SUMMARY OF MID-TERM REVIEW ONLINE DEBATE

Topic 3: Integration of climate change in HFA implementation

Dates: 12-23 July

Question:
How should climate change adaptation be integrated in the next five years of the HFA implementation?

Sub-questions:
What kind of policy and programmatic linkages have proven to be helpful for the integration of DRR and climate change adaptation?
What would be the most conducive institutional arrangements at the national level to realize stronger integration between DRR and climate change?

Rationale
Although the HFA recognized the importance of promoting the integration of risk reduction associated with climate change into strategies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, this issue has come to the forefront of the international debate only in more recent years. This question aims at exploring ways in which climate change adaptation programming and funding should be integrated in the next five years of HFA implementation and beyond.

The third online debate, organized as part of the Mid-Term Review of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) coordinated by the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), aimed at exploring integration of climate change in HFA implementation. It took place between the 12th and the 23rd of July, 2010 on PreventionWeb.net, and was moderated by Dr. Joern Birkmann, Head of Vulnerability Assessment for the Risk Management & Adaptive Planning Section at the United Nations University.

Overall the debate sought new perspectives and insights by inviting participants to consider three specific questions: “how should climate change adaptation be integrated in the next five years of the HFA implementation?”, “what kind of policy and programmatic linkages have proven to be helpful for the integration of DRR and climate change adaptation?” and “what would be the most conducive institutional arrangements at the national level to realize stronger integration between DRR and climate change?” It counted over 170 registered users, and saw the active participation of 45 individuals affiliated with international organizations, research institutes, non-governmental organizations or expressing their views in personal capacity. The following is a thematic summary of the major points raised in the course of the debate.

Key ideas expressed in the course of the debate covered a number of areas; indeed, the majority of the participants stressed the importance of harmonizing and integrating the frameworks and policies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation (CCA) within the broader context of poverty reduction and sustainable development. It was in fact highlighted that - whilst experts talked of these issues as of belonging to different fields - these converged at the household level and therefore had to be dealt with in a holistic manner.

On the other hand, some pointed out that states struggled in promoting integrated multi-sectoral strategies, as the agencies/ministries in-charge of these issues seldom interacted. It was reminded that governments were being called upon to “harmonize and link” areas under the control of separate authorities, in spite of the fact that such authorities often sought to expand their own area of influence with little intention to share responsibilities and resources with other departments. Overall, participants agreed that the fragmentation of responsibilities among ministries and agencies at national level was a complex challenge to overcome due to the natural internal competition over resources, powers, and influence.

Similarly, it was also agreed that practitioners and proponents of both DRR and CCA focused too narrowly on their own vested interests while attempting to mainstream or integrate the other side into their own domain. One participant in particular highlighted that the current efforts to integrate DRR and CCA per-se signaled “the ontological and epistemological fact of their disintegration and divides.” Indeed, some stressed that both DRR and CCA had to be treated and used as lenses to guide development and poverty reduction programs, as preaching for the integration of one into the other was “less meaningful than joining hands and forces to work together”.

Nevertheless, participants also emphasized that these two fields were not easy to integrate, as their work was based upon different institutional paths. It was suggested that DRR and CCA worked more effectively at the local rather than regional or international level as in the former actions were not excessively affected by the competing interests of state departments and international organizations. In response to the comments above, a number of participants stressed that not all DRR practitioners suggested or believed that disaster risk reduction had to be considered the “ultimate or fundamental process” into which integrate other approaches.

Such attitude nevertheless was not shared by all participants. Some comments in fact considered climate change “one disaster amongst many” and reiterated that it naturally fell within the DRR domain. Indeed, they strongly advocated for the integration of CCA in HFA implementation in order to draw upon the expertise of the DRR community. On the contrary, other comments warned participants of the dangers of such an approach. In doing so it was stressed that climate change per-se was not a disaster; indeed a number of participants rejected its categorization as ‘natural hazard’ and advocated for the use of a neutral definition which would reflect both the positive and negative consequences of the phenomenon.

On a more practical level, some pointed to the benefits deriving from a common resilience framework. These included the development of unified tools supporting greater coherence and coordination between the different approaches; a reduction in the duplication of efforts leading to the optimized use of available resources; an increased potential for harmonization promoting collaborative alliances and joint actions between the different disciplines; and the ability to provide better guidance for policy makers and practitioners in programme design, implementation, and evaluation. Moreover, it was suggested that a common framework could inform policy advocacy aimed at the formulation of appropriate DRR polices and legislation at national and regional levels and - on top of this - form the basis for an independent locally-based monitoring and reporting process with associated indicators.

Other comments warned participants against exaggerating the benefits of an integrated approach; in particular, some felt that CCA was already implicitly addressed in HFA implementation. It was in fact

stressed that good DRR practices were - as a matter of fact - taking into account climate change “just as they were taking into account indigenous knowledge, gender issues, and socio-economic conditions.” Nevertheless, it was reiterated that some simple practical actions - such as the involvement of climate change bodies in national platforms and the inclusion CCA actions in HFA reporting - could help strengthening the visibility of CCA in the HFA and ISDR frameworks.

Some comments moreover stressed that there was an urgent need to collect and share specific information across the two fields. In this context it was highlighted that the international community needed to determine which key structural and non-structural DRR measures were in place in specific high-risk locations in order to link these with CCA ones. As such, it was further reiterated that alongside the development of a common framework - deemed necessary - it was important to think of quality criteria and procedural elements that allowed for better integration of DRR and CCA based on the promotion of scientific and technical knowledge.

In addition, it was also suggested that coherence and cohesion between DRR and CCA could be enhanced by focusing upon coordinated actions that addressed the underlying drivers of people's vulnerability. One participant in particular stressed that - whilst the two communities could be affiliated to different national ministries and separate funding structures at the national level - at the local level both disasters and climate change shared similar underlying root causes that cut across spatial, temporal and normative differences.

A restricted number of participants at last rejected the notion that CCA should be integrated in HFA implementation. One in particular considered both the HFA and ISDR “too small institutions to be able to include climate change into their agendas and activities.” Indeed, it was stressed that the integration of climate change in HFA implementation - although necessary at the conceptual level - required institutions with much larger capacities in order to adequately carry out the tasks at stake. Other participants on the contrary reiterated that the creation of new institutions was not a useful approach. Indeed, it was reported that future success lied in the integration of CCA and DRR in the design, planning and financing procedures of existing institutions so to enhance the use of current methodologies and conceptual frameworks.

Nevertheless, other comments also doubted the usefulness of such methodologies and frameworks. One comment in particular reminded participants that the problem was not “climate change itself, but the conditions of vulnerability that accumulated over the decades, such as lack of planning, inadequate resources exploitation, and environmental degradation.” In this context it was stressed that HFA’s action in relation to climate change had to focus on identifying and reducing the physical vulnerability of those populations living in areas of greatest impact for the occurrence of extreme natural phenomena by promoting sound management of generated risk.

Other participants built upon such point, and reported on different initiatives revolving around alternative methodological frameworks. One of these in particular, named Climate-Smart Disaster Risk Management (CSDRM) - an approach promoted by Christian Aid, the Sussex Institute of Development Studies, and Plan International and consisting in tackling “the effects of climate change on disaster risk by assessing and acting on changes to the frequency and severity of hazards, preparing for increasing uncertainty through enhancing adaptive capacity and addressing poverty, vulnerability and their causes” - was mentioned multiple times as a paramount example of how to ensure the sustainability of disaster risk management activities in a changing climate.

Again, such comments triggered contrasting views. One participant in particular stressed that at a civil society level practitioners were in danger of “going overboard in terms of tools and development of frameworks.” It was highlighted that the CSDRM tool was in fact not very different from others available DRR tools which had been utilized and/or adapted for CCA. Indeed, it was reiterated that it

was important to review and evaluate existing tools before “moving ahead and reinventing the wheel yet again.”

Interestingly, a few other comments questioned the appropriateness of the term mainstreaming; it was in fact highlighted that this was “yet another platitude that slips off our tongues and keyboards easily.” More specifically, by drawing upon the example of gender mainstreaming, one participant stressed that mainstreaming simply led to the burying of specific concerns under the general activities UN agencies or government ministries, making it “everyone's business and nobody's business, as everyone's accountable and no one's accountable.” It was hence reiterated that building DRR and CCA into government programs, institutional mandates, and educational curriculums was necessary, yet that such action could lead to efficiency loss “under the weight of bureaucratic inaction.”

Transcript:

Topic 3: Integration of climate change in HFA implementation

Dear Participants of the online discussion on the Integration of Climate Change in the Hyogo Framework,
The UN is looking for your recommendations on how to improve the integration of climate change in disaster risk reduction and more particular, in the Hyogo Framework of Action (mid-term review process).
FROM GENERAL ARGUMENTS TO SPECIFIC CHALLENGES
From my perspective - major progress has been made on the general argumentation line that disaster risk reduction has to be considered as one tool within climate change adaptation (see e.g. UNFCCC draft negation text).

Less progress has been achieve on how we can effectively link Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation - including the mismatches and constraints we have to consider when aiming to link both.

Although the Hyogo Framework includes climate change as one of the challenges in its preamble (see preamble part A "Challenges posed by disasters"), there is little information on how the relationship between Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation should develop in the future.

NORMS, GUIDING VISIONS, MEASURES and GOVERNANCE
Which norms, guiding visions and measures as well as funding regimes are appropriate? - Which governance structures are needed when aiming to develop integrative and people centred adaptation strategies that include disaster risk reduction? – Most of the internationally funded adaptation strategies have been focusing on the national level, while much of the Disaster Risk Reduction - research and work emphasizes the local scale. These spatial and temporal scale mismatches have to be addressed.

Moreover, many funding regimes established at the international or national level pre-dominantly focus on formal adaptation processes (adaptation strategies of gov. agencies or ministries), while far less attention has been given to informal adaptation processes, for example of urban poor in the Megacities of Asia and South-East Asia.

BEST and BAD PRACTICES
Furthermore, it would be quite interesting to discuss "best" and "bad" practices in linking Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. What can we learn from it? What aspects are context specific? - What kind of aspects and recommendations can be transferred to other regions and cultural contexts?
- Or whether we over stress the importance of climate change.

In this regard, I would be keen to know more on the specific guidelines or strategies that stakeholders in Disaster Risk Reduction apply to consider climate change adaptation aspects for example in disaster response and reconstruction processes. Do we have to modify the humanitarian assistance in order to effectively consider climate change adaptation?

These and other questions might also need to be reviewed in terms of both: how to integrate Climate Change (Adaptation) in Disaster Risk Reduction and how to ensure that the Climate Change

Adaptation discourse also sufficiently acknowledges the experiences and tools within Disaster Risk Reduction (research).

Your comments and input is appreciated!

Joern Birkmann – Moderator
Head, Vulnerability Assessment,
Risk Management & Adaptive Planning Section
UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY
Institute for Environment and Human Security

Dear Participants in the online discussion on the integration of Climate Change in the Hyogo Framework

My background is that I have worked in DRR since the early 1970's, and more recently in seeking to integrate Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and DRR. Currently I am one of the lead authors working on the two year IPCC "Special Study-Adaptation to Climate Change", which is due to be published in 2012. This has been a fascinating, and demanding task, since the project has brought together, for almost the first time in my own experience, a good cross section of the DRR community with the community of researchers and practitioners working within the field of Climate Change. From the rich experience of working with them on the harmonization of the HFA and the CCA agendas, I have two points to raise on the first topics that Joern has helpfully raised for the current online discussion.

My first point, concerns the need for specific evidence of progress, or bottlenecks before we can move much further Yes, there has certainly been solid progress, but I am sure that most of us would agree with the chair of the Second Global Platform Meeting in Geneva in 2009, when she said:
“The overwhelming view of the Global Platform is that urgent action is required to harmonize and link the frameworks and policies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, and to do so within the broader context of poverty reduction and sustainable development. A priority is to incorporate both disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation as core policy and programmatic objectives in national development plans and supporting poverty reduction strategies and country assistance plans. Better preparedness for the humanitarian consequences of climate change is needed, including through early warning systems and local level adaptation."

Global Platform for Disaster Reduction (2009) - Outcome Document: Chair’s Summary of the Second Session, 16-19 June 2009 - UNISDR: Geneva

Website: preventionweb.net/globalplatform/2009/

So, to pick up the Chair's comment, we must recognize the pressing need, not just to harmonize DRR and CCA, but to accept the even greater challenge of linking the fused frameworks with poverty reduction programmes and sustainable development, She then proceeded to identify a key task to incorporate the fused frameworks , or agendas:

"In core policy and programmatic objectives in national development plans, and supporting poverty reduction strategies and country assistance plans."

The rhetoric is just splendid, but where is this very demanding 'incorporation' actually happening? Can any of the participants in this discussion tell us how this has been achieved within their respective countries, and if so what has been the effect? In what way have the DRR, CCA and Millennium

Development Goals been brought together into fully integrated programmes? We also need to know of failures to fuse frameworks and build them into core policy, and why?

My second point concerns the urgent need for specific information. The Global community needs to determine, in specific high risk locations, what are the key structural and non-structural DRR measures that are in place, and which of these are also measures to adapt to climate change? Further, are there climate change adaptation measures in place that are not DRR actions, if so what are they?

It is clear that in most hazard prone countries that there are DRR measures in place that relate to geo-physical hazards, thus they remain outside this debate concerning linked frameworks. Also, within countries experiencing climate change there are likely to be measures in place to tackle exceedingly slow incremental changes that will have devastating long-term consequences. Again adaptive measures may be in place, or are being contemplated, that do not constitute DRR activities. So highly specific diagnostic work is needed, to help decision makers understand what are the links between the HFA and CCA , what are the overlaps and what are not? This data is clearly a prerequisite before the HFA, or the IPCC can become sharp tools that can lay down the groundwork to harmonize parallel agendas and programs, that in turn can lead to actions that actually reduce risks.

The old saying, "if you want better answers, try asking better questions" seems to apply here!

Thank you for your attention, and thank you Joern for effectively launching our discussion.

Ian Davis
Senior Professor in Risk Management for Sustainable Dev. in Lund University, Sweden
Visiting Professor in Cranfield, Oxford Brookes and Kyoto Universities

---

Dear participants,

If I may suggest I was part of a team that wrote the Climate Resilient Cities Primer for the World Bank. It is a participatory process somewhat to the surprise of the Bank and brings the two terms together. They are flip sides of the same coin and it will be useful to consider them as such. Climate change will make extreme events more frequent and of greater intensity. How one identifies pro-actively such impacts is part of the Primer.

One needs to think of expanding the definition of urban infrastructure to include mitigation and adaptation. The capital requirements are significant but systems can be made responsive to accomplish over time the retrofitting and new construction to enhance security and resilience. This is obviously not a short term project but a long term commitment. Consistent access to a stream of human, technical and financial resources is required. International support can start the process but the bulk of resources needs to come from domestic sources.

Regards,

Earl Kessler

Dear all,

It is kind informative that we all are working for DRR. Today its become a challenging for climate and environment. No doubt the earth have the challenge of DRR due to many reasons. But one thing which is most important and would be endorsed by the economic giant of the world.

The voice of the social scientist remains vague because the social scientist are working on the sensitization and advocacy. They could not access on economic perspective. They could not grasp the developed country for rapid developmental production. huge industry and the greed for earning by the Multi nation company MNCs is increasing rapidly. Sky scraping population of developing countries and the threating environment of the earth is on stack. But we cant blame the unaware and poor countries.75% of the worsening environment is due to USA by huge production. The rest of the threating environment by the word. Whereas 3% share in production is from under develop countries of the world. It means we should all work to combat and protest for USA because it has moving the world/earth into catastrophe. I would like it is debatable and we should analyze the things where is going on today.

Amir Ahmed Sahibzada

Hello to all colleagues, and apologies for joining the 'debate' late.
Unfortunately it seems like deja vu, we are in a entirely expected mode of breast thumping about poor progress and making analytically sophisticated statements on why.
I believe we need to be more careful, more measured in what we say and do, and have a somber appraisal of where we are at in making progress at reducing risk and building resilience, and making development more disaster proof.
Lets get real, things are different from when we started. And we do have 'measurable' progress.

There is more awareness, understanding, organized structures, and institutions and communities energized to confront risk, and make their immediate and national environments safer and their livelihood assets better protected.

First of all lets us get our timelines straight. We are at the midpoint of the HFA Implementation decade (2005 to 2015) and happily still have more than half of a decade (5.5 years) to accelerate our progress and make significant leaps in 'building the resilience of communities and nations against disaster risks.' While we are not going to reach zero risk by 31 Dec 2015, we are capable of making the world and each of our local communities a safer place to live and work in. We can build safer schools and hospitals, we can teach children about prevention and protection, et al and we can all be concerned citizens contributing professionally and personally towards these goals.

And if we remember and recognize our earlier start, January 1990, the beginning of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR); our 15 year old mid term effort in 1994 at developing the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World - YSSW (with targets for each country to achieve by the end of that decade,) and our strong commitment in 1999 to building a culture of prevention articulated at the end of that 'first' decade, we have a more realistic time frame in which to bench mark progress.

So in the 20 years since IDNDR began, we have continued building coalitions of girls and boys, women and men; committed citizens; professionals; local, district, provincial and national governments working together for better public safety.

To 'measure' against indicators, let me share one metric axis of DRR progress. In these 19 and a half

years i.e. 234 months, we have walked 157 kilometres on a 495 km DRR journey. (more on the scale I use in a subsequent post.) Just under a third of the way in four fifths of a quarter century.

No progress??? OR is it the good old half full, half empty syndrome?

The first trimester is crucial milestone in a pregnancy.

In any race, getting though the first third of the way is critical.

And since we had a slow start up, lets play catch up in this marathon race. We can aim for the remaining two thirds in five years. OR we can opt to go slower. But We can still be faster than the last twenty.

Lets aim to stop jogging, start running, but not yet sprint. Lets aim to cover 218 kilometers by Dec 2015.

That will still leave us 120 km to cover in the 'third' decade from 2016 onwards. But lets deal with that later.

So in the next 5 and a half years, about 65 months to be precise, we have a lot to do. And we know we have to move faster.
So having measured progress and set targets for the rest of the implementation decade, what should we do now during a HFA mid term review.
Lets recognize our foundation stones. Lets calibrate our pillars, celebrate our small victories, consolidate our core capacities. Lets analyze our wrong turnings, and bad investments.
And lets repeat our successes, routinise them in places they have taken root in.

Lets abandon our failures, retrace our misdirected journeys and not hesitate to signpost them.

And doggedly soldier on, expanding our liberated, risk free, resilient zones.

And tell our stories, meekly and humbly so that others may be inspired to walk the same walk.

So let this MTR benchmark and showcase success, even when it is only 30% there; analyse key sucess factors and visibilise the real champions, individuals and institutions at the grassroots and in the trenches of communities and national and local governments.

And record honest public confessions of what went wrong, and what not to do, so that in playing catch up, we do not need to waste time following false starts and biting bitter 'silver bullets'.

And we can pass on and receive the right batons, that we can easily and wisely grasp.

And let us mobilise our friends and partners and activists and practitioners who are doing the work, to cope with the high tech of this on line debate, and tell us their stories in their own language, so we may hear their meek and awesome voices.

Hope this rambling piece is not off track as we try to focus this week on the mysteries of linking CCA and DRR.

Warmly, and humbly,

Loy Rego

For me, integrating climate change into HFA is fairly straightforward: climate change is one disaster amongst many and so naturally falls within disaster risk reduction, which has long dealt with many other long-term disasters. Details of and scientific evidence for this approach are at:

http://www.ilankelman.org/articles1/daeditorial2008.pdf

http://www2.undprcc.lk/ext/HDRU/files/climet_change/drr/APHDNet_Ilan_Kelman_and_JC_Gaillard_contribution_SubTheme3_1April2010.pdf

The simplified argument is that climate change by definition does not include aspects such as earthquakes and volcanoes. Conversely, disasters by definition have always incorporated short-term and long-term climate-related phenomena, including all forms of climate change and climate variability. Meanwhile, climate change adaptation yields actions that have already long been enacted through disaster- and development-related processes. Consequently, climate change as yet another major disaster to deal with sits nicely within HFA and can draw on the decades of experience within disasters.

Ilan Kelman

Dear Participants in the online discussion on the integration of Climate Change in the Hyogo Framework

I want to discuss the problem of dispersed responsibility for risk management within governments, a problem that may be a major bottleneck to progress.

Regarding DRR, I have undertaken a number of consultancies where my task has been to provide technical support a given government, or region, in developing risk reduction strategies. These countries covered the economic spectrum from Tanzania to Australia and I began to notice some clear patterns in the difficulties they seemed to encounter in the implementation of risk reduction. While emergency management and preparedness generally has a natural home within a given Government line ministry, (such as Home Affairs, Ministry of the Interior or Civil Defense), in sharp contrast risk reduction remains a nebulous, dispersed subject with multiple homes. For example, here are a few frequently disconnected sectors: Ministry of Urban Affairs- (safe urban planning controls), Health Ministry (safe hospitals), Education Ministry (safe schools and a safety education curricula), Ministry of Housing (building bylaws for safe design and building regulation) etc etc. So while it was easy for the people drafting the HFA to call for integrated, multi-sectoral strategies for DRR, they may have forgotten that this presents an enormous challenge for most governments, that are not well joined up with their isolated 'silos' covering varied sectors.

Turning to adaptation to Climate Change, it is worth recalling the final summary words from the chair of the Second Global Platform Meeting in Geneva in 2009:
“The overwhelming view of the Global Platform is that urgent action is required to harmonise and link the frameworks and policies for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, and to do so within the broader context of poverty reduction and sustainable development.

A priority is to incorporate both disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation as core policy

and programmatic objectives in national development plans and supporting poverty reduction strategies and
country assistance plans".

So Governments, who may already be having great difficulty in dealing with the cross-cutting issues of DRR, and now being called upon to 'harmonise and link" three areas that may be under the authority of even further dispersed line ministries. The three areas being DRR, Climate Change and Poverty Reduction . As noted above, DRR is likely to be under dispersed ministries, Climate Change may be under the Department of Energy or Meteorology and Poverty Reduction, may be anywhere and everywhere , but is often the responsibility of Ministries of Social Affaires or Rural Development. Given the turf wars within the UN , it is hardly surprising that these battles also exist in most government ministries who seek to expand in funding and influence but rarely go out of their way to share responsibilities and resources , unless they are obliged to do so by a forceful Prime Minister, NGO advocacy or an informed electorate.

Thus the powerful rhetoric calling for harmonisation sounds fine and logical, but practical advice is needed in this debate from experienced civil servants and politicians concerning the complexities of integration:
* How can this be achieved?

- Is there a need for a unified task force drawn from the stakeholders to make this happen?
- * How to proceed when everyone expresses the need for coordination, but nobody wishes to be coordinated?
- * Are there good experiences of Government Cabinet Offices forcing the pace of harmonization across sectors and line ministries?
- The old saying, "if you want better answers, try asking better questions" seems to apply here!

Ian Davis
Senior Professor in Risk Management for Sustainable Dev. in Lund University, Sweden
Visiting Professor in Cranfield, Oxford Brookes and Kyoto Universities

---

The question is: What kind of international instrument/tool do we think would be most useful in furthering DRR to follow-up to the HFA beyond 2015? The sub-questions is: Would setting up specific international and national targets help improving DRR impact at the national and local level, or what kind of international institutional structures/instruments would be most helpful to continue to accelerate and support risk reduction work? The rationale says that the 'questions aims at exploring whether an international instrument on disaster risk reduction post-HFA should also be of a voluntary nature; whether there is sufficient interest and international momentum to build up a campaign to advocate for and successfully negotiate a legally binding instrument' etc. Well, but how could we? Let us look at the macro level scenarios since our meso or micro initiatives will take us where I don't no. Don't think that I'm a pessimist.

I want to draw attention of the readers to a narrow passage of the 'Waxman-Markey' energy bill in the US Congress last summer, better known as cap-and-trade, has its political foes though this is the first American attempt to put a lid on their national carbon emissions. But groups like Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth have science on their side to decry Waxman-Markey as an industry diluted half-measure with soft gums that falls far short of what is necessary to avoid cataclysmic climate change later this century. While it is not sure whether Senate approve the cap-and-trade bill, scientists say that has little importance. This is what the situation in America about global warming denial vs. support. Those who read British scientist Prof. James Lovelock’s controversial 2006 book, The

Revenge of Gaia, know that hopefuls should keep a safe distance from the 90-year-old scientist. His prognosis is now starker than ever. The small window of short-term hope he left open in 'Revenge' is closed in his latest book 'Vanishing of the Gaia.' In its place is a long-term hope that humanity in some form will survive the present century, though barely. The result is a dark and contrarian work that seeks to demolish the terms of the climate debate while mocking our response to the crisis.

What kind of international instrument we need, and what kind of the stuff we could ever get? There's a big gap...

Thanks and regards.

Sirajul Islam

Dear all,

Thanks for great contributions so far. The question of mainstreaming DRR in CC adaptation or DRR in CC change adaptation is a question that is used by practitioners and proponents of each one of the circles to suit vested and narrow interests of each group. Each side thinks that they are the core and the others shall be mainstreamed or integrated into their circle or domain. This has to do with internal agenda and competition for funding etc. Eventually, both DRR and cc adaptation shall be treated and used as lenses that shall guide development and poverty reduction plans and programs. CC adaptation is a long process that aims at reducing risks associated with climate change impacts and extreme events, DRR is a process that intends to address all type of disaster risks including those caused by CC impacts. Both approaches complement each other, is there any one who could tell me whether "terracing of eroded hilly rural area in Ethiopia (where it is affected by more frequent droughts, floods than before apparently due to CC impact) to enhance water catchment, reduce erosion and protect environment for eventually improve crop or food production" is a cc adaptation or DRR. I think both lenses contribute to each other, and to the identification and design of such interventions. This confirms the necessity of harmonization of both approaches and utilizing them in development and poverty reduction planning by national governments, aid agencies and donors.

I agree with Prof Davis on the challenge that is manifested in the fragmentation of responsibility among ministries and entities at national level, and among UN agencies. Which is rightly due to competition over resources, powers, profiles and positions. I found the experience of South Africa that has developed DRR framework and law a good example (even that it is still facing some challenges in its implementation) that could be (as an example) amended and used to institutionalize both DRR and CC adaptation in policies and structures.

The CC date that is available is still far from communities' reach. I carried out a research in Turkana/Kenya last year shows that communities feel and perceive the impact of climate change and they refer the increased frequency of droughts and floods to cc. However, without knowing or using historical statistics or climate change projections. Therefore, if climate change adaptation interventions need to be designed to reduce disaster risks associated with changes in drought, rain and temperature patterns, weather and climate projections and analysis must be prepared to represent conditions at local level, explained and communicated to communities. A adaptation has been going on with and without external intervention by affected communities. But, many communities has depleted their resources so they may not be able to carry a rapid-enough CC adaptation process, so they require external assistance. Future, policies and intervention that HFA may propose or encourage MUST consider the indigenous knowledge while introducing new technologies and ideas/practices. In this case, DRR and CC adaptation could be used at community level and complement each other.

CARE has developed a draft community based - CC adaptation which uses DRR lens. CARE International. 2009. CVCA handbook.
http://www.careclimatechange.org/cvca/care_cvcahandbook.pdf

All best,

Mohammed Khaled
CARE International
ECA Regional office – Nairobi

Dear All,

The world is currently characterized by two competing forces over which little human control is possible. On the one hand population growth is driving demand for natural resources in the quest for economic growth and development. On the other hand the environment in which social and economic systems are embedded is naturally dynamic with a human-induced signature that increases perturbations and makes our current capacity to predict somewhat limited. Within this broader set of conditions we have sub-elements such as an increased propensity to urbanization, often in areas that are disaster-prone. Associated with this is the reduction in the land and water resource-base on which human livelihood is dependent. These issues combine to produce a massive population of vulnerable people, often with tenuous links to livelihoods, sometimes without skills needed for a modernizing industrial economy.

This opens up the discussion on the difference between a first and a second-order resource. A first-order resource is a natural resource like land, forests and water. A second-order resource is a social resource that can be best conceptualized as being the capacity of society to adapt to rapid changes in first-order resource availability, either as the result of a rapid change induced by a disaster, or as the result of a slower change driven by over-demand and thus manifesting as a chronic scarcity.

From this it can be hypothesized that disaster mitigation is more likely to be effective in societies with a higher level of second-order resources (the capacity to adapt rapidly or the capacity to mitigate impacts as the result of previously thought through intervention strategies). Conversely, societies in which second-order resource scarcities are acute, will probably become increasingly disaster-prone over time. Central to such a discussion is the role of strategy as a previously thought-through anticipatory approach to an as yet vaguely envisaged future state in which a major disaster can pose a direct threat. This can be further divided into two categories for analytical purposes. The first category arises from endemic disasters such as hurricanes, typhoons and cyclical flooding (monsoon). The essential characteristic in this category is that learning from past experiences can inform future strategies so a degree of anticipation of the nature and scope of an event can be factored into the process. The second category arises from unanticipated disasters that are rapid, catastrophic, but are not part of a cyclical pattern in a given area and thus not part of any institutional or social memory. An example of this could be a Tsunami arising from a tectonic event manifesting in an area that is not usually Tsunami-prone. New tool should follow bottom up pyramid approach. The new tool should be above the basic foundation stone of HFA.

With best regards,

Abhishek Mendiratta
Jupiter Knowledge Management Innovative Concepts Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, India

Dear Joern, Ian, Ilan and colleagues from the discussion in week 3, Our challenge is how to integrate CCA and DRR in the routine work of development actors, be they Ministries, departments, private investment agencies, or even the school management associations that construct new schools in many parts of the world and the education curriculum development and approval mechanisms in countries and provinces all over the world.

Both the communities of advocates and practitioners for CCA and DRR, are by and large operating in different institutional homes and silos. Preaching integration of one into the other is less meaningful than joining hands and forces to work together and talk together to the development decision makers and decision making apparatus in every level.

There have been calls for action on this issue in regional and national conferences on DRR. These are lightly negotiated text, and therefore reflect the pragmatic boundaries of do able action. Both the Delhi and Kualalumpur (KL) declarations on DRR arising from the Asian Ministerial Conferences of 2007 and 2008 have an element of linking DRR and CCA mechanisms into dialogue at national level in each Asian and Pacific country. The 2009 KL action plan entitled "Advancing implementation of HFA in Asia' to be worked on in the 6 years from 2009 to 2015, has one of its seven components focusing on this subject.

The coming fourth Asian Ministerial in Incheon Korea in October 2010 focuses exclusively on achieving DRR thru CCA.

Bothe SAARC and ASEAN have developed clear strategies for action. The SAARC road map on mainstreaming of Climate change and DRR into development, and the ASEAN's AADMER work program 2010 to 2015 have elements of this theme in the Prevention and Mitigation component of the work Program.

At the national level, several DRR action plans, national strategies, and road maps draw links with the NAPAs and specific projects therein. There is progress in this dialogue between CCA and DM/DRR national machineries in country in several countries of South and South East and East Asia.

But it is slow, and difficult. And we have to have the stamina that comes from taking baby steps, stumbling and falling before we learn to walk. And this requires us to learn new languages, acronyms and disciplines and speak in tongues with colleagues who are our sisters and brothers in arms but, we still do not recognise we are on the same side.

At communities, cities and districts and provinces, it is easier. People and their elected representatives and the appointed officials see the issues as developmental gaps and problems affected and exacerbated by climate and disasters. They are keen on solutions, approaches, resources and patient listeners.

So lets keep trying, learning by doing, and listening on the ground.

And lets also do some handholding and arm-twisting at national level to get people and institutions in the same room to talk and understand each other, and then start to build coalitions and alliances.

Warmly,
Loy Rego

Dear Participants,

In my view, current efforts to integrate DRR and CCA in itself signals the ontological and epistemological fact of their disintegration and divides. Therefore, there should be a sort of “boundary crossing” fort both worlds to be integrated. Both may share similar risks but also the difference lets be honest and critical, are not easy to be reconcile because the they both worlds are working based on different institutional paths.

I would like to contribute to this debate with two little story. Eight years ago, as a program officer for disaster management of grant making organisation, I managed to visit a community based flood mitigation project in West Timor, where colleagues of mine worked since 1998 tackling different risks from drought, floods back to drought and water and food security. Time for them to get support is no longer available today. This year, one of the village experience similar drought experience as in 1999. I meet another two colleagues of mine one in Netherlands and one in German and both of them went to do research in the same village where I conduct longitudinal observation. One of them is doing climate adaptation. To my surprise, all minds seem to be simply disintegrated. But one thing colleagues in the field told me - "different donors give different earmarked grants, one is DRR the other one is CCA, but we end up doing the same thing on the village - either drought or flood mitigation."

Last June 2010, I managed to talk with Indonesian delegates during their recent conference at the UNFCCC in Bonn and talked about CCA. And most of them, view that there is little they can take from DRR. At the end of the an hour chat, I realised that people in CCA business did not make enough crossing. I also shared with them my Power Point presentation in Kyoto last year entitled: Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation: Shared Problems, Different Worlds? Hope it brings new insights to the debate. I am personally pro integration as I grown up in both worlds by chance. I cut and paste one of my observation that I did not publish: In retrospect, DRR and CCA knowledge have been set by the history of their analytical settings, thus a historical argument. Below are some pointers to reflect.

• Systematic studies of disasters (including its prescription to for ex-ante risk reduction) have about turned 60 years, more or less. The First disaster journals such as Disasters under the auspicious of Overseas Development Intitute (ODI) in London appeared the first time in 1977. The very first articles were about logistics, shelters and humanitarian interventions.

• If one look at the first edition of IJMED (International Journal Of Mass Emergency And Disaster) in 1983, it was started with households adaptation to disasters, disaster response and recovery and social solidarity in disasters.

• If you look at the type of articles today in both Disasters and IJMED, climate and environmental issues are occasionally coming in. Disasters had a special issue on Climate change but when one is curious to know how many articles about CCA in there, using key words “climate change”, one will not find more than 15 articles, in which the first ones started in 1990s. In contrast, in IJMED I hardly found article started with a title climate change.

• Most Climate Change related journals, started in 1990s. Global Environmental Change started in 1990s, began with greenhouse effects, energy issues and some climate hazard related. It is widely explicit to note that in mainstream climate change journals, CCA is not the main issue thus rather marginal in comparison to climate mitigation. Policy instrument inside CC such as Kyoto stressed more on green house gases mitigation. • Now what about Natural Hazards Review that published since 2000? Don’t be surprised, no single article started with climate change in their title. Probably, ASCE (American Society for Civil Engineers) views on CC was influence by George Bush administration’s views on climate change? I have no answer.

• Natural Hazards that came in 1988 started its first articles about geo-hazards, mainly seismic. CCA still marginally discussed in the last 5 years of publication.

• You probably curious to know about what topics discussed in the first edition of Journal of Risk Analysis in 1981? Here is the fact. Risk Analysis was started with Alvin Martin Weinberg 1981

(Nuclear Physics), Stanley Kaplan, B. John Garrick (Engineering and Applied Science), Chris Whipple (Engineering Science) including four more papers on risk of Carcinogens. • Now if you don't want to dismiss the Journal of Humanitarian Assistance from the list, that started in 1994, aka JHA is "Field experience and current research on humanitarian action and policy" in the context of disasters and humanitarian crisis. For more information, please visit http://jha.ac/. Hardly any article entitled climate change adaptation.
To be honest, I don't how such a science division above affects the real world division of roles in risk reduction. But you can argue that each journal has its own critical mass (i.e. its own scientists, public intellectual and professionals, and engaged communities).
Jonatan Lassa
PhD Candidate
United Nations University
Institute for Environment and Human Security UN Campus
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10 53113 Bonn, Germany

At the forth international conference on Community-Based Adaptation in Dar Es Salaam Tanzania 21-27th Feb 2010 a CBA / DRR Working Group was formed and committed to developing a common community-based resilience framework that incorporates aspects of disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation within the broader context of sustainable development. The members of the Working Group agreed to develop a draft framework ready for subsequent presentation and discussion at the fifth international conference on Community-based Adaptation to be held in Dhaka, Bangladesh February 2011.
Some of the benefits of developing a common resilience framework are as follows:
* Unifying frameworks, common approaches and tools can support greater coherence, coordination and synergy between different thematic approaches (e.g. DRR, CBA, Poverty Alleviation)
* Reduce duplication of efforts, optimise use of resources, increase impact and avoid confusion at the local level
* Increase potential for harmonisation, building collaborative alliances, joint actions, knowledge sharing and learning between different disciplines
* Guidance for policy makers and practitioners in programme design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation
* Can inform policy advocacy aimed at formulation of appropriate CBA and DRR polices and legislation at national and regional levels
* Can form the basis for an independent locally-based monitoring,reporting and evaluation process with associated indicators to establish local baseline - leading to greater transparency and accountability
* Support an integrated risk management approach to development
Whilst "experts" may talk in thematics of disaster risk reduction, climate adaptation, food security or poverty alleviation, it is clear at the household level that these issues converge and are dealt with in a holistic way. Accordingly an appropriate resilience framework used to guide local-level actions with at-risk people and local actors must reflect day to day grassroots realities.
If you'd like to join this group do please let me know.

All the best
Marcus

Marcus Oxley
Chairman
Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction

Dear Colleagues,
Dear Markus - and CBA/DRR Working Group - it would be quite interesting to see once the ideas for the common framework to integrate DRR, CCA and community resilience. We are also currently trying to develop a common framework for vulnerability assessment within a project called MOVE - together with e.g. Omar Dario Cardona and David Alexander. The effort to harmonize different communities is quite a challenge. Already the discussion and agreement of what exposure encompasses was a hard task.

Furthermore, I would be interested to know how the framework can inform policy makers and practitioners. Many governments still favor structural /technological adaptation measures, such as dyke programmes and relocation of people. Although these measures might help to reduce physical exposure, they at the same time might increase vulnerability due to the cut of social networks and social-ecological coupling processes.

Thus a key question for me still is: how to evaluate the success of societal response strategies to climate change and natural hazards? This also implies that one has to answer: at which temporal and spatial scale(s) the success or failure of these strategies and measures should be evaluated?

If your framework provides here some solutions let us know.
Also from a scientific perspective we have as Jonatan outlined - developed rather a very sophisticated disciplinary orientation, that means most of the resilience literature does not acknowledge the DRR literature and vice versa. Consequently, building bridges is important.

Lastly, Ian you underlined that harmonization sounds good - but practical advice is needed.

My feeling is that - beside the development of frameworks (which are crucial) - we have to think of quality criteria and procedural elements that allow for a better integration of DRR and CCA.

Joern Birkmann – Moderator
Head, Vulnerability Assessment,
Risk Management & Adaptive Planning Section
UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY
Institute for Environment and Human Security

Dear Colleagues,

My experience in Portugal teaches me that is necessary to consolidate the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction through a instrument more strong/robust/ambitious than HFA. This tool can be something like the UNFCCC and a protocol of action to Reduce Disaster Risks.
Best,
Teresa Rodrigues (Lisbonne- Portugal)

Ilan suggests that "climate change is one disaster amongst many..." But Ilan knows that not all of climate change is by definition a disaster by any score. When people in northern England start cultivating vineyards, due to warmer average weather conditions, this has nothing to do with disaster, rather it is grasping one of the positive outcomes of possible climate change. Such adaptive actions to grasp the opportunities presented by climate change have nothing to do with DRR, and obviously do not fit within the remit of the HFA.

But perhaps the link between the positive aspects of hazard impact and incremental climate change is that both have an 'upside' as well as the more obvious 'downside' The upside of tropical cyclones may be moisture redistribution, or the destruction of old growth in forest fires, or irrigation and the distribution of fertile silt from major flooding. I have a friend who has spent his career dealing with flood issues and he moans about the term 'hazard' on account of its wholly negative association. Perhaps we need a more neutral, and more accurate term than 'natural hazard', such as 'natural phenomena' or 'extreme event'. The term 'Climate Change' has that neutral association, reflecting both the negative and position consequences.

Marcus makes such an important point when he rightly points out that for communities at risk the tidy boxes that academics and specialists use for DRR, CCA, or MDG's are meaningless, for them everything 'converges'. Perhaps this why DRR and CCA seem to work so much more effectively at local levels that at the international or regional level where they inevitably become tangled up in the differing (and competing) mandates of UN Agencies or ministerial responsibility.

Ian Davis

Dear Joern, Marcus and all,

I just wanted to share one contribution to this area of practical, evidence-based integration of CCA and DRR work, that we call a Climate Smart Approach to Disaster Risk Management.

This approach to integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Disaster Risk Management has been developed as part of a project between Christian Aid, the Institute of Development Studies - Sussex, and Plan International.

I would really welcome your thoughts and feedback on it. I think as one of you highlighted, it ends up focusing on one part of the whole vision around integrating DRR and CCA and Development, which is by trying to influence current practices of DRM.

What is Climate-Smart Disaster Risk Management (CSDRM)?

CSDRM is: “an approach to tackle the effects of climate change on disaster risk by assessing and acting on changes to the frequency and severity of hazards, preparing for increasing uncertainty through enhancing adaptive capacity and addressing poverty, vulnerability and their causes.”

The CSDRM approach is a way of ensuring disaster risk management activities are sustainable in a changing climate. In practice, CSDRM provides a guide to strategic planning, programme development and policy-making and helps to assess the effectiveness of existing DRM policies, projects and programmes in the context of a changing climate. It consists of actions and guiding questions that directly respond to the affects of climate change on disaster risk – by understanding and acting on changing hazards, managing increasing uncertainty and tackling the drivers of vulnerability.

Example of the actions incorporated in a CSDRM approach …The actions associated with a CSDRM approach are elaborated in fig. 1, but include the ability to:

- Regularly triangulate local knowledge of changing disaster risks with evidence from the climatological and meteorological community, recognising that a changing climate means disaster risks can constantly shift.
- Use this information to tackle people's exposure to these risks.
- - Continually learn and reflect with partners and other stakeholders about the best approaches given changing hazards, vulnerability, exposure and capacities.
- - Manage increasing uncertainty by working in partnership to build the capacity of people, communities and organisations to adapt to unexpected events in both the short and long-term.
- - Build partnerships with the development community to ensure interventions to manage disaster risk also help to tackle the underlying drivers of vulnerability and poverty.
- - Ensure that disaster risk management and development interventions are environmentally sustainable and do not unnecessarily emit greenhouse gases, something that will ultimately worsen people's vulnerability.

Disaster risk managers have longstanding experience of implementing many of these actions as components of the Hyogo Framework for Action or as part of community-based or comprehensive DRM and CSDRM should not be considered as new. However, it can be argued that CSDRM (a) takes a more holistic view of DRM, development and climate change, (b) refocuses efforts on tackling vulnerability and its causes (an area considered as lagging in the mid-term review of the Hyogo Framework for Action), (c) considers the longer-term capacity of people to adapt and create their own sustainable changes and (d) encourages innovative partnerships across diverse stakeholder groups.

Who is the CSDRM approach for?
National and sub-national disaster risk managers, whether policy-makers or practitioners, can use the CSDRM approach to inform policy, programme and project design and to evaluate the effectiveness of existing initiatives. It is designed to be used across different scales and can be tailored to specific national, sub-national or local contexts. To facilitate this, the CSDRM approach will begin drawing on specialist guidance on how to implement the actions in different contexts.

What does the CSDRM approach consist of?

•To respond to the effects of climate change on disasters risk (Box 1), the CSDRM approach (see figure 1) incorporates three pillars: (a) tackle changing disaster risks, (b) enhance adaptive capacity and (c) address vulnerability and its causes. These three pillars are not mutually exclusive and include a spectrum of actions that should be considered simultaneously in programme, project or policy design or evaluation.

•The actions under each pillar should be treated as a menu. No single CSDRM intervention could possibly incorporate all elements or try to tackle all the drivers of vulnerability. Nonetheless, the actions across the three pillars provide a prompt to help disaster risk managers ensure they are not inadvertently making things worse or missing opportunities. There are limits to what disaster risk managers can achieve alone, but the CSDRM approach highlights the importance of working in partnership with development and climate change agencies to ensure development outcomes are more robust to changing disaster risks.

•Guiding questions are provided to help apply the different actions to specific contexts, recognising there is a need to tailor the entire CSDRM approach to local realities. This is the responsibility of the agencies applying it and cannot possibly be a feature of this generic approach.

How has the CSDRM approach been developed?
The CSDRM approach has been developed through extensive consultation with practitioners, policymakers and academics concerned about the impact of climate change on disasters. These consultations occurred during meetings in ten countries, through in-depth interviews during fieldwork in three countries and at two workshops with researchers and civil society partners in the UK. The three pillars within the approach are founded on long standing theoretical ideas – mainly related to the progression of vulnerability from root causes to unsafe conditions (Blaikie et al. 1994) and to those associated with resilience, adaptive capacity and uncertainty (e.g. Holling 1974, Folke et al. 2002). The CSDRM approach introduced here is still in its early stages of development, and it is hoped that practical experience of applying the approach will help sharpen it and increase its use – a goal of the Strengthening Climate Resilience (SCR) consortium – the group behind its development.

What is the 'Strengthening Climate Resilience' Programme and how can I get involved?
'Strengthening Climate Resilience (SCR) – through Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management' is a new UK Department for International Development funded programme that aims to enhance the ability of developing country governments and civil society organisations to build the resilience of communities to disasters and climate change. It is co-ordinated by the Institute of Development Studies (UK), Plan International and Christian Aid, who are working with a variety of organisations across ten countries (Kenya, Tanzania and Sudan in East Africa; Nepal, India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka in South Asia and Philippines, Indonesia and Cambodia in South East Asia). The consortium is holding national meetings and regional workshops on CSDRM and is developing a comprehensive website to feature latest news, meeting reports and evidence of CSDRM being applied in practice.

Please contact me for more information about this approach or to discuss how it links with initiatives like that of the working group from the Tanzania meeting that Marcus mentioned.

Regards,
Katherine Nightingale
Christian Aid

Ian Davis' description of the trouble that authorities have in trying to deal with so many pressures and challenges simultaneously is exactly why consolidation is important. Disaster risk reduction has long dealt with long-term climate-related challenges and opportunities. It would ease the difficulties that Ian Davis mentions by applying that experience and integrating climate change adaptation into disaster risk reduction (but it must not stop there--see below).

That is an opportunity to help the process, not another contributor's comment about promoting vested interests. I am particularly unclear what "vested and narrow interests" exist in explaining the fact that climate change by definition does not deal with earthquakes?

And vineyards in northern England? Ian Davis' point regarding grasping the opportunities afforded by climate change is exactly in line with decades of disaster risk reduction research and practice explaining how disaster risk reduction and disasters yield opportunities.

Consequently, even if the connection to disaster is tenuous, of course cultivating vineyards in northern England is about disaster risk reduction. It grasps the opportunity afforded by the hazard (or challenge/opportunity) of climate change while actively implementing famine risk reduction (the

grapes, I mean, not the wine). Separating that from disaster risk reduction is artificial and is not in line with many researchers and societies (often indigenous) who explain or act regarding taking advantage of changing environmental conditions--precisely to support their livelihoods and to reduce disaster risk.

Thus, this links directly to the powerful point made by Loy Rego about enfolding disaster risk reduction, including climate change adaptation, into development. That is exactly the point that I and my co-author made in the two articles that I referenced--we never suggest nor do we believe that disaster risk reduction is the ultimate or fundamental process. It is definitely about (from Loy Rego) "joining hands and forces to work together and talk together to the development decision makers and decision making apparatuses in every level". And I fully agree that the terminology is a hindrance, especially considering the number of languages and cultures that lack the words and concepts of "vulnerability", "resilience", "hazard" (see also Ian Davis' point), and some have said even "disaster".

I have no problem framing disaster risk reduction, including climate change adaptation, as a development, livelihoods, and sustainability challenge and opportunity. If it would help to overcome the disparities amongst terminology and ideas, I would also support dropping terms such as "disaster risk reduction" and "climate change adaptation", instead enfolding those processes within the rich history, practice, and experience of aiming to achieve sustainability for humanity.

Unfortunately, then we need to define "sustainability" which has long been debated. And that certainly does not help to answer Joern Birkmann's needed and practical question about "quality criteria and procedural elements".

So does it help to create one Grand Unified Challenge of Everything in the World? Or is it more useful at a practical level to start with what we know, rather than re-inventing processes by framing a challenge/opportunity according to only one hazard (or challenge/opportunity) amongst many, that of climate change? I think that this message's subject line, also from Loy Rego, is appropriate. I would also caution not to overemphasise the "opportunity" of disasters or of climate change, for obvious reasons--perhaps it should perhaps be CHALLENGE in a large font and opportunity in a small font.

Ilan Kelman

Dear Marcus,

It is good to know that Fifth international conference on Community-based Adaptation to be held in Dhaka, Bangladesh on February 2011. For your information, I am from Dhaka, Bangladesh and appreciate your idea (common framework for action) since twelve years we have been working with grassroots women in rural and urban area of Bangladesh. Every year they are fighting with different type of disaster. Bangladesh Government is taking many initiative on DRR, but we do not know how it is implementing. As our Government does not contact with us in this regard, we do not know, how we will join at this conference.

Looking forward to hearing from you.
Best regards,

Quazi Baby
Executive Director
Participatory Development Action Program (PDAP)
Bangladesh

This is an interesting point Ian has made. Floods are useful. It is humans who have mismanaged their relationship to them locating in vulnerable places and contributing to flood volumes by felling trees etc. The recent storms in the Amazon that felled a thousands and thousands of trees is one such example of natural processes in action and humans need to know that such are necessary to sustain the areas in which they occur. Our control of nature is dubious and wrong headed. The last series pf disasters is proof positive we need to plan and build better in more harmony with nature than to compete with it.

Training and capacity building is a start as is the inclusion of climate change and planning issues in formal education that exists is ntoo few universities and technical institutes.

Regards,

Earl Kessler

Dear Colleagues

With regard to the integration of climate change in the HAF:

1. It must be clear that the impacts that have generated and could result in future climate change extreme events are mainly associated with the vulnerability that society has built, which is manifested in different risk scenarios at local, national and subregional levels.

2. At first, the problem is not climate change itself, but the conditions of vulnerability to current and accumulated over the decades (lack of planning, inadequate resources exploitation, environmental degradation, etc..,), By inadequate relationship between human beings and nature. In that sense all of HAF's efforts in relation to climate change should focus on identifying and reducing physical vulnerability of populations living in areas of greatest impact for the occurrence of extreme natural phenomena by promoting sound management of generated risk. This means reviewing the current economic models of development, responsible for many risk scenarios currently exist worldwide. On the other hand, the HAF should promote a prospective management for adaptation to climate change with governments in order to build and avoid accumulating further vulnerability.

3. Regarding the phenomena associated with climate change the role of the HFA should be to stimulate international debate so that major world powers are truly committed to actions to reduce environmental pollution has accelerated these natural processes of the planet.

4. The annual impact of weather on vulnerable communities such as in Latin America and the Caribbean is full knowledge of governments. However the only intervention actions are reactive in nature (emergency response) and no corrective or prospective (mitigation-planning). What are we doing to get out of this vicious circle, when we know in advance what could happen to us?, For many states and governments just blame the nature of their ailments?, Even when many governments are going to continue to evade direct responsibility the occurrence of disasters? To end... not the earthquakes that kill people are the bad buildings that fall on our head ... With this analogy, then it is necessary to clarify that climate change is not a problem, the real problem is the vulnerability in our cities grow continuously. Until we reduce the causes of these vulnerabilities in our countries, the impact this climate changing will increase.

Henry

Ing. Civil Henry Adolfo Peralta Buriticá Especialista en Desarrollo Local Sostenible y Reducción de Riesgos – Programa Delnet del Centro Internacional de Formación - CIF de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo – OIT, Organización de Naciones Unidas – ONU, Turín Italia

---

Dear Friends,
Greetings From UDYAMA!!

Climate change modeling and India

One of the most accepted climate change models is that if global warming will continue USA will be drier, India will be wetter, and Europe will be warmer. Regarding Indian subcontinent, the forecast is that there will be more destructive sea storms, sea surges , coastal erosion and coastal inundation. Even if serious efforts are now made to reduce green house gases, the effect of such gases already released to atmosphere will continue be felt for decades to come, because of long residence time of these gases in atmosphere.

Another apprehension is that global temperature may not rise in a linear manner; there may be sudden and stiff rise in temperature. That is to say that the temperature curves in stead of being linear it can be kinked

Climate change – Orissa context

Rich state like Orissa unfortunately is in the path way of depressions and cyclones formed in the Bay of Bengal during south west monsoon. With advance in global warming if sea storms acquire greater destructive power as is being forecast, the state will be required to bear the brunt of such storms which means all the gains of development will be washed away in flood/storms waters.

Floods, Droughts, Cyclones and Heat waves: What Next?

“If ever concept called disaster tourism is to catch fancy of those bitten by wander bug, then Orissa certainly will be the number one destination. Floods droughts, cyclones and heat weaves, this eastern state has it all.”

Floods have been a regular affair of every monsoon for the past 18 years. The other extreme, droughts have been going side by side for last 19 years. Cyclones have dealt heavy blows to the people for the last seven years. These natural disasters have killed many including innumerable number of livestock and destroyed property. According to the state government’s Human Development Report 2004, property loss has been steadily growing every year over the past few decades.

“Natural calamities have become a serious problem for the poor people of Orissa. It has increased vulnerability and has caused serious fiscal imbalances through a heavy demand on revenue on expenditure, expenditure on restoring assets and reduction of revenue in terms of taxes and duties because of crop and property loss”.

We are witnessing coastal inundation in many places and there is no country wide or widespread drought in the past several years. The drought situation has become localized. Higher rainfall may

mean higher food production but gains of higher food production will be neutralized by greater incidence of diseases. There is already resurgence of malaria and other water borne diseases.

Before draining into the Bay of Bengal, all the major rivers of Orissa flow long distances; some of them having their sources originating beyond the state of Orissa.
The intensity of floods inundating the rivers depend much on the topography of the State, the drainage system with low channel capacity, low flood slope, sand banked mouths, high concentration of rainfall in a small number of days in the catchments basin etc.

Research needs:

- Study of coastal dynamics and sea current changes (wind velocity etc.)
- Selection of species which can withstand high velocity storms of creating coastal shelter belts
- Nature of protection walls/dykes, housing and other infrastructure

Agriculture

It is being observed that our food basket is getting narrower both in terms if vegetables and cereals and pulses. It is now well known that Green revolution has by passed coarse cereals and minor millets besides pulses and large number of vegetables. Further, with increasing urbanization as people leave rural areas to live in urban areas they get disconnected from their past and along with that also forget the variety of millets and vegetables they used to collect from the wild. Thus, there is a steady erosion of genetic diversity and with that the rise of vulnerability of the people. Many cereals, vegetables, pulses which have pest resistance, drought resistance, disease resistance and resistance to climatic variability are disappearing and/or knowledge about them is disappearing. It is necessary that these forgotten food items are brought back into our food basket so that greater diversity provides stability and sustainability of food production system.

Environmental costs are becoming enormous. Subsidy for fertilizer etc is becoming unbearable for government and without subsidy inputs will not be affordable for the farmers. Alternative agriculture becomes inevitable.

Research is necessary to raise food production in a sustainable manner. Package of practices for sustainable agriculture and suitable for different agro-climatic conditions are to be developed and promoted. Study on Cultural biodiversity is essential to know that adaptive capacity and coping mechanism in relation to food security resilience of rural and tribal community during critical and lean period/ stress management or in disaster situation.

1. Identification of these food items, collection and conservation
2. Assessing their nutrition value, Increasing their productivity
3. Development of flood resistant rice varieties
4. Development of post harvest technology and value addition

The ultimate carbon sink is the forest. In Orissa thousands of hills and hillocks are without trees; yet, the root-system continues to exist and given protection new shoots will emerge from old roots and one gets an excellent regenerated natural forest in no time. To facilitate protection on a large scale what is really necessary is releasing community initiatives. The community will be encouraged to promote and protect these countless hills and hillocks, if and only if the community is assured of tenurial security and rights over the forest.

Research needs:

Motivating factors to protect forest

Local specific appropriate management practices

Product sharing, value addition of forest produce, providing and promoting market linkages

Experience of other places/regions in linking tenurial security with forest protection has to be initiated.

Water

With more emphasis on Industrialization now there is greater pressure on available water. Industry has emerged as a major competitor for water. Further, mining and industrial activities are polluting the water bodies and ground water. The problem is being complicated by increasing use of agro-chemicals, pesticides and fertilizers which find their way to all water sources including ground water.

Research needs:

- To reduce water requirement of industries and study ways of growing crops with less water
  - To find cheaper and effective ways to remove pollutants from water
  - to make it drinkable and fit for agriculture crops
  - Input intensive agriculture has raised production to a great extent but now it is evident that productivity cannot continue to rise beyond a point.
  - Focus should be more micro- water projects within community reach and rain water conservation and retention with adequate backward and forward linkages. It is necessary to study methods to increase community access and community involvement in water management.
  - Catchments protection with integration of technical, mechanical, agrosrological and biodiversity conservation initiative.

Udyama envisages very broad based initiatives in this context which can be mentioned as follows:
· Links to the broader view of poverty and poverty alleviation that goes beyond just income to include empowerment, capability.

· Highlights the crucial role of 'context' (especially vulnerability context) – and how this influences the asset base, the selection of livelihood strategies, and the outcomes for households.

· Giving space to advocate local initiatives and linking global perspectives - categorize the strategies that make up their livelihoods diversification & convergence.

· Build on what exists - a multidimensional, integrated perspective that unites the concepts of economic and entrepreneurship with ecological development for value addition that will help to reduce vulnerability and environmental sustainability.

· Capacity Building of smaller CBOs & NGOs for resource building approaches and innovative adaptive knowledge dissemination and development of good practices, simultaneous programming to make self sufficiency and self employed.

All the best,

Pradeep Mohapatra
Team leader,UDYAMA

Hello everyone,

I just would like to briefly insert a very general comment on this topic. Overall integration of climate change with disaster reduction efforts is a very interesting idea. However, in my opinion the HFA as well as the ISDR are just too small institutions to be able to include climate change into their agendas and activities. Indeed I always believed that disaster reduction at international level needs institutions that are adequate for the problems that they want to tackle or address. Neither INDR, nor the ISDR have been adequate enough for such large problems. Integration of climate change with HFA, although very important and necessary at conceptual level, requires institutions adequate enough to be able to carry out the tasks it involves. We need an institution with much larger capacities and long term mandates and missions. Dealing with this issues in a decade by decade approach would not achieve any useful results especially if we are talking about climate change.

This could be elaborated and discussed much further, but I stop here and would like to read your comments on this.

Thank you very much.

Regards,

Ali Asgary, PhD
Associate Professor of Disaster and Emergency Management
School of Administrative Studies, Faculty of Liberal and Professional Studies

---

Would it possible to ask Ilan Kelman to share his two articles that he referred to in his message?

Thanks,
Khaled, Mohamed (Kenya)

I think where possible we should avoid creating new institutions for either DRR or CCA. This is about a way of doing development in hazard-prone areas against a future of climatic change. So the starting point in my mind lies in the integration of both issues into the design, planning and financing procedures of existing disciplines and institutions in both the social and economic spheres. This will involve enhancing the use of existing methodologies and tools and better collaboration and sharing of information and knowledge and forging of alliances, coalitions and partnerships recognizing this is a political challenge as much as a technical one.

Marcus Oxley
Chairman
Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction

---

Dear All,

In line with others who have already contributed to this discussion it is my opinion that CCA needs to

be embedded within DRR and in turn DRR embedded within sustainable development processes, thereby ensuring that underlying risk factors including climate change as one factor amongst many are addressed. Ian Davis states that perhaps we need to start asking better questions if we want better answers. Yet as Marcus Oxley points out at the household level issues of CC, DRR, poverty reduction, livelihoods etc already converge and are dealt with in a holistic way. Ian Davis also goes on to quite rightly point out the difficulties of integration at a national level and how can harmonisation be achieved with the dispersed levels of responsibility within and across government departments? So in response to his question perhaps it is the wrong people we are asking answers of rather than the wrong questions being asked and those lessons from a grassroots level where these issues have been tackled for many centuries could be utilised to adequately inform policy and harmonisation at a national level. The voice of communities and civil society needs to be listened to more carefully to assist in harmonisation at national levels – there has been some progress towards this with the establishment of the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for DRR led by Marcus Oxley but this combined voice needs to be recognised for its authority and listened to more – arguably this is increasingly occurring but as evidenced at the UNISDR Global Platform 2009 civil society are still allocated the back row seats in terms of HFA discussions. Mohammed Khaled reiterates this point when he refers in his correspondence to the necessity to use and build upon indigenous knowledge. This is despite the fact that clearly some of this knowledge may no longer be applicable in light of the increased pace of change experienced today.

I think it is rather naïve of Ian Davis to suggest that positive adaptive actions have nothing to do with the HFA and consequently DRR. As Ilan Kelman subsequently points out decades of DRR research outline the opportunities hazards present as well as the risks and how local communities capitalise upon these. Indeed, first and foremost what we as 'outsiders' perceive as hazards are often considered by communities as first and foremost a livelihood with the hazard considered secondary (although not to dismiss it's importance) – e.g. communities living on a floodplain may utilise available water resources for drinking, washing, irrigation, fishing etc but this same livelihood resource also presents a major hazard in terms of flooding. In my view Ian Davis's reference to the need for 'highly specific diagnostic work' to help decision makers understand the links between the HFA and climate change is making a mountain out of a molehill. He has already referred to the difficulties of integration within and across government departments – what is the benefit of making something which is so clearly simple and obvious at the local level (and thus could assist in harmonisation at the national level) larger than it really is, this can only contribute to the increased difficulties of harmonisation and integration at the national level. This point is linked to my comments above regarding lessons which can be learnt at the local level.

Likewise I think at a civil society level we too are in danger of going overboard in terms of tools and development of frameworks. Katherine Nightingale refers to the development of a tool to assist in terms of CCA and DRR – Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management (there are also many more such initiatives). She goes on to state that the tool is not new but perhaps helps to take a more holistic view but as Marcus Oxley states this is already occurring at the local level – so perhaps it should be more about the process and a review and evaluation of existing tools before we move ahead with reinventing the wheel yet again? Such a tool while ensuring changes in climate are considered (which incidentally should already be occurring in a standard CBDRR process) is not so different to many other available DRR tools which have been utilised and/or adapted for CCA. Would it not be better to review and evaluate the outcomes of these and other DRR methodologies especially the CBDRR process, thereby improving the capacity to use these and ensuring a united, consolidated approach before moving into the development of new tools, which in any case should occur from an identification of shortfalls in existing tools? Likewise would the development of the Common Resilience Framework which Marcus Oxley refers to build upon lessons learnt from already existing DRR tools and methodologies? How can we coordinate these initiatives more?

I also support the comments from Earl Kessner of the importance of education and knowledge.

Embedding CCA within DRR in a wider, holistic sustainable development process presents an opportunity for a stronger educational message to be delivered which focuses on the problem as a whole (obviously adapted to specific contexts) rather than individual elements such as climate change, earthquakes, environmental degradation etc. As Ilan Kelman states we need to build upon what we know and the many decades of DRR research as CC is one challenge amongst many which needs to be addressed at local, national, regional and international levels.

With best wishes

Jessica Mercer
CAFOD
London

Dear All

Jessica and many others have made really good contributions to this debate.

I did want to support a message from Ian Davis's sent earlier this week.

I too am a Lead Author on the IPCC Special Report on "Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation". This is a significant step and an excellent decision by the IPCC to prepare this report, following a proposal jointly developed over 2008 and 2009 by UNISDR and Norway. I believe it will contribute and assist in providing a sound scientific basis for action to reduce the growing risks of disasters and to support UNFCCC policymaking and practical adaptation to climate change. Many involved in this work have a real desire to show DRR and CCA as well as the influence of DRM. Maybe when this report is out it will help to really encourage the focus of DRR and CCA and help to raise the profile of UNISDR and the HFA.

Best wishes,
Virginia

Professor Virginia Murray, FFOM, FRCP, FRCPath, FFPH
Consultant Medical Toxicologist and Environmental Public Health
Centre for Radiation, Chemicals and Environmental Hazards, London
Health Protection Agency

In my humble opinion the contribution must be substantiated in concrete actions of training, the existing methodology and equitable distribution of resources. Climate change is not a slogan, is substantiated by the facts and the knowledge, actions must be proactive and from the local level. In our vision and action is impossible to speak of local development without the variable climate and in my experience we talk about global change, but very little has been done in measurements and monitoring at local level. That is a challenge for us to integrate risk reduction to concrete actions to adapt to climate change locally, even making climatic variables monitoring a local level, with the people.

Graciela Salaberri
Uruguay

Dear Colleagues,

- Virgina, Ian: yes we are all part of the IPCC Special Report SREX and it is really fun to work on it.
- But perhaps a more critical question: what are the lessons learned from this exercise for the modification of global disaster risk reduction policies or governance strategies. Definitely, we now know much more climate change scientists personally and we can manage to communicate - but can we also think of lessons or warnings or something we would suggest to put into an international framework such as the Hyogo Framework of Action to better address the integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction - if we want that at all. - Virginia is disaster medicine already taking into account climate change in the medium and long run?
- To what extend are at the moment national and sub-national adaptation strategies to climate change trying to integrate local knowledge and institutions (fragmented responsibilities) for disaster risk reduction? In most studies we have undertaken e.g. Urban planning acknowledges the importance of climate change (adaptation), however, it often is a major constraints that these formal and legal planning tools have major problems to deal with various uncertainties. Thus the actual integration of these concerns in spatial and urban planning for example remains minimal - often solely past hazards and disasters are taken into consideration, such as the flood prevention policy in Europe. Also in developing countries, such as Vietnam - studies and first concepts suggest that urban planning - and particularly building codes - should be strengthened in order to improve the adaptation of urban structures to extreme events and climate change. Although these tools are important - the actual challenge are the informal settlements and the lack of service provision to these people - thus the instruments and tools discuss often fail to address the most vulnerable once.

Garciela,
- In this regard it would be interesting to know more about the climate monitoring and the question of awareness raising for climate change - particularly if changes occur rather slow. Any example of your tool application?

Katherine,
- Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management sounds good and I would be happy if you could outline a specific case study which worked and which might failed. Additionally, it would definitely be of interest for the humanitarian organizations within the international community to know what kind of applicability the tool has for humanitarian assistance within and after disasters have occurred. Some more information would be very valuable.

Looking forward to your responses,
Joern

Joern Birkmann – Moderator
Head, Vulnerability Assessment,
Risk Management & Adaptive Planning Section
UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY
Institute for Environment and Human Security

Dear All,

There is no question of making mountain or embedding something into existing strategy. The question is what is to be included and what is to be excluded so that DRR remains DRR and nothing else hence you can include whatever youwant on the basis of priority and weightage. The thing is we should have something better than HFA and should be as executable and simple as HFA.
Thanks and with best regards,

Abhishek Mendiratta
Jupiter Knowledge Management and Innovative Concepts Pvt. Ltd.

Dear Colleagues,
Thanks to the active advocacy of CSOs during the Yokohama (1994) and Hyogo (2004) conferences notably the Duryog Nivaran, Periperi and LaRed network members, the practice of community based disaster risk management (CBDRM) is now an important approach for achieving disaster risk reduction within the HFA.

During the first quarter of 2010, I conducted a personal research seeking an interrogation of the CBDRM practice vis a vis the challenges of climate change. I embarked on asking the following questions:

1. Is the approach as currently practiced sufficient to address climate related risks at the community level?

2. What aspects of CBDRM approach works and what does not?

The following are the summary of responses I received from colleagues. I have yet to complete the full report that included a robust literature search but I thought that views expressed by people who responded are useful to highlight in this online debate.

1. IPCC (2007) defines adaptations as "actions that people take in response to, or in anticipation of, projected or actual changes in climate to adjust to and cope with impacts, moderate damages." CBDRM is relevant as it puts the community as the key actor for adaptation. Under this practice, the community takes the greater burden of coping with intensive risks or catastrophic events, but more importantly in managing extensive risks or more frequent, but less intense shocks (Jegillos, 2009). CBDRM is based on participation, planning and actions are community driven, and it supports empowerment and strengthens local capacity. Nevertheless, climate change demand new approaches-CBDRM planning is event driven and focuses on coping approaches. Communities have not yet fully understood the nuances of climate change such as the difference between variability and long term changes adjustments (Thomalla, 2010). It has not incorporated predicted long term impact into assessment and planning which require long term adjustments (Velasquez, 2010).

2. Stakeholders agree on the common definitions of CBDRM (PROVENTION Consortium, 2005). However, in practice CBDRM has become a cover term for several approaches that emerged from different traditions arising from experiences from recent disasters (Touch, 2010), but influenced by divergent environment, views and values. In some cases, objectives are combination of several intentions and are related to the specific context that each organization is addressing. The menu of CBDRM objectives includes to:

. identify through participatory approaches the characteristics of community risks and indigenous coping mechanisms,
. promote public awareness and education through informal systems and using traditional cultural practices,
. organize self help and volunteer groups for local level preparedness mitigation, response and recovery,
. involve communities as part of improving the early warning chain and emergency response at local level,
. mobilize community action and improve social capital to address vulnerability,
. mobilize community participation in government's mitigation measures
. ask people to contribute their labor and other resources, emphasizing local ownership,
. advance local level decision-making and partnering with local government,
. transform power relations, and to challenge policies and ideologies responsible for generating vulnerability locally.

Strong opinions exist that the above contribute to risk reduction and are valuable in managing climate risk. Evidence exist that CBDRM programmes that promote public awareness, volunteer groups, and self help mechanisms have been successful in saving lives from extreme weather events (Jegillos, 1994). There are other CBDRM best practices that also provide evidence of usefulness of the practice. Respondents recommend that these measures ought to be strengthened further (Daep, 2010).

4. CBDRM practice must recognize limitations (Ariyabandu, 2010) in addressing climate change. The case of Kutubdia, in Bangladesh where I had worked earlier is a profound evidence of the limitations of coping mechanisms. Constant erosion and other causes had reduced the area of the island from 60 square kilometers to 25 square kilometers in a generation (Kakissis, 2009). Sadly, while the volunteer based Bangladesh Cyclone Preparedness Programme has been effective in saving lives, the environmental degradation is alarmingly rapid and the occurrence of extreme weather events promote rapid accentuation of these "daily disasters".
5. Since many CBDRM are project driven with limited duration, and implemented by NGOs and other local actors, the practice rarely generate the institutionalization that sustainable process would require. Although best practices exist in promoting community based early warning system, the involvement of local government and its continuous support has not been addressed well (Espinueva, 2010).

6. Interestingly many respondents disagreed with the world view that CBDRM is highly successful in achieving goals identified during the pioneering years in Asia some 15 years ago. They believe that aid agencies do not directly respond to local people's needs and has not change risk generating behaviors. Instead the nature of CBDRM responses is shaped through the worldviews of the intervening agencies and has not resulted to empowerment and ownership of communities or the municipal level governments. Many commented that most initiatives would seem to be programmes and projects that are implemented at local level rather than with community or local ownership.

7. In discussions related to climate change adaptation, the view considers scientific and technical knowledge essential to reduce risk. Risk is viewed mainly a function of increasing severity of hazards, etc. as a result of global warming, and exposure of population. Respondents stated that this narrow view will not be helpful in addressing vulnerability which is more complex. Moreso, a dominant hazard perspective will favor actions to promote awareness on climate science and could ignore the importance of improving flexibility and agility in making choices, decision making and implementing response.

8. Most respondents emphasized that participation as practiced now within CBDRM means consultation and not questioning or confronting power inequalities such as decisions over land use

and environmental degradation which are important drivers of climate change risk accumulation. In practice, people's local knowledge may be used but local perspectives not necessarily.

Note to readers: please don't get me wrong, my passion for supporting community based approaches, particularly promoting participation has not waned.

Hope these are useful and happy to read your comments.

Sanny Ramos Jegillos
Regional Programme Coordinator
Regional Crisis Prevention and Recovery
UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok

Dear All,

Good day! First of all, let me highlight those portions of HFA where climate change is addressed. The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development8, held in 2002, requested the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to “improve techniques and methodologies for assessing the effects of climate change, and encourage the continuing assessment of those adverse effects…”. In addition, the General Assembly resolutions on natural disasters and vulnerability (59/233, and 58/215) has encouraged the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1771, No. 30822), and the parties to its Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/CP/1997/7/Add.1, decision 1/CP.3, annex.) which has entered into force in February 2005) to continue to address the adverse effects of climate change, especially in those developing countries that are particularly vulnerable. The United Nations General Assembly resolutions on natural disasters and vulnerability (59/233, and 58/215) also encouraged the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to continue to assess the adverse effects of climate change on the socio-economic and natural disaster reduction systems of developing countries.

Mainstream disaster risk reduction measures appropriately into multilateral and bilateral development assistance programmes including those related to poverty reduction, natural resource management, urban development and adaptation to climate change is another factor which needs coordinated effort.

In order to 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. Again many of these are addressed in isolation in several parts of the world. In many countries, the ministerial domain is very watertight. Better coordination among ministries will harness better result even in existing mode of implementation.

It is also narrated in HFA to promote the integration of risk reduction associated with existing climate variability and future climate change into strategies for the reduction of disaster risk and adaptation to climate change, which would include the clear identification of climate related disaster risks, the design of specific risk reduction measures and an improved and routine use of climate risk information by planners, engineers and other decision-makers.

All above discussion lead to the point that climate change has been adequately addressed in HFA. Coordination among implementing organs is the need of the hour. Multimodal delivery will also help in this regard.

Thanks and regards,

Pradip Dey
(Comments provided in personal capacity)

Dear Mohamed,

Thanks for your interest. The articles that I mentioned from my other message are at:

http://www.ilankelman.org/articles1/daeditorial2008.pdf

http://www2.undprcc.lk/ext/HDRU/files/climet_change/drr/APHDNet_Ilan_Kelman_and_JC_Gaillard_contribution_SubTheme3_1April2010.pdf (if that does not work, then use http://tinyurl.com/37samsx).

With thanks to everyone for this discussion,

Ilan Kelman

Dear Sanny,

Thanks for your initiative and effort. It's good to know that more people are now interested and doing real CBDRM work.

Please, keep up the effort

Attah Benson
Executive Director
Community Emergency Response Initiative

Dear All,

This part of the HFA debate on community based disaster risk management (CBDRM) is really relevant. Many thanks to Sanny for making these comments. However, most of what has been discussed to date is again on rapid onset disasters such as floods. As was mentioned CBRDM has limitations for some aspects of climate change, e.g. frequent drought.

The debate so far largely ignores the fact that communities may very well own an approach and want to do something but may simply not be able to do it alone, for lack of technical expertise (you do not make a herder into an engineer overnight) and for lack of cash or in kind assets to provide for drought preparedness and management. This is especially true for households caught in the rapidly

accelerating downward spiral of livelihood erosion from ever more disastrous effects of increasingly frequent droughts.

And in the absence of a truly responsible and collaborative government, both at national and at local level, which is often completely discredited among the communities whom they are supposed to represent and support, what resource can poor and vulnerable communities rely on to assist them were they cannot go it alone? All the talk about community based early warning and disaster preparedness and management planning is empty and a dangerous waste of time if vulnerable communities are denied the hard tools to implement these plans. Time is running out fast after all.

Two other facts that require attention in the CBRDRM debate are the following:

(1) Many pastoral areas are victims of rapidly shrinking land for pasture, resulting from distress sale of such land and from rapid urbanization. Would effective DRR mean that urbanization in vulnerable areas should be legally contained? Which brings us back to the governance (compliance enforcement) issue in most of the affected countries. Plus which provides a good example why many of the much quoted traditional coping mechanisms cannot work any more - as they would have relied on conditions which are not changing as fast and irreversibly as they actually do.

(2) In all the years that I have followed debates on DRR, I have only once been fortunate to hear the "big Elephant" in most of these discussions actually mentioned, for obvious reasons on the Western side. Most if not all of the vulnerable countries have a population growth rate which beats even the most wildly successful interventions in development and DRR. Yet, family planning promotion is not considered to be part of DRR. Although the greatest disaster will result from continued unmitigated population growth, which, to make it worse, is often at its highest in the most vulnerable areas. In my experience, it is also not true that communities would resist any attempts at up-scaling strategic family planning. Most women in vulnerable areas would be extremely grateful if they had access to family planning resources.

Happy to learn more about these and other issues.

Sincerely,

Iris Krebber
Welthungerhilfe / German Agro Action (GAA)
Regional Director
Nairobi, KENYA

Dear All,

I have been reading the discussion on DRR and Climate Change Adaptation. I just want to share my thoughts on how we approach it.

Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) is an emerging approach in response to climate change where Cordaid's development partners facilitate the empowering process to build resilient communities. The CMDRR process allows communities to actively identify, analyze and provide solutions to the disaster risks they are vulnerable to. Communities also identify, implement and evaluate DRR measures.

DRR was identified as one of the 10 programme areas in the Cordaid Strategic Plan 2007-2010. This

reflects Cordaid's acknowledgement of the need for proactive rather than reactive response to the increasing hazard events in different parts of the world. Cordaid envisions DRR as an emerging framework and a tool for development. Furthermore, Cordaid recognizes its indispensable role in addressing impacts of various hazards, with climate change as a compounding factor that has adversely affected the entire world, especially its vulnerable communities.

The framework of Cordaid on climate change mitigation and adaptation and DRR considers the different factors that affect society at various levels. Responses that will be developed will be geared towards building the resilience of communities to hazard events.

Cordaid believes that climate change and disasters are both social constructs (man-made). Therefore, the people themselves are the focal point of processes to address the impact of climate change. This is the basis for the shift of Cordaid's paradigm as reflected in its policy, programmes and actions.

The shift in paradigm entails recognition that current practices and lifestyle contribute to climate change and expects a transformation that should result from it. The culture of consumerism that contributes to the increase in emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere must be addressed because these harmful gases are causing the changing climate. The effects of climate change are translated into various hydro-meteorological hazards like drought, hurricane, and floods that further aggravate human-induced hazards like conflicts and civil unrest and societal hazards.

The climate mitigation generally means reducing carbon emission and increasing carbon sink and sequestration. In order to reinforce measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change, activities and concerns must be accomplished at different levels of engagement. At the global level, Cordaid will support policy negotiations through reduction of carbon and CFC emissions, and carbon sequestration. At the national level, country partners should contribute in terms of developing policy agenda and legislation to cut carbon and CFC emissions. Community action should be focused on increasing carbon sink and sequestration, and lastly, at the individual level, Cordaid advocates for and educates people towards change in lifestyle to reduce carbon footprint.

Climate adaptation and DRR are means to strengthen the resilience of communities and to build a safe society. Cordaid approaches these by responding to the hydro-meteorological hazards caused by climate change and human-induced hazards. In this context, Cordaid will help partners to link their work to the National Adaptation Plan for Action (NAPA) and Strategic National Action Programme (SNAP)-DRR platform. Furthermore, Cordaid will push for strengthening community readiness for hazard management, prevention and mitigation at the community level. At the individual level, Cordaid will promote human rights as a foundation for safety, hazard specific knowledge, and enhanced attitude and skills for survivability.

Cordaid believes that all action points have to shift paradigms and mindsets from cost benefit analysis to a strong sense of moral obligation to cut carbon emissions. Cordaid also supports partners to shift mindsets to influence policy and programme towards CMDRR, continue promoting basic rights as a foundation of safety, and build awareness to adopt a change in lifestyle that reduces carbon and CFCs emission. A paradigm shift will lead to more resilient communities that are less vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

Hope this could contribute to the discussion.

Warmest regards to all!

Rusty Binas
Global Advisor on Disaster Risk Reduction
Cordaid

Dear Joern and colleagues,

I have been following the conversation with considerable interest and have enjoyed the wide ranging set of comments on this topic.

Earlier Katherine Nightingale posted a message concerning the 'Strengthening Climate Resilience through Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management' programme, a programme that I currently direct that involves IDS, Christian Aid and Plan as co-ordinating agencies and that is funded by DFID. I thought it might be useful to talk a little more about the initiative and a few things we have observed so far.

We have been developing a Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management approach - essentially a version of DRM that integrates the challenges posed by a changing climate - through a widespread consultation process that has involved meetings of DRM, adaptation and development practitioners and policy makers in 11 countries and in two regions. This process started in February this year and is ongoing. A further regional consultation is being held next week in Bangkok, when I hope to see a number of those who have contributed to this online discussion so far.

Overall, these meetings have involved 400-500 people to date and have included about 100 presentations of disaster risk management projects, programmes and policies that have attempted to take climate change into account from a variety of different civil society, research and government agencies. From this evidence base and with the help of all those who have attended, we have iteratively developed a one-page approach that hopefully captures many of the dimensions that have been discussed here. Within a few weeks, we will be sharing the Climate Smart Disaster Risk Management approach widely and request that civil society organisations and government departments trial it and see whether or not it helps them deal with climate change a bit more systematically in their efforts to manage disaster risk. A website will be available within the next two weeks that includes copies of all these presentations, a variety of 'talking heads' type videos of people explaining dimensions of this issue, records of all the national and regional meetings and details of how people can get involved in the process. We intend to formally launch much of this material, a discussion paper series and the approach through a set of meetings in a number of countries for UN disasters day on the 13th October.

Our aim is to create an evidence base of 20 'climate smart disaster risk management' projects, programmes or policies by the end of 2011 drawn from a variety of countries and organisations. These will be shared via multi-media resources that highlight different aspects of this working/or not working. If you haven't been involved in this process so far and want to know more, please send me an e-mail.

The process so far has highlighted a few interesting dimensions of this debate:

- DRM and adaptation are similar ways of managing threats to development outcomes. Effectively managing and tackling risk, uncertainty and vulnerability within development processes is fundamental to both DRM and adaptation and from what we have seen so far, much of the practice on the ground is indivisible and we just use different terms to describe it. Maybe then it is incorrect to be talking about whether adaptation needs to be mainstreamed into DRM or vice-versa, but rather working together to convince water, agriculture, health and finance people for example that a risk and uncertainty aware version of development is crucial to securing improved development outcomes.

- Much debate has taken place about whether those working in the adaptation and DRM communities

have a responsibility to consider poverty reduction and reducing inequalities (and other various development outcomes) as part of their day-to-day work. The conclusion has generally been that DRM practitioners must work hand-in-hand with their more purely development oriented counterparts to ensure the full range of desirable outcomes, but the DRM agenda should not be 'unnecessarily' burdened with too many objectives.

- In practice, DRM falls short of its conceptual ideals. Climate change, while bringing very little new in terms of practice to DRM, does allow for a critical reflection on incomplete delivery of DRM/HFA, particularly priority area 4 on underlying risk.

- DRM Practitioners and the communities that they work with are witnessing a variety of climate-related changes and there is significant demand for ways to integrate climate change perspectives into existing work. The amount of money and political will circulating around the climate issue is one of the other drivers of this demand and many people have voiced that demonstrating a 'climate-smart' version of DRM will help the disasters community to legitimately access these resources.

- The knowledge on which options, decisions and interventions are based must be drawn from local communities, climatologists, meteorologists, other scientists and those involved in assessing vulnerability and its trends. The process for blending and integrating these different, potentially contradictory knowledges is challenging and there is clearly a role for well-informed intermediaries to be brokers in this process.

- Given that climate change is exacerbating problems of increasing exposure and vulnerability, the DRM community has a responsibility to consider the carbon emissions of its interventions (potentially as part of environmental impact assessment processes). This however does raise issues of equity and justice given that those most regularly impacted by disasters have done least to contribute to the problem of climate change.

- The need to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities, agencies and institutions through DRM interventions is at the heart of climate smart disaster risk management. In practice this means systematically innovating, experimenting, learning-by-doing, networking, educating, planning for system failures, imagining diverse scenarios, creating redundant capacity and establishing a cadre of practitioners and policy makers comfortable with moving seamlessly between communities of practice. This helps to build resilience, deal with unexpected impacts and manage uncertainty. While there appear to be some good examples of this kind of thing happening as part of DRM, it is not seen as business as usual.
-
  Look forward to reading other contributions before the end of the week,
-

Best wishes,
Tom

Tom Mitchell
Research Fellow
University of Sussex

Other contributors to these debates have highlighted the importance of retaining a focus on the overarching goal of efforts to reduce disaster risk; that is poverty reduction and sustainable development. Indeed, it is by factoring disaster and climate risk into policies and programs in infrastructure, health, education, agriculture, etc. that the biggest gains are likely to be made in

reducing losses from natural disasters. Integration into development is a considerable challenge for the DRR and climate change agendas.

Effective integration would be further aided by two processes. The first is ensuring DRR and climate change communities speak clearly to each other wherever possible – using common frameworks, forums, terminology, goals and objectives. I believe the DRR community understands the implications of climate change for natural disasters and development and is very good at speaking to itself about these issues. The challenge (and there is progress here) is in reaching out to the climate change community and demonstrating to them the value of active joint engagement.

Once a level of partnership has been achieved between DRR and climate change; the second process is to speak with one voice to development partners; to work together. To effectively, (and here I quote a contributor from the 2nd week) find a way to undertake development in hazard prone areas, then we need to have a consistent message when we speak to other sectors. Here, there is an opportunity to emphasise that development, DRR and climate change adaptation are united by the need to reduce underlying social and economic vulnerabilities and build resilience through measures such as improved governance, economic opportunities and better environmental management.

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) is actively working to bring together climate change, disaster risk reduction and environment in a common approach to integration. Joint tools and training have been developed for staff to provide guidance on how these issues can be considered together in broader development programming. While this approach is still in pilot phase, so far it seems to be working well and is far more efficient than trying to tackle each issue separately.

Finally, we were invited to comment on how climate change could be integrated into the Hyogo Framework for Action. My feeling is that climate change is already implicit in the existing HFA. Good practice disaster risk reduction activities will take account of climate change, just as they will take account of gender, indigenous knowledge, social and economic conditions in their design and implementation. However, some simple practical actions that could help strengthen the visibility of climate change in the HFA and ISDR frameworks include: involving climate change bodies in national platforms; and ensuring that reporting on climate change adaptation action is included in reporting on the HFA.

Lisa Staruszkiewicz

Dear Friends,
Greetings!!

Good to know that Google Earth Map Showing Temperature rises Unveiled during the debate on DRR and climate. This for your information. Do keep continuing discussion. All the best.

Google Earth map showing temperature rises unveiled

London: British ministers have launched a new Google Earth map designed to show the potential impact of temperature rises of four degrees Celsius. The interactive map lets members of the public see the dramatic changes that could occur if action is not taken to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Significant alterations include higher temperatures over land compared to the sea, and extreme temperature increases in the Arctic, according to the map. It was created using analysis from the Met Office Hadley Centre, a largely state-funded climate change research unit that advises government, and other leading scientists in the field, according to a Foreign Office statement. Unveiling the map on

Wednesday, Foreign Office minister Henry Bellingham said it demonstrated the new government's determination to tackle climate change and show a wide audience the dangers or rising temperatures. "The threat from climate change has not gone away and this government is committed to doing what it can to take action," he said. "We are committed to being the 'greenest' government ever." Greg Barker, energy and climate change minister, said: "This map reinforces our determination to act against dangerous man-made climate change." Vicky Pope, from the Met Office, added: "If greenhouse gas emissions continue to rise, global average temperatures could increase by four degrees Celsius by the end of the century, and possibly as early as 2060." The map can be viewed at: www.fco.gov.uk/google-earth-4degrees.kml.

http://www.zeenews.com/news641090.html

Pradeep Mohapatra
Team leader, UDYAMA

Thank you very much Ilan for sharing the links. It is indeed a very interesting discussion that is taking place.

I concur with Iris (thought you left Nairobi already!) that CBDRM won't be successful (specially in slow onset disaster prone areas) without addressing structural issues and problems that stem from population growth, poor governance, discrimination, privatization of communal land, limited mobility, conflicts and shift in people's development levels and interests. We could be successful in working with communities to identify and addressing risks that are climate change related and other types, but this success won't be sustainable without having a suitable supportive policy framework. What one shall do in a government doesn't see the economic and social added value of arid lands and pastoral communities, local level investments to help CC adaptation and reducing CC-driven risks at community level is doomed to failure if a government is not supportive in its policies and actions. In Kenya, less than 3% of the public budget is allocated to development of arid lands, while they contribute more than 30% to the agricultural sector production, and about 10% of the GDP (apologies I may not have the exact figures but approximately. If public investments in infrastructure, education, health and business development is lacking, DRR and CC adaptation won't be possible regardless of all efforts of CBDRM.

Mohammed Khaled
CARE - East and Central Africa regional office

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

I believe the shared objective of disaster risk management and climate adaptation is the safety and wellbeing of lives, livelihoods and assets in hazard-prone areas affected by climate change. As previously raised, poor people tend to understand climate change and disasters in a holistic way, being just two of many other inter-related problems such as poverty, health, livelihoods and food security. The ultimate point of convergence or "common integral" of these and others issues isvulnerable people. It therefore makes sense in terms of achieving greater policy and programme coherence across different disciplines to make decision-making processes as close to the point of convergence as practical through de-concentrated and self-organising management structures. It also makes sense when developing coherent cross-disciplinary strategies to base these on a shared

conceptual framework that resonate with the day to day realities and needs of at-risk people and local actors.

When discussing disasters and climate change with vulnerable people several elements consistently arise:

* Livelihoods - the way and means people make a living, oftencentral to a person's identity and culture
    - Build environment - the roads, dykes, bridges, homes, schools, health and other buildings, utilities and infrastructure where people live, work and play * Natural environment - the climate, land, hills, mountains, vegetation, land, rivers, soils, mineral resources within people's boundaries
    - * Local governance - people, power and politics, particularly local government and its relationship with at-risk people
    - * Knowledge - Understanding, perceptions and attitudes (which influence individual and group behaviour)

    I would suggest the above elements and their mutually reinforcing relationships determine the nature of resilience at the local and national levels: the natural environment is vital for strengthening livelihood security (particularly poor rural people) , developing a safer build environment and importantly regulating weather-related hazards (e.g. local flooding and mudslides)- as does the planet's biosphere regulate the global climate. The mutual relationship between people and the natural environment (including access to assets and resources at the local level) is determined by governance - as applied through our social, political and economic systems, which in turn reflect societal value and belief systems (ideologies) . Increasing knowledge, changing people's perceptions, values and attitudes is one of the keys to changing the status quo.

    Many of the above are what the UNISDR calls the underlying drivers of disaster risk. Addressing underlying risk factors provides the greatest opportunities to reduce risk, although ironically this is the area where least progress has been made. Many of the above are also the principle actions of climate adaptation - in a recent analysis of 448 NAPA projects: 138 were agriculture projects; 62 were related to land-based eco-systems, and 50 related to marine ecosystems.

Increasing coherence and cohesion between DRR and climate adaptation can be enhanced by focusing on coordinated actions that address the underlying drivers of people's vulnerability. Whilst the two" expert" communities may be affiliated to different national ministries and separate funding structures it is clear both disasters and climate change share underlying root causes, and at the local level (where vulnerable people live and work), share similar solutions that cut across spatial, temporal, norms and knowledge differences. DRR provides an excellent entry point into the process given increasing community resilience to extreme weather events provides an effective way and insights to build local capacities to adjust and adapt to more gradual longer term changes in climatic conditions. Protecting and strengthening lives, livelihoods and assets in hazard-prone areas is about connecting indigenous knowledge with inclusive decision-making processes, and the capacity and resources to implement those decisions.

Marcus Oxley
Chairman
Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction

---

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for very interesting and enlightening discussions and information. These information and ideas are very helpful practitioners working in the field. We can learn much from this discussions. In some cases putting the theory in practice in a complex environment needs lots of efforts. I would like to suggest to moderator to document these discussions and would be best to share with us all the consolidated report of these discussions.

Now coming back to the discussion of DRR and CCA integration in the HFA. My experience from the field, implementation and working with communities it is quite clear that no matter you name it CCA or DRM but the actual work comes to one point that is community resilience or strengthening the coping capacities of the communities. For me CCA and DRR is the two side of the same coin. The climate change is further increasing the risks of the communities already at risk or communities with little risk from certain disasters. However as far as the Climate Risk Management such as reduction in the green gasses, global warming etc goes beyond the DRR spectrum.

The Climate Change Adaptation which is directly related to communities and reducing the immediate threat to lives and livelihood of people is and should be part of DRM. HFA as tool should include the CCA as part of the community resilience. DRM has already strong practical mechanism and tools emplace for implementation of risk reduction initiatives. That could be modified to accommodate CCA (which in many cases are the same). Instead of re-inventing the wheel for CCA and be considered as separate issue.

I understand there are many challenges and issues for converging the two in to one at the political level but if we practitioners have clear understanding of the two while implementing at the ground level. The two (DRR and CCA) can go hand in hand and reducing the risks of the hazards threatening the lives and livelihood of the communities as well as sustaining the development efforts of the states.

In short Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation are same and can be approached as one issue and should be converged to complement maximize the impact.

With regards,
Ghulam

Ghulam M Sherani
Disaster Risk Management Advisor
UNDP, Nepal

I would like to add to this discussion the urgency of linking activities to combat desertification to DRR and to climate adaptation, since they are closely r5elated. Although it might be redundant to mention that the loss of the upper 2, 5, or 20 cm layers of soil is a disaster in its own, which causes the loss of many lives particularly in drylands as some of the most disaster prone areas, this is much too often forgotten. (Compare the speech of the Executive Director of the UNCCD on June 17th on the occasion of World Desertification Day.) Policies to combat desertification serve almost totally to adaptation to climate change, since they also contribute to carbon sequestration, make soils and therefore societies more resilient to metereological as well as to biophysical droughts, prevent storms and particularly sandstorms by protecting soils from erosion and sand dune formation and by decreasing wind speeds.

Although I see the institutional problems connected with integrating all these activities with DRR, as has been mentioned before, I think, in future measures which focus on the synergies between DRR,

CC and combating desertification and and many cases also with food security, WASH and education programmes would be much more efficient than the parallel and separated, sometimes even disharmonized implementation of these programmes, which can frequently be observed, and activities to combat desertification offer much more concrete entry points also to combine with DRR than only adaptation programmes to CC, which are frequently not that concrete or more related to future threats while sometimes not so much addressing present problems. And as I said before, combating desertification is too me one of the most effective measures to adapt to climate change anyway.

Cheers
Ingrid Hartmann

We are meteorologists, climatologists working from the communities, one of the first actions has been the creation of groups of volunteer observers, we received information from the communities affected by adverse weather, by itself this means participation and is important to track the trace of the threats of the events on society. Monitoring meteorological variables, temperature, rainfall, another of the inputs that we consider relevant, people are empowered systematic information environment of their own environment.

We believe that knowledge of the environment, beyond the perception is the basis for risk mitigation, a community trained, which monitors its resources, which puts the value of their knowledge and appropriate tools to achieve key developments.

I am sorry about my english, but I must to say that we are keen to participate in these dialogues and reflections.

Muchas gracias

Met Graciela Salaberri
Sociedad CivilAmigos del Viento Meteorología Ambiente Desarrollo

---

Dear all,

I like Rusty's comment's and Cordaid's approach to DDR and climate change, and would like to add my own perspective to matters. The debate has been covering a lot of details and principles. I would like to visit the motivation behind good governance and DDR, so that we can focus our efforts collectively.

In response to Rusty's comment: "Cordaid believes that climate change and disasters are both social constructs (man-made). Therefore, the people themselves are the focal point of processes to address the impact of climate change." Extreme natural events (such as hurricanes and earthquakes) have been happening well before humans were capable of contributing major impacts to the planet. What makes an extreme natural event become a disaster is how we as a society have positioned ourselves to become vulnerable. The Red Cross Disaster Action Team (DAT) at the Seattle Chapter understands that the individuals unaffected by a disaster are those who are prepared for the occurrence of a disadvantages natural event. The more prepared the DAT members are for the event, the more resources we free up to help the rest of the population.

On DDR and climate change, I would like to use the analogy of the human body to describe the society problems related to the natural world. I think of climate change like a chronic disease, such as cancer, which slowly spreads and attacks the body, and meanwhile we have time to think about which strategy to try to kill off the cancerous cells. Extreme natural disasters are like earthquakes and floods are like breaking a leg or an arm at a sportevent. Earthquakes and floods give us very little advance notice, and we have to react quickly within a short period of time to reduce the amount of impact, and accept the impact afterwards. If I wear full body gear before playing American Football, of course I can expect the impact of a severe injury to reduce. Understanding the long and short term differences between climate change and other natural disasters should help us understand how we can plan our responses and adaptation differently, and therefore, how do we create a framework that accommodates for these differences.

How does this analogy help us understand the role of the HFA? First, we need to understand that climate change and natural disasters are in detail very specific to the local-- there are micro-climates as well as regional climates, and different parts of the world are susceptible to very different disasters, or even the same disaster, but for very different reasons. As the name suggests, the Hyogo Framework it is a framework, just like ahospital is a framework. A hospital, by itself, is just a building with walls, to support many rooms to house equipment that care for and detectmany different types of illnesses. Different illnesses are analogous to different types of natural disasters that are unique to the locality. Each room is equipped with specialized tools for specific purposes, and I argue here that regions and local communities should think of themselves as these rooms, preparing themselves for the unique environment and geographic features within which they are constrained.

Concerning the framework itself: The trick about building a hospital is to make sure that the layout and floor plan of the building is optimal for the wide variety of problems that everyone will be likely to face, and we want to standardize some things so that we can share resources when needed and applicable, or so we can quickly convert a room for another purpose. We also build a hospital to geographically consolidate all of these rooms and equipments instead of many small clinics so that we can enjoy an economy of scale. I see the advantage of having a good framework for DDR and climate change for these reasons-- to enjoy economies of scale of our efforts, and to be able to apply knowledge, experience, and strategies across regions.

Of course, these analogies are not perfect, but the purpose of the story is that we need to understand exactly how we react to the natural environment (which is unique to each location), and plan according to the specific problem we have. The role of HFA is to be a framework that helps the individuals and communities heal from their problems as quickly as possible, and be a framework that is accessible to all of the communities.

Your comments would be warmly accepted.

Kind regards,

Joanne Ho, PhD
Natural Resource Economist
School of Forest Resources, University of Washington and member of the Red Cross Disaster Action Team, Seattle Chapter

---

Another issue to focused is land destruction as a consequence of climate change and natural resources management, this issue is closely related to desertification, climate adaptation. Hygiene and

sanitation with waste management might to be focused to reduce green house gases effects on climate change.
The challenge to face is how to empower integration theses thematic in local and sectorials planification for actions taking.

Elisabeth Tossou

Other than Japan or California (USA) Armenia is experiencing sudden-onset major earthquake not so often. The last big one was Spitak 1988 M7.0 earthquake which caused many casualties and losses.
Therefore it is difficult task to persuade people to learn earthquake disaster rules without the real practice.
The altenative opportunity is the simulation of real conditions through training and drills.
To allocate more resources in memorizing and sensitizing the people to cope with earthquake disaster is difficult and promising task to make the population alert to such natural phenomenon as earthquake.
It should be inwoven in National DRR policy.

Hayk Hakobyan

Dear Elisabeth, thank you, I do fully agree!

I was wondering now, since this discussion has focused now on all issues that should be integrated, if it could be shifted now into the direction about HOW all this could be done?

I am asking that, because I mainly look for advice on this matter in practical implementation and to benefit from the expertise assembled here on this list.

Cheers,
Ingrid Hartmann

Dear Ingrid,

I am delighted that the HOW has come up for the discussion has been dedicated to raising issues related to assessments and research. What is missing is how does one deal with these issues to prepare the community to defend itself as first responders and most importantly pro-actively as retrofitting and better planning and construction and cropping. The need for outreach and training based on updated information on what and who is vulnerable is one starting point. Mapping at the community and city level is productive and feeds the planning, simulations and reflection necessary to devise local Action Plans. National programs need to support local initiatives as systems of support including technical, human and financial resources. If this is not done we will be always responding not mitigating or adapting. It is to apply the many manuals and methods that now exist but sit on shelves for lack of leadership, application and funds.

Regards,

Earl Kessler

Dear Moderator,

This has been by far the best online debate I have participated in, with proposal, counter proposal, new direction, further direction, 'back to the drawing board', 'but what about this…' etc etc. Is it possible for you to pull the material together into a 'state of the art' concerning where we have reached?

Many thanks to so many friends and colleagues for excellent insights.

Ian Davis

Thanks to all for your very interesting inputs so far. I would like to contribute, in a private capacity, on the issue of prioritising investments in disaster mitigation, governance and challenges facing the implementation of prevention policies. These are my own views based on analysis of OECD countries. My opinions do not necessarily reflect the official position of my employer (the OECD). I do not claim that these solutions might be transferable to the situations in developing countries, but I'd be very interested to hear your views on that point.

Several OECD countries have developed a National Risk Assessment (NRA) to compare the likelihood and consequence of various hazards facing their national territories. This tool is meant to help decision makers direct scarce resources to develop specific capacities that are thought to enable society to withstand events that do occur, in short to build societal resilience. There are several methodological approaches to this exercise that I won't describe here, but I would like to emphasize a few complimentary practices to the NRA in the United Kingdom that enhance this process.

First, the UK leverages the knowledge and know-how of first responders to test whether its capabilities system is targeting the right risks. The National Capabilities Survey provides an assessment of current levels of national resilience to inform policymakers where there are relative strengths and weaknesses; therefore the top ranking risk in terms of likelihood and consequence is not necessarily the event that will receive priority attention. In the exercise conducted in 2008, questionnaires were issued to over 900 groups of Category 1 responders. The survey had a 95% response rate and included some 50 questions on a range of 'capabilities' relevant to local responders' responsibilities for emergency planning and response. Second, is the requirement under the Civil Contingencies Act for First responders at the local level to conduct risk assessments facing their communities and to publish them in local registers. Third, the United Kingdom publishes certain scenarios in its National Risk Register to better inform citizens of the hazards and threats facing the country. The purpose of making these scenarios available is to inform the public, and provide guidance on what the public can do to prepare for the consequences of the most likely risks, should they wish to do so. The publication of the National Risk Register is, therefore, the start of a dialogue with the public to not only provide details of what the Government and emergency services are doing to prepare for emergencies, but also to provide advice on how organisations, individuals, families and communities might better prepare for major emergencies, thereby helping to improve the United Kingdom‘s resilience.

This message has already far exceeded the average length of messages so far, so I will limit my comments to the following observations. Implementing disaster prevention policies often runs against the short term interests of local authorities to promote economic development. Progress needs to be

made to address this tension, especially where national disaster solidarity funds are made available. A few countries have seen progress in the establishment of institutions meant to give voice to stakeholders with very different, and sometimes opposed, interests-- especially with regard to flood risk management; such as river basin authorities. Inclusiveness, however, does not always amount to influence in decision making.

I look forward to the contributions in this continuing discussion.

Best regards,
Jack Radisch

Dear Colleagues,

As Ian suggested - I will try to summarize some points of our vital and quite sophisticated discussion. Please do not expect that I can summarize all key points - thus it will be a first draft that you might complement with your suggestions what the discussion already covered and encompassed. Normally, I assumed with UN/ISDR colleagues that the summary would be necessary at the end of our discussion, however, the various and many inputs have really produced quite a lot of interesting material.

I hope to have a short summary in form of bullet points within the next 2 hours.

Best regards
Joern Birkmann – Moderator

Dear Colleagues,

The discussion is very rich and has definitely a large potential for informing the mid-term review of the Hyogo Framework. Please find below some points I took from the discussion – particularly regarding:

a) governance scales,
b) b) synergies between DRR and CCA,
c) c) common or different goals, visions between DRR and CCA,
d) d) societal construction of disasters,
e) e) comments Hyogo Framework and
f) f) best and bad practices.

Please note that this short summary or comments in form of thesis and some voices are not comprehensive. There were many more comments – which I can not summarize in detail at this stage. However, it would be very helpful if we can focus a part of the discussion on two additional subjects which have been discussed in parts already, but where we might want to provide more detailed information:

1) What should be changed in the Hyogo Framework for Action – in order to better promote a coherent and comprehensive framework to also strengthen the link between DRR and CCA?

2) Imagine we would have access to all the adaptation funds that are currently in the development. What kind of criteria would we suggest in order to evaluate the quality of linked approaches between DRR and CCA?

PLEASE also have a look at some of the voices selected – please add your comments and do not be angry when I did not list your comments. We will analyze the discussion in depth at the end.

Looking forward to a further stimulating discussion and perhaps we can focus on the value and deficits of the Hyogo Framework and its implementation as well as on the evaluation of existing tools and measures and their success to link DRR and CCA.

Best regards,
Joern Birkmann – Moderator

I was interested to learn of the actions that have been put in place under the Civil Contigencies Act (CCA) in the UK and how this is hoped will lead to resilience. However I made the point in the debate last week about HFA progress and I will reiterate again now....where is the education to support such political Acts? The CCA in the UK still leave most people with no real knowledge of planning for and responding to emergencies. This is partially due to the set up of such central government initiatives that the general public are largely unaware of and whose range of responsibilities include protection from terrorism alongside planning for floods, chemical spills etc. This setup tends to (still?) follow the dominant paradigm for disasters that is top-down and inherited from a somewhat militaristic view of hazard mitigation! It is useful and right that there are experts and that responders are aware of a range of hazards, but this reinforces what some psychologist may term an 'external locus of control' whereby the general public see the preparation and response to hazards as 'some one else's responsibility', rather than building and nurturing an internal locus of control that allows us mere mortals to take responsibility for our own safety! If it has been done for road safety, then why not other hazards?

Education that challenges preconceptions and allows recipients to learn that they can do much to help themselves is the missing link in the CCA. I have been developing curriculum along these lines for several years (http://edu4drr.ning.com/ page/curriculum-1) with the aim of allowing students to learn to know what to do to prepare for and respond to a wide range of hazards. This includes preparing their own family go- bags which they do by talking to their family about what to include and why. These are then brought into school and assessed by their peers as to their usefulness before being taken home. This is one type of simple lesson and an example of curricular that could easily be applied to help our society to become less dependent on governments (national or local) and more independent and resilient together. However this needs to be supported by more than words but rather action and finances. We all understand the quote attributed to Benjamin Franklin, 'an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure' and yet we (and I include many of our governments) are still not investing in education in a meaningful way. By meaningful, I mean relevant and experiential education that allows students and the wider public to think about what they can do so be better prepared and to ACT upon it. This does not mean adding to the wealth of didactic, unchallenging and sometimes dull material that exists at this time, but involving teachers and educators to develop challenging resources and to involve schools in drills and emergency planning more actively.

I would welcome further debate about education that is priority 3 of the HFA and yet has not been mentioned in this debate this week - is education not important for both DRR and climate change? And if it is there needs to be dual bottom up and top-down approaches that allow citizens (including

children and youth) to be better represented in the planning process and allowed to take ownership for their own preparation and response.

Kind Regards,
Justin Sharpe

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for the input again. I would like to ask you whether some of you are working on integrated programmes for climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction - LINKING also local and national scales and governance levels?

It would be quite interesting to see how the different perspective and administrative levels are linked. Additionally, as outlined yesterday - it would be good to know how far you refer to the Hyogo Framework as a basis or whether it helps.

Cheers,
Joern Birkmann – Moderator

Topic 2: Less effective elements of the HFA, Date 5-9 July

1 - It seems that there is a need in providing clear executive guidelines namely implementation of the contents of The Hyogo framework for action. Although the HFA has been formulated in an elaborated manner but it dose not provide concrete methods of implementation. They can be classified in four categories as follows:

A - Executive regulations at national level
B - Mechanism and executive structure
C - Standards for implementation
D - Allocation of funding

2 - The international organizations and the UN agencies should be assigned as responsible bodies at national level to contribute effectively in implementation of the HFA and Disaster Risk Reduction.

HFA Iran

Dear Joern and Friends.

I am following the discussions for the last two weeks and found it very minteresting and informative.

I have studied 4 regions and prepared their reports for the Central Asia and Caucasus (Regional, sub-

regional and Country levels assessment), ASEAN (Regional and Country levels assessment, under review), South – Asia (Regional and Country levels assessment), and South-Eastern Europe (Regional and Country levels assessment), Please note that Hyogo Framework of Action, HFA (2005-1015) have been taken as a basis in preparing Disaster Risk Management Framework-Status of countries and I am sure it helps. The studies also contain a chapter on Climate Change Impact onDifferent Sectors. Link to some of these studies and discussion on them are available at: http://community.understandrisk.org/profile/SushilGupta

Quick disaster risks assessment studies can be carried out at regional, sub-regional, and country levels. A brief methodology for carrying out such real life disaster risks assessments is presented (http://api.ning.com/files/fZnt*NJbR5QCHDqXSdoAHd8VO7VsxvDFSBOxRE-1EnnkAbnWONncoHWyYS98a56yJo9EOK7Y7XhYKogiSaXJK-atf7UppckP/SubregionaldisasterrisksassessmentADRRtoolfornationalinvestmentplanningSushilGupta.pdf) and detailed methodology is described in the following reports:

- intranet.unisdr.org/_DOCS/Risk_Assessments/CentralAsiaCaucasusRiskAssessment.pdf
- intranet.unisdr.org/_DOCS/Risk_Assessments/ASEAN_draft_Assessment_Report_SG1.pdf
- - intranet.unisdr.org/_DOCS/Risk_Assessments/SAR_report_RevA12_Jan28_2010_sg-wTC.pd

Hope, you may find these useful.

Best regards

Sushil Gupta
General Manager,
Risk Modeling and Insurance, India

Dear Joern and all,

Since I am doing institutional vulnerability assessment, I am keen looking at the institutional and organisational arrangement of both DRR and CCA. The questions are: 1. What kinds of institutional and organisational arrangement or scenarios will look like? This is important as both may come out from totally different historical path and continue to be based on path dependency such as DRR largely occupied by Emergency Management structure or National Disaster Management Office, while CCA are either under new Ministry of Environment and Energy - talking from the experience in Southeast Asia - or under new institutional set up as a council? It is easy to say on papers that both DRR institutions and organisations to mainstream CCA and in other hand CCA related institutions/organisations to mainstream DRR. So far the examples are given by NGOs, which 180 degreee different from goverments. Agree that we can move from government to governance but we still need steering capability from the government. In fact, developing countries suffer from governmental steering deficits.

2. Mainstreaming fatigue - local organisations have been asked too many things to be mainstreamed. Local NGOs in the developing world are probably fatigue of being asked to mainstream participation, accountability, gender, child rights, human rights, elderly rights, mainstreaming risk reduction, and now CCA and CC mitigation. At the local government, let me give you one little example from Indonesia, a relatively moderate country in terms of regulatory quality and government effectiveness. As of today, as I write this email, 20% of 500 cities/district have been complied with Disaster Management legislation. While only 2% of the same size of cities/district have complied with Spatial Planning

legislation (produced in the same year as DM law). The former will take 10 more years for all cities/district to comply while the later will take 40 more years. By the time, the legislations will be expired. There are many more examples of "institutional mortality" (such as mitigation related regulations that barely enforce at all - but will keep it for later debate.) So, basically, I am curious to know empirical evidence from the developing countries. Not only the voice of INGOs in this forum andthink tanks but also from government people - if there is any one, please your views on the institutional constraints and opportunities of DRR CCA integration.

Best regards,
Jonatan Lassa

Dear Colleagues

A few initial thoughts on Joern's point 'e' concerning developments in the Hyogo Framework. In my view there is a need to reduce the endless carbon devouring international conferences where tired material is recycled so persistently by the same people, for the same people. Also cut out further attention on the targets, slogans, wish-lists and rhetoric, there has been more than enough of that. All this needs to be replaced in the coming five years with deeply practical advice concerning “HOW", “WHEN", "WHERE", "WITH WHAT LIKELY CONSEQUENCES" and "WITH WHOM" rather than "WHY" Lets assume that after five years sustained efforts we are now preaching to the converted… (but having said that, there is an exception to this observation, noted under 3 below).

Thus the latter five years of the HFA needs to place emphasis on three approaches:

1. HOW TO DO IT
Practical guidance for government and civil society officials concerning the down to earth practicalities of implementing DRR and DRM in varied settings and contexts , with a bank of case study material concerning successful and unsuccessful attempts to reduce risks. The publication on implementation a few years back was a good step, but I am thinking of some advice that goes much further into the nuts and bolts of policy implementation/ approaches to implementation that have worked well/ with detailed budget and programs considerations etc.

2. HOW IT HAS BEEN DONE ALREADY- EXAMPLES TO FOLLOW…
On the case study issue , UNISDR, perhaps in partnership with a key media enterprise (ie. Time/ Life , BBC World, CNN, National Geographic, Discovery Channel, Gates Foundation etc.) could publish attractive books, interactive software and DVD's on the following typical examples:

* An effective Early Warning System (EWS) for drought risk reduction that embraces physical and social/ economic monitoring devices
* An example of holistic integration of CCA and DRR in one of the most severely affected regions subject to climate change * An example of effective DRR being built into reconstruction, (such as the excellent earthquake resistant housing program in Pakistan following the 2005 earthquake
* An example of DRM being successfully mainstreamed into general development, or higher education An example of risk sharing/ risk reduction through micro insurance at community levels and also at macro risk sharing between countries , (such as the Bank's initiative in the Caribbean)
* An example of a vital link being forged between the Millennium Development Goals and the HFA

3. WHY IS THIS SO VITAL AND URGENT
Take a leaf out of the UNICEF approach and secure the active support of some "Champions", a select team of very high profile individuals to promote the cause, by lobbying heads of state and through the

use of the media: for example: Bill Gates/ Bill Clinton/ Al Gore/ Desmond Tuto (alas, too many men on my list…)

Ian Davis

You got support from someone in Grenada. In the Caribbean. People need to know the hazards they face how vulnerable they are to these hazards and what they can do to reduce their vulnerability.

Mr. Benedict Peters MPH
National Disaster Coordinator
National Disaster Management Agency

Ian - and Colleagues,

I agree with most of the points Ian outlined, however, some issues still could be quite interesting, e.g. the role of TARGETS. Should we really skip TARGETS or would it make sense for linking DRR and CCA to specify targets and to more from nice words to more concrete targets. MDGs might not be the most attractive example, but sometimes also the terms in DRR are quite a large container - with various interpretations, such as resilience.

Moreover, some other remarks to the discussion:

- Practical guidance – yes I totally agree, but the main success from my point of view were the national platforms for disaster risk reduction, e.g. Germany, UK and other countries, - perhaps a recommendation could be to ensure that the climate change community and particularly agencies who decide on adaptation funding should be part of these national platforms.

WHAT were approaches that worked well – Ian any advice, example? Ingrid and others? Any advice – what really worked well at different levels or specific projects in linking DRR and CCA?

Perhaps the HOW TO DO IT – has also to acknowledge the different time scales – what Ingrid pointed out that the Climate Change Community can benefit from DRR since when looking at DRR also short and medium term actions are necessary.

Perhaps the HOW TO DO IT – might also mean a stronger recommendation for a management perspective – goals for specific timelines / timeframes. I think the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy of Cape Town is in this regard an interesting approaches, since they really cluster different goals in terms of the realization and implementation timeframe. However, some measures of this strategy are definitely controversial, such as relocation.

EXAMPLES
- Beside the important role of the media, I was wondering what OUR ROLE as SCIENTISTS WILL BE to identify, document and communicate best and bad practices. The examples Ian outlined are very good – but could we perhaps also develop an understanding who should normally gather such information and evaluate the quality of the work and the linkages developed. My feeling is that we have a lot of nice TV material in the UN, but if you aim to go beyond a first layer of raising awareness, the brutal difficulties occur. Example: Relocation as a strategy to reduce disaster risk in Vietnam in

flood prone areas has caused major problems, however, if Sea-Level-Rise scenarios of 1 meter are somehow realistic, than we have to think about planned relocation and migration for millions – thus perhaps partnerships with local communities in the highlands must be developed now in order to be able to strengthen linkages with potential host communities in the long-run. THUS we might need to develop also procedural recommendations on how to evaluate the value of different best and bad practices.

Big Names such as Bill Clinton etc. – Ian - I totally follow your idea, however, if we would compare the post-tsunami reconstruction process (Bill Clinton was special UN advisor) and the Local Agenda 21 processes (Based on the Rio declaration) – I would perhaps even come to the conclusion that both is needed: TV Champions to raise awareness, but also a strong recommendation to develop own initiatives at the local level to strengthen the integration of DRR and CCA.

Lastly, it might also be good to recall that Ilan – underlined that we should be careful not to overestimate the Climate Change Adaptation link, since hazards such as earthquakes and volcanoes would not be covered through such a perspective.

COLLEAGUES

- If you have some more concrete examples on HOW to do it in terms of concrete actions ,but also priority and goals setting (linking DRR and CCA) please circulate some more information. - Ingrid, Marcus, Loy etc. Please check whether we can distill important ingredients of such successful projects and approaches - that are relevant also for other communities. Definitely, core issues have been named already, but perhaps you can provide us with some more concrete examples and check whether local or national specific situations were also key for the success or failure of the approach.

Thanks,
Joern Birkmann – Moderator

For some years there has been tentative and inconclusive debate about how DRR in particular may be integrated with other policy and programme priorities (in effect mainstreaming). This debate contains two important issues. First that DRR and CCA are not ends in themselves but means or processes to greater community safety and wellbeing and second that if integration into broader programmes is desirable, what programmes and activities may contribute to greater community safety. DRR and CCA are not standalone activities but operate (at a minimum) parallel to other social, economic and environmental services (health, education, social insurance etc) and hopefully are integrated with these. This can move teh debate forward by leading us to ask what 'non DRR, non CCA' policies and programmes can contribute in a meaningful way to risk reduction and to increased and sustainable community safety and wellbeing.

For operational, budgeting and auditing purposes some 'siloing' of programmes is unavoidable but this shouldn't lead us to lose sight of the fact that the outcomes we want are better lives and opportunities for people and that programmes are a means to this end which we can approach in diverse ways.

Philip Buckle

Philip makes an important point about mainstreaming that lies at the heart of this vital debate.

THE PROBLEM:
'Mainstreaming' is yet another platitude that slips off our tongues and keyboards easily, but the reality in making this happen is so, so different. In 'Race Against Time' by Stephen Lewis (UN Sec General's special envoy on HIV/AIDS in Africa) Lewis makes an unusually powerful comment for a UN official concerning mainstreaming. In his case he writes about gender mainstreaming, but his observations have wider relevance to the deep problems we see everywhere in the persistent attempts to mainstream DRR or CCA into all the 'silos' that Philip describes.

"…instead of bona fide, specialized programs, women get 'gender mainstreaming', and gender mainstreaming is a pox for women. The worst thing you can do for women is to fold their concerns into the mandates of UN agencies, or bury them under the activities of government ministries. Once you have mainstreamed gender (or in our case DRR, DRM or CCA), it's everyone's business and nobody's business. Everyone's accountable and no one's accountable. I don't know who thought up this mainstreaming guff, but I often wonder what the motives were. And even if the motives were well-meaning, surely experience has shown us how damaging to women mainstreaming truly is."

THE ANSWER:
Of course it is essential to seek to build DRR, DRM and CCA into government machinery, institutional mandates, programs, educational curricula etc etc, but there is a grave risk, as Lewis points out, of it being buried, lost without trace under the weight of bureaucratic inaction. So in addition to the universal desire to incorporate at all levels and sectors, these vital concerns to reduce risk need to be protected and nurtured. Or in the wise words of the late David Oakley, every good idea needs a 'home'.

So, given the possible limits of mainstreaming, what, or where are the 'safe, nurturing homes for disaster risk reduction or adaptation to climate change'?
Any good suggestions?:

* IPCC?
- ISDR?
- * UNDP?
- * GFDRR?
- * Specialised Government Agencies or task forces?
- * Our Universities?
- * Greenpeace?
- * The Bob and Melinda Gates Foundation?
-

  Ian Davis

Taking an integrated approach to adaptation

* With our Southern partners, we at Tearfund are developing research on lessons learned from current practice and on the potential for taking an integrated approach to adaptation. Findings from this research will be presented towards the end of this year (2010). We have produced an interim report that brings together learning and recommendations from extensive existing research on adaptation conducted by Tearfund and our partners across a number of sectors, including disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change, water resources management, food security and environmental sustainability, and across a number of countries and contexts. These recommendations can be grouped into four

broad categories, the four 'I's of adaptation: Integration, Investment, Institutional strengthening, and Information and involvement. Tearfund believes that donors and governments must support action in these four areas to ensure effective adaptation to climate change.

- Tearfund recommends that adaptation must be integrated into national and local development plans, and into relevant sectoral policies and strategies (such as water, agriculture, environment, planning, finance and rural development etc). It should not be viewed as a separate 'sector', with separate frameworks, tools and approaches.
- * Tearfund's work on DRR underscores the need to understand the linkages between 'sectors'. One priority has been to increase both DRR and climate change communities' awareness and understanding of adaptation and DRR synergies and differences. A lack of coordination between the climate change adaptation and disaster risk management communities will increase administration burdens, prevent efficient use of financial, human and natural resources, and undermine the overall effectiveness of efforts to reduce risk. So joint development of DRR and adaptation strategies is important, and so too is the need for policies and tools to help mainstream adaptation and DRR into national development planning, to ensure policy coherence.
- * Research on the water sector shows the importance of supporting the establishment of climate risk-based approaches that address both short-term climate variability as well as long-term climate change within water policy frameworks. For this to be viable, it is essential that there is consensus on the need to develop the legal and regulatory structures necessary to support adaptive change. Adopting these measures is critically important to avoid the creation of water policies and structures which fail to take climate change into account and which cannot guarantee communities sustainable access to water for domestic and agricultural use.
- * In relation to food security, research in the Sahel region of West Africa found that donors, governments and NGOs had made limited progress in integrating disaster risk reduction into development, relief and recovery policy and practice. The underlying causes of vulnerability need to be addressed and resilience to economic and climatic shocks strengthened to prevent food crises, reduce their impact and ensure that communities are prepared.
- * There is currently a lack of donor and UN policy coherence on food security, DRR, climate change, water resources management and environmental sustainability. Donors need to support governments to develop national strategies that incorporate all of these approaches, to prevent the development of parallel efforts and overcome other inefficiencies, including: competing rather than complementary agendas; complicated policy frameworks; missed opportunities for sharing tools, methodologies and approaches; and the waste of financial, human and natural resources. Coordination and coherence need to improve between staff, policies, programmes and departments to ensure a comprehensive and multi-disciplinary approach to tackling these areas. This involves matching the objectives and goals of development strategies and policies with what is required to strengthen adaptive capacities, access to resources and livelihood assets, and the resilience and flexibility of different social groups in adjusting to changes in seasonal patterns and long-term climatic changes.
- * Drawing on government perspectives on community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM) in Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger and Zambia, Tearfund acknowledges that governments face competing demands in national developing planning. However, if DRR is integrated into development planning, it can be 'absorbed' within existing development budgeting and can bring cost savings in the longer term. The cost-effectiveness of this approach is further demonstrated when the link between climate change and the increasing frequency and severity of extreme weather events is taken into consideration.

DRR and UN climate change negotiations

- * The latest version of the LCA text under the UNFCCC negotiations ('Text to facilitate negotiations among Parties' 9 July 2010) promotes an integrated approach to adaptation and includes DRR as an area for enhanced action on adaptation, referencing the HfA. Tearfund

believes that the final agreed text must include a comprehensive approach to building resilience. There should be a focus on principles to ensure prioritised implementation and commitment to a risk reduction approach, including a stronger focus on addressing underlying risk factors in the adaptation text (one of the five priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action). There should be strong references to the need for linkages and coherence between adaptation and DRR, poverty reduction and national sustainable development plans. The framework should encourage ongoing, systematic dialogue, information exchange and joint working between climate change and disaster reduction bodies, focal points and experts.

- We believe that adaptation should build on existing capacity and experience to increase the resilience of the most vulnerable communities. The adaptation framework should build on and expand existing strategies and mechanisms for disaster risk reduction (DRR), making use of transferable and practical experience in addressing hazards. The adaptation framework should ensure that substantial and additional human and financial resources are available and consistent with the priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Richard Weaver
Senior Policy Adviser - Environment and Disasters
Tearfund

Richard Weaver,

Thanks for the interesting and quite comprehensive overview of the activities you are doing with Tearfund. Most of the points are definitly needed and some of them should also appear in the Hyogo Framework modification or as a priority for the 5 years until 2015.

However, I was also wondering whether you have experienced any limits of the current DRR strategies, tools and measures to deal with climate change adaptation. Our experience is that not only the mind-set of different ministries and agencies responsible for DRR versus CCA is an important constraint, but also the different funding regimes and for example the perspective - to take just one example - that early warning systems are mainly following the logic of known sudden-onset hazard warnings, while new issues such as Sea Level Rise or Salinization are often solely attributed to the environmental ministry and not in the focus of those agencies at national and provincial level that are responsible for DRR.

Lastly, a remark for the COLLEAGES FROM AFRICA.

I think we have less input from your side. It WOULD BE VERY NICE IF SOME COLLEAGUES FROM AFRICA could also engage more actively in this discussion. Perhaps Tearfund, UNCCD or ADPC and other important colleagues could stimulate their partners to provide some input from their side.

Looking forward to some more experiences and recommendations on how to deal with DRR and CCA.

Thanks,
Joern Birkmann – Moderator

Dear Philip,

I totally agree with you, but I would like to participate with the following:

When we are talking about mainstreaming either gender or disaster into development policies, I think we should first know at which level we are talking, is it international, regional, national or local level. Then, we will be able to define our plan.

In this respect, I think, we should work at all the level, and build linkages among all of those levels. Then, harmonization will be more effective, since all levels will talk the same language.

Meanwhile, we should also stress on the importance of the regional initiatives and partnership. E.g. our Centre is working for disaster risk reduction in the Arab Region through the following:

- Integration of DRR into regional and national sustainable development policies, strategies and plans.
    - Enhancing regional and national capacities in the field of DRR research, education and training.
    - - Contributing to the development and harmonization of regional DRR methodologies and tools including database and guidelines.
    - - Promoting partnership building with a multi-stakeholder approach to accelerate the implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action.
    - Regarding the climate change, it can be environment issue or natural hazards which can be led disaster. However, both the environment and disasters are cross-cutting issue, which can be dealt with from such prospective.

Tamer M. Abou Gharara, MSc
Programme Manager
Regional Centre for Disaster Risk Reduction (RCDRR)

Dear all,

We are right integrated approach to adaptation will help to work on all vulnerable sectors together. The main actions will be Integration, Investment and institutional strengthening. But adaptation and DRR integration in national and local development plans will be the operational strategy which will empower country and intuitional appropriation and facilitate resources mobilization. That is what we are working for in Benin. A technical guide is elaborate and a training will be held for all communes for reinforce stakeholder capacity in integrating environment, climate change and DRR in all the steps of local plans formulation.

Elisabeth Tossou

Dear Elisabeth,

Many thanks for your contribution. Could you kindly assist me, because I am getting a bit lost in the debate. What is "intutional appropriation"?

Kind regards.

Iris Krebber
GAA Regional Director

Eco-literacy and woman empowerment can go a long way to achieve DRR. Eco-literacy among common mass is poor especially in developing countries; more so in under developed countries. For example, eco-literacy in terms of soil, climate and crop species can help farmers to understand complexities of these on environment and impending disaster. Similarly, woman empowerment is also important.

Pradip Dey

Dear Colleagues,
Thank you very much for your intensive discussion and the various issues you raised. It is nearly impossible to summarize all the important points you have addressed. Your comments and input underlined that several approaches do already exist and important tools and projects are in the testing phase (some seem to be already successfully running).

Overall, - without intending to make a final full summary - I think what has become clear is that the level of successful cooperation between DRR and CCA also depends still on the agencies involved as well as the respective hazard and problem context. While desertification is a topic that shows a clear advantage in linking CCA with DRR, it is less obvious for other hazard phenomena.

Most of the colleagues underlined the important role of vulnerability reduction and addressing the underlying risk factors, such changing social, economic and environmental conditions. Community Based Risk and Adaptation strategies are definitely essential, but what kind of recommendations can we draw for the international level?
Ian Davids and others recommended lets move from the WHAT to HOW? - Lets be more precise for the Hyogo Framework:
Which role should the different stakeholders have?
How to ensure quality in actions at local level and national level? - and
Which role do the National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction play in this process?

I would appreciate if we could collect some final recommendations on what actually should be a priority within the next 5 years of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action in terms of the nexus of DRR and CCA.

What will happen of the negotiations on a post-Kyoto protocol will fail in Mexico?

Thus, if you want - you are welcome to make some final remarks on what should be done in terms of a better governance structure towards adaptive disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

I will provide you after the closer of this debate - thus by beginning of August with a more comprehensive summary of the main arguments and the lessons learned that I can distill from the

intensive discussion we had - for the Hyogo Framework of Action and for the topic of linking DRR and CCA more generally.

Best regards,
Joern Birkmann – Moderator

Dear Joern and fellow debaters,

Apologies for the delayed response to your question in your last summary email. If I may rephrase, your question was asking about who the actors are in my analogy of a hospital as the framework and human illnesses analogous to local and regional disasters. The simple answer is, the inter-governmental organizations are analogous to the hospital administrative staff, and those working on the ground, such as NGOs and other civil society organizations working closely with the disasters are analogous to doctors working with patients. The long answer: the administrative staff build the environment for doctors to work in, but they also do their job best by listening to the doctor's needs. If there is a new technology out there that the doctors think will improve their performance, they tell the administrative staff. The framework needs to be clear and rigid enough that workers can depend on it, but at the same time, those who build and manage the framework need to be responsive to the time-sensitive needs of the people working on the ground. Keywords being depend-on, responsive, and time-sensitive. I can appreciate the difficulty of this job.

Now, I have also seen Ian's question of *which* inter-governmental organization should be responsible for building the framework. I don't an answer for that. I do know, however, that accountability an clear ownership of responsibilities needs to be apparent in order for a solid and functional framework to arise. Not just ownership of building a successful framework (which I hope is a moving target that is always improving for new needs), but also ownership of the role to inform the governmental organizations of the new findings and needs on the ground. I might even go so far to say someone should own the role of opening the channel between those two actors. In other words, let this debate continue, because this communication is valuable. And in order for those roles to be fulfilled, we all need to agree to a set of clear *achievable* goals.

I would personally like to thank everyone for your participation in this debate - it has truly been a learning experience for me. Thank you Joern for doing an excellent job organizing and maintaining focus of this debate.

Joanne Ho

Thanks Joern for this quick salary and posing challenging questions.

Using the term "adaptive DRR or DRM" sounds pretty good to bridge gaps and distances between the DRR and CC communities. It was mentioned during the debate that there is a lot of emphasis put on developing international financial means and mechanisms to address various CC aspects. DRD/DRM remains underfunded and the international financial mechanisms that have been developed to address DRR are limited in number and size. The adaptive DRR to climate change shall provide a venue to advocate at global level to the development of global funds that intend to reduce the CC related disaster risks, these funding mechanisms shall address the underline all causes of vulnerability and CC induced hazards. Such funding mechanisms must be directed towards community, national

and regional levels. Money shall not be spent on research and production of fancy publications; instead it shall reach the round. This doesn't mean that research and education on DRR and CC is not important, but we shall not get drowned in academic and high level debates while vulnerable and affected people are left alone or used as experiment field.

All best,

Mohammed Khaled

Dear Colleagues,

I find this discussion very much stimulating and let me share practical experience from Bangladesh on the links between DRR and CCA.

Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP) and Poverty Environment and Climate Mainstreaming Programme in Bangladesh are aimed at contributing towards integration of DRR and CCA at the community to different administrative tiers from union, sub-district, district and through policy influence at the national level.

In Bangladesh, the entry point at the local level for integration is through the disaster and environment management committees which exist at each administrative tier. Integration of both DRR and CCA related activities across organizations, sectors and policy levels are planned for resilience and sustainability.

At the local level, community risk assessment (CRA) is the first step to capture the integration issues which is a participatory tool developed by CDMP to identify, assess and prioritize community risks and develops a corresponding Risk Reduction Action Plan (RRAP) for a particular community. RRAPs are implemented through existing or newly formed local community institutions or local government bodies.

RRAPs include:

- Prevention / Mitigation Measures
- - Preparedness Measures
- - Climate Change Adaptation Measures

Mainstreaming DRR and CCA is one of the outcomes of CDMP which supports 12 sectoral development Ministries. Improved disaster-proofing of development funding across broader government development in those Ministries through generating increased awareness of hazard risks and the provision of technical information, advisory services and resources to incentivize positive changes in planning and investment decisions over the long-term. The overall objective is to systematically integrate DRR/CCA into planning and budgeting processes.

Financial and economic impacts of disasters can be reduced through risk transfer. While these risks can never be completely eliminated, they can be shared. The most obvious risk transfer tool is insurance, or micro-insurance. There are other arrangements such as common property resources, social safety nets are similarly useful adaptation measures as well as risk reduction. CDMP will also be exploring how the application of this in Bangladesh.

There are five major elements to mainstream DRR and CCA knowledge and technology (i) develop adequate human and organizational capacity, (ii) create an appropriate enabling

environment at the institution level, (iii) establish effective mechanisms, (iv) adequate financial flow and (v) supervised programme for effective implementation.

The Challenges
The complexities of integrating climate adaptation into the coastal disaster management policy, a necessary prerequisite for sustainable development, remains largely ignored. Existing fragmentation between different government agencies and departments with little policy integration across sectors, let alone incorporation of climate change risk continues. The cost involved in facilitating a national-, and sub-national dialogue to create the necessary policy environment to address climate change risks will remain overlooked in favour of more pressing short-term reactive actions. Without intervention using climate funds with DRR integration, the institutional and policy environment will continue to cater to pressures arising from current weather, and not lead to the necessary policy options to better manage climate change risks.

Best regards,

Aminul Islam
Assistant Country Director
Climate Change, Environment & Disaster Management
UNDP Bangladesh

Dear Colleagues,
As we go through the mid term phase of the Hyogo Framework it is clear that the HFA is having an impact, particularly in terms of guiding and informing the formulation of national DRR policy and legislation. However, we also know that national DRR policy is not resulting in enough action at the local level. As we shift the emphasis from "what" to "how" it is apparent that local institutions are the primary actors in turning DRR policy in practice with vulnerable people.

The reality is that policies - no matter how well worded - are being weakened by a lack of resources and capacity at the local level to carry them out - indicating a lack of national political ownership of the DRR agenda. It's not easy to raise commitment given limited domestic resources and competing national priorities. Particularly when those priorities are determined by established power structures; bear in mind that disaster impact most on poor marginalised people who have least influence on political decision-making processes. So it is unlikely that the pro-poor changes we're looking for will emanate from states alone.

Again, local stakeholders can have a crucial role to play - local authorities can pressure national governments to act.... and active citizens can pressure local authorities to act. Perceptions of risk are important here - how an individual and society perceives risk associated with disasters and/or climate change is fundamental in determining their motivation and ability to act, to cope, to adapt. And that means when raising levels of awareness and understanding of risk it has to be done in the way that local people can identify with - through their livelihoods, their build environment, the natural environment, and local governance structures and processes (i.e. underlying risk factors).

As we enter the final five years of the HFA, turning policy aspirations into actual practice involves finding the right balance between top-down and bottom-up engagement - an important "push-pull" factor. One only has to look at the key outputs of the UNISDR 2010-11 biennial work programme to see that the current approach remains heavily top-down government-centric with a strong focus on building regional (rather than sub-national) capabilities.

So what would the main elements of a complementary "bottom-up" strategy look like ? Some examples; 1/ Actions to increase participation and interaction between local state and non-state actors; 2/ Increased public demand and ownership of DRR; 3/ Strengthen domestic accountability and transparency (at the heart of effective implementation of risk reduction and/or climate adaptation at the local level is an independent local-level monitoring, reporting and verification process) 4/ Strengthen capacities of local actors - state / non-state; 5/ Improve horizontal exchange of experiential learning and good practices; 6/ Build cross-disciplinary linkages and broad-based alliances (poverty alleviation, food security, social protection).

Of course climate change offers an opportunity, an opportunity to mobilise resources for building local level capacities, and perhaps most significantly, an opportunity to increase political commitment to address the underlying drivers of risk and environmental degradation - to fundamentally change the way we do development. Let us hope we have the ability to learn, to be flexible and responsive enough to embrace these opportunities.

Marcus Oxley
Chairman
Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction

---

Dear Joern and all,

Thank you for an interesting and informative debate which has developed over the last weeks. In responding to Joern's question I am reminded by the challenge poised by Ian Davis and others regarding the mainstreaming of DRR/CCA and at the same time the need for this championing agency that would ensure against DRR of CCA swallowing each other or being swallowed by other competing development priorities.

At the same time, as Marcus points out, action on DRR/CCA within the HFA requires a bottom-up community approach and local accountability, as well as the push-pull of international agencies, donors, governments and their institutions implementing commitments outlined in the HFA.

So we have the challenge of mainstreaming and championing, and the need for community bottom-up and global top-down.

What these challenges seems to mean in reality from the discussion I have seen and the summary here is that, the HFA can support the implementation of CCA/DRR if it provides a clear set of proposals that can be used by both member states and civil society on how CCA can be incorporated into the implementation of the current framework and indicators by which those governments are held to account.

It can also only help if this integration requires implementing actors to incorporate CCA into their existing strategies, and maintains a strong political focus on the CCA component that is being brought to DRR and then together these components that are being brought into sust dev.

In terms of who should do this? If we are challenging ourselves, it would seem logical that, in the absense of a single global body, there be a DRR/CCA/Sust Dev taskforce established at international level to galvanise the political will and help channel the financial resources needed. This should comprise UNISDR, UNFCCC and UNDP and include at given moments bodies like UNOCHA, Unicef and UNWomen, and possibly involve a UN Special Rapporteur on CCA and DRR that complements

the existing UN special representatives. I will leave it another day to debate whether this is likely or realistic, but what it may well do is support that need for international political will within the push-pull challenge Marcus mentioned.

In terms of how the HFA should reflect this, I again move away from how realistic it is that the text of the HFA can change, but it has helped me to look at the HFA objectives and see how these might change to include CCA if we were revisiting them now. The aim of this was also to think about then how the actions and indicators for government and civil society holding governments to account, would reflect these changes:

So, from Christian Aid's perspective, on one level the HFA would need to change, to reflect and include CCA;

1) where the first objective is the effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sust dev, this should specifically include CCA considerations,
2) 2) the second objective refers to the building of resilience and this concept of resilience may be where CC needs to be integrated and a concept of Climate Resilience included as we know that the reference to 'past disasters' may be less of a good indicator for future risk because of climate change, in this second objective building disaster resilience in a world affected by Climate Change should also have a strong emphasis on 'enhancing adaptive capacity' and building communities ability to adapt, the core skills upon which CCA effectiveness will depend.
   3) and on the third objective focused on the systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into emergency preparedness it would be key to specify the new challenge of unpredictability that mean a new approach to risk reduction would be needed within Climate Change.

By looking through these objectives from the perspective of the 3 components of tackling changing disaster risks and uncertainties, enhancing adaptive capacity and addressing the vulnerability and poverty through effective integrated sustainable development can help to identify where existing approaches as outlined in the HFA need to change.

I found it also a useful exercise to go through the 5 HFA action areas through the perspective of these 3 integrated goals, just as we do with the Climate Smart Approach to DRM that we have been looking at with IDS, Plan and partners in East Africa, South Asia and South East Asia. It would be at this broken down detailed level that the kind of activities local communities would use to measure state's fulfillment of a HFA that includes CCA would be spelt out.
I won't post all that reflection here, but if anyone would find it useful please do email me and I am happy to share those thoughts.

Many thanks again for such an interesting discussion and good luck Joern and all with capturing these discussion areas.

Katherine Nightingale
Senior Research and Policy Officer - Building Disaster Resilient Communities
Humanitarian Division
Christian Aid

The North-Africa and Middle-East Region is one of the most vulnerable regions to the negative impacts of climate change. This entails greater frequency of natural disasters such as drought, sand storms, heat waves, floods, tsunamis, pests, diseases, etc… DRR strategies on the national and

regional level should include plans and action programs for adequate preparedness and adaptation to reduce disaster risks due to climate change with special attention paid to provide advanced monitoring control and early warning systems as well as enhancing capacities raising awareness and highlighting the role of local communities. Intergovernmental organizations could have a major role in implementation in close cooperation with all relevant partners. However to be able to implement such plans and programs necessitates the provision of adequate financial technical and capacity building support from the developed countries. COULD YOU TELL ME HOW WE CAN MAKE THESE COUNTRIES FULFIL THEIR OBLIGATIONS AND COMMITMENTS.

Fatma El Mallah

Dear Fatma and all,

Thank you for bringing this to discussion. I totally agree with you, there is a strong and growing need for the Arab world to 'wake up' and see further to the level of risk it is faces. I have contact many universities in many Arabic universities to highlight this and work with them in developing new strategies and techniques to mitigate these risks and provide solutions which will enhance the slow development (in most of these countries).

Personally, I am happy to be involved in any activity that aims to reduce the risks and enhance the resilience. My contact details are shown below and I look forward to hearing from the other members.

Best wishes,
Nebil Achour

Dear Marcus and All,

To me, the way forward and approaches you made, is really great. I wonder there are sort of underlying facts at all stages causes of all challenges. In ref to paragraph 5 from your writings; So what would the main elements of a complementary "bottom-up" strategy look like? Some examples; 1/ Actions to increase participation and interaction between local state and non-state actors; 2/ Increased public
demand and ownership of DRR; 3/ Strengthen domestic accountability and transparency (at the heart of effective implementation of risk reduction and/or climate adaptation at the local level is an independent local-level monitoring, reporting and verification process) 4/ Strengthen capacities of local actors - state / non-state; 5/ Improve horizontal exchange of experiential learning and good practices; 6/ Build cross-disciplinary linkages and broad-based alliances (poverty alleviation, food security, social protection).It is fact if the "Bottom-up" strategy. "Participation" and "Interaction"
are so comparative issues that varies community to community and time to time in relation to resources and capacity. To my experience, there different level of 'participation' in the total development fields. To understand the reality, I would like to share some cases, as below:

Participation and interaction -1:
In the paper there is the woman focal point in the local communities and committees. The woman focal point's participation is visible but she generally does not have any contribution in the decision making process. She may not have the capacity or she does have the opportunity to air her voices.

But officially it is shown that the women representative is active and takes part in all meetings and decision making process i.e. active "participation" and "Interaction" - have been taking place.

Participation and interaction - 2:
There are some women focal points, they are willing take part in the decision making process and try their best to contribute when they have a chance. Even they avail the chance to speak out in the meetings, questions and answers etc. works well. But the decision is made, what the Committee Leader and key people want. The women focal point does not have the opportunity to check or update whether her suggestion contributed something or not. She does have the ability or capacity or opportunity to ask the leader why the decision does not reflect the ideas from the meeting. In this case, the woman focal points participation visible but her contribution has been recognized. As a result, the result is something like case 1, but officially it is shown that the women representative is active and takes part in all meetings and decision making process.

Participation and interaction - 3:
Women is village leader/committee head and has the opportunity to contribute in the decision making process. But there are some *unseen *advisers and she needs to satisfy them. As a result, the decision is made by women leader but still it is biased but officially it is shown that the women representative is active and takes part in all meetings and decision making process.

Participation and interaction - 4:
Women focal point is really active, responsive and have the ability and capacity to check and balance against the issues discussed in the meeting and decisions are made. That is the ideal case and expected case. Officially it is shown that the women representative is active and takes part in all meetings and decision making process as well. The case 4 is always expected and all the plans and developments initiatives are made considering this ideal situation. But the reality is so far from the situations. Case 4 can be seen rare.

Please note that these cases have been experienced in the developing countries from Asia. I am not sure what is the fact in the other regions.

The same cases is applicable for your DRR and CCA Resilient draft document (apology for not making comments because I was busy in the filed trips).
think, once we can improve the situations to case 4 from cases 1-3 will be working well the total plans effectively that will be resulting sustainability.
Would you please mind to see applicable mechanism to improve the situations to case 4?

Sano Akhteruzzaman
Save the Earth Cambodia
