UNISDR
The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

GAR
Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction
2015

BACKGROUND PAPER

Prepared for the 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction

DISASTER RISK GOVERNANCE DURING THE HFA IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD

UNDP Thematic Review

Authors:
Yasemin Aysan and Allan Lavell

Commissioned by
UNDP

November 2014

Technical Review: Debbie Hillier, Terry Jeggle, Kamal Kishore, Angelika Planitz, John Twigg, Krishna Vatsa, and the members of the Global Assessment Report peer review panel.

Research Assistance: Alice Guinan, Manuel Pastor.

Editing: Alice Guinan, Julia Stewart.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AADA	Accountability for Audit of Disaster Related Aid
AF	Adaptation Fund
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
DARA	Development Assistance Research Associates
DFID	Department for International Development
DM	Disaster Management
DR	Disaster Risk
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRG	Disaster Risk Governance
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECOWAS	Economic Commission for West African States.
GAR	Global Assessment Report
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HAP	Humanitarian Accounts Partnership
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDNDR	International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction
IFI	International Finance Institution
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
INTOSAI	International Organization for Supreme Audit Institutions
IRGC	International Risk Governance Council
ISDR	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean

LDCF	Lesser Developed Country Fund
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
PEM	Public Expenditure Management
PPCR	Pilot Project for Climate Resilience
PRA	Participatory Rural Assessment
RRA	Rapid Rural Assessment
SADC	Sothern African Development Community
SAI	Supreme Audit Institutions
SDC	Swiss Development Agency
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goal
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

As recognized by the UN member states in the Millennium Declaration (2000), the core values and principles of governance are important means of achieving and maintaining national development goals. The values and principles of governance are equally important for achievements in reducing disaster risk and understanding the changes, successes and failings in disaster risk management policy and practice. Increasingly, this is known as disaster risk governance (DRG), the theme of the present paper.

The purpose of this thematic review is twofold: firstly, to obtain an understanding of progress and evolution of disaster risk governance over the period 2005-2014; secondly, to inform the policy dialogue on future disaster risk management challenges and the mechanisms for addressing them. The thematic review also seeks to inform the formulation of the successor framework on disaster risk reduction (HFA 2), and the synergies sought between it and other international development agreements, also to be formulated in 2015. In particular, the review intends to influence the HFA 2 on how to embrace and integrate new dimensions of disaster risk governance that have emerged since 2015, and that see governance as a process and not just as a series of outputs, such as policies, laws or plans.

The emerging issues in disaster risk governance presented in this paper for future consideration are briefly summarized as follows:

- DRG approaches are likely to become more disaster risk reduction centric (rather than response/preparedness), if they are able to reflect in implementation, the change of the discourse towards "prospective" disaster risk management. This would mean a more comprehensive appreciation of risks, including risks related to climate change, environment, economics and conflict. In this regard, disaster risk management is considered as an essential component of sustainable development that avoid the creation of new risks.

- The weak social contract for disaster risk reduction that often exists between a state and its citizens is an impediment to progress in DRG at local levels. Achieving local ownership depends on many factors, and decentralization is characterized by a multitude of factors and stakeholders. The interactions between communities and local actors in charge of implementing disaster risk reduction policies take place in a political context, sometimes characterized by competition and power relations. Research shows that, with some exception in the more developed countries and federal systems, there are strong indications that many failings exist in attempts to practice decentralized disaster risk management at local government and community levels. Thus, for disaster risk reduction programmes to gain traction on the ground, it will be particularly important to better understand the potentials and limitations of decentralization.

- The dominant discourse on mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development still suggests the notion of integration or the incorporation of DRR activities into a separate order of things, i.e. development, in order to enhance the latter's performance. According to this, DRR is considered an 'add-on' to development. The counter position, which has fundamental consequences in terms of praxis, is that considerations of disaster risk and its prevention or mitigation should be inherent in the very definition of development. For DRR mainstreaming to be successful, it will require governance arrangements that allow synergy and negotiation

between diverse interest groups. With the already ongoing discussions on the Sustainable Development Goals and development finance for the future, the debate on DRR mainstreaming is essential to be considered.

- There are many examples of good development practice that can contribute to disaster risk reduction even if they are not labeled as such. Examples include, poverty alleviation programmes that aim to diversify income generation, good agricultural practice that is climate risk sensitive, or simply good building practices. Whilst not specifically characterized as disaster risk reduction, they do contribute to making peoples' livelihoods more sustainable. These already mainstreamed practices are not always recognized for their contribution to disaster risk reduction, albeit this is precisely the challenge for the future.

- For institutional arrangements for disaster risk management to be effective, they need to have authority and recognition, and their legitimacy and relevance must be established with access to sufficient capacity and resources. The capacities need to include the ability to manage complex processes that help to achieve responsiveness, participation, transparency, and accountability.

- The lack of financing for disaster risk reduction and the ensuing lack of continuity and piece-meal approaches is usually considered as a major contributing factor to a lack of progress with reducing underlying risks nationally or locally. The low level of DRR financing reflects a lack of prioritization on the part of governments and donors. It is also the result of insufficient societal demand for reducing disaster risk. And without a strong public demand for DRR, it is even less likely that states will prioritize its financing. Financing is particularly critical when dealing with corrective or migratory disaster risk management, such as retrofitting hospitals and schools, constructing dykes, or disaster response and reconstruction. Hence, there is clearly a case for strengthening existing financial mechanisms, and DRG must pursue this as one of its objectives. However, when dealing with prospective or preventive disaster risk management as part of development, financing is of secondary concern. In these cases, establishing norms and methods and their enforcement, and public accountability and transparency become far more important and may well receive more attention in disaster risk governance.

- At the start of the HFA implementation period in 2005, DRG was predominantly perceived in terms of outputs and normative aspects of governance (policies and laws, financing, institutional structures, decentralization, and platforms), rather than as a complex web of context specific processes and interactions of various aspects, institutions and actors. Also, the transformation of outputs into disaster risk reduction outcomes (i.e. reduced disaster impacts or vulnerability) was not adequately considered. These are important lessons for the future. Disaster risk governance processes and progress, opportunities and obstacles, can only be adequately and thoroughly understood when based on an integral analysis of specific regional, country or local contexts. The same applies to the monitoring of disaster risk governance progress. Emphasis should be given to establishing a set of principles and standards that countries can then apply according to their particular national idiosyncrasies. Also any interventions and support for change and progress must be developed differentially based on in-depth political science or theory of change analysis for different contexts.

For the HFA successor arrangement, it will be important to embrace and integrate these new and emerging dimensions of the disaster risk governance problem that have emerged since 2005. Disaster risk governance of course cannot hope to overcome the structural limitations and defining contexts of a country, region or locality. Rather it will mirror what is already in place. Therefore, the lack of progress in disaster risk governance is a challenge that relates to the restrictions, blockages and obstacles that exist within the overall governance arrangements and is influenced by government action, the citizen-state relationship and features of the particular society that is attempting to implement it. This an important reminder that true DRG cannot be addressed without engaging in broader governance issues.

PART I: Introduction

Prior to the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction to be held in Sendai, Japan in March 2015, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) will publish its Fourth *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction* (GAR). This report reviews the state of disaster risk management worldwide. One major component of the report will be a retrospective analysis covering the years 2005-2014 on themes that are critical for understanding the evolution of disaster risk management over that period and the level of implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), as endorsed by 168 governments in 2005 (see text box for details).

The purpose of the thematic reviews is not just to gain an understanding of past progress, but also to inform the dialogue on future disaster risk management challenges and the mechanisms for addressing them. The formulation of the successor framework on disaster risk reduction, currently referred to as the HFA 2, and the synergies sought between it and other international development agreements, also to be formulated in 2015 (on the sustainable development goals and climate change), will hopefully be informed by the findings of the GAR's thematic reviews.

One fundamental aspect for understanding the changes, successes and failings in disaster risk management policy and practice since 2005 relates to disaster risk governance (DRG), the theme of the present paper.

Specifically, the terms of reference for this paper (see Annex) asked for a discussion of the following aspects of disaster risk governance:

- The evolution and conceptual understanding of disaster risk governance to underpin the thematic review and to inform the HFA 2.
- A retrospective assessment of progress achieved in disaster risk governance covering the period 2005 – 2013, including: good practices, gaps and challenges; the impact of disaster risk governance on achievements under other HFA priorities for action; and progress in disaster risk governance in the context of different governance systems and development situations.
- A comparative analysis of approaches to mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into national, sub-national and sectoral development.
- An analysis of emerging issues in disaster risk governance since the adoption of the HFA in 2005. This includes the role of transparency, accountability and corruption in disaster risk reduction; financing and resource allocation for disaster risk reduction; social demand, whole-of society and rights-based approaches in disaster risk reduction with a special focus on gender issues and the role of children and persons with disabilities; and successful enforcement of laws and regulations that foster disaster risk reduction; and
- Recommendations for strengthening disaster risk governance in the HFA 2 with proposals for progress and impact indicators.

Disaster risk governance is implicitly incorporated in the HFA under Priority for Action 1, on policy, institutional and legislative frameworks, and Priority for Action 5, on disaster preparedness and response.

Hyogo Framework for Action

The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) is the first plan to explain, describe and detail the work that is required from all different sectors and actors to reduce disaster losses. It was developed and agreed on with the many partners needed to reduce disaster risk - governments, international agencies, disaster experts and many others - bringing them into a common system of coordination. The HFA outlines five priorities for action, and offers guiding principles and practical means for achieving disaster resilience. Its goal is to substantially reduce disaster losses by 2015 by building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. This means reducing loss of lives and social, economic, and environmental assets when hazards strike.

Priority Action 1: Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

Countries that develop policy, legislative and institutional frameworks for disaster risk reduction and that are able to develop and track progress through specific and measurable indicators have greater capacity to manage risks and to achieve widespread consensus for, engagement in and compliance with disaster risk reduction measures across all sectors of society

Priority Action 2: Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.

The starting point for reducing disaster risk and for promoting a culture of disaster resilience lies in the knowledge of the hazards and the physical, social, economic and environmental vulnerabilities to disasters that most societies face, and of the ways in which hazards and vulnerabilities are changing in the short and long term, followed by action taken on the basis of that knowledge.

Priority Action 3: Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.

Disasters can be substantially reduced if people are well informed and motivated towards a culture of disaster prevention and resilience, which in turn requires the collection, compilation and dissemination of relevant knowledge and information on hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities.

Priority Action 4: Reduce the underlying risk factors.

Disaster risks related to changing social, economic, environmental conditions and land use, and the impact of hazards associated with geological events, weather, water, climate variability and climate change, are addressed in sector development planning and programmes as well as in post-disaster situations.

Priority Action 5: Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

At times of disaster, impacts and losses can be substantially reduced if authorities, individuals and communities in hazard-prone areas are well prepared and ready to act and are equipped with the knowledge and capacities for effective disaster management.

Source: *www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa*

Although there was no definition or discussion of disaster risk governance as such in the HFA, organizations such as UNDP have long worked on governance issues relating to development as a whole, and to disaster risk management in particular. Moreover, over the last 15-20 years, UNDP has extensively supported national efforts to improve institutional and policy systems and legal frameworks for disaster risk management (UNDP, 2007). At the same time, it is with the UNISDR Global Assessment Reports, and especially with the 2011 version, that disaster risk governance concerns are more explicitly dealt with in ISDR (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) global discussions. In these reports, governance, and especially urban governance, and its failings are considered principle drivers of the process that led to the construction of disaster risk (UNISDR, 2011b).

PART II: Methodology

2.1 Information Sources

This paper is primarily based on relevant secondary sources, such as existing literature, including published reports, grey literature, as well as GAR, HFA progress and institutional reports. Due to the time limitations imposed on the analysis, primary data collection was not feasible. The secondary sources were complemented with the authors' specialized knowledge and understanding of regional and country contexts and their governance challenges.

In addition, professionals from different fields, institutions and organizations were openly invited to contribute by providing input papers on the different aspects of disaster risk governance to be covered by the review. A total of 34 proposals were received and 19 finished documents were made available to inform this review. They covered varied themes and areas of enquiry, and a range of countries or regions. Those documents that were pertinent to the arguments and analysis of the present paper are referenced and listed in the bibliography (in bold). Also the findings of a series of papers commissioned by UNDP on disaster risk governance, and other regional reports inspired by and through the United Nations system were considered (also in bold).

With the available material it was possible to gain an understanding of the approach to analysis of disaster risk governance that has been pursued to date. It was also possible to assess overall progress in disaster risk governance, the obstacles faced and conditions that stimulate advance and implementation of disaster risk reduction measures. The documents consulted for this paper have been grouped as follows according to the type of analysis conducted:

- Analysis based on a large number of countries and the correlation or regression of development, disaster incidence, general governance and disaster risk governance variables (Lassa, 2010; Wilkinson, et al., 2014; Hamdan, 2013a). These studies offer ideas on relationships and conditions and context but also indicate the need for other approaches to understanding causality as opposed to correlation and regression.

- Analysis based primarily on qualitative analysis of HFA monitoring results for countries and regions. These include regional retrospective DRG reviews commissioned by UNDP from Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, Asia and Pacific (Hamdan, 2013a; Zupka, 2014; Orrego, 2014;

Van de Niekerk, 2014), the 2007-2013 Review of HFA Monitor results (UNISDR, 2013a), and successive Global Assessment Reports.

- Cross-country global or regional scale analysis that are not based on the HFA monitoring results, using approaches to analyze more global governance concerns or specific sector approaches (IFRC and UNDP, 2014 for 31 countries; Tall, et al., 2013, for 55 African countries; Ojo-ECOWAS study for West African countries, 2013; and WHO, 2013 on the health sector in Africa.). Some, if not most of these studies correct or even contradict the findings of the HFA monitoring results.

- Country-level analysis of governance concerns and characteristics using political science and theory of change elements which allow a more detailed context-specific approach and reasoning (Christoplos, et al., 2013, for four countries; Wilkinson, et al., 2014, for eight countries; Lassa, 2010, for one country; Williams, 2010, based on a four-country case study approach).

- Analysis of progress in DRR mainstreaming seen through various documentary sources for a single sector (Trujillo and Baas, 2014).

- Analysis of particular DRG sub-themes, characteristics or facets per country or across several countries (Walch, 2013, on patronage, clientelism, conflict in the Philippines; Huertas and Murillo, 2013, on animal protection for livelihood protection in Costa Rica; Visconti, 2013, on what is needed to guarantee good governance in Mexico; Ochoa, 2013, on public investment and planning processes in Ecuador; Chakrabarti, 2013a, on indicators and finance; Kellett, et al., 2014, on finance for disaster risk management; Dorsouma, 2013, on health; Black, et al., 2013, on guidelines at the local level; Carvalho and Burnside-Lawry, 2013, on resilient cities; Coskun, 2013, on accountability tools).

These studies and their approaches produce different results, ranging from more generic statements on relationships through to detailed analysis of specific contexts and causes. Tensions exists between looking for commonalities (generalizations) and looking for idiosyncratic conditions (specifics) and, between descriptions (but rarely explanations) based on HFA monitoring results and analysis based on other sources and methods that many times indicate significant differences to HFA monitoring and Views from the Frontline results (for example Tall, et al., 2013).

2.2 Scope of Analysis

2.2.1 Conceptual Understanding of Governance and Disaster Risk Governance

Before defining the scope of analysis it is critical to establish an understanding of the concept of disaster risk governance (DRG). Disaster risk governance is a derivation of the idea of governance as it relates to development and social advances in general. Much has been written on the topic of governance over the last 20 years and multiple definitions and specifications of the term exist. For the purposes of this paper, an understanding of the generic concept of governance, as well of disaster risk governance are provided.

Governance: The 1995 United Nations Commission on Global Governance report *Our Global Neighborhood* defines governance as *"the sum of the different ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs…it includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions have either agreed to or perceive to be in their interests" (1995).* This, and the wide range of other definitions that exist, all refer to a process by which governance involves more stakeholders than just governments, including private sector and civil society actors.

Beyond such a general definition of governance, there is also the notion of good governance (which allows for the possibility of bad or weak governance). This is significant because it essentially identifies processes and characteristics that are essential if governance is to be effective in achieving set goals and objectives. The notion of good governance, as discussed and used in many studies (UNDP, 2010a; Gisselquist, 2012; Best et al., 2014) is further described in part three of this paper.

Disaster Risk Governance: Disaster risk governance may be considered a subset of the concept and practice of governance in general. For the purposes of the present review, its terms of reference establish that disaster risk governance refers to *"the way in which public authorities, civil servants, media, private sector and civil society coordinate at community, national and regional levels in order to manage and reduce disaster- and climate-related risks. This means ensuring that sufficient levels of capacity and resources are made available to prevent, prepare for, manage and recover from disasters. It also entails mechanisms, institutions and processes for citizens to articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and obligations and mediate their differences"* (UNDP, 2013a).

Despite the fact that the use of the term disaster risk governance is now common currency in disaster risk reduction and management circles, it is, as Lassa (2010) points out, of recent development and definition and this process is not yet complete, fully detailed or understood. Lassa provides the following working definition of disaster risk governance: "*the way society as a whole…manages the full array of its disaster risks (*authors note: as related to a range of different types of hazards)*. It promotes the notion that there are many overlapping arenas or centers of authority for decision-making and responsibility for disaster risk reduction…the arenas may emerge as networks….Risk governance encompasses a broader spectrum of politics, policies, and polity….at different scales and levels from global to local. It recognizes the polycentric nature of disaster risk reduction…**Disaster risk governance provides the framework within which disaster risk management is to be implemented**."[1]

The UNDP study *Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development* (2004) noted that disaster risk governance includes economic, political and administrative governance considerations. These relate to poverty, equity and growth, the means for laying out policy decisions and legal frameworks and the organizational basis for the implementation of disaster risk management. The International Risk Governance Council (IRGC), a fundamental reference point for risk governance concerns, has indicated that disaster risk governance includes risk assessment (and its subcomponents), risk management and risk communication (Florin, 2013). These three elements require an understanding of formal and

[1] Emphasis added by this paper's authors.

informal institutions, the social and economic context in which risk is evaluated and the involvement of stakeholders in political and policy arenas that range from the local to the global levels (IRGC, White Paper no.1, 2005).[2]

While by no means covering or introducing the whole range of considerations discussed in the literature, the aspects discussed above provide a sufficiently detailed point of departure for understanding the concept of disaster risk governance in this review. They also allude to the difficulty involved in reviewing progress of such a complex and multi-faceted issue that potentially concerns over 180 countries that have endorsed the HFA.

2.2.2 Defining the Research Focus

The starting point for the review of how disaster risk governance has evolved over the last decade, is by specifying the nature of the disaster risk reduction challenge to which DRG must respond. The rapidly evolving understanding of disaster risk management (DRM) in the period 2005-2014 (see text box), provides an important backdrop to any analysis of progress, including the present discussion on disaster risk governance. For the purpose of this review, priority will be given to the disaster risk reduction element of disaster risk management as opposed to disaster management (see text box).

The new determinants of DRG that have emerged since 2005 feature a much greater understanding of the complexity of circumstances, actors and relations (typified by what Lassa and others have called "polycentric relationships") based on a more thorough understanding of the overall risk drivers and underlying causes of risk.

Disaster risk reduction and its associated concepts were initially formulated and advanced internationally during the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) – between 1990 and 2000 (academia has been engaged since the 1970s). Over the past ten years, they have been further refined, and have garnered greater acceptance by official authorities (national and local) and professional communities (Kent, 2013). The HFA in particular, has increased the saliency of disaster risk reduction. It has also been increasingly incorporated into the discourse by international agencies and local and international non-governmental organizations. The growing losses associated with disasters and increased environmental and social stressors associated with climate change and globalization are among the factors that have stimulated a search for a more proactive approach to disaster risk and its governance.

The DRR paradigm has been accompanied by a range of arguments for supporting a development-based approach to reducing disaster risk. UNDP, UNISDR, and the Global Assessment Reports have promoted such aspects as: a) skewed development, governance, environmental and urban development, poverty and land-use as key drivers of disaster risk; b) distinctions and complementarities between intensive and

[2] Renn and Graham, 2014. Also summarized in Lassa, 2010, in turn summarizing Renn and Walker, 2008, Renn, 2008, and summarized The Institute of Risk Governance Council, 2008.

extensive risk and the immediate or accumulative impact of small-, medium- and large-scale disasters on development and livelihood security; c) distinctions between corrective or mitigatory practices with

Terminology

The disaster-related terminology is not used uniformly throughout the world. In the United States of America the term emergency management is more commonly used, whilst in Europe, Asia and Africa disaster management is more frequently used. In many places, the terms disaster and emergency management are used as the encompassing concept rather than disaster risk management (DRM). This tends to be associated with the continued use of the disaster cycle, which encompasses, mitigation, preparedness, response recovery as distinct elements. This notion, however, has been increasingly replaced by a risk continuum. In accordance with this understanding, DRM captures the entire process related to the management of both risk and disaster events. This is accompanied by a trend towards moving away from emergency and disaster management as the defining and dominant functions of national institutions.

For the purpose of this paper the term **disaster risk management** (DRM) shall encompasses both: **disaster management** (DM), i.e. preparedness, response and post-disaster recovery processes; and **disaster risk reduction** (DRR), i.e. ex-ante processes that attempt to reduce or control the levels of existing disaster risk and which can also be incorporated into post-disaster recovery.

Disaster risk (DR) is understood as the potential for future damage and loss due to the combined existence natural hazards, societal exposure to these and human vulnerability.

Prospective or anticipatory or preventive risk management: "activities that address and seek to avoid the development of new or increased disaster risks. The concept focuses on addressing risks that may develop in future if risk reduction policies are not put in place, rather than on the risks that are already present and which can be managed and reduced now" (UNISDR, 2009).

Corrective or mitigatory risk management: "activities that address and seek to correct or reduce disaster risks which are already present. The concept aims to distinguish between the risks that are already present, and which need to be managed and reduced now, and the prospective risks that may develop in future if risk reduction policies are not put in place" (UNISDR, 2009). Measure would include early warning systems, resilience-strengthening activities, and risk transfer and insurance schemes.

Compensatory or reactive risk management: "activities that seek to prepare for and deal with disaster events once they materialize" (UNISDR, 2009). This may include traditional preparedness and response measures as well as insurance, reinsurance, transfer to capital markets, and contingent financing.

reference to existing risk, and prospective or preventative approaches to controlling the creation of new risks, and reactive or compensatory approaches for dealing with residual risk (Hamdan, 2013b; UNISDR, UN-Habitat and UNFPA, 2012; UNDP, 2012; UNDP, 2013b; World Bank, 2014). In the ongoing dialogue on the HFA 2, there is a definite tendency to emphasize and prioritize the disaster risk reduction requirements and the need to reduce the drivers of risk and conditions of underlying risk. Also the discussions in the context of the SDGs are proof of an increased awareness of the link between disasters and development, and increasing acceptance by the development community.
The significance of the move in favor of disaster risk reduction is manifold. An appreciation of the new challenges it involves is an essential part of gaining an understanding of the progress achieved in disaster risk governance over the last decade. Three contexts particularly have affected the governance process and needs.

Firstly, the realization that risk is largely rooted in flawed development and that development interventions are critical entry points for reducing disaster risk, has given rise to the concept of mainstreaming DRR into development planning and budgeting, which is considered predominantly a governance process. The greater emphasis on the importance of development processes has also opened a space for applying the characteristics or principles of good governance to achieving disaster risk reduction outcomes.

Secondly, risk informed development means establishing relationships between national and local levels, as well as international economic and financial processes that may have contributed to the construction of risks. Disaster risk and its reduction then becomes a component of overall risk management seen from multiple economic and social angles. The significance of this for disaster risk governance is enormous as, the stakeholders in disaster risk management are also stakeholders in other economic and social processes and these may have interests that compete with disaster risk reduction as an objective. An example of this is when apparently short-term economic gain and profit is increased when disaster risk reduction is not considered a priority, as is the case with much coastal tourism and location of transnational corporations in coastal and river plain areas (UNISDR GAR, 2013b). In the long-term, however, the cost of disasters are surely to exceed these initial benefits. Such dilemmas call for much greater regulation of different economic activities and environmental resources, which requires placing more responsibility on designated institutions. Hence, DRG must be seen in the light of the more general governance systems at a national or local level. That is to say, the governance of disaster risk is dependent on the state of overall governance in a country to a far greater degree than the governance of disaster response.

Thirdly, the concentration on disaster risk reduction requires a significant evolution in the type of local involvement that has typified the humanitarian response paradigm in previous decades. Disaster risk reduction solutions are best sought locally. However, disaster risk is constructed through multiple processes that often exceed the territorial circumscription of the locality and are to be found in regional, national or internationally-based economic, social and political processes. This has immense

consequences for disaster risk governance, requiring vertical and horizontal integration, coordination and collaboration (Wilkinson, et al., 2014).
The extent to which DRG arrangements have been able to respond to this advanced understanding of disaster risk reduction in the context of development will be examined in greater detail in subsequent sections of this paper. The HFA and its progress indicators provide a central point of reference for gauging progress in disaster risk governance in the period under review (see part 3). The essence of what the HFA considers as the core of disaster risk governance is captured under the following indicators:

- National policy and legal frameworks for disaster risk reduction exist and include decentralized responsibilities and capacities at all levels (Priority for Action 1).
- Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction activities at all administrative levels (Priority for Action 1).
- Community participation and decentralization are ensured by delegating authority and resources to local levels (Priority for Action 1).
- A national multi-sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning (Priority for Action 1).
- Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective, are in place (Priority for Action 5).

2.2.3 Limitations of Analysis

The documents consulted for this paper allowed for approximations to understand the current status of disaster risk governance. However, they inevitably left large gaps as regards what determined the level of progress in different countries and as to opportunities and obstacles to progress in specific cases.

The only extensive information and evaluation of progress that exists as far as the HFA and its priorities is concerned is generated through the HFA Monitor. Nonetheless, this monitoring has limitations in terms of the consistency and coverage of its results, the lack of continuity in country participation, and the input and output as opposed to outcome and impact nature of its results (Chakrabarti, 2013a).

Whilst the HFA provided a decent set of indicators at the time of its development, in hindsight it failed to capture the complex nature of disaster risk management, its many stakeholders, and the interrelationship between its thematic priorities. Beyond the notion that there is a general disaster risk governance framework defined by policies and laws and the institutions that implement or uphold them at national and sub-national level, the HFA did not sufficiently capture the cross-cutting nature of governance across all Priorities for Action (Hamdan, 2013a).

This highly aggregated nature of the HFA's approach to governance poses a real challenge for a more comprehensive analysis of disaster risk governance that gives due justice to the new determinants of DRG that have emerged since 2005. Any attempt to review the state of disaster risk governance at this point in time, can therefore only be tentative. In order to overcome this, greater consideration must be given to disaster risk governance as an area for future research.

Given the number of countries with a discernible or serious disaster risk problematic, and the numerous factors and facets that define disaster risk governance, it is not possible to provide an in-depth analysis of individual countries in this paper. Selected countries are only referred to when illustrating or exemplifying more generic conclusions, statements or considerations. The paper also does not attempt to summarize the vast amount of information, cases, and examples available in the individual studies consulted for this review.

PART III: Advances in disaster risk governance during the period 2005 – 2014

3.1 Advances in DRG in line with HFA Indicators

At the conceptual level, disaster risk reduction approaches of a preventative and mitigatory nature, and their links with development planning and programming, are relatively well developed. Problems still exist with their implementation at a large scale as disaster response and recovery still very much dominate disaster risk management practice throughout the world. A significant part of this deficit relates to the still inconsistent social and political support for disaster risk reduction on the part of development and private sector constituencies. As a consequence, the governance arrangements associated with disaster risk reduction are still at a nascent stage. Considering the time it takes for new institutions, policies and governance arrangements to take root, this level of progress is, however, not surprising.

3.1.1 National policies and legal frameworks (Priority for Action 1, Core Indicator 1)

Policies and laws capture the essence of the ways that national and local governments understand and prioritize disaster and disaster risk matters. Since 2005, according to HFA monitoring results, more than 120 countries had undergone legal or policy reforms. Most analyses of policy and legal reforms show a definite move toward new policy and legal formulations with an increasing concentration on disaster risk reduction aspects (more so correctively and less prospectively) as opposed to traditional response and preparedness concerns. The variety and range of approaches, details and perceptions of the problematic are still enormous across countries, but as is depicted in IFRC/UNDP (2014) and Tall, et al. (2013), among others, preparedness and response policies and laws as opposed to those focused on risk reduction still dominate.

UNISDR has noted that this signifies the setting of a scene but that it still requires greater progress in terms of conceptualization and implementation in the future. It finds that "*the main progress made in living up to the expectations of the HFA in recent years has been qualitative, grounded in policies, legislation and planning that has laid the foundations for more quantitatively measurable achievements in the future. As such, this progress represents a crucial first stage, a change of mind set without which little that is significant can be achieved. It represents a shift from crisis management to proactive (prospective or anticipatory) risk management, risk reduction and safety*" (UNISDR, 2013a).

Mitchell (1999) has stated that institutional and legal systems for managing risk and disaster evolve at rates that are not commensurate with the rate of change of the risk environment and our understanding

of it. Time is required to transit from understanding and the dimensioning of a problem, to consequent intervention. Recognition of the disconnect between the symbolic value of establishing institutional and policy processes for DRR on the one hand, and real implementation goes back to the 1970s (Edelman, 1971). However, weaknesses in implementation are not only linked to problems of understanding risk, they are also rooted in how different interests perceive and influence institutions. Governance, including DRG, is first and foremost a compromise or compact between competing interests.

The governance dimension behind these policy and legal changes in DRM, is still not well understood in many places. Understanding policy changes in disaster risk management and the study of related decision-making processes (e.g., global processes, consultations, influences, stakeholder participation, parliamentary discussions), has also not been a strong point on the existing research agenda. However, some studies have identified such diverse influence as:

- status quo positions guided by traditional response groups such as the military or civil protection agencies (see Christoplos, 2013);
- planning, economic and financial institutions (World Bank, 2014);
- civil society and grassroots movements, often in post-disaster contexts (see Lassa, 2010, for Indonesia and Van de Niekerk, 2013, on African countries);
- academic and practitioner networks (Alexander, 2013).

3.1.2 Institutional Arrangements (Priority for Action 1, Core Indicator 1 and 3)

National level management: Given the past wholesale concentration on response, disaster risk management arrangements have long been dominated by civil defense and similar crisis response institutions. The increased focus on DRR and the rise of risk informed development approaches has inevitably placed a strain on these organizational arrangements and a large part of modern disaster risk governance concerns refer to the transitions that have been achieved or are required in order to take better account of disaster risk reduction needs.

Prior to 2005, innovation had already begun in some countries with regard to disaster risk management structures, including Colombia, where an innovative, inter-institutional, decentralized and participatory system was created in 1989, and El Salvador, where National Service for Territorial Studies was created in 2003. Since 2005, there has been a move toward more innovative arrangements, such as advances made in the Philippines and Bangladesh with their shift towards proactive disaster risk management and budget allocations for DRR from national to local levels (Government of the Philippines, 2010; Government of Bangladesh, 2009).

Change has been witnessed in some countries in which response and disaster risk reduction have been separated functionally and organizationally, such as in Peru in 2011 or as seems to be the case in Iraq. The institutional separation of response and risk reduction functions, however, has not been successful in all countries. After a decade of such separation, Bangladesh decided to merge again the functions of the Disaster Management Bureau (responsible for DRR) and the Directorate for Relief and Rehabilitation into the Department of Disaster Management under the newly created Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief.

Problems with promoting changes in structures stem from a fear of loss of power in status quo contexts and the still small base of development actors that are versed in disaster risk reduction. Few ministries of economy, planning, finance or coordination have the capacity to add disaster risk reduction into their area of intervention, although there have been positive moves in this direction in Indonesia, the Philippines, as well as selected Pacific island countries, such as Samoa and the Solomon Islands.

Decentralization and local level management: Decentralization, much encouraged by development assistance, was introduced because central public investments were not working effectively at the local level. Development financing lacked participation, ownership and involvement and maintenance of investments at the local level. Decentralization was thought to hold promises for improving the delivery of services, as citizen input (participation) and oversight (accountability) were understood to improve effectiveness. There is, however, no blue print for decentralization. Diverse historical and contextual factors can influence the shape decentralization takes and how it performs in a specific country. The degree of institutional and political development, demographic and social characteristics, extent of social capital, and political and economic issues are all contributing factors (Olum, 2014).

Nevertheless, there are some common assumptions made about decentralization, whether its aim is to promote poverty reduction or disaster risk reduction. In principle, decentralization strategies favor 'devolution' of power and resources to elected local governments and thus seek to decentralize part of the management of public affairs to entities that are directly accountable to citizens (Faguet, 2013). The purpose of this approach is not only to put effective local government institutions in place, but also to support governance at the local level. It means going beyond the vertical decentralization of power, responsibility and resources from the central to the local level to including a horizontal process that aims to ensure participatory management of local affairs, with a key role for civil society organizations and public engagement.

These notions of decentralization and local level participation, influenced particularly by rural development principles and methods (such as Participatory Rural Appraisal, Rapid Rural Appraisal), found their way also into disaster risk management and disaster risk governance over the last several decades (see Williams, 2011; Scott and Tarazona, 2011). The global trend towards decentralization is exemplified in the 31 sample countries reviewed by IFRC/UNDP (2014) and other research (Olum, 2014). This has had the effect in the sample countries that more and more responsibility is being placed on elected local governments for not only specific disaster risk management, but also the related activities of climate change adaptation, environmental and natural resource management, land use and building codes (IFRC/UNDP, 2014).

The wide-spread lip service paid to decentralization, however, is hampered by a frequent lack of commitment at the central level to decentralize authority. Devolution of power through decentralization is ineffective without transfer of funds and putting in place the required human capacities. For example, a lack of technical capacity or access to resources can hinder disaster risk reduction planning at the local level, despite the existence of a nationally-guided plan. In the IFRC/UNDP (2014) study, stakeholders in all but the highest income countries reported that the relevant local institutions for disaster risk management, as well as local governments, where these were different, were, to varying degrees under-

resourced and/or lacked capacity for the tasks assigned them. The Mid-Term Review of the HFA found that only 20 countries had dedicated budget allocations to local governments for disaster risk management, even though 65 percent of the countries have made local governments legally responsible for the same (UNISDR, 2011a).

In light of the long-standing interest in decentralization as a strategy for local engagement, one would expect considerable progress with its effective implementation. However, the discourse so far on the advantages and benefits of decentralization is a rather normative one. The outcomes and impact of decentralized disaster risk reduction programmes have not yet been analyzed in a comprehensive and systematic manner. With some exceptions, in the more developed countries and federal systems, there are strong indications that many failings exist in attempts to practice decentralized disaster risk management at local government and community levels. These are largely linked to weak local accountability mechanisms, insufficient community involvement in DRM, and gaps in local capacity, expertise and funding (IFRC, 2011). They also reflect the broader failures of national governments, as well as inequities of local power structures (Williams, 2011). With increasing fiscal constraints and competing needs, the lack of resources is likely to be a recurring theme. To add to this, the persistent problem of turnover in government and lack of trained personnel is as constant and relevant as ever for local level DRM.

The operationalization of local ownership depends on many factors. Decentralization is characterized by a multitude of factors and stakeholders. The heterogeneity of local actors and their competing interests points to the complexity of achieving a locally owned process of disaster risk reduction. The interactions between communities and local actors in charge of implementing disaster risk reduction policies take place in a political context, sometimes characterized by competition and power relations. Thus, in the literature, mention is extensively made of the problem of local corruption and patronage politics (Walch, 2013) and the still patchy guiding principles and legal bases for local participation (IFRC/UNDP, 2014).

A wide range of complex institutional relationships and expectations can often create confusion over the roles and responsibilities in a decentralized setting. In some countries, such as Guatemala or Namibia, the additional layers or parallel institutions established specifically for disaster risk management alongside local government, have apparently caused further competition for scarce local resources, including competition over skilled people (IFRC/UNDP, 2014). Whilst such parallel institutional arrangements for DRM at the sub-national level have resulted in good progress in DRG some countries (such as Mozambique), it may be useful for countries to reflect on what types of institutional structures are more effective and sustainable at the local level. There may be cases where it seems worthwhile to consider rationalizing local disaster risk management structures by placing more of the resources for its implementation with local government, rather than creating parallel structures that also consume significant resources (IFRC/UNDP, 2014).

Community participation: Many countries recognize that effective disaster risk reduction requires strong community engagement and partnerships that can capitalize on existing coping mechanisms more effectively and strengthen community capacities. 48 percent of countries have reported that significant and ongoing reliance on this approach has remained stable throughout review cycles, and

another 51 percent of countries reporting partial reliance (Chakrabarti, 2013a). Despite the level of commitment by the countries to participation, progress is often hampered by the weakness of civil society.

Empowerment of essential governance actors such as community based organizations, volunteer groups and non-governmental organizations is important. Empowered civil society can play an active role not only in planning and in forming policies for disaster risk reduction, but particularly in their implementation at the local level (Carvalho and Burnside-Lawry, 2013). However, truly participatory involvement of all segments of people is not simple. It is a process that requires substantive support to local governments in strengthening their technical and institutional capacities and in understanding the main principles of people's participation and good governance in parallel to creating support mechanisms for engagement by civil society. In principle, these are developmental processes that cannot easily be achieved through sporadic training or pilot projects scattered in time.

Whilst most of the disaster risk management laws reviewed in relation to the participation of women and vulnerable groups in decision-making do have some kind of legislative mandate, the majority of these fall into the model of general aspirational statements without specific mechanisms for implementation. Where these are complemented by more specific regulations or policies, they can be very effective. From the perspective of guaranteeing representation of communities, and the most vulnerable groups within them, the small number of country laws that make specific provisions for the participation of women and/or vulnerable groups (i.e. Ethiopia (policy), Guatemala, Namibia, Nepal (policy), Philippines, South Africa, and Vanuatu) represent good practice, as the mandates and duties are clear. Especially the inclusion, in law and practice, of the voices and needs of women and vulnerable people within disaster risk management institutions has been identified as an area requiring further study (IFRC/UNDP, 2014).

According to a study by Christoplos, et al. (2013), in four countries analyzed (Vietnam, Nepal, Zimbabwe and Uganda), accountabilities are such that village level authorities are largely excluded from discussions about real investments. District and provincial level officials and politicians that are largely responsible for mediating between national policies and the need to address risks where they exist are commonly labeled as local government, yet are in effect quite distant from the community. This raises critical questions about how community-based disaster risk management, climate change adaptation, and related fields could be integrated into emerging governance systems where the intermediate level of government has a central role. Examining this political context may help to understand better what defines and promotes local ownership (Walch, 2013).

Another major influence on the local level disaster risk reduction agenda is the role of international aid in a country, especially after a major disaster when funding becomes available for such activities. Because aid has historically played a central role in shaping the national institutional landscape of disaster risk reduction, the institutional systems for disaster risk management have in many cases been drawn-up using external expertise and with fragmented support to individual communities in the form of pilot-projects that the central government seldom has the capacity and resources to scale up and

sustain. These pilots remain predominantly activities of non-governmental organizations that are dependent on steady flows of external funding (Lavell, 2009).

The increasing donor interest in adaptation aspects of climate change at the community level has introduced another set of responsible authorities, processes and policies to the local scene without necessarily investing in significant additional capacities. In most cases, both climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction efforts by governments and civil society are managed in parallel, with limited actual cooperation. The extent to which civil society actors have been consulted and involved in national climate change adaptation planning differs according to the respective histories and maturity of civil societies. In some countries (e.g., Zambia) civil society involvement in national planning processes are dependent on the extent to which donors press for their involvement. Similarly, in Viet Nam, the national government has made a commitment to national implementation of a community-based disaster risk management system (Decision 1002), presumably due to calls from the United Nations and non-governmental organizations. However, it has not allocated significant resources to rolling this out, leaving the agenda effectively in the hands of the non-governmental organizations who are managing small and scattered pilot projects (Christoplos, 2013).

For further observations on participation, please refer to section 3.3.2.

3.1.3 National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction (Priority for Action 1, Core Indicator 4)

Since 2005, over 190 countries have established disaster risk management focal points and over 80 have created national multi-stakeholder platforms for DRR with responsibility for coordinating the implementation of the HFA, providing policy support and technical guidance to key national actors, partners, and coordinating the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development and sectoral policies, plans and programmes (UNISDR, 2013a). The significance of these numbers in the absence of qualitative analysis of their impacts is difficult to judge, especially in terms of their significance for the transition from dominantly disaster management concerns to increased and more balanced disaster risk reduction aspects. Since many of the focal points are still located in traditional disaster management organizations, their impact on disaster risk reduction is likely to be limited. In the National Progress Reports of 86 countries on the implementation of the HFA (2009-2011), there was an average progress rating of 3 out of 5 on the establishment of National Platforms (Preventionweb, 2011). This rating signifies that institutional commitment to DRR has been attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial. Japan was the only country that reported comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels (ibid).

The membership, functioning and regularity of disaster risk management platform meetings has been criticized in many countries and the inclusion in these meetings of development-based organizations and private sector interests is still low. A survey conducted by UNISDR (2013c) of members of 50 National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction identified institutional and governance dimensions such as leadership, legal frameworks and membership as key determinants of the capacities and limitations of national platforms to foster disaster risk reduction in their countries. Because of the complex and cross-cutting nature of disaster risk reduction, a defining feature of national platforms is that they have broad representation, with two third of survey respondents reporting that their countries have a moderate to high incorporation of a multi-sectoral approach. However, it was also found that platforms

in general do not fully consider stakeholder inclusion and that there is a lack of involvement of NGOs, the private sector and research institutions (UNISDR, 2013c).

3.1.4 Financing of Disaster Risk Reduction (Priority for Action 1, Core Indicator 2)

Governments of all income levels identified the lack of financial resources for carrying out disaster risk reduction as the main barrier to progress in their national HFA reports. The reports brought up the resources issue repeatedly when responding to each of the 22 HFA indicators, stating that lack of resources affects their ability to invest in fulfilling the Priorities for Action (UNISDR, 2013a).

> In his report to the General Assembly (A/62/320, para. 79) the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon (2007) emphasized the need to:
>
> *"encourage governments, donors and funding institutions to increase substantially their investment in disaster risk reduction, as an integral component of all programmes for humanitarian action, economic and social development, and environmental protection, as well as to improve the coordination and tracking of these investments. Governments should also consider setting targets for public spending on multi-year Disaster Risk Reduction programmes at national and local levels."*

Mapping and estimating how disaster risk reduction is funded is a challenge. Quantifying the total amount of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) spent on disaster risk reduction is equally difficult since such data is limited and donors are still unsure how to report it. Current reporting methods still fail to capture adequately the full nature and extent of financing for disaster risk reduction (Global Humanitarian Assistance, 2012). However, what can be said is that much of the donor funding for disaster risk reduction has been spent in middle-income countries, and until very recently, predominantly on infrastructure projects and recovery (Kellett, et al., 2014). Yet, also this finding might be distorted by the fact that a significant proportion of this funding came from the World Bank and Japan and is likely to have been in the form of loans to middle-income countries. The evidence from analysis of international disaster risk reduction financing over the past 20 years also reveals that the overall volumes spent on disasters are a fraction of development aid, and within that, the amount committed to disaster risk reduction is an even smaller percentage (Kellet, et al., 2014). DRR is still predominantly seen as a humanitarian issue, financed largely out of emergency budgets, and it is difficult to make it a donor priority among the competing demands of response and recovery.

It is often assumed that the financing of disaster risk reduction – especially in developing countries - comes from international donors. The reality is, however, that in some contexts national financing of disaster risk reduction outweighs financing from the international community. At the national level, some countries have established designated budget mechanisms to ensure disaster risk reduction has some level of guaranteed resources, through allocations by law, such as in the Philippines, India, Maldives and Nepal or through budgetary policy, as in Japan, or out of special mitigation funds such as in Mexico. According to a study of several countries by Kellett, et al. (2014), the Philippines government is investing 20 times more than the international community in disaster risk reduction and the

government of Indonesia almost 10 times more. The majority of governments, however, fund disaster risk reduction measures from a general budget for the overall disaster management system. In such cases, the resources for DRR are often hi-jacked, particularly at the local level where resources are limited, for emergency response and sometimes for recovery. A similar problem occurs where a certain percentage of humanitarian budgets is set for disaster risk reduction, as was promoted in the Chair's summary report of the Second Session of the Global Platform for DRR for more predictable resources (UNISDR, 2009b).

Separate budget allocations for disaster risk reduction programmes are still exceptional in most countries. DRR activities are commonly concealed within wider programmes and projects, including those relating to food security, health and environmental management. However, it is noted that resourcing for disaster risk reduction varies greatly between countries, and that where there is already a high level of integration of disaster risk reduction and development planning, much of the risk management budget may be covered from sectoral revenues or local government budgets (UNISDR, 2011b). This is particularly so in high-income countries. Yet, there is no financial tracking of the scale of and savings made through this ex-ante and more mainstreamed way of reducing disaster risks, nor is there adequate documentation on its effectiveness. Even then, any dedicated funding for disaster risk reduction aspects of development programmes often has to compete with various other development needs. It should be noted that the better disaster risk reduction is integrated into development, the less visible it is, and the harder it becomes to track and measure it.

One of the few clear positives to come out of an examination of financing for disaster risk reduction activities is the increasing level of funding that comes from climate adaptation financing sources, such as the Adaptation Fund, Least Developed Countries Fund and the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience. According to Kellett and Caravani (2013), prior to 2008, only a few projects that were approved related to "non-targeted disaster risk reduction" activities. By 2011, the overall profile had changed remarkably and positively (especially given the considerable institutional and policy disconnect that often exists between disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation activities at the country level). In that year, of the 130 projects approved, 70 had at least a partial disaster risk reduction objective (53.8 percent of the total), while 17 were targeted directly (Kellett and Caravani, 2013).

In some countries, such as in Vietnam, where development assistance is phasing out, their vulnerability to climate change has meant that climate change funding continues to rise. Observers suspect that some development efforts (by both government and international non-governmental organizations) are being repackaged to attract climate change funding. Christoplos, et al., 2013, suggest that in such a context, for pragmatic reasons of accessing funding, a certain degree of merging of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation objectives could be presumed (Christoplos, 2013).

The question remains as to whether or not financial resources are a guarantee for good DRG with effective institutions and sufficient capacities to make a real impact on disaster risk reduction. A UNISDR study on *Effective Financial Mechanisms at the National and Local Level for Disaster Risk Reduction* (2011c) reviews the principles and practice of public expenditure management and applies these to the context of investment in disaster risk management at national, local and community levels. The study

concludes that, "public resource allocation is influenced by conflicting plans, policies, and pressures extant during the bureaucratic process of preparing budget proposals and the political process of approving them."[3] It can be suggested that both financing and good practice largely depend on the approach a country takes in general and the priorities it sets. That is to say if financing is not prioritized in the everyday running of government, then it will not be forthcoming for disaster risk management.

Although much has been emphasized in the HFA progress monitoring and other sources about financial limitations as an explanation for gaps in implementation, and many practitioners are asking for tracking mechanisms of financial allocations, this problem may be over-exaggerated or at least skewed. The availability of resources alone is not a cure and the importance of effective use of resources and human and institutional capacity to generate and absorb funds should not be under-estimated. While corrective and reactive or compensatory risk management requires finance, and many times in great quantities, prospective management principles and actions - mainstreaming for example – may be more appealing since they can be lower in financial capital intensity, but may be higher in political capital.

3.2 Advances in DRG beyond HFA indicators

3.2.1 Self-organization and networking

Informal institutions are a central element of governance. At the same time, there is a difference between single organizations and social movements. A critical step is the ability to generate networks and mobilize around issues of common concern in ways that motivate social movement for change. In this vein, the notion of self-organized, voluntary associations is of critical importance as a form of citizenry. In the aftermath of recent major disasters, such self-organized groups and networks have been very active, operating through social media with some impact and international recognition. For example, during and immediately following Hurricane Sandy, more than 20 million tweets related to the disaster were posted on Twitter despite the loss of cell phone service during the peak of the storm (FEMA, 2013). Following the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, Ushahidi, an open-source Web platform was used to coordinate health supplies, and many victims trapped under the rubble reached out for help via Facebook (Merchant, et al., 2011). More international non-governmental organizations and donors such as Doctors Without Borders and UNOCHA are supporting the use of such networks in post-disaster contexts.

It is also possible to observe that there has been a general shift in institutional systems for disaster risk management both at the international and national levels from a traditional centrally-managed approach to one based on more participatory and egalitarian-style networks. A successful recent example of global networking is the UNISDR promoted Making Cities Resilient initiative that has been expanding the network of various groups that operate in an urban context to advance on disaster risk reduction (Carvalho and Burnside-Lawry, 2013).

[3] Paper written for the Mid-Term Review of the HFA by David Jackson of the United Nations Capital Development Fund, January 2011.

This form of network governance challenges the old assumption in structural analysis in social science that development outcomes stem from the totality of efforts from actors involved, namely, individuals and organizations/institutions. As Lassa (2010) identifies, "governance research tries to advocate a new approach based on the fact that agents and institutions exist and co-exist more in the form of networks. This is the main argument, which is based on the emerging form of governance as networks of individuals and organizations/institutions."

Globally, there is an increasing recognition that purely centrally and hierarchically controlled approaches have limitations, especially when it comes to solving complex problems that span numerous administrative boundaries and fragmented institutions. Network governance can be defined as the interconnectedness of independent units of authority and power, whether individual, community, state or corporate. Networks are characterized by systems of communication, knowledge exchange and dialogue. Network governance breaks down institutional silos and creates horizontal channels for knowledge exchange and collaboration that can lead to more inclusive and better informed decision-making and implementation.

3.2.2 Principles of good DRG

As mentioned above, good governance most generally refers to a list of positive characteristics or principles of how government decision-making and policy implementation ought to be carried out. For the World Bank, the characteristics of good governance comprise voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, and control of corruption.[4] The UNDP singles out characteristics such as participation, responsiveness, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, rule of law and equity as its most important characteristics (UNDP, 2013a). Although all of these characteristics are relevant in the context of DRM, only participation, accountability, rule of law and transparency will be discussed in greater detail in this section as they are considered fundamental and have strong linkages to many of the remaining principles.

These core values and principles of governance are important means of achieving and maintaining development goals as recognized by UN member states in the Millennium Declaration in 2000. They are also compatible with key human rights principles set out in a number of UN declarations and conventions. These fundamental principles can be used to characterize the institutions and processes that guide the strategic interactions among public officials and between policymakers, private businesses, intermediate organizations and citizenry. The better these principles are realized in a country's governance system, the better government is prepared to ensure a sound management of public resources, an enabling environment and a productive exchange of information between the public and the state. They are also key for enabling the achievement of particular development outcomes, such as poverty reduction, education for all, disaster risk reduction and environmental protection.

[4] Worldwide Governance Indicators, available at: info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home.

Participation: There are some critical issues that have not been addressed extensively within the disaster risk reduction literature on participation, such as the quality or type of participation. The participation ladder provides a wide spectrum of levels of engagement that can span from self-mobilization (the most advanced level), to participation in analysis, functional participation, consultation, and passive participation that is limited to the mere handing out of information (Pretty, 1995). Evaluation of community-based disaster risk reduction programmes and similar programmes against the types and levels of participation could provide for useful pointers as to what level of engagement has been achieved.

There may also be issues linked to the transaction costs of community consultation, particularly at the local level where resources are scarce. Potential clashes between greater inclusion and postponement of decisions and action on disaster risk reduction measures are possible scenarios. Moreover, there are concerns as to how far participation can reduce conflict and tensions among the diverse economic and social groups regarding risks.

Government failures are now reasonably well understood as part of governance studies. Rarely is much thought given to the possibility of 'civil society failure' as the existence of civil society involvement is seen as the panacea for 'good governance'. Injection of resources for a participatory development projects can, for example, attract the attention of the better off, making exclusion of the most vulnerable more likely. Participatory projects may fail to build cohesive and resilient organizations. During the course of a project, benefits attract people to participate and build networks but these mechanisms tend to dissolve when the incentives are withdrawn. Longitudinal studies on civil society aspects of disaster risk governance are still rare.

According to Christoplos, et al., (2013) the way policies and institutions—land reforms, education systems, the judiciary, the media, and efforts at social inclusion— have evolved in a country can influence the responsiveness of governments to public mobilization, affecting the incentives for collective action. Some countries have a long history of community consultation and participation, developed in the process of struggles for independence from colonial rule or against the rule of entrenched elites. Such social movements help to create a culture that facilitates public participation also in DRR.

Accountability: Accountability is a key requirement of good DRG. Not only governmental institutions but also the private sector and civil society organizations must be accountable to the public and to their institutional stakeholders. At the administrative level, accountability varies depending on the relevant institutional arrangements and systems for disaster risk reduction. At the political level, in general, an organization or an institution is also accountable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions.

Accountability requires agreement on clear roles and responsibilities of organizations, as well as individuals, and reporting on the actions taken. This is the basis on which stakeholders may monitor if their views and needs have been taken into account and whether agreed standards of performance

have been complied with. In this sense, accountability and transparency are closely interwoven. In fact, accountability cannot be enforced without transparency and rule of law.

Accountability also lies at the heart of many of the potential benefits expected from decentralization of disaster risk management (e.g., citizen participation in local affairs, improved service delivery, and transparency). Furthermore, it should offer protection against 'elite capture' of resources made available for disaster risk reduction, though this is not easy and requires strong formal and informal systems in place to hold local power-holders accountable. This risk can be contained by developing effective self-governance structures at the community level that many of the community-based disaster risk reduction programmes have been promoting (de Guzman, 2003). In this sense, civil society has a critical role to play in establishing the necessary conditions and mechanisms not only at the community level, but also for ensuring 'downward accountability' of local authorities towards their constituencies. However, as stated elsewhere in this review roles and responsibilities between different levels of government (vertically) and across the various local actors (horizontally) are not always clear or monitored for disaster risk reduction to ensure an effective system of accountability. The involvement of multiple institutions and actors in DRR - including technical, political, administrative, central, local, formal, and informal - further diffuses the lines of accountability when faced with the consequences of various disaster risks, or the failure for their reduction (Coskun, 2014).

Out of a complex web of interactions, three lines of accountability can be identified (Transparency Accountability Initiative, 2014):

- **Downward accountability** of local governments to citizens, which refers to political accountability and is at the core of democratic decentralization and a direct line of responsibility. Most countries do not have formal mechanisms of accountability specific for disaster risk reduction, while in contrast the pressure to be accountable is expectedly higher for response.
- **Horizontal accountability** within local governments and administrations, which refers to the administrative accountability of local civil servants and locally-elected officials and traditional representatives to each other. This is also relevant across parallel institutional structures that have a role in disaster risk reduction. Disaster risk reduction committees are one of the mechanisms that serve this purpose, but where they function, they seldom have a comprehensive mechanism for accountability.
- **Upward accountability** of local authorities to central government, which enables upper layers of government to verify that local institutions are complying with major policy goals and statutes and to monitor or track local government actions and expenditure. This happens more in relation to disaster risk reduction plans and programmes and monitoring of finance. It is, thus, a mixture of administrative and performance accountability.

An audit of disaster risk reduction carried out by the Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs) of 10 countries suggests that accountability between the government and citizens, i.e. providing sound information about the conduct of public affairs, especially policies, strategies, targets and implementation of public

institutions to the citizens, is often inadequate (Coskun, 2014).[5] Christoplos, et al., (2013 p. 31) on the contrary provide some evidence for the view that the majority of government officials realize the political necessity of being seen to respond, and thus an understanding of the importance of the social contract with citizens and the legitimacy it endows. However, the social contract does not seem to extend to situations in which disaster risk reduction is not politically rewarding. Politicians across the country case studies generally did not prioritize disaster risk reduction over citizens' demands for socio-economic development.

Disasters that result in large-scale physical damage and/or loss of life and have the potential to result in reputational losses for authorities, often prompt a high public demand for accountability. In many ways, responses to a disaster can highlight the functioning (or failing) of institutions and standards, in particular the relationship between states and citizens in a country. It provides an 'acid test' on the degree to which a given government is open and accountable to its citizens. The press, and, where international assistance is provided, donors, international media and increasingly the citizens (through social media) demand high levels of openness from the state after disasters, including revealing the causes of disaster risks and why they have not been mitigated. However, despite decades of public awareness raising by the governments, United Nations and the non-governmental organizations demand for accountability for existing risk levels have been limited (Polack, Luna and Dator-Bercilla, 2010). The reasons for this are complex and little understood. It could even be yet another reflection of the question posed earlier regarding whether disaster risk reduction is a priority for accountability when compared to other pressing needs such as access to employment, health services or clean water.

Where there is a high level of demand for accountability from the citizens, individuals and social groups have instruments to monitor decision-making and are able to take action against the violation of rules. Formal and informal networks, such as community deliberation councils and watchdog committees, can serve as monitoring devices. There are some internationally recognized accountability mechanisms and standards in humanitarian response for the performance of international non-governmental organizations[6] and donors[7], as well as national standards and audits when international funding is involved. However, accountability mechanisms for disaster risk reduction are much more diffuse, involving very diverse actors and institutions, and complex sets of relationships from policy to action to impact.

At the international level there have been some attempts (generated by a major disaster event, i.e. the Indian Ocean Tsunami) to establish international standards for auditing accountability. The International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI), which operates as an umbrella organization for the external government audit community, set up the *Accountability for Audit of Disaster Related Aid Working Group* to deal with issues concerning disasters, including risk reduction. This was done in order

[5] For more information, see: www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/statistics/?cid=79, November 2013.

[6] The Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) International was established in 2003 to promote accountability to people affected by humanitarian crises and to acknowledge those organizations that meet the HAP principles of accountability. By applying these principles an organization becomes accountable for the quality of its work to the people it aims to assist and on whose behalf it is acting.

[7] The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Accra Agenda for Action (2008).

to enhance good governance and accountability and promote transparency and efforts related to anti-corruption through collective experience in the field of disaster risk management. In this context, auditing guidelines for disaster risk reduction (ISSAI 5510) was prepared and endorsed to provide guidance for the SAIs to improve their auditing (Coskun, 2014).[8] INTOSAI supports a citizen-oriented perspective to enhance public accountability for a mutual relationship between the SAIs and citizens. However, Coskun (2014) points out that performing an audit of disaster risk reduction from a citizen-oriented perspective will be a challenge for the SAIs. First, an audit mandate does not encompass all or most of the activities and organizations involved in disaster risk reduction. Second, access to reliable and complete information to prepare a comprehensive audit report will be restricted. In addition to these challenges, SAIs do not have sufficient tools to strengthen their cooperation with citizens. A more engaged citizenry is certainly key for achieving a higher level of cooperation and make government more accountable.

Rule of law: Linked to accountability is the right of individuals and groups to appeal to the courts, including legislative provisions for DRM, if rules are violated. The institutions responsible for ensuring accountability and realizing and upholding existing DRR standards and principles, such as anti-corruption commissions, judicial bodies, ombudsmen's offices, parliaments, etc., then need to have the required standing and capacity to fulfil these responsibilities. A number of countries include rights of enforcement or remedies for breaches of constitutional rights (IFRC/UNDP, 2014).

An example of enforcement of constitutional rights by citizens comes from India where constitutional rights can be enforced in the Supreme Court. Using a specific mechanism termed a 'public interest litigation' it is possible for a group of citizens to initiate a claim in the Supreme Court of India, as was done in 2013 concerning states' inaction on establishing disaster laws to properly implement India's Federal Disaster Management Act 2005. Although many countries do not have specific public reporting or parliamentary oversight mechanisms in their disaster risk management laws there are other forms of general public accountability for government performance of their statutory and other obligations (IFRC/UNDP, 2014).

Transparency: When in place, transparency can encourage civil engagement and public accountability by rendering the public decision-making process more accessible. This, in turn, strengthens confidence in governments and public agencies. However, there are very few tools to ensure transparency in disaster risk reduction. Transparency is understood as the sharing knowledge of risks and how to reduce them, though it is often limited to disaster preparedness only. Such information needs to be audited to obtain the confidence of national and international actors involved in the process, and to determine whether the activities fulfilled contribute to reducing disaster risks and whether the financial resources allocated have been used in an effective and efficient manner. Coskun (2014), in summarizing the results of national disaster risk reduction audit reviews performed by a number of SAIs, concluded that many national public information sharing programmes were one time efforts with no follow up, and that the disaster risk activities were not audited for their effectiveness.

[8] INTOSAI, ISSAI 5510 Audit of Disaster Risk Reduction, www.issai.org/4-auditing guidelines/ guidelines- on-specific-subjects.

The key accomplishments to increase transparency stated by the countries in HFA reports echo this finding. They mostly report on specific measures to increase public awareness and national outreach campaigns on disaster risk reduction. The key challenge stated in the national reports for achieving lasting impact from these outreach activities is a lack of financial and human resources to implement such measures.

The relationship between good disaster risk governance and transparency, however, is not straightforward in practice. Many Latin American countries have good examples of disaster risk reduction practice and effective institutions, yet show high rates of corruption, low levels of transparency and other dimensions of weak governance (Wilkinson, 2014). Some more autocratic Asian countries have demonstrated that it is possible to have relatively good, or at least efficient, governance with very little transparency. Another example is Bangladesh, a country which ranks among the lowest 14 countries on a standard governance index (the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index) yet has made remarkable progress in disaster risk reduction at policy and practice levels, including successful mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development and poverty alleviation (Wilkinson, 2014).

The establishment of a more transparent deliberation process will not automatically ensure the ultimate goals of reducing uncertainty in policy-making and increasing safety. The ownership and legitimacy of controlling risks may reside with certain professionals or the government, and conflicting views and interests still need to be reconciled. With more public access to data and more actors in the policy-making arena, the lines of accountability in practice could even become fuzzier (Kenny, 2012).

PART IV: Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development

4.1 Conceptual understanding of mainstreaming DRR into development

Mainstreaming DRR into development, although predominantly covered under the HFA Priority for Action 4, is examined as part of this thematic review on DRG, since it is a governance process that provides the enabling environment for ensuring risk reduction becomes an underlying principle of sustainable development (UNDP, 2012). Mainstreaming thus reflects a process of institutionalizing or sustaining change (UNDP, 2010b).

There is no formal and agreed upon definition of mainstreaming DRR into development (since not defined in the 2009 UNISDR Terminology), despite it being referred to as a central goal of disaster risk management in global policy documents since 1989. The 1989 IDNDR Resolution (A/RES/44/236), for example, called on governments “to formulate national disaster-mitigation programmes, as well as economic, land use and insurance policies for disaster prevention, and, particularly in developing countries, to integrate them fully into their national development programmes.” The Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action (1994) stated that “disaster prevention and preparedness should be considered integral aspects of development policy and planning at national, regional, bilateral, multilateral and international levels.” And one of the objectives established for the ISDR in 1999 was “to proceed from protection against hazards to the management of risk, by integrating risk prevention strategies into sustainable development activities” (A/54/497). Also the HFA (2005) talks of “integrating

disaster risk considerations more effectively with sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, preparedness and vulnerability reduction."

The UNDP Framework for Mainstreaming DRR into Development (2010b) states that mainstreaming of a particular social issue implies that it is brought into the 'mainstream' of activities rather than being dealt with as an add-on. In the area of disaster risk reduction, the term mainstreaming has been used to describe a 'process' aimed at ensuring that all key development interventions in risk prone countries effectively address disaster reduction concerns. The 'result' of mainstreaming DRR would be a stage when the fundamental elements of risk reduction are embedded into development practice and fully institutionalized within a government's development agenda, i.e. in policy and legal precepts, strategies, mechanisms and instruments that do not explicitly or directly deal with disaster risk as such, but which in their functioning and coverage can be seen to contribute to the construction or reduction of disaster risks.

Mainstreaming disaster disk reduction into development has the dual purpose of: i) ensuring that development is protected from existing and future disaster risk through DRR elements; and ii), ensuring that development does not increase existing and future levels of disaster risk (UNDP, 2010b). It signifies the incorporation of goals and values directed by risk management considerations in "other" spheres of action with the intention of increasing their efficiency, quality, sustainability, functioning and performance. These spheres of action or objects of mainstreaming are generally defined in sector (development, agriculture, infrastructure, education, etc.) and territorial (municipal, district, river basin, economic regions etc.) terms (UNDP, 2010b). Mainstreaming hence moves DRR beyond the bounds of disaster risk management specialists and into the realm of development professionals and groups.

DRR Mainstreaming is an essential aspect of what is now referred to increasingly as 'prospective' or 'anticipatory' risk management (UNISDR, 2009a). This means anticipating risk construction processes in sectorial or territorial development policies, strategies, mechanisms, actions and searching for their prevention from the outset. This includes recovery and reconstruction processes, when these are guided by risk prevention considerations in new investments. Prospective management would involve, for example, controls over patterns of land use and territorial organization, environmental degradation, the impacts of poverty on disaster risk and similar development concerns. Mainstreaming can also be understood from the perspective of corrective disaster risk management (Pelling, 2007). Interventions in sectors, territories, infrastructure etc. that improve or update the quality or coverage of existing investments may be needed to address risk considerations. As these are normally explicit decisions, corrective disaster risk actions are more easily monitored and subject to easier evaluation and assessment. Examples may include the retrofitting of buildings, the relocation of settlements and the diversification of agriculture.

The prospective risk management aspect of mainstreaming is more difficult to assess in terms of progress and implementation. Only explicit references to consideration of disaster risk in development instruments and decisions can be subject to assessment and evaluation. However, this is not the case with what may be categorized as implicit DRR measures, i.e. when development actors incorporate

disaster risk considerations without specifically referring to them as disaster risk management. Examples of this are 'good building practice', 'good land use planning', 'good agricultural planning' and implementation that naturally builds in hazard risk management and human security. DRR Mainstreaming is also difficult to evaluate due to the fact that it is not palpable or easily measured in its effects: avoided or reduced risk (Mitchell, 2003; World Bank, 2010).

DRR Mainstreaming may go hand-in-hand with mainstreaming of other significant themes, such as gender, environment, vulnerable groups, etc. Such multiple processes of mainstreaming specific themes into development are rather complex and often seen as overburdening already challenged development interventions, and therefore not without their difficulties.

4.2 Advances with mainstreaming DRR into development

National and sub-national planning: Laws and policies are an indicator of the political importance placed on disaster risk reduction. Mainstreaming of DRR into policy and legal instruments is still nascent in most countries. Even when it features, such as in social housing, physical planning or watershed management it is not widely implemented. Macro analyses of disaster risk management and its relationship to development indicators and overall governance characteristics suggest in general that the higher the levels of development the greater the progress made in incorporating disaster risk reduction into development pursuits (Hamdan, 2013a; Wilkinson, et al., 2014; Lassa, 2010).

Considering the complexity of mainstreaming DRR, the multiple contexts in which it is pursued, and the overall lack of broad-based analyses of progress in mainstreaming, means that conclusions are largely based on anecdotal, country and theme-specific studies. IFRC/UNDP (2014) classified only seven of their 31 sample countries as having seriously and dominantly adopted disaster risk reduction as a basis for new legislation and policy. Tall, et al. (2013) in a study of policy for hydro-meteorological disasters in Africa classified only six out of the 55 countries studied as risk averters, while 33 were considered to be "unprepared fire fighters", still dedicated primarily if not exclusively to disaster response. When cross country studies on mainstreaming exist, as in the case of studies by the Economic Community of West African States (Ojo, 2013) and the Southern African Development Community (2014), or when reference is made to mainstreaming in regional reviews, despite a good deal of informative detail and description the results are normally provided at a general level and almost invariably point to the lack of, or difficulties with, mainstreaming and disaster risk reduction. While such results point to progress in awareness, policy and legality, very limited progress on the ground is made due to resource constraints, other overriding priorities and lack of understanding of mainstreaming goals and processes. Implementation is severely deficient especially in lower and middle-income countries (IFRC-UNDP, 2014; Tarazona, et al., 2010; Williams, 2010).

Sectoral planning: Mainstreaming DRR into investment decisions is becoming more frequent. In some instances, ministries of finance, economy and planning are requiring disaster risk to be taken into account in public investment (for example, in Costa Rica, Guatemala and Peru). This is one of the broadest and most comprehensive ways of dealing with risks that are linked to exposure and vulnerability to natural hazards, given the potential to provide coverage for all critical public infrastructures and buildings. However, gaps in information and analysis of costs and benefits of DRR

and the lack of trained personnel have slowed down such processes in countries that have been studied, and it has not been easy getting finance and economy ministries on board in many places (Chakrabarti, 2013b).

Christoplos, et al. (2013) have noted how in Viet Nam, for example, disaster risk reduction rarely takes precedence over investment decisions that promote local development and employment and that controlling risk generated by private sector investment is not easy. Similarly, goals for high yield agriculture production lie in the balance against the at times contradictory goal of avoiding crop losses. Investment decisions are more likely to be weighed by political rather than technical considerations and are more influenced by growth and employment priorities. Negotiation and incorporation of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction goals is dependent on the convergence of goals and efforts among sectors at the provincial level.

It is important to integrate disaster risk control and reduction in land use planning, territorial organization and environmental planning. All of these are related to goals of de-concentration (i.e. the relocation of central government to lower administrative levels) and bolstering the roles of sub-regional and local government and organizations.

Within environmental planning in particular, there has been a widespread lack of awareness of disaster risk reduction and incorporating it into environment-related policies and plans has proved elusive (Gupta et al., 2012). In addition, only few countries could report through the HFA monitoring processes how the results of environmental impact assessments that mainstream DRR were used to accomplish disaster risk reduction. For example, Mozambique in its national HFA report reported that the high dependency of local communities on natural resources for survival, due to high levels of poverty and the increased pressure on those resources, made environmental policies entirely impractical. Nearly all countries reported difficulties in incorporating climate change adaptation measures into national policies, however, it is found that climate change concerns and the increasing notion of adaptation via environmental conservation is helping to change approaches in some places.

Some factors that have been reported as working against mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into land use planning include (Johnson, 2011; Lavell and Maskrey, 2013; IFRC/UNDP, 2014):

- preference to exploit the economic gains of the resource base that exists in hazard prone areas, as compared to considering possible future losses due to the impact of hazards;
- tendency to increase the tax base of local governments by permitting occupation of risk-prone land;
- speculative behavior with land;
- lack of access to safe land for poor groups and lack of consideration of informal groups in planning;
- availability of cheap or free, but hazard-prone land, for school and hospital construction and other community infrastructure.

4.3 Case study: Progress with mainstreaming DRR in the agricultural sector

A sector-specific study on mainstreaming DRR into agriculture (FAO, 2014) was specially prepared for this thematic review on DRG and offers an opportunity to examine in greater detail different facets of mainstreaming and their presence and influence on sector planning. Unfortunately, similar analyses for other sectors cannot be easily found. Nevertheless, the study offers important conclusions on the DRR mainstreaming process and its promotion.

Thirty countries were studied, examining both the integration of disaster risk reduction into agricultural planning, and how agricultural issues are reflected in national disaster risk reduction strategies. The study looked at progress in mainstreaming, implementation of disaster risk reduction in agriculture, and emerging trends. It also looked at how mainstreaming DRR in agriculture is featured in the HFA monitoring process. While the study is not representative of all countries, given that it examined only high-risk contexts, it gives a good indication of the great difficulty of measuring progress and of specifically attributing change to the influence of the HFA.

The FAO study found that only five of the 30 countries specifically addressed any disaster risk governance aspects in their agricultural planning policies (HFA Priority for Action 1). However, 18 countries considered and provided policy prescriptions that address underlying risk factors (Priority for Action 4). This can be explained by the importance of environmental services and land use planning in agriculture, and the fact that reducing underlying risk factors is a requisite for agriculture, irrespective of any specific disaster risk management, mainstreaming or governance conditions to support it. The study also found that it is more likely that DRR is incorporated in individual sector plans such as agriculture when disaster risk reduction is given prominence in a country's overall development plans and policies.

The key drivers supporting progress in mainstreaming DRR into agriculture were identified as:

- awareness of hazards;
- inclusion of disaster risk reduction in national development policy and poverty reduction plans;
- existing national level legislation and policy;
- clear understanding of the nexus between disaster risk and sustainable development;
- existence of international policy instruments;
- broad consultation and participation;
- impact of disasters on sector; and
- articulation of a national climate change agenda.

The need to distinguish between conditions that are conducive to mainstreaming and those that are direct drivers of mainstreaming was highlighted. For example, hazard awareness is not as critical as disaster impact in promoting change. Broad consultation is conducive to, but not a direct driver of mainstreaming. On the other hand, understanding the relationship between risk and development were found to be critical for mainstreaming.

The study found that a significant time span exists between the introduction of mainstreaming as a national priority and its effective implementation in agricultural development planning. According to the

study, “the time gap could have been bridged if national efforts to mainstream disaster risk reduction had been inclusive of development sectors from the start in 2005” (FAO, 2014).

The study concluded that, “to effectively mainstream disaster risk reduction into agriculture, it is necessary to have a sector-specific institutional mechanism to coordinate within the sector doing policy formulation and planning for agriculture and overseeing implementation” (FAO, 2014). This idea, however, has been strongly argued against in other contexts in which it is believed that creating specialized disaster risk reduction units within a sector contradicts any efforts to achieve a broad involvement of sector development specialists in DRR (Lavell and Maskrey, 2013). Moreover, where such units exist in government ministries, they are often embedded in the overall disaster management structures and often suffer from limited capacities and limited power to influence attitudes and practice in the sector they are concerned with.

As is the case in some other sectors, by definition also good agricultural practices are already climate risk sensitive since the main source of hazards are climate related. Thus, climate sensitive practices in agriculture are routine and might not necessarily be labeled as disaster risk reduction.

PART V: Emerging Issues in Disaster Risk Governance for Future Consideration

5.1 Institutional arrangements

For disaster risk management institutional arrangements to be effective, they must reflect both the risk profile as well as a country’s overall governance arrangements. They need to have authority and recognition, and their legitimacy and relevance must be established with access to sufficient capacity and resources. The capacities need to include the ability to manage complex processes that help to achieve responsiveness, participation, transparency, and accountability.

Many of the problems and slow advances in the disaster risk management field are the result of a monolithic view of the theme, operating under a ‘blue print’ of institutional, policy and legislative arrangements. DRG approaches are likely to become more disaster risk centric (rather than response/preparedness) if they were able to reflect the change of the discourse towards prospective disaster risk management that is part and parcel of a more comprehensive appreciation of risks, including risks related to climate change, environment, economics, or conflict. Prospective disaster risk management is better considered as an essential component of sustainable development management, whereby risks are avoided in the first place. As such, prospective disaster risk management is, or should be, primarily the realm of sector-based and territory-based development actors. It requires reaching out to and giving a greater onus to planning and finance ministries, as well as private sector who have much influence on the course of development. It also requires completely different structures, approaches and governance arrangements than those utilized under the currently much more common corrective management modality. The notion of network governance introduced earlier could well lead to more inclusive and better informed decision-making and implementation. While such an approach has gained momentum at the global level, it still remains to be seen if network governance would be an appropriate tool for DRR particularly at the national level.

The weak social contract for disaster risk reduction that often exists between a state and its citizens is an impediment to progress in DRG at local levels. For disaster risk reduction programmes to gain traction on the ground, it will be particularly important to better understand the benefits and limits of decentralization. An understanding of the complexities of decentralization should inform national and donor policies and programmes. There may also be benefits in rethinking and rationalize local disaster risk management institutions in light of constraints on resources and capacities.

5.2 DRR mainstreaming

The dominant discourse on mainstreaming DRR into development still suggests the notion of integration or the incorporation of DRR activities into a separate order of things, i.e. development, in order to enhance the latter's performance. According to this, DRR is considered an 'add-on' to development. The counter position, which has fundamental consequences in terms of praxis, is that considerations of disaster risk and its prevention or mitigation are, or should be, inherent in the very definition of development. The essence of this argument is that if development itself, in some of its modalities, is contributing to disaster risk, then it would be necessary to reframe or redefine development modalities rather that adding a palliative onto an existing risk generating system. Unless this happens, any DRR measures will fail to yield their full benefits and results. Also international agencies supporting disaster risk governance should reconsider their approaches and ensure that development assistance is sensitive to disaster risk reduction. Although this is not a new demand, it is still highly topical.

Linked to this observation, are the many examples of good development practice that can contribute to disaster risk reduction even if its integration is not labeled as such, as was highlighted in the above case study on mainstreaming in the agricultural sector. Also poverty alleviation programmes that aim to diversify income generation, as for example, in coastal Bangladesh, address the underlying causes of food insecurity which have indirectly contributed to disaster resilience (Aysan and Bene, 2013). None of these practices are specifically labeled as disaster risk reduction, yet they do contribute to making the livelihoods of farmers more sustainable. These already mainstreamed practices are not always captured for their contribution to disaster risk reduction, albeit this is precisely the challenge for the future.

According to Toscano-Rivalta (2014), the mainstreaming/incorporation/integration strategy adopted in the four global disaster risk reduction frameworks from 1989 (IDNDR), 1994 (Yokohama), 1999 (ISDR) and 2005 (HFA) seem to have put the onus on the development experts to pick up and apply the policy recommendations of the disaster risk management experts. The question is then, whether this is plausible without a strong buy-in on the part of development planners, across all sectors and territories, national and local, public and private. Change will require governance arrangements that allow synergy and negotiation between diverse interest groups, i.e. DRM and development communities, and a thorough discussion of the 'business as usual' versus a transformative development debate.

With discussions underway on the Sustainable Development Goals and development finance for the future, this debate cannot be ignored. Moreover, if the integration vision is seen to have its limitations, then this will inevitably have an impact in terms of disaster risk prevention or control in the future. There is increasing recognition that the integration approach to DRR mainstreaming assumes a position whereby disasters and disaster risk are constructed exogenously to development as opposed to

endogenously, and that the pitfalls of this have been ignored or bypassed to date (Lavell and Maskrey, 2013).

5.3 Financing of DRR

Insufficient funding and the ensuing lack of continuity and piece-meal approaches is one of the major reasons why DRR has not progressed nationally or locally. The low level of DRR financing reflects a lack of prioritization on the part of governments and donors. It is also the result of insufficient societal demand for reducing disaster risk. And without a strong public demand for DRR, it is less likely states will prioritize its financing.

Financing is a critical issue especially when dealing with corrective or mitigatory disaster risk management and its concrete actions, such as relocating communities, retrofitting hospitals, constructing dykes, or disaster response and reconstruction. However, when dealing with prospective or preventive disaster risk management as part of development, financing is only of secondary concern. Instead, establishing norms and methods and their enforcement, and public accountability and transparency become far more important. Land use planning, controls over locating populations and infrastructure in hazardous locations and proper building and planning practices are less costly activities if done as a regular part of, for example, urban development. Yet, these issues have a high political and organizational capital.

There is clearly a case for strengthening existing financial mechanisms, and DRG must pursue this as one of its objectives. The calls made at the 2013 Global Platform to enhance the tracking of disaster risk reduction need to be taken seriously. In particular it is important to understand better how much money domestic governments are investing in risk reduction, and on what, and the relationship between national and international sources. This is particularly important when the success of pilot projects funded by external donors is at risk due to the lack of sustainable national resources for scaling up good practices. The data available for tracking the financing of disaster risk reduction, both globally and at the country level, however, is not as good as it should be.

5.4 The HFA Monitor

The HFA progress monitor is clearly the result of the discourse on disaster risk management at the start of the HFA implementation period in 2005. At the time, DRG was perceived more in terms of outputs and normative aspects of governance — e.g., policies and laws, financing, institutional structures, decentralization, and platforms — rather than a complex web of context specific processes and interactions of various aspects, institutions and actors. Moreover, the transformation of outputs into disaster risk reduction outcomes (i.e. reduced disaster impacts or vulnerability) was not adequately considered. These are important lessons for the future. Approaches to monitoring disaster risk governance should be anchored in the historical and political context of each country (or territory), and progress should be measured within this context, and not only against outputs but also outcomes. Emphasis should be given to establishing a set of principles and standards that countries can then apply according to their particular national idiosyncrasies. Realistic expectations about what can be achieved in disaster risk governance within a one decade time-frame need to be established and regularly

monitored. The corresponding measuring tools should reflect these. The relationships between disaster risk reduction activities and goals and sector or territorial development needs and their organizational setups (health, water and sanitation, education, etc.) should be identified, in order to co-promote these interrelated activities and goals.

5.5 Information sources and analysis of DRG

Disaster risk governance processes and progress, opportunities and obstacles, can only be adequately and thoroughly understood when based on an integral analysis of specific regional, country or local contexts. This is because countries and localities comprise distinctive systems and provide contexts in which the interaction of the many aspects of disaster risk governance is historically, culturally, socially, economically and politically constructed. This is not to say that there aren't any common requirements, approaches, criteria, goals and challenges across countries as regards disaster risk governance. It simply establishes that the way these manifest themselves in reality will vary according to place and time, context and social structure, among other factors (see Williams, 2010; Lassa, 2010; Wilkinson, et al., 2014; Christoplos, et al., 2013). Attempts to import approaches into fundamentally different national or local environments is likely to and has led to failure on many occasions (UNDP, 2007).

The relevance of multiple country studies that attempt to review and correlate distinct and varied aspects of the disaster risk governance context across the board and in relation to, for example, development or general governance indicators is questionable. Such studies often fail to move beyond notions of correlation and regression and are unable to capture the true reasons as to why apparently similar conditions are in fact causally and process-wise very different (for example, the lack of progress from laws and policies to real implementation; the difficulties in achieving decentralization and participation; the lack of adequate financial resources). Thus, a particular problem may be common to many contexts, but the causes and consequences may be very different. Moreover, intervention and support for change and progress must be developed differentially based on in-depth political science or theory of change analysis for the different contexts.

The following themes have been identified for future research in the area of DRG:

- Research on how the overall context of governance influences DRG and vice-versa.
- Research that moves toward better understanding of probabilistic causality using causal analysis tools, such as Structural Equation Modeling, Bayesian Network, and Systems Dynamics modeling should be promoted.
- Understanding and evaluating risk vis-à-vis development objectives and understanding the real options for risk reduction vis-à-vis other more pressing and permanent social problems.
- Exploration of approaches such as 'good enough governance' and 'best fit practices' for DRG.
- Research into monitoring mechanisms that combine aspects of the Sustainable Development Goals, climate change and the financing for development agreements where these relate to risk, sustainability and development and have co-determining governance needs and requirements.

6. PART VI: Conclusions

For the successor arrangement of the HFA, it will be important to embrace and integrate the new dimensions of the disaster risk governance problem that have emerged since 2005, and that see governance as a process and not just as a series of outputs, such as policies, laws or plans. This would require an understanding of how governance processes and characteristics have been established and operate specifically at country level, as well as globally to provide an enabling environment for implementing disaster risk reduction.

The characteristics that define good DRG, such as transparency and low levels of corruption, accountability, participation, efficiency in government, etc. are largely influenced by the specific context of a country or society and not of generic origin and causation. Although one can deal individually with these characteristics, in the end good DRG will occur only if they are addressed together to achieve positive results. For example, decentralized DRM without participation, transparency, accountability, and a host of other pre-conditions will likely fail.

Disaster risk governance of course cannot hope to overcome the structural limitations and defining contexts of a country, region or locality. Rather it will mirror what is already in place. Therefore, the lack of progress in disaster risk governance is a problem that relates to the challenges, restrictions, blockages and obstacles that exist within the overall governance arrangements and is influenced by government action, the citizen-state relationship and features of the particular society that is attempting the implementation. This an important reminder that true DRG cannot be addressed without engaging with broader governance issues. The temptation to avoid engaging in the more political aspects associated with governance and to focus instead on the relatively simpler technical solutions that allow relatively more control of inputs and outputs must be overcome. In addition, more consideration should be given to advancing the notion of such concepts as “good enough governance” (Grindle, 2002) and “best-fit solutions” (Carrothers and Gramont, 2011) for achieving measured, consolidated moves toward better disaster risk governance conditions. This requires prioritization of goals, strategies and tools and the identification of possible sequential effects of investment in prioritized areas of concern.

Disaster risk, and thus, disaster risk reduction, involves a vast number of conditioning contexts and factors. It requires a consideration of a very large number of stakeholders and diverse interest groups for different sectors and territories, as well as a broad range of themes in order to fully understand disaster risk causality and the governance options for intervention and control. Disaster risk governance is correspondingly complex and an understanding of its composition and progress is still a challenge using current monitoring and evaluation yardsticks. There is limited learning being shared across generic work in governance and DRG, and disaster risk specialists could benefit greatly by becoming more conversant with the complexities and challenges of the governance experience of practitioners in other contexts, such as parliamentarian development, electoral assistance, health, agriculture, poverty, education, and others.

Annex 1:

Terms of Reference

UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery

A. Project Title: Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance for GAR 2015

Consultants: Preparation of Background Paper

B. Project Description

Background:

Over the coming months, UNDP will be undertaking a major thematic review on risk governance as a contribution to the 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR 2015). The GAR is a biennial global assessment of disaster risk reduction and comprehensive review and analysis of the natural hazards that are affecting humanity. The GAR contributes to achieving the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) through monitoring risk patterns and trends and progress in disaster risk reduction while providing strategic policy guidance to countries and the international community. The GAR aims to help focus international attention on the problem and need to address disaster risk and consolidate political and economic support to disaster risk reduction.

The Report is coordinated by UNISDR in collaboration and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, including various UN agencies, governments, academic and research institutions, donors and technical organizations and specialists. To-date three GAR reports have been issued:

- The GAR 2009 provides hard-hitting evidence to demonstrate how, where and why disaster risk is increasing globally and presents key findings from a global analysis of disaster risk patterns and trends, including where high mortality and economic loss is concentrated.

- The GAR 2011 on revealing risk, redefining development provides guidance and suggestions to governments and non-governmental actors alike, on how they can, together, reduce disaster risks.

- The GAR 2013 on Shared Risk to Shared Value: the Business case for Disaster Risk Reduction, explores the interactions between business investments and disaster risk. It highlights how disasters are becoming a growing global challenge to business and country competitiveness, sustainability and resilience.

UNDP has made specific contributions to all three reports, and will also contribute to GAR 2015 by coordinating one of several thematic reviews that will be carried out to provide an independent scientific/academic analysis of progress in HFA implementation since 2005. The review will also look into areas that deserve greater attention in the post-2015 HFA, i.e. the HFA 2. GAR 2015 will not have a theme, but venture into where DRR will be going beyond 2015, and examine what challenges lie ahead. In particular, UNDP has been assigned as the coordinating agency for carrying out the thematic review on disaster risk governance.

For the purpose of this literature review, *disaster risk governance shall refer to the way in which the public authorities, civil servants, media, private sector, and civil society coordinate at community, national and regional levels in order to manage and reduce disaster and climate related risks. This means ensuring that sufficient levels of capacity and resources are made available to prevent, prepare for, manage and recover from disasters. It also entails mechanisms, institutions and processes for citizens to articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and obligations, and mediate their differences. A more detailed definition of risk governance and its principle aspects and components may be developed in the course of the preparing the thematic review.*

A series of input papers are being called for over the coming months to inform this thematic review. The process of drafting the actual thematic review paper will be spearheaded by a team of two lead authors. Lead authors will also be involved in the process of shaping the focus of inputs papers and the selection of abstracts received from the call for input papers.

C. Scope of Work:

The *objective* of this assignment will be to provide the conceptual guidance for the thematic review on disaster risk governance, and in particular to author the final paper that will eventually feed into the preparation of the GAR 2015. The paper will undergo a thorough peer review process and lead authors will be required to revise the paper and eventually produce a final draft.

The *scope* of the thematic review on risk governance shall cover the following aspects:

(1) The evolution and the conceptual understanding of disaster risk governance that underpins the thematic review and that will inform the HFA 2;

(2) Retrospective assessment of progress achieved in disaster risk governance covering the period 2005 – 2013, including good practices; gaps and challenges; and the impact of disaster risk governance on achievements against other HFA priorities; progress in disaster risk governance against different governance systems and development situations.

(3) Comparative analysis of approaches to mainstreaming DRR into national, sub-national and sectorial development

(4) Analysis of emerging issues in disaster risk governance since the adoption of HFA 1 in 2005; including the role of transparency, accountability and corruption in DRR; Financing and resource allocation for DRR; Social demand, whole-of society approaches, and rights-based approaches in DRR with special focus on gender issues, and the role of children and persons with disabilities; Good practice paper on successful enforcement of laws and regulations that foster DRR.

(5) Recommendations for strengthening disaster risk governance in the HFA 2 with proposals for progress and impact indicators.

Methodology:

The thematic review paper will use existing analysis, publications and knowledge products on the topic of disaster risk governance. Also ongoing analysis and research shall be used as appropriate and accessible. Where gaps remain, new research will be requested through a specific call for papers which is coordinated by UNISDR, or commissioned by UNDP.

Indicative Work Plan:

This consultancy assignment will be conducted in two phases: Phase I will span deliverables scheduled for 2013; Phase II will span deliverable scheduled for 2014. For Phase II, the specific tasks and number of working days may be reviewed once input papers have been finalized in order to achieve a realistic assessment of the outstanding tasks to prepare the thematic review. BCPR will make an initial financial commitment to cover the costs related to Phase I. The financial commitment for Phase II will be reviewed before the end of the year.

This assignment will be carried out by a team of two lead authors. The actual division of labor between the two authors will be specified in the work plan (i.e. depending on their regional and subject matter interests).

This is primarily a home based assignment. Occasional travel may be required, most likely to New York or Geneva, to discuss the scope, progress and analytical direction of the thematic review with UNDP, UNISDR and other authors involved in the preparation of the GAR 2015.

D. Main Expected Outputs and Deliverables

Phase I:

Outputs/Deliverables		Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals
1.	Advise on TORs and abstracts	30 Sept 2013	No
2.	Detailed work plan	11 Oct 2013	Yes
3.	Annotated outline of report	11 Oct 2013	Yes

Phase II:

Outputs/Deliverables		Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals
4.	Zero order draft report	31 Jan 2014	Yes
5.	First order draft report	31 Mar 2014	Yes

6.	Second order draft report	31 May 2014	Yes

E. Management arrangements

The assignment will be implemented under short term consultancy arrangements through individual contracts for each consultant with clearly identified number of work days, work plan and deliverables. Under the guidance and direct supervision of the Disaster & Governance Advisor and the overall leadership of the DRRT Coordinator, a team of 2 lead authors will be commissioned to draft the thematic review on risk governance, based on a series of input papers and literature that will be made available to them. The authors will work in close collaboration with members of BCPR's Disaster Reduction & Recovery Team, UNISDR's GAR team, other lead authors who are working on other thematic GAR reviews, and authors of inputs papers as required.

Applicants to this consultancy are required to submit a financial proposal together with their expression of interest. The financial proposal will consist of an "all inclusive fee that indicates the total consultancy fee for the full preparation and completion of the product with a breakdown of deliverables. Payments will be made against satisfactory completion of deliverables as per the above time line. The payment will be based upon the certification and acceptance of the outputs of the relevant approval officer as stated in section D.

F. Qualifications

The following qualifications and experiences are required:

- Master's degree or higher in public administration, public infrastructure management, development / environmental studies or a discipline relevant to governance and institutional and policy analysis and development in disaster and climate risk management.
- A minimum of 15 years of professional experience in research or planning, implementing and managing programs and projects related to governance and/or disaster and climate risk management.
- Strong analysis skills, methodical approach and precise style of writing.
- Sound understanding and experience of working on development issues and understanding of the relationship of development, governance and DRR.
- Broad knowledge of recent institutional and policy developments in the global DRR community, both within and outside of the UN.
- Working experience in different regional contexts across Africa, Asia Pacific, Arab States and Latin America and the Caribbean.
- The consultant team will require an excellent command of English; other UN working languages such as Spanish or French will be an asset.

Bibliography

Papers prepared specially for this thematic review appear in bold type.

Alexander, D. E. 2013. Resilience and disaster risk reduction: an etymological journey; Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 13, 2707–2716.

Aysan, Y., Bene T. 2013. Asia Regional Report, Annex 14. In Steen N. et. al.. Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean, Rome, FAO.

Best, J., Gheciu A. eds. 2014. The Return of the Public in Global Governance. Cambridge University Press.

Black, R., Bruce, J., Egener, M. 2013. Disasters and Climate Change Adaptation Management: A Guide for Local Government.

Carothers, T., and Gheciu A. 2014. The Return of the Public in Globalde Gramont, D. 2011. Aiding Governance; Cambridge in Developing Countries Progress amid Uncertainties. *Democracy and Rule of Law.* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Carvalho, L., Burnside-Lawry, J. 2013. Leadership at the Local Level. Community participation in the Municipality of Amadora, Portugal. Civil Protection Municipal Service, Municipality of Amadora, Portugal. School of Media and Communication. RMIT University Press Melbourne, Australia. Input paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Chakrabarti, D. 2013a. Developing Indicators for Measuring Progress of Disaster Risk Reduction. Input paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Chakrabarti, D. 2013b. Tracking Public Investment for Disaster Reduction and Recovery.

Christoplos, Friis-Hansen, Funder, Pain, and Lindegaard 2013. What Drives Transformations in Meso-Level Disaster Risk Governance? Emerging lessons from Zambia, Nepal, Viet Nam and Uganda. Danish Institute for International Studies. Prepared for UNDP for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Coskun, A. 2014. The expansion of accountability framework and the contribution of supreme audit institutions. Input paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

De Guzman, E. M. 2003. Towards Total Disaster Management Approach. UN Publications Website. Asian Conference on Disaster Reduction 2003, Kobe, Japan.

Edelman, M. 1964. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.

Edelman, M. 1971. Politics as Symbolic Action. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Florin, M. 2013. Risk Governance: An Overview of Drivers and Success Factors. International Risk Governance Council. Input paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Gisselquist, R. M. 2012. Good Governance as A Concept, and Why This Matters for Development Policy. WIDER Working Paper 2012/30.

Government of Bangladesh 2009. Standing Orders on Disaster.

Government of the Philippines 2010. Philippines Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act.

Grindle, M. 2002. Good Enough Governance: Poverty Reduction and Reform in Developing Countries. Kennedy School of Government. Harvard University.

Grindle, M. 2007. Good Enough Governance Revisited. Development Policy Review, 2007, 25 (5): 553-574. Overseas Development Institute.

Grindle, M. 2010. Good Enough Governance: The Inflation of an Idea. CID Working Paper No. 20. Harvard College.

Gupta, A.K., Nair, S.S. 2012: Environmental Legislation for Disaster Risk Management Project, National Institute of Disaster Management and GIZ.

Faguet, J.- P. 2013. Decentralization and Governance. World Development, Volume 53, January 2014.

FEMA 2013. 2013 National Preparedness Report.

Hamdan, F. 2013a. Retrospective Assessment of Progress in Disaster Risk Governance against the HFA- The Case of Three Arab States Disaster Risk Management Centers (Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon). MIStructE, MRINA, CEng (UK, Lebanon). Prepared for UNDP for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Hamdan, F. 2013b. Intensive and Extensive Disaster Risk Drivers and Incentives for Disaster Risk Management in the MENA region. Background Paper prepared for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2013.

Huertas, G. and Morales, E. M. 2003. Costa Rica Emergency Fund for Animals in Disasters. World Society for the Protection of Animals, Central America. Input Paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

IFRC 2011. Law and Disaster Risk reduction at the Community Level. Geneva.

IFRC and UNDP 2014. Effective Law and Regulation for Disaster Risk Reduction: A Multi-Country Report. New York.

International Risk Governance Council (IRGC) 2005. White paper no 1. Renn O. and Graham P. (Annexes) 2005. Risk Governance, Towards an Integrative Approach. Geneva.

International Risk Governance Council (IRGC) 2008. An Introduction to the IRGC Risk Governance Framework. Geneva.

Johnson, C. 2011. Creating an enabling environment for reducing disaster risk: Recent experience of regulatory frameworks for land, planning and building in low and middle-income countries. Development Planning Unit. University College London. Global Assessment Report On Disaster Risk Reduction 2011.

Kellett, J. and Caravani, A. 2013 (September). Financing Disaster Risk Reduction, A 20 year Story of International Aid. Overseas Development Institute. London.

Kellett, J., Caravani, A., and Pichon, F. 2014. Financing Disaster Risk Reduction: Towards a coherent and comprehensive approach. Overseas Development Institute. London. Prepared for UNDP for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Kenny, C., 2012. Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries: costs, benefits and institutions, *Disasters Journal*, Jean-Paul (2013); Volume 36, Issue 4, Decentralization and Governance; World Development, Volume 53, January 2014, Pages 2−13.

Kent, R. 2013. Making Futures Real: The Policy-Makers Challenge. Humanitarian Futures Programme. Background Paper for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2013.

Lassa, J. 2010. Institutional Vulnerability and Governance of Disaster Risk Reduction: Macro, Meso and Micro Scale Assessment (with case studies from Indonesia). Dissertation from Hohen Landwirtschaftlichen Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn.

Lavell, A. 2009. Local Risk Management: Examples from the Andes. PREDECAN, Lima.

Lavell, A., Maskrey, A. 2013. The Future of Disaster Risk Management. UNISDR-FLACSO (forthcoming in Environmental Hazards).

Merchant, R. M., Emler S., Lurie N. 2011. Integrating Social Media into Emergency-Preparedness Efforts. New England Journal of Medicine.

Mitchell, J. 1999. Crucibles of Hazards: Mega Cities and Disasters in Transition. United Nations University Press. Tokyo.

Mitchell, T. 2003. An Operational Framework for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction, Benfield Hazard Research Centre, Disaster Studies Working Paper 8.

Norfolk, S. 2004. Examining Access to Natural Resources and Linkages to Sustainable Livelihoods. A Case Study of Mozambique. FAO Livelihood Support Programme. Working Paper 17, 69.

North, D. C. 1998. Economic Performance through Time. In Brinton/Nee eds. The New Institutionalism in Sociology; Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ochoa, E. 2013. Incidencia de la Inversión Gubernamental en la Reducción del Riesgo de Inundación en el Periodo 2008-2012.

Ojo, O. 2013. Second Draft Report - Sub-regional Assessment on mainstreaming and Implementing Disaster Risk Reduction measures in West Africa. ECOWAS.

Olum, Y. 2014. Decentralisation in Developing Countries: Preconditions for Successful Implementation. Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance, Issue 15.

Orrego, J. C. 2014. Reporte de progreso de la gobernanza en reducción de riesgos de desastres con relación al Marco de Acción de Hyogo. Documento borrador. Input Paper for the GAR 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015.

Pelling, M. 2007. Making Disaster Risk Reduction Work, Provention Consortium.

Polack, E., Luna, E., Dator-Bercilla, J. 2010. Accountability for disaster risk reduction: Lessons from the Philippines. Climate and Disaster Governance.

Pretty, J.N. 1995. Regenerating Agriculture: Policies and Practice for Sustainability and Self-Reliance. Earthscan, London; National Academy Press, Washington.

Renn, O., 2008. Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World. Earthscan.

Renn, O. and Walker, K. (eds) 2008. Global Risk Governance-Concepts and Practice using the IRGC framework. Dordrecht: Springer.

SADC and UNDP 2014. Sub-regional Assessment on Mainstreaming and Implementing Disaster Risk Reduction Measures In Southern Africa. Final Report.

Scott, Z., and Tarazona, M. 2011. Study on Disaster Risk Reduction, Decentralization and Political Economy. Analysis Prepared as UNDP's contribution to the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2013.

Toscano-Rivalta, M. 2014. Is mainstreaming the enemy of mainstreaming? Notes for a discussion. Unedited. UNISDR-UNDP. Singapore.

Transparency Accountability Initiative 2014. Definitions. http://Www.Transparency-Initiative.Org/About/Definitions.

Trujillo, M. and Baas, S. 2014. Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Agriculture: An Assessment of Progress Made Against the Hyogo Framework for Action. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Input Paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

United Nations 1989. IDNDR Resolution (A/RES/44/236).

United Nations 1994. Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation. New York.

United Nations 1999. Report of the Secretary-General (A/54/497) Re: International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction: Successor Arrangements. New York.

United Nations 2007. Report of the Secretary-General (A/62/320) Re: Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. New York.

UNDP 2004. Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development. New York.

UNDP 2007. A Global review: UNDP Support to Institutional and Legislative Systems for Disaster Risk Management. Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. New York.

UNDP 2010a. A Guide to UNDP Democratic Governance Practice. Bureau for Development Policy. New York.

UNDP 2010b. Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development at the National Level: A Practical Framework. New York.

UNDP 2011. Towards Human Resilience: Sustaining MDG Progress in an Age of Economic Uncertainty. New York.

UNDP 2012. Putting Resilience at the Heart of Development: Investing in Prevention and Resilient Recovery. New York

UNDP 2013a. Issue Brief: Disaster Risk Governance. Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. New York.

UNDP 2013b. Protecting Development Fromfrom Disasters: UNDP's Support to the Hyogo Framework for Action. Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery. New York.

UNISDR 2005. Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. United Nations, Geneva.

UNISDR 2007. Words into Action: A Guide for Implementing the Hyogo Framework. Geneva.

UNISDR 2009a. Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction.

UNISDR 2009b. Chair's Summary of the Second Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. Geneva.

UNISDR 2011a. Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action, 2010-2011. Geneva.

UNISDR 2011b. Chapter 7: Reforming Risk Governance. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction.* Geneva.

UNISDR 2011c. Study on Effective Financial Mechanisms at the National and Local Level for Disaster Risk Reduction.

UNISDR 2011d. Compilation of National Progress Reports on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009-2011). Geneva.

UNISDR 2013a. Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, Summary of the Second Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk ReductionReports 2007–2013.

UNISDR 2013b. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2013: From Shared Risk to Shared Value, the Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction. Geneva.

UNISDR 2013c. Findings of the Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction 2012 – 2013, Final Report. Geneva.

UNISDR 2014. Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction by the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary General for Disaster Risk Reduction.

UNISDR, UN-Habitat, UNFPA 2012. Linkages between Population Dynamics, Urbanization Processes and Disaster Risks: A Regional Vision of Latin America.

Van de Niekerk, D. 2013. Retrospective Assessment of Progress in Disaster Risk Governance against the Hyogo Framework for Action. Prepared for UNDP for the 2015 GAR UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Visconti, E. 2014. Governmental and Institutional Fortress (GIT). Toward a parameter on factors unrelated to the risks that might have an effect on the final results of a disaster. Input Paper for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015.

Walch, C. 2013. Disaster Risk Reduction and Local Ownership- The effect of political competition, patronage and armed conflict on the local ownership of disaster risk reduction in the Philippines. Department of Peace and Conflict Research and Centre for Natural Disaster Science, Uppsala University.

WHO, Olu, O., Kalula, K., Tarande, M., Usman, A., Ngoy, N., Mayikuli, C. 2013. From Framework to Action: Operationalizing the Hyogo Framework of Action 2005 To 2015 in the Health Sector; Progress, Important Lessons and Way Forward for Post-2015 Hyogo Framework for Action Public Health Agenda in Africa.

Williams, G. 2011. The Political Economy of Disaster Risk Reduction. Study on Disaster Risk Reduction, Decentralization, and Political Economy. Analysis Prepared as UNDP's Contribution to the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2011.

Wilkinson, E., Comba, E., and Peters, K. 2014. Disaster Risk Governance: Dimensions, Variations and Transformations. Overseas Development Institute. Prepared for UNDP for the 2015 GAR UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

World Bank 2014. World Development Report, Risk and Opportunity: Managing Risk for Development. Washington.

World Bank 2010. Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters: The Economics of Prevention. Washington.

Zupka, D. 2014. Retrospective Assessment of Progress in Disaster Risk Governance against Hyogo Framework of Action. Focus countries: Armenia, Georgia, Germany, Kyrgyzstan and Norway. Prepared for UNDP for the 2015 GAR UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

<u>Other references</u>

Benson C., Twigg J. with Roissetto T.. 2007. Tools for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction: Guidance Notes for Development Organisations. Provention Consortium.

Bussell, J. 2010.Review Essay. Between State and Citizen: Decentralization, Institutions, and Accountability. *India Review*, vol. 9, no. 2, April–June, 2010, pp. 285–294.

Costea, A. and Felicio, T. 2005. Global and Regional Mechanisms of Disaster Risk Reduction and Relief: Review, Evaluation, Future Directions of Integration. Presentation at the UNU- UNITAR

Training *"Environmental Governance: The Role of Regional Frameworks to Promote Sustainable Development".* UN HQ, NY March 21-22, 2005. UNU-CRIS Occasional Papers.

Ferris E., and Petz, D. 2013. In the Neighborhood: The Growing Role of Regional Organizations in Disaster Risk Management. The Brookings Institution – London School of Economics. Project on Internal Displacement.

Fitzgibbon, C., Kurauchi, Y., Opiyo, F. and Cabot Venton, C. 2014. Building Disaster Resilience for Sustainable Human Development Lessons Learnt from Community Based Resilience Analysis in the Horn of Africa. UNDP Drylands Development Centre. Input Paper for the GAR 2015 UNDP Thematic Review on Disaster Risk Governance.

Godden, L., et al., 2013. Governance arrangements for climate change adaptation and natural disaster risk management in Victoria. The Victorian Centre for Climate Change Adaptation Research at the University of Melbourne Victoria, Australia.

Gupta, M. 2010. Filling the Governance 'Gap' in Disaster Risk Reduction. Global Assessment Report On Disaster Risk Reduction 2011.

Hewitt, C. 1998. Uses and abuses of the concept of governance. UNESCO. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK.

Hyden, G., and Court, J. 2002. Governance and Development. *World Governance Survey Discussion Paper 1.* United Nations University.

Hyden, G., Court, J., and Foresti, M., and Fritz, V. 2008. Governance assessments for local stakeholders: What the World Governance Assessment offers. *Working Paper 287.* Overseas Development Institute.

Hyden, G., Court, J., and Mease, K. 2003. Making Sense of Governance: The Need for Involving Local Stakeholders. Overseas Development Institute.

Hyden 2002. Assessing Governance: Methodological Challenges. World Governance Survey Discussion Paper 2. Overseas Development Institute.

Hyden 2002. Governance Performance: The Aggregate Picture. *World Governance Survey Discussion Paper 3*. United Nations University.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the World Bank. 2013. Risk and Opportunity. Managing Risk for Development. World Development Report. Washington, D.C.

Leavy, J., Scott, Z., Tarazona, M., Wooster, K., Hearle, C., Maconick, R., and Few, R. 2014. Strategic Research into National and Local Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management. Literature Review. Oxford Policy Management.

Overseas Development Institute 2006. Governance, Development and Aid Effectiveness: A Quick Guide to Complex Relationships. Briefing Paper. ODI, London.

Overseas Development Institute 2007. Governance Assessment. Overview of governance assessment frameworks and results from the 2006 World Governance Assessment. *Report from Learning Workshop*. United Nations University.

Satterthwaite, D. 2011. What Role for Low-income Communities in Urban Areas in Disaster Risk Reduction? International Institute for Environment and Development.

Scolobig, A., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Komendantova, N., Patt, A.,' Di Ruocco, A., Gasparini, P., Monfort, D., Vinchon, C., Bengoubou-Valerius, M., Mrzyglocki, R., and Fleming, K.' 2013. From Multi-Risk Assessment to Multi-Risk Governance: Recommendations for Future Directions. Input Paper for the 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction.

Townshend, T., Frankshauser, S., Matthews, A., Feger, C., Liu, J., and Narciso, T. 2011. Climate Legislation Study. GLOBE International. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and Environment at London School of Economics and Political Science.