 40 percent.

The National Disaster Risk Management Strategy and the NTP on CCA identify key projects and outline funding needs. The Ministry of Finance (MoF) and Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) have been assigned to allocate and seek the financial resources to implement these plans. The MPI prioritized DRM needs in the Socio-economic Development Plan for 2006–2010, while the MoF sets aside annual contingency funding from 2 to 5 percent of national and provincial budgets for disaster response and recovery. However, because contingency funds must cover emergency response, significant funding gaps remain for recovery, reconstruction and DRM.
shows that less than half the countries (38 out of 82) budgeted explicitly for DRM within post-disaster recovery programmes and, of these, very few could report specific amounts or percentages of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to risk reduction.

The 2009–2011 review shows little or no advance on the 2007–2009 results. Most countries continue to have difficulty integrating risk reduction into public investment planning, urban development, environmental planning and management, and social protection.

Some countries have yet to recognize climate change adaptation as an important area. A number of high-income countries or territories, such as Croatia, Czech Republic, and the Turks and Caicos Islands, reported that climate change is not yet on their policy agendas and, as a result, increasing climate risk is not taken into account in DRM. However, the majority did report the emergence or strengthening of climate change adaptation projects and programmes: 72 percent globally, with a relatively equal distribution across regions and income classes.

Compared with 2007–2009, lower-middle-income countries, such as Bhutan, reported most progress in integrating disaster risk reduction into national development plans and climate change policies (Figure 4.10). However, lower-middle-
Box 4.6 The Risk Reduction Index

The DARA Risk Reduction Index (DARA, 2011) is based on 38 indicators that measure the extent to which a country is addressing the underlying risk drivers identified in GAR09, and to which it has appropriate and effective governance arrangements. In a detailed comparison of seven countries in Central America and the Caribbean, Costa Rica was found to have the strongest risk governance capacities, and Nicaragua the weakest (Figure 4.11).

The Risk Reduction Index uses data from a large range of well-established indices, including the World Bank’s Governance Index. In preparatory analysis for the Index, a global risk index table for 184 countries was developed (DARA, 2011; Lavell et al., 2010). This analysis shows that the top six countries (Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland, Norway and Finland) are all high-income countries with strong governance capacities, and have largely addressed their underlying risk drivers. In contrast, the bottom six countries (Afghanistan, Chad, Haiti, Somalia, Democratic Republic of Congo and Eritrea) are low-income countries that are experiencing or have recently experienced conflicts or political crises. These countries have very weak capacities to address the drivers.

A number of middle-income countries, such as Chile, Barbados and Malaysia, rate relatively highly on the Index, indicating that risk governance capacity is not just a reflection of GDP per capita. Low- and middle-income countries do not have to wait for their economies to develop before they address their disaster risks. Conversely, a number of relatively wealthy countries whose economies depend on energy exports rate lower on the index, including Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Equatorial Guinea and Angola.

The in-depth comparison of Central American and Caribbean countries highlighted major differences in capacities not only among countries, but also among different areas of the same country. As well as reflecting widely varying processes of risk construction, this highlighted important differences in perception of both risk and disaster risk management among different stakeholders, and between local and national levels.

Surveys, structured around the four drivers of risk identified in GAR 2009, were conducted to inform an index on conditions and capacities for disaster risk reduction. Consistent with findings from the 2009 civil society review ‘Views from the Frontline’, government respondents scored governance capacities considerably higher than did members of civil society. Poor governance emerged as the driver that conditions all the other underlying drivers. Improving governance was thus emphasized as the single most important priority for reducing disaster risk.

Box 4.6 confirms that countries differ widely in their capacities to address risk drivers, such as badly planned and managed urban and regional development, the destruction of ecosystems, and

---

Figure 4.11
Risk governance capacities across Central America and the Caribbean

(Source: Adapted from DARA, 2011)
the pervasive poverty of risk-prone households and communities.

Given these different starting points, it is unsurprising that those countries that reported little progress did so from very different perspectives. Some national reports (from Albania and Senegal, for example) reveal a focus on preparedness and emergency management and higher progress in HFA Priority Area 5 (strengthening disaster preparedness) than in other areas. Others, such as Peru, show a sophisticated understanding of the complexities of addressing underlying vulnerabilities and drivers of risk together with a low progress score. Namibia reported that investment into DRM, rather than response and preparedness, is difficult to plan and account for. Greater understanding appears to bring greater awareness of the magnitude of the task.

4.6.1 Investment planning

Only 38 percent of all countries and territories, relatively equally spread across income classes and regions, systematically incorporated risk reduction into national- and sector-level public investment systems. However, it is unclear if more than a few of these are fully functioning and institutionalized systems. For example, Viet Nam reported that decisions on public investment are based on relatively limited information on hazards, climate change and underlying vulnerabilities.

As Figure 4.12 shows, countries reported less progress towards estimating the potential impacts on future disaster risk of large infrastructure projects – such as dams, highways and tourism developments – than they did in the previous reporting period. Less than 10 percent of lower-middle-income countries awarded themselves a score of 4 or 5. Again, this limited progress may reflect increased understanding of the complexities involved in conducting systematic assessments.

New supporting data for the current reporting period show that countries employ different types of mechanisms to assess disaster risk. As Figure 4.13 shows, while most OECD and other high-income countries directly assessed risks in critical infrastructure projects, low- and middle-income countries seem to rely more on pre-existing environmental impact assessments to fulfil this function.

4.6.2 Urban and land use planning

In the present reporting cycle, lower-middle-income countries reported significant progress in the area of urban development and land use planning compared with 2009. However, there remains a staggering discrepancy between high- and low-income nations, with almost 70 percent of high-income countries and only
15 percent of low-income countries scoring 4 or 5 (Figure 4.14).

As Figure 4.15 shows, while most (95 percent) high-income countries (and all OECD countries) invested to reduce risks in vulnerable settlements, only 60 percent of low-income countries reported such investments. This is particularly critical considering the large concentration of disaster risk in urban areas in low- and middle-income countries. But even some high-income countries had trouble developing appropriate land use plans. In Barbados, for example, this problem led to increased vulnerability for low-income groups. Barbados also had difficulties dealing with vulnerable settlements that were developed before current legislation on zoning and urban land use planning was passed. Although a lack of political will is rarely acknowledged, particularly with regard to relocation, it is implicit in many countries’ descriptions of barriers to progress. Weak enforcement of plans is another reported challenge, reflecting the need for more participatory approaches to planning and development.

Low-income countries find it harder than higher-income countries to make the investments necessary to reduce urban risk (Figure 4.16). Urban drainage systems, for example, are recognized as an important tool for reducing urban risk but less than half (46 percent) of low-income countries invested
in drainage infrastructure in flood-prone areas. Less than a third (31 percent) of low-income countries took measures to counter landslide risk, compared with around 60 percent of lower- and upper-middle-income countries, and 68 percent of high-income countries. A less significant but similar trend was observed for the provision of safe land for low-income households and communities. This finding is consistent with the rapid increase in housing damage in urban areas reported in Chapter 2.

Some countries have introduced hazard-resistant building regulations only recently. The Syrian Arab Republic, for example, first introduced a seismic code in 1995. Weak implementation and enforcement mechanisms are common problems in countries where most urban development is informal.

In addition, reports from several countries and territories reveal the trade-offs internalized in any decision to invest in DRM. For example, Croatia reported pressure from the construction industry to lower standards and codes to reduce overall construction costs, even in hazard-prone areas.

4.6.3 Environmental planning and management

Most countries and territories addressed the decline of regulatory ecosystem services and reported positively on provisions for protected areas legislation (77 percent), environmental impact assessments (83 percent), and climate change adaptation projects and programmes (73 percent). Fewer reported payments for ecosystem services, which is still a relatively new policy area. Integrated planning, such as risk-sensitive coastal zone management, was also lacking. Overall and except for middle-income countries (see Figure 4.17), less progress was made integrating DRM into environmental policies than in 2007–2009.

More than 95 percent of lower-middle-income countries have ecosystem protection measures in place, and more than 80 percent of countries globally have mechanisms to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services. However, a number of countries claimed that existing laws needed stronger legislation or enforcement. For example, Sierra Leone reported that enforcement bylaws need updating to act as effective deterrents. Similarly, Indonesia points out that overlapping responsibilities and legislation on environmental and disaster management result in a lack of synergy and coordination, which hinders enforcement. Timor-Leste, along with several other countries worldwide, is hampered by protective-area legislation that does not take disaster risk into account.

4.6.4 Social protection

The lack of effective social protection erodes the resilience of poor households globally (ERD, 2010; UNRISD, 2010). GAR09 highlighted the role of social protection in DRM and Chapter 6 of this report discusses how countries are adapting various instruments designed to increase community and household resilience (Box 4.7). As well as supporting individuals and communities during and after a disaster, social protection is increasingly recognized as a means for increasing pre-disaster resilience.

Ensuring that micro-level social support and economic incentives – such as targeted welfare and employment programmes and micro-business development – are in place before a disaster strikes can be an effective way to assist vulnerable households. As Figure 4.18 shows, progress in this area since the last reporting period has been particularly significant for middle-income countries.
Different instruments scored very differently across income groups. Figures 4.19 and 4.20 show that, on one hand, penetration of crop and property insurance is far higher in high- and upper-middle-income countries than in low-income countries. On the other hand, 58 percent of low-income countries use micro-insurance instruments, compared with only 25 percent of high-income countries.

Low- and lower-middle-income countries and territories such as Bolivia, the Cayman Islands, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Madagascar, Maldives and Nicaragua all reported no or little progress on the provision of social protection instruments, such as cash transfers or employment programmes that can enhance households’ disaster resilience.

Ecuador is one of few countries that implemented a wide range of social policy instruments as part of their disaster risk reduction strategy. As the country’s Ministry for Agriculture is responsible for a number of these social development programmes, they are tightly linked with livelihoods and asset protection.

Myanmar and Timor-Leste reported limited progress in the provision of social development policies (levels 2 and 1, respectively). Their analysis of constraints and challenges echoes that of many disaster-prone countries. Social protection is often limited to areas that have recently experienced disasters, such as those affected by Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar (2008) or regions suffering recurring floods in Timor-Leste.

---

**Box 4.7 Linking social protection and disaster risk reduction**

All of Malawi’s social development policies are designed and implemented so as to reduce the vulnerability of at-risk communities. Its new Social Support policy, scheduled to be approved in 2011, explicitly links social protection with disaster risk reduction. Further, Malawi reported that a pilot cash-transfer programme, primarily targeted at orphans and the elderly, has already had a positive impact on a number of districts.
Only 23 percent of countries globally reported the use of employment guarantee schemes (Figure 4.21). This is unsurprisingly low given that such schemes are perceived as a large burden on national budgets, though this is being countered by evidence from successful and affordable schemes across the globe (see Chapter 6). Conditional cash transfers, although considered more targeted and efficient, are used by only 31 percent of low-income countries, including Burundi, Kyrgyzstan and Zambia (Figure 4.22). Of all the countries that use these instruments, more than half are middle-income countries. High-income countries tended not to use these instruments because their social welfare systems usually operate via pensions, family benefits and other similar mechanisms.

### Figure 4.21
Countries reporting on the use of employment guarantee schemes

<table>
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<tr>
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### Figure 4.22
Countries reporting on the use of conditional cash transfers

<table>
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<td>High-income</td>
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<td>5%</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Strengthening institutional and legislative arrangements

Often national DRM organizations lack the political authority and technical capacity to engage development sectors. A failure to strengthen local governments and make progress in community participation means that the gap between rhetoric and reality is widening.

The location within a government of authority for national policy on DRM can critically influence a country’s ability to use national and sector development planning and investment to reduce its disaster risks. National DRM organizations often lack the political authority and technical capacity to engage development sectors. Timor-Leste, for example, failed to generate substantial momentum for DRM in sector ministries because of the relatively isolated and weak position of its National Disaster Management Department.

Some countries have made DRM apex bodies of presidents’ and vice presidents’ offices (or placed them within existing apex bodies). These include Myanmar, where the National Disaster Preparedness Central Committee is chaired by the prime minister; Nepal, which has moved the responsibility for its National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management under the chairmanship of the prime minister; and Botswana, where the National Disaster Management Office is an apex of the vice president’s office. However, it is unclear whether this has improved the coordination of national or sector development planning and investment.

There is little evidence of countries locating responsibility for DRM in their economic and financial planning ministries. Only the United Republic of Tanzania reported such a move, developing its Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty for 2010–2015 through the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs. This has provided a strong push for DRM, from
reviewing and harmonizing laws and policies to infrastructure improvements, capacity building and community-based disaster preparation.

Several countries have spread the various functions of DRM across different levels of governance. In Nigeria, for example, a central coordinating body chaired by the vice president leads policy development, monitoring and response; at the lower levels of governance, states set up their own emergency management agencies with responsibility for disaster prevention, education and awareness raising, and local response preparedness.

A number of countries reported major coordination challenges where DRM responsibilities are distributed across sectors. In addition, where responsibilities are spread horizontally and vertically, new laws and strategies may sit awkwardly next to outdated statutes and policies developed within sector departments. To address this challenge, Morocco, for example, has set up a working group with the Ministry of the Interior to conduct a joint revision of outdated laws and policies. However, as reported by Namibia, updating national policies and disaster management plans according to new legislation can be a slow process.

4.7.1 Limited local capacity and action

The central role of local governance in DRM is now acknowledged by most countries. However, across all indicators relating to decentralization, a failure to strengthen local governments and make progress in community participation means that the gap between rhetoric and reality is widening (Figure 4.23).

Local capacity was identified as a key gap in delivering effective DRM. While Yemen, for example, has structurally decentralized disaster risk management and reduction, existing financial and technical resources do not match local governments’ new responsibilities. This is a common experience across the globe. In Madagascar, the legal framework for decentralized risk management does not include any provisions for budget allocations or specific responsibilities and procedures. As a result, local governments find it difficult to assume their roles as designated leaders in disaster risk reduction. As discussed in Section 4.5, dedicated budget allocations to local governments for DRM remain the exception rather than the rule. However, China and a handful of other countries reported comprehensive achievements in this area – though much of this progress concerns response preparedness rather than DRM in a broader sense.

4.7.2 Very limited progress in public awareness and education for DRM

Public awareness of risks and of how to address them is a key to strengthening accountability and ensuring that disaster risk management is implemented. Yet, only 19 countries reported substantial progress in this area, with 63 indicating weak or average progress. Anguilla, Côte d’Ivoire, Kyrgyzstan, Poland and the Seychelles advanced least in this area, compared with all other HFA priority areas. Most countries reported significant efforts in campaigns to raise public awareness, including outreach to local governments and risk-prone communities. Despite these advances, around 60 percent of countries that rated themselves as making good overall progress, reported weak or average progress on making available information on disasters and disaster risk reduction issues.
China was a notable exception, reporting substantial and comprehensive progress on the availability of risk information, on developing a countrywide public awareness strategy, and on integrating DRM into school curricula (from primary to tertiary levels). As Chapter 7 of this report highlights, access to information and risk awareness drive social demand for disaster risk reduction. If countries have no established mechanism for accessing disaster risk information, their citizens will find it difficult to demand more effective risk reduction.

Almost 60 percent of countries have included DRM in the national educational curriculum. But, as Figure 4.24 shows, efforts have focused more on the primary level than the secondary or tertiary levels. However, while few countries included DRM in university and professional training, the literature analysed for the HFA Mid-term Review in 2010 highlighted a rapid expansion of specialized DRM courses at training institutes and universities. Distance-learning courses are also becoming more popular, particularly for developing the skills and knowledge base of governmental and NGO staff.

Another area where progress has been slow is in research; in particular, research on improved multi-risk assessments and cost–benefit analyses. Three-quarters (63 out of 82) of the reporting countries reported little or average progress in this area, with only 19 countries indicating substantial progress. Furthermore, most countries (85 percent) reported no research into the economic costs and benefits of disaster risk reduction.

4.8 Regional progress

Many regional inter-governmental organizations have successfully developed regional risk reduction frameworks and strategies. However, these often emphasize risk management over risk reduction and it has been difficult to engage non-governmental actors meaningfully in these processes.

Disaster risks associated with major hazards are often a regional concern. Most (74 out of 82) countries participated in regional and sub-regional DRM programmes and projects, and many countries also have action plans addressing trans-boundary issues.

Many regional inter-governmental organizations have successfully developed regional risk reduction frameworks. More than three-quarters (63) of the countries participated in the development of regional strategies – with SOPAC in the Pacific, ASEAN in South-East Asia, CDEMA in the Caribbean, CEPREDENAC in Central America, the African Union and NEPAD in Africa, amongst others, all developing regional disaster risk reduction frameworks. The most recent success was provided by the Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment (CAMRE), which adopted the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2020, endorsed by heads of state in January 2011. The Incheon REMAP initiative is another example of an innovative approach to regional learning and cooperation (Box 4.8).

Initiatives in Europe have resulted in agreement on a comprehensive strategy and implementation plan for the European Commission’s support to disaster risk reduction.
Moreover, the Council of Europe has taken steps toward a joint European approach to managing risk in member states (Box 4.9).

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) has agreed on a Comprehensive Regional Framework on Disaster Management, and has established its organizational structure. Despite this success, SAARC reported that although constitutional commitment has been attained, comprehensive or substantial achievements are still elusive (Box 4.10).

The regional progress report of the Arab States also highlights a lack of ongoing sub-regional and regional programmes that consider transboundary risks. Whereas national processes to better understand and monitor risk are underway (in Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen, for example), the lack of information at regional level affects...

---

**Box 4.8 An Asian roadmap to cope with weather-related risks**

In October 2010, 50 Asian and Pacific region governments agreed to make risk reduction part of their national climate change adaptation policies and jointly address the increase in severe weather events. The Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction approved a five-year regional roadmap, the Incheon REMAP, which brings together climate-sensitive risk management systems at the regional, national and community levels.

This new regional framework recognizes disaster risk reduction as a key tool for climate change adaptation. The main components include raising awareness on weather-related hazards, sharing information through new technologies, and integrating disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into sustainable development policies. The roadmap also promotes the sharing of information on, and new technologies related to, emerging risks and vulnerabilities. Goals include improving national hydro-meteorological capacities to increase preparedness, forecasting, risk transfer, and early warning and evacuation systems, as well as incorporating disaster risk into urban development for the most exposed communities. The roadmap’s progress will be reviewed at the next Asian Ministerial Conference, to be held in Indonesia in 2012.

---

**Box 4.9 The European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement**

Created in 1987, the Council of Europe’s European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA) is a platform for co-operation between European and southern Mediterranean countries in the field of major natural and technological disasters. Its remit covers the knowledge of hazards, risk prevention, risk management, post-crisis analysis and rehabilitation.

EUR-OPA’s plan of action and activities are aligned with the priorities of the HFA and support the development of national platforms. Since 2008, in close collaboration and coordination with the UNISDR Europe Regional Office, EUR-OPA has supported the establishment of the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (the acting regional platform for DRR in Europe), which was officially launched in 2009 and is composed of the European HFA focal points, national platform coordinators and regional organizations.

In the past four years, the activities carried out by EUR-OPA focused on the drivers of risk and disasters. Moreover, following the EUR-OPA 12th Ministerial Session in September 2010 in Saint Petersburg, Russia, a new five-year plan (2011–2015) was adopted. The new plan seeks to address persistent vulnerabilities and envisages the involvement of citizens in building resilience to reduce disaster risk and adapt to climate change.
Box 4.10 The challenges of addressing trans-boundary risks in South Asia

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) reported that the process of agreeing on the Comprehensive Regional Framework on Disaster Management was “painstakingly slow” and was hampered by limited commitment of member states, limited resources and the competing priorities and responsibilities of different government departments. The fact that the Framework is not legally binding is seen as a major impediment to effective implementation. Despite these challenges, SAARC has developed nine regional roadmaps, which cover coastal, marine and urban risk, and risks associated with earthquakes, landslides and droughts.

Information-sharing is another challenge. Bilateral exchange of information already exists on, for example, rainfall and river discharge data. Regionally, however, there is a reluctance to share data and information on trans-boundary hazards and vulnerabilities in a systematic and ongoing manner. SAARC sees this as a major gap in current progress and reports on three main challenges to trans-boundary risk assessment in South Asia: scarcity of quality data; lack of coordination between different and often competing ministries and member states; and lack of adequate financial and human resources (including technical capacity). These impediments mean that although the region has succeeded in getting high-level commitment to carrying out trans-boundary assessments, this has yet to translate into practice.

Regional capacity for early warning on trans-boundary risks, particularly for multiple hazards. Regional access to national hazard analysis and loss databases has also been identified as a constraint for regional progress. The League of Arab States initiated the first review of progress on the current status of implementing disaster risk reduction in the Arab region in 2007. After encountering significant constraints in the start-up phase, the League has since seen a surge in member countries’ interest in engaging in national as well as regional reporting and coordination (Box 4.11).

Many of the existing regional frameworks and strategies remain skewed towards disaster management and HFA Priority Area 5 (strengthening disaster preparedness). The European Commission, for example, admits that its contributions have to date been mostly to HFA Priority Area 5, but points to a number of ‘projects fitting into a more holistic DRR approach.’ Similarly, the SAARC report emphasizes achievements in response preparedness, particularly when it comes to capacity building.

Regional inter-governmental organizations also find it difficult to meaningfully engage non-governmental actors in their processes. For example, SAARC reported that efforts to reach out to a wider audience and involve NGOs and independent experts are regularly limited by the Association’s own ‘rigid rules and procedures’, which can make it impossible to convene multi-stakeholder forums.

4.9 Global gender blindness

While most countries now have legislation, policies and institutions in place to promote gender equality in employment, health and education, progress on incorporating gender considerations into DRM has been much slower.

Integrating gender considerations into disaster risk reduction remains a major challenge. Only 20 percent of countries reported substantial achievement in this area in 2009. Two years on, there has been little improvement, with only 26 percent of countries reporting significant ongoing commitment to gender as a driver of progress (Figure 4.25).
Box 4.11 Regional progress on early warning for trans-boundary risks

While the Arab States reported limited progress in addressing trans-boundary risks from a multi-hazard perspective, some initiatives promise success in years to come. A number of specialized agencies of the League of Arab States have, in cooperation with their national and regional counterparts, developed sub-regional early warning systems for specific hazards such as drought and earthquakes.

As drought risk is significant in the region, the Arab Centre for the Study of Arid Zones and Dry Lands is establishing regional drought monitoring and warning systems and a Desertification Monitoring and Assessment Network (ADMAnet). Similarly, the Arab Organization for Agricultural Development has established early warning systems for insect infestation (particularly locusts) and for monitoring desertification, drought and floods.

The Arab Disaster Risk Reduction Network supports these efforts by facilitating cooperation and coordination of disaster risk management across the region and providing a platform for sharing technologies and lessons learned. Capacity building initiatives such as the Regional Centre for Disaster Risk Reduction – Training and Research, established in 2009, round out a list of significant efforts made in the region over the last few years.

Even countries that score their efforts as ‘significant and ongoing’ such as Brazil and Saint Kitts and Nevis, provided little detail on what constitutes progress or reflects gender across the different priority areas. This limited visibility of the role of gender in DRM is confirmed by the low proportion of countries that included gender considerations in different areas of DRM (Figure 4.26).

Few risk assessments consider or generate gender-disaggregated data (see Section 4.2), and few countries incorporate gender-based issues into recovery. Gender-differentiated needs and vulnerabilities remain neglected in recovery assessments with severe consequences for safety and health, particularly of women (Haiti, 2010; UNESCAP and UNISDR, 2010).

These gaps are echoed in country reports. Gender aspects are ‘not taken into account in current risk reduction policies’ in Comoros, and there is no ‘specific policy on gender perspectives in risk reduction’ in Antigua and Barbuda. Argentina, Bolivia, British Virgin Islands, Maldives and Nepal all reported existing gender policies but have difficulty integrating them with DRM. A large number of countries concur with the United Republic of Tanzania, which identifies the lack of appropriate knowledge of ‘how and where to implement gender matters’ as the main barrier. Many countries,
including Honduras, reported on gender-based programmes and initiatives led and funded by international organizations, implying that addressing gender considerations remains a donor-driven priority rather than a government one.

Although most countries now have legislation, policies and institutions in place to promote gender equality in employment, health and education, progress incorporating gender considerations into DRM is much slower. Some countries, such as Egypt, appear to have difficulty promoting or even protecting the constitutional rights of women in practice. The lack of gender-disaggregated data, as identified by Bahrain, also hampers understanding of how women and men differ in their vulnerability and their specific contributions to reducing disaster risk.

As is the case in many countries generally, most of the progress is focused on response and preparedness. This is an obvious and practical area in which to ensure gender equality, but does not necessarily challenge dominant gender dynamics and power relations. Nevertheless, there are exceptions in low- and lower-middle-income countries. In Zambia, for example, assessments conducted for social protection programmes incorporate gender considerations and the different kinds of vulnerabilities of women and children.

Despite the hurdles, there are also encouraging and concrete examples of progress. In Ghana, a gender-based NGO was tasked by the national government to engage in a country-wide education campaign for women and humanitarian service providers. The programme included raising women’s awareness of their right to humanitarian support and their role in reducing disaster risk. As a result, women have become more involved in planning and implementing risk reduction activities, particularly in the vulnerable northern regions of the country.

Notes
1 See Annex for core indicators. For more information on the methodology, a complete set of indicators, key questions and means of verification and the HFA Monitor reporting template, see www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/?pid:34&ptil:1.
2 Information provided by Hening Parlan, Indonesian National Platform, February 2011.
3 The 2010–2011 World Disaster Reduction Campaign “Making Cities Resilient” addresses issues of local governance and urban risk while drawing upon previous ISDR Campaigns on safer schools and hospitals, as well as on the sustainable urbanization principles developed in the UN-Habitat World Urban Campaign 2009–2013. For more information see www.unisdr.org/english/campaigns/campaign2010-2011.
5 A list of countries and territories is available online and the interim country reports are available on the GAR11 CD, and also at www.preventionweb.net.
6 World Bank country classification (http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups).
7 10 percent of response suggested by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs at the Kobe HFA conference, January 2005; and 2 percent of development and recovery noted in the proceedings of the Asia Regional Ministerial Conference, 2009.
8 A comprehensive questionnaire on all risk drivers included 24 questions on risk governance and governability, grouped under four categories: the state of democracy, government efficiency, the state of law, and the role of NGOs and international agencies. Almost 350 informants – from national and local government, the private sector, NGOs and organized civil society – responded to the questionnaire. Respondents were from all seven of the participating countries, and were all involved in risk management. Responses were made on a scale of 1 to 9; the lower the score, the worse the evaluation of existing conditions and capacities.
9 Civil society responses mirrored a generally negative view of both state and government efficiency.