

Literature Review

By Kamal Kishore

Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action

United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

Literature review: Mid-Term Review, Hyogo Framework for Action

1.0 Background

The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) was launched at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) held in Kobe from 18-22 January 2005. The HFA is supported by the Hyogo Declaration issued by 168 member states that came together at the WCDR. The Hyogo Declaration recognized the “intrinsic relationship between disaster reduction, sustainable development and poverty eradication.” While it acknowledged the importance of “involving all stakeholders, including governments, regional and international organizations and financial institutions, civil society, including non-governmental organizations and volunteers, the private sector and the scientific community”, it also stated that “the States have the primary responsibility to protect the people and property on their territory from hazards.” The declaration placed equal emphasis on formulating appropriate national policies as well as building capacities at the community level. Member states adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 as a guiding framework for the next decade on disaster reduction.

Since 2005, the Hyogo Framework for Action has become the guiding framework for the work of not only the national governments and international organizations but also the civil society organizations, and the academia. In support of the implementation of the HFA, and capitalizing on the field experience, the ISDR Secretariat as well as other actors have developed guidance material related to its application in programming. A selection of these can be accessed at:

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/framework/key-documents/>

The expected outcome of HFA over 2005-2015 period is “substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries.” It articulates three strategic goals, five priorities for action and four cross cutting issues. The HFA states that its implementation “will be appropriately reviewed” and requests the ISDR to “prepare periodic reviews on progress towards achieving [its] objectives and priorities.” Accordingly, at the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in June 2009 ISDR Secretariat initiated the Mid Term Review (MTR) of the HFA.

The MTR will be informed by five distinct but inter-linked processes:

- Review of existing reports
- Outcomes of structured workshops held at regional and national level
- In-depth studies
- One-on-one interviews with key policy makers
- On-line debates

The present report is an output of the first process.

2.0 Objectives of the Literature Review

At the outset, the main objectives of the literature review were:

- to generate a baseline of the disaster risk reduction landscape at the time of the HFA adoption and of the information available about its implementation during its first five years; and
- to identify global trends as well as gaps in HFA implementation.

There is little systematized material available that describes the state of disaster risk reduction in 2005, articulates it along the broad structure of HFA and presents it in a manner comparable across countries. While it may be possible to describe the general state of disaster risk reduction at the beginning of 2005, it is difficult to establish a firm baseline. Therefore, for this paper, of the two objectives mentioned above, meeting the first objective has proven to be difficult. The focus of this paper is primarily to identify global trends as well as gaps in HFA implementation.

3.0 Methodology

This literature review has taken into account country and regional HFA reports that were prepared in the run up to the first (2007) and second (2009) sessions of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk reduction, analytical material that was produced as contribution to the Global Assessment Report (2009), the report Views from the Frontline, more than 40 documents on the subject sourced through prevention web and relevant articles of select journals. A large part of the review was based on a collection of institutional progress reports and hence presenting specific institutional perspectives on the issues. Every attempt was made to triangulate the key findings from a variety of sources. However, there may still be specific conclusions of this review that may need to be verified through more focused information collection and analysis. This is being done through the other processes described above in Section 2 that are contributing to the MTR.

4.0 Overall findings

At a higher level, five broad conclusions can be drawn from the literature review:

- HFA has proven to be a useful normative framework in guiding the global effort towards disaster risk reduction. It has facilitated articulation of comprehensive approaches towards disaster risk reduction as opposed to piecemeal efforts. A review of national policy documents reveals that over the last five years, national level efforts have increasingly been framed using the five HFA Priorities for Action as key guideposts. There are also a few interesting examples of “localizing” the HFA Priorities for Action in specific geographical contexts.¹ As concerns of climate change and associated risks have taken centre stage in disaster risk reduction arena, these emerging issues have found a clear ‘space’ within the HFA, particularly under the HFA Priority for Action 4 (underlying factors of risk).
- Although HFA has been increasingly used to frame disaster risk reduction initiatives, in many cases, it has sometimes tended to become an oversimplified ‘catch-all’ framework.

¹ Gautam, D. R. Khanal, S. 2009. *Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction: Contribution to Hyogo Framework of Action – Case Study*. Lalitpur: Mercy Corps Nepal.

Activities are often labeled as contributing to a particular HFA Priority for Action without reflecting an adequate understanding of the significance of that Priority for Action, particularly in the case of HFA Priority for Action 4. Also, in some cases, inter-linkages between different HFA Priorities for Action are not fully articulated in the design and implementation of disaster risk reduction initiatives. For example, under HFA Priority for Action 3, Information, Education and Communication (IEC) initiatives have been framed to enhance public awareness but there is little or no emphasis on how enhanced awareness can lead to greater accountability of the governance systems towards disaster risk reduction issues (HFA Priority for Action 1). This is a pattern that tends to repeat at the national, regional and global levels and a number of reports allude to this tendency.

- In the implementation of HFA, there has been much greater emphasis on the Priorities for Action than on the Strategic Goals. Many national level documents do not make any mention of how disaster risk reduction activities contribute to the strategic goals and ultimately to the overall expected outcome.
- Measuring progress against the five Priorities for Action using largely subjective indicators (which are quite robust, having been developed through a highly consultative process) has been particularly challenging. There are wide variations in the assessment of progress depending on the perspective of the assessor. For example, GAR indicates most progress on HFA Priority for Action 1&5, View from the Front Line (VFL) indicates most progress on HFA Priority for Action 4&5, and Child Focused Groups (CFG) indicates most progress on HFA Priority for Action 3&4. Also, within each of these studies there are a lot of variations among different respondent groups. However, these variations do not necessarily contradict each other. To the contrary, these are complementary views that help us give a more complete picture of the progress. These variations also point to the limitations of a method that attempts to quantify progress on a five-point scale. Perhaps greater emphasis needs to be given on 'drivers of change' type of analysis presented in the GAR, which goes beyond quantitative methods and attempts to understand the underlying social, economic and political processes that lead to accumulation or reduction of disaster risk.
- As mentioned earlier, there has been a gradual move towards more comprehensive approaches to disaster risk reduction. In HFA language, it has meant a shift from focus on HFA priorities 1&5 to covering all HFA priorities. However, attempts to address underlying factors of risk have been rather superficial and focused mainly on visible (or 'structural') measures. There is not enough evidence in the literature to suggest that risk reduction is getting hardwired in the "business processes" of the development sectors, planning ministries, financial institutions etc. There is evidence of greater investment in disaster risk reduction, but most of the funding is still going to response preparedness type of activities.

5.0 Findings and Gaps in information against each HFA Priority of Action

HFA Priority for Action 1: Making DRR a National Priority

Findings

Significant progress has been made in this area, especially in the form of institutional and legislative arrangements for disaster risk reduction at the national level. However, there are relatively few examples in the literature reviewed where new legislation addressing disaster risk concerns is harmonized with pre-existing legislative frameworks in other sectors (such as water resources, agriculture, power and energy) that have a direct bearing on how disaster risk is managed.² Similarly in many countries national action plans exist but these do not synchronize with the national policy in key development sectors.

There has been notable progress in setting up *institutional structures* and developing *plans* but limited movement on allocating *resources* from regular national budgets and encouraging broad-based *participation* in the processes leading up to new institutional structures. In spite of significant overall progress in this area, huge disparities exist between national and local levels. Institutional structures are often put in place but are not connected to the local and community processes.³

The notion of differential vulnerability of different societal groups is not adequately addressed by the new institutional and legislative arrangements. Most of the progress is made at a highly aggregate level. There are relatively few examples of local knowledge informing policy. However, there is an expanding body of knowledge on locally rooted strategies particularly in the case of climate change adaptation.⁴ There are numerous efforts to “localize” HFA and translate the priorities for action into specific local initiatives.⁵

In the literature, it is now widely recognized that community and local participation combined with decentralization can be drivers of change. However, there are few examples of this being put into practice. Although lack of adequate and broad-based participation remains an area of concern, the involvement of civil society organizations has gradually but consistently increased over the last five years. Greater involvement of civil society organizations, especially the NGOs have led to innovation, particularly at the local level. However, complementarity between NGO action and government efforts is not systematically defined. At the same time, mainstreaming DRR within the development work of NGOs remains a challenge.⁶

Some literature sources point to the lack of sufficient empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of different governance systems for disaster risk reduction.⁷ National Platforms have emerged as an important element of national institutional systems for disaster risk reduction. There is a lot of variation in how National Platforms have developed in different country contexts. For example, participation of civil society and the private sector is highly

² Based on a number of unpublished reports from countries that have enacted DRR legislation in recent years and UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

³ Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

⁴ Roberts, D. 2008. “Thinking globally, acting locally — institutionalizing climate change at the local government level in Durban, South Africa”, *Environment and Urbanization*. Vol. 20 (2): pp. 521-537.

⁵ One such initiative is led by ECHO, Mercy Corps and Nepal Red Cross in selected high disaster risk communities of Nepal.

⁶ Based on review of process documentation of some of the recent legislative processes and Matin, N. & Taher, M. 2002. “The Changing Emphasis of Disasters in Bangladesh NGOs”, *Disasters*. Vol. 25 (3): pp. 227-239.

⁷ Gebrekiros, A. et al. 2009. *Baseline Report: Africa Community Resilience Project*. Medford: Feinstein International Center.

varied across countries. The effectiveness of National Platforms is being assessed based on the experience of the last ten years. Literature is beginning to emerge on what works and what doesn't, and what are the characteristics of an effective National Platform.⁸

Gaps

There is very limited literature on the process aspect of institutional and legislative systems. It is easy to find a compilation of recently enacted disaster risk reduction related legislations but extremely difficult to find documentation on the process that led to the formulation, enactment and implementation of the provisions of the new legislation. During the course of this literature review, only one such example was found. This pertained to legal reform Indonesia and imparted very useful insights.⁹ In addition, there is useful normative material from the Pacific region (an 8-step process for national action planning) but it does not analyze how the process actually went in specific countries and what can be learned from it.

Among the “innovative” approaches described in the literature, most of the focus is on “technocratic” solutions or at the most “awareness raising” type of activities. There is little documentation on innovative practices on governance aspects of disaster risk reduction.¹⁰

HFA Priority for Action 2: Understanding Risk, Early Warning Systems

Findings

Over the last five years, the importance of risk assessment as a basis for development (and risk reduction) decision-making has been firmly established. At present, there are numerous initiatives underway to undertake risk assessment at the national and regional levels.¹¹ There are also examples of territorial risk assessments (particularly in high risk urban areas) being commissioned by national and sub-national authorities.¹² However, progress on risk assessments at the local level has been limited.¹³

Based on the review of the literature, the following overall patterns emerge in the area of risk assessments:

⁸ Sanahuja, H. E. for IFRC & UNISDR. 2010. *National Platforms for Disaster Risk reduction in the Americas: A critical analysis of these processes five years after the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Unpublished.

⁹ Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana, UNDP. 2009. *Lessons Learned: Disaster Management Legal Reform – The Indonesian Experience*. Jakarta: UNDP.

¹⁰ Compilation of innovative ideas such as “IDRC: 100 Ideas for Action” present very useful ideas but limit themselves to “technical” domain and seldom get into how some innovation could be brought about within the political life of a country to support disaster risk reduction efforts.

¹¹ Examples include regional level assessments of varying scope and technical rigour in Central America, South Asia, Southeastern Europe and Central Asia as well as numerous national level risk assessments supported by initiatives such as the Central American Probabilistic Risk Assessment (CAPRA) and the Global Risk Identification Programme (GRIP).

¹² Examples include city level multi-hazard risk assessments commissioned by cities of Amman and Aqaba in Jordan and the city of Delhi in India.

¹³ Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

- Scientifically-based risk assessments often do not connect with local level community based vulnerability and capacity assessments (VCA). There has been an increase in both scientifically-based risk assessments and the traditional VCAs but this has been almost in parallel without many concerted efforts towards bringing them together. Stray efforts to bring these together have largely remained at the pilot stage.¹⁴
- There is limited networking and collaboration across various players involved in risk assessments. There is a sizeable number of practitioners in this area but as such they do not yet form a vibrant *community of practice*; and
- In spite of the efforts of several international, regional and national entities, data sharing, harmonization of data management systems and inter-operability of various systems remains a major challenge. There are few examples of integration of datasets held by different agencies of the government and the private sector. Some regions have begun to make progress in this area (e.g. in the Pacific, Pacific Cities Project has brought together datasets on infrastructure, critical facilities, building location and characteristics, seismic microzonation, topography and bathymetry.)¹⁵.
- There are a few examples of linking risk assessments to innovative risk management solutions (for example, development of innovative micro-insurance products). However, these efforts have not achieved a critical scale to become wide spread practice.

Significant progress has been made in the area of early warning systems. However, many general improvements in the area of risk communication and early warning systems are primarily as a result of proliferation of better technology (like the use of mobile phone networks for improved risk management in the fisheries sector). Following are the main trends:

- There are numerous efforts currently underway to improve early warning systems at the regional/ national levels¹⁶ but the connection with local systems remains tenuous.
- Some of the literature sources indicate that there is greater progress on improving early warning systems for high visibility hazards (often with low frequency, high impact events) such as volcanoes and tsunamis and less progress on more frequent but less spectacular hazards.
- There are relatively few examples of integration of indigenous knowledge and scientifically-based early warning systems.

HFA Priority for Action 3: Knowledge and Education

Findings

¹⁴ Mercer, J. et al. 2009. "Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction", *Disasters*. Vol. 34 (1): pp. 214-39.

¹⁵ SOPAC Secretariat. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015*. Suva: SOPAC. Page 26.

¹⁶ Examples include Pacific Malenian Volcanic Network, Climate Predictions Project, HYCOs.

Public awareness of natural hazards and their potential impact on the lives and livelihoods of vulnerable populations is at an all time high. Over the last five years, efforts of governments, civil society organizations and the media have contributed to this. There is clear evidence that the mass media is now projecting a more nuanced understanding of natural disasters rather than present them as “acts of god.” There are signs of progress in terms of exploring new channels of communications (such as community radio, street theatre) and improved use of more traditional channels (like newspapers) for awareness generation. However, there is no clear evidence that enhanced awareness has translated into concerted action.¹⁷ In many countries “projectization” of public awareness generation work is being observed with excessive focus on production of IEC materials. The effectiveness of such public awareness generation work in terms of risk reduction is not clearly established. Work on HFA Priority for Action 3 has not necessarily led to more responsive governance in terms of risk reduction. Communities at risk are still not adequately aware of their entitlements, rights and responsibilities in the context of risk reduction. There are few examples in the literature of campaigns where enhanced awareness has translated into public action and greater accountability.¹⁸

Over the last ten years, the notion of incorporating disaster reduction in school curricula has been pursued with great enthusiasm. A perception survey of children and young people undertaken in ten countries indicates that these respondent groups think that most progress has been made in this area.¹⁹ However, there is little evidence in the literature to suggest that this has been done within the framework of overall education sector strategic planning at the national level. Complexity of incorporating new material in the school curricula is often underestimated. A study undertaken in the Asia Pacific region observes that this requires “strong national political will, a systematic approach and sustained action” and that “the institutional and technical capacity in many countries [to do this] is still weak, and the financial resources needed to build these capacities are limited.”²⁰ There are few examples that address DRR education needs in a systematic manner.²¹

School safety has received a lot of political support. However, the political will in this area is not necessarily translating into practical strategies for implementation as evidenced by allocation of local and national resources for school safety.

At the tertiary education level, disaster risk reduction is gradually becoming established as a discipline of study. There are more mid-career professional development opportunities now than ever before. Some regions have established international distance learning programmes in disaster risk reduction. Once such example is where six Pacific island nations have been

¹⁷ Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

¹⁸ Christian Aid’s work on “Community-led policy monitoring for disaster risk reduction” is one of the few examples in literature that present guidance to help civil society organisations and communities to better monitor, influence and secure commitment to the HFA.

¹⁹ Plan International, World Vision International. 2009. *Children on the Frontline: Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction*. Page 18.

²⁰ Tran, H. P. for UNISDR. 2009. *Regional Analysis on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Education in the Asia Pacific Region: In the Context of Priority of Action 3 of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Page 25.

²¹ A collaborative multi-country effort led by Kyoto University in partnership with University of Madras (India), Institute of Technology Bandung (Indonesia) and University of Perdeniya (Sri Lanka) is one of the few examples in the literature where a systematic effort has been made to identify the education needs of a variety of target groups ranging from school teachers to local government planners to NGOs to community leaders.

participating in a Post-Graduate Certificate in Disaster Management by distance learning offered by Swinburne University of Technology, Australia.²² However, such efforts are not necessarily a part of any coherent national human resource strategy for disaster risk reduction.

An overall pattern that can be discerned from the survey of the literature is that while there is a proliferation of documentation on 'lessons learned', 'comparative experiences' and 'good practices', there are relatively few examples of turning these into established ways of doing the business of development. Beyond the high level guidance (such as guidance for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in CCA/ UNDAF), this literature survey did not come across practical (and binding) DRR guidance to inform the work of national and international development agencies.

The progress on different aspects of this priority for action varies greatly from region to region. For example, Europe shows more progress on access to information and awareness strategies and relatively less on school curricula and research methods.²³ In other regions such as Asia²⁴, greater progress has been made on incorporating disaster risk reduction in the school curricula.²⁵ In Africa, the need for including disaster risk reduction in school curricula is well recognized but inadequacy of resources for doing thus is cited as a constraint.²⁶

Gaps

Following are the main gaps in the literature to review progress on this HFA Priority for Action:

- While there are examples of public awareness programmes, this literature survey did not come across studies that systematically assess the effectiveness of various public awareness generation strategies in actually achieving risk reduction.
- This literature survey came across only one example²⁷ where linkage between HFA priority for action 3 and 1 is explored i.e how greater public awareness can translate into greater accountability of governance systems towards risk reduction.
- The literature review did not come across integrated national strategies for public awareness, education and knowledge management.

²² ESCAP. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in Asia and the Pacific: Follow-up to the Outcome of the Third Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction – From the Regional to the Global Platform*. Bangkok: ESCAP. Pages 22, 37.

²³ Council of Europe, German Committee for Disaster Reduction, UNISDR. 2009. *Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action in Europe: Advances and Challenges*.

²⁴ Based on "Key Progress Made on the Hyogo Framework for Action –Focusing on HFA Priority 3", presentation by Jerry Velasquez, Senior Regional Coordinator for UNISDR Asia and Pacific. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/4/43683917.pdf>

²⁵ Tran, H. P. 2009. *Regional Analysis on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Education in the Asia Pacific Region: In the Context of Priority of Action 3 of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Bangkok: UNISDR.

²⁶ International Institute for Sustainable Development. 2009. "ARC Briefing Note on the Second Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Consultative Meeting". *IISD Reporting Services*. Volume 19 (1).

²⁷ Christian Aid. 2007. *Community-led Policy Monitoring for Disaster Risk Reduction: A Collection of Practice Notes*.

HFA Priority for Action 4: Addressing Underlying Factors of Risk

Findings

This area accounts for least progress. Some literature sources attribute this to “inadequate understanding” of underlying factors of risk. The mainstream planning processes of many governments are beginning to reflect disaster risk reduction concerns.²⁸ However, such concerns are an “add-on” rather than “hard wired” in the key development sectors. There are very few examples where “economic and productive sectoral policies” have incorporated risk reduction in an explicit manner.²⁹ This is not to say that there is no risk management practice within the sectors. It is just that such efforts are not focused on disaster risk. At the local level there is an increasing recognition of linkages between natural resource management and disaster risk reduction issues.³⁰

Disaster risk assessments do not go far enough to analyze the risk of loss of economic output in sectors. Progress has been made on development of building codes and by laws for risk reduction. However, enforcement remains weak. The role of “Spatial Planning and Land Use Control” in shaping risk patterns is recognized but there are other powerful drivers that overshadow risk reduction concerns. Integration of risk reduction in infrastructure projects is one of the most promising area right now but most of the action has been very one-sided. For example, a highways project would take into account the risk that the project itself is exposed to but may not adequately take into account how it is likely to reconfigure risk territorially.

The last five years have seen a lot of innovation in developing new products for risk transfer at different levels (ranging from weather-indexed insurance for small farmers³¹ to catastrophic risk financing for nation states³²). However, on the whole, this area of work is still at a pilot stage.

The notion of differential vulnerability – recognizing that different social groups are vulnerable in different ways and hence need to be supported in different ways – and the impact of larger global processes on the most vulnerable are not being adequately taken into account in policies and programmes. However, at the academic/ technical level the interest in this area is high. A number of studies have been undertaken in different parts of the world. In a few cases where these issues are addressed, it is through a “tinkering at the edges” type of interventions (such as provision of food aid or seasonal cash-for-work programmes through social welfare departments) rather than more structural approaches. The linkage

²⁸ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

²⁹ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Page 131.

³⁰ Plan International, World Vision International. 2009. *Children on the Frontline: Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction*.

³¹ Weather Risk Management Association. “Weather Risk and Agriculture”, http://www.wrma.org/risk_agriculture.html. Accessed 24/11/2010.

³² Cummins, J. D. Mahul, O. for The World Bank. 2008. *Catastrophe Risk Financing in Developing Countries Principles for Public Intervention*. Washington: The World Bank.

between MDGs and disasters has been articulated in literature³³ but there is little evidence of this being translated into specific programmes.

Similarly, the need for integration between climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction is now well recognized, functional linkages in policy and practice remain inadequate at the local and national levels. Resources and implementation mechanism also remain largely separate.³⁴ This review could find very few examples of integrated risk assessments³⁵ – taking into account risks emanating from natural climate variability (based on historical records), observed climate change trends, and projected climate change -- that drive risk management practices. In the context of risks emanating from a changing climate, there seem to be three kinds of practices in practice: vulnerability reduction; adjustment of risk management practices over time; and diversifying the risk. Most of the current emphasis is on the first type.

At the same time, at the local level there is a plethora of small-scale projects that attempt to address underlying factors. These include small bio-engineering projects and community infrastructure projects.³⁶

Gaps

- It is possible that risk reduction approaches are implicit in some of the sectoral work. This literature review hasn't gone through the literature emanating from development sectors.

HFA Priority for Action 5: Preparedness for Response

Findings

Good progress is reported on establishing the institutional framework for preparedness and response. Many countries now have clearly defined national, sub-national and local levels mechanisms to manage disaster response. However, financial allocations, especially at the local level, for managing response remain uneven across countries.³⁷ Not many countries have established well-defined emergency funding mechanisms at all administrative levels. Many countries have national or sub-national mechanisms but at the local level there is no funding allocation for emergency response. The flow of funds from higher administrative levels is often reported to be slow.

³³ UNDP. 2004. *Reducing Disaster Risk: a Challenge for Development*. New York: UNDP.

³⁴ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations.

³⁵ Examples include World Bank supported risk assessment in Madagascar and UNDP supported assessments in Armenia, Ecuador, Indonesia and Mozambique.

³⁶ One such example is from Nepal where localization of HFA has largely led to bio-engineering/small scale mitigation projects. Based on Gautam, D. R. Khanal, S. 2009. *Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction: Contribution to Hyogo Framework of Action – Case Study*. Lalitpur: Mercy Corps Nepal.

³⁷ Based on various regional reports and Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*.

Over the last five years, there has been major emphasis on developing contingency plans. These vary a lot in terms of scope and geographical coverage and are often static documents that are not updated as risk patterns change or capacities at different administrative levels develop.³⁸ This literature review did not come across any evidence that indicates that inclusion of early recovery or recovery dimensions in these plans is a rarity. There is a major issue of inadequate participation in the formulation of contingency plans. Risk reduction in recovery or “Build back better” is now well accepted but on the ground there are many missed opportunities. Stand-alone DRR efforts, particularly strengthened early warning systems type of interventions, tend to overshadow the more challenging aspects of integrating risk reduction in recovery sectors. Capacities to quickly influence the recovery processes are weak.

6.0 Challenges faced in undertaking this literature review

- As mentioned above in Section 2.0, establishing a baseline for 2005 proved to be extremely difficult given limited systematized material from that period. A number of global reports produced between 1999 to 2005 provide useful insights.³⁹ The findings of these reports, however, are at a highly aggregated level and are mostly presenting country cases on an anecdotal basis in support of specific thematic discussion. The 2004 UNDP report, “Reducing Disaster Risk” presents a picture of global risk but does not provide a status update of disaster risk reduction efforts.
- A large part of the review was based on material that is essentially a collection of institutional progress reports describing progress made at different geographical levels: local, national, regional and international. These documents indicate that HFA has indeed become a widely accepted guiding framework for a large variety of organizations. However, this category of documents largely capture the contribution made by specific institutions through their own work and therefore bring in specific institutional perspective rather than a complete view of the progress and gaps.
- A lot of the progress on HFA is implicit in the work of different development sectors and as such does not necessarily use the disaster risk reduction parlance. This is particularly true in relation to HFA Priority of Action 3 & 4. For example, digitization of land records⁴⁰ in India combined with strengthening of local governments will support improved planning practices and will have a disaster risk reduction benefit. Similarly, public administration reform and capacity development of local level government officials will be a building block of disaster risk reduction efforts in the country.⁴¹ Such efforts are not reflected in mainstream disaster risk reduction literature. The time frame of this literature review and the sheer magnitude of documents that should have been consulted prevented this kind of investigation to take place.

³⁸ UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Page 136.

³⁹ The four most notable documents during this period are: Natural Disaster Management (1999), Living with Risk (2001), Know Risk (2004) and Reducing Disaster Risk: a challenge for development (2004).

⁴⁰ Ministry of Communication and Information Technology, Government of India. “Land Records”, <http://www.mit.gov.in/content/land-records>. Accessed 24/11/2010.

⁴¹ Government of Timor Leste. “Programme of the 4th Constitutional Government”, <http://timor-leste.gov.tl/?p=16&lang=en>. Accessed 24/11/2010.

- Limitations of country, regional reports: This review has looked at a large number of country and regional reports. These reports capture the progress on disaster risk reduction to varying depths. As a result, comparability is a big issue. The analysis of country reports undertaken by the “Global Assessment Report 2009” as well as the report “Views from the Frontline” have tried to address this challenge. This literature review relies heavily on this work.

Overall Gaps in the literature

A review of the literature on different aspects of the implementation of HFA leaves a number of gaps in our understanding of the progress on implementation of HFA priorities for action. These gaps fall into three broad categories:

- *Gaps in understanding of processes:* The existing literature imparts limited insights on *process* aspects of disaster risk reduction. For example, it is possible to find information on different pieces of legislation but not on the wider political process that led to the enactment of a legislation and implementation of its provisions. The literature on “innovation” also tends to focus on “technocratic” aspects rather than share insights on processes.
- *Gaps in evidence base on effectiveness of different approaches:* While there is a lot of normative guidance available on different aspects of disaster risk reduction, there is little by way of empirical evidence on the effectiveness of different approaches. For example, the evidence base on effectiveness of public awareness generation approaches currently in vogue is limited. Similarly, there is limited evidence base on effectiveness of different institutional frameworks in different overall governance contexts.
- *Gaps in our understanding of risk reduction work that is implicit in the work of different development sectors:* It is possible that risk reduction approaches are implicit in some of the sectoral work. However, few attempts have so far been made to systematically review literature emanating from these sectors to understand this aspect better. One challenge in doing this is that the terms and concepts often used by other development sectors are different from the one in use in the disaster risk reduction arena. This gap can be addressed partly by undertaking case studies in selected sectors.

Literature Review Bibliography

ActionAid International. 2006. *Disaster Risk Reduction: Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8847_AImplementinghyogo.pdf>.

African Union Commission, The World Bank, UNISDR. 2009. *Status Report on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-Saharan Africa: Contributing to the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the African Regional Strategy*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12061_UpdatedAfricaStatusReport17Sept09.pdf>.

Asian Conference on Disaster Reduction. 2007. *Summary Report 25-27 June 2007*. Available at <http://www.adrc.asia/acdr/2007_summary.html>.

Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Asian Disaster Reduction Center, UNISDR. 2007. *Regional Synthesis Report on HFA Implementation in Asia and Pacific: An Overview of Reports by Countries up to 2007*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10503_RegionalSynthesisReportFinalVersion.pdf>.

Asian Disaster Reduction Center. 2008. *Total Disaster Risk Management: Good Practices 2008*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9052_TDRM08.pdf>.

Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana, UNDP. 2009. *Lessons Learned: Disaster Management Legal Reform – The Indonesian Experience*. Jakarta: UNDP. Available at <<http://www.undp.or.id/pubs/docs/Lessons%20Learned%20Disaster%20Management%20Legal%20Reform.pdf>>.

Christian Aid. 2007. *Community-led Policy Monitoring for Disaster Risk Reduction: A Collection of Practice Notes*. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=1055>>.

Council of Europe, EUR-OPA, UNISDR. 2008. *Twinning of National Platforms - A European Perspective: Concept Note*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8902_200830EN1.pdf>.

Council of Europe, German Committee for Disaster Reduction, UNISDR. *Implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action in Europe: Advances and Challenges*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9452_V114.05HFABLEU7.pdf>.

- Council of Europe, German Committee for Disaster Reduction, UNISDR. 2008. *Disaster risk reduction in Europe: Overview of European national platforms, Hyogo Framework for Action focal points and regional organizations/institutions*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7651_DRRin_europe1.pdf>.
- Cummins, J. D. Mahul, O. for The World Bank. 2008. *Catastrophe Risk Financing in Developing Countries Principles for Public Intervention*. Washington: The World Bank. Available at <http://gfdrr.org/docs/Track-II_Catrisk_financing_Overview_booklet.pdf>.
- ESCAP. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in Asia and the Pacific: Follow-up to the Outcome of the Third Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction – From the Regional to the Global Platform*. Bangkok: ESCAP. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8729_CDRINF41.pdf>.
- European Commission Humanitarian Aid, UNISDR. 2006. *Disaster Risk Reduction: 20 Examples of Good Practices from Central Asia*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2300_20GoodExamplesofGoodPractice.pdf>.
- European Union and Islamic Relief. 2008. *Witnesses account, contributing towards Hyogo Framework for Action: community-based disaster preparedness – Bangladesh*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8728_IslamicreliefBGDCaseStudytowardsHFA1.pdf>.
- Galperin, A. for UNISDR. 2009. *Regional Synthesis Report on Implementation of the HFA in Asia and Pacific 2007 – 2008/09*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11776_HFAasia.pdf>.
- Gautam, D. R. Khanal, S. 2009. *Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction: Contribution to Hyogo Framework for Action – Case Study*. Latipur: Mercy Corps Nepal. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10365_casestudynepal.pdf>.
- Gebrekiros, A. Hailu, S. Maxwell, D. Mukwavi, M. Tadesse, G. Zewold, W. G. 2009. *Baseline Report: Africa Community Resilience Project*. Medford: Feinstein International Center. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12233_baselinerreport.pdf>.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: A local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9822_9822VFLfullreport06091.pdf>.

- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2008. *Visión de primera línea: manual para 2008-2009*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7842_manualproyectovisiondeprimeralineaabreviado1.pdf>.
- Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. 2009. *Recommendations of National Platforms to the Chair and participants of the second session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10265_NPRRecommendationsFinalEnglish.pdf>.
- Global Risk Forum, UNISDR. 2009. *IDRC Davos 2008: "100 Ideas for Action" to support the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Davos: Global Risk Forum. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10642_Brochure100Ideas.pdf>.
- Government of Timor Leste. "Programme of the 4th Constitutional Government", <<http://timor-leste.gov.tl/?p=16&lang=en>>. Accessed 24/11/2010.
- Houghton, R. 2006. *Joint Evaluation of the International Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami: Synthesis Report*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2097_VL108905.pdf>.
- Indonesian Red Cross (PMI). 2008. *Light up: Indonesian Red Cross Contribution towards the Hyogo Framework of Action*.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. 2006. *The Hyogo Framework for Action and the International Federation*. Geneva: IFRC. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8323_hyogoframeworkfederationen1.pdf>.
- International Institute for Sustainable Development. 2009. "ARC Briefing Note on the Second Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Consultative Meeting". *IISD Reporting Services*. Volume 19 (1). Available at <<http://www.iisd.ca/africa/brief/briefing1901e.pdf>>.
- Maalouf, S. for World Vision. 2009. *Views from the Frontline: Country Report for Lebanon*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10263_Lebanoncountryreport.pdf>.
- Matin, N. & Taher, M. 2002. "The Changing Emphasis of Disasters in Bangladesh NGOs", *Disasters*. Vol. 25 (3): pp. 227-239.

- Mercer, J. Kelman, I. Taranis, L. and Suchet-Pearson, S. 2009. "Framework for integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge for disaster risk reduction", *Disasters*. Vol. 34 (1): pp. 214-39.
- Ministry of Communication and Information Technology, Government of India. "Land Records", <<http://www.mit.gov.in/content/land-records>>. Accessed 24/11/2010.
- National Agency for Disaster Management Indonesia. 2008. *Profile & Directory Disaster Risk Reduction Organisations in Indonesia 2008*. Available at <http://digilib-ampl.net/detail/detail.php?kode=2875&row=6&tp=pustaka&ktg=buku&kd_li nk=>>.
- Plan International, World Vision International. 2009. *Children on the Frontline: Children and Young People in Disaster Risk Reduction*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10576_13121ChildrenontheFrontlineGPreport.pdf>.
- Roberts, D. 2008. "Thinking globally, acting locally — institutionalizing climate change at the local government level in Durban, South Africa", *Environment and Urbanization*. Vol. 20 (2): pp. 521-537.
- Sanahuja, H. E. for IFRC & UNISDR. 2010. *National Platforms for Disaster Risk reduction in the Americas: A critical analysis of these processes five years after the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Unpublished.
- Sharma, A. 2009. *Progress Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in the Asia and Pacific Region*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12082_ProgressReviewofNationalPlatformsfo.pdf>.
- Shaw, R. 2009. *Building Resilience to Tsunami in the Indian Ocean: Action Research, IEC and Practices*. Kyoto: Kyoto University Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10910_BuildingResilience.pdf>.
- SOPAC Secretariat. 2009. *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for action 2005-2015*. Suva: SOPAC. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10641_MR06741.pdf>.
- Sustainable Environmental and Ecological Development Society. 2006. *SEEDS Annual Report 2005-06*. New Delhi: SEEDS. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2696_1annual20report20050620with20pics.pdf>.

- Tearfund, UNISDR. 2007. *Institutional Donor Progress with Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1199_DRR20donor20progress2020071.pdf>.
- Tearfund. 2008. *Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2012 Framework*. Bonn Climate Change Talks 2-13 June 2008. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8936_DRR20post201229thMay1.pdf>.
- The World Bank, UNISDR. 2009. *GFDRR Track 1: Building Global and Regional Partnership – FY08 Mid-Term Report to the World Bank Development Grant Facility*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7760_GFDRRTrack1MidTermReport.pdf>.
- The World Bank, UNISDR. 2009. *GFDRR Track 1: Building Global and Regional Partnership – Giving Risk Reduction a Regional Dimension*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/9923_GFDRRTrack1GivingRiskReductionaRegi.pdf>.
- Tran, H. P. for UNISDR. 2009. *Regional Analysis on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Education in the Asia Pacific Region: In the Context of Priority of Action 3 of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/12081_RegionalAnalysisonDRREducationinthe.pdf>.
- UNDP. 2004. *Reducing Disaster Risk: a Challenge for Development*. New York: UNDP. Available at <http://www.undp.org/cpr/whats_new/rdr_english.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2005. *Progress Report on the Matrix of Commitment and Initiatives to Support the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1039_inf11progressreportmatrixcommitmentIATF12.doc>.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Acting with Common Purpose: Proceedings of the first session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva, 5-7 June 2007*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1464_GPActingwithcommonpurpose.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Evaluation and Strengthening of Early Warning Systems in Countries Affected by the 26 December 2004 Tsunami*. Bonn: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/3609_TEWSdonorreport.pdf>.
- UNISDR. 2007. *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf>.

UNISDR. 2008. *Indicators of Progress: Guidance on Measuring the Reduction of Disaster Risks and the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action*. Geneva: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2259_IndicatorsofProgressHFA.pdf>.

UNISDR. 2008. *La Gestión del Riesgo de Desastres Hoy: Contextos Globales, Herramientas Locales*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2280_gestiondelriesgo.pdf>.

UNISDR. 2008. *Policy Note: Thematic partnerships for disaster risk reduction and the development of ISDR Thematic Platforms*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2764_ThematicPlatforms020608.pdf>.

UNISDR. 2008. *United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction activities in Central Asia*. Dushanbe: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10834_10834UNISDRactivitiesinCAeng1.pdf>.

UNISDR. 2009. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction – Risk and poverty in a changing climate*. Geneva: United Nations. Available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/report/index.php?id=9413>>.

UNISDR. 2009. *Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Creating linkages for a Safer Tomorrow*. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11963_GP09Proceedings.pdf>.

UNISDR. 2010. *Protecting Development Gains: 2008-2009 Biennial Report and 2010-2011 Work Plan Highlights*. Bangkok: UNISDR. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/13210_ISDRAP0809reportreduced1.pdf>.

United Nations General Assembly. 2009. 64th Session, Item 55(c). *Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction*. (A/64/280). Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/11127_SGReportonISDReng09.pdf>.

Velasquez, J. “Key Progress Made on the Hyogo Framework for Action – Focusing on HFA Priority 3”, presentation by the Senior Regional Coordinator for UNISDR Asia and Pacific. Available at <<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/4/43683917.pdf>>.

Walker, P. Wisner, B. 2005. *Beyond Kobe: A Proactive Look at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction - 18-22 January 2005, Kobe, Japan*. Medford: Feinstein International Famine Center. Available at <http://www.preventionweb.net/files/2609_BeyondKobe.pdf>.

Weather Risk Management Association. "Weather Risk and Agriculture", <http://www.wrma.org/risk_agriculture.html>. Accessed 24/11/2010.