

SUMMARY OF MID-TERM REVIEW ONLINE DEBATE

Topic 4: What kind of instrument post-HFA?

Dates: 26-30 July (extended until the 6th of August)

Question:

What kind of international instrument/tool do you think would be most useful in furthering DRR to follow-up to the HFA beyond 2015?

Sub-questions:

Would setting up specific international and national targets help improving DRR impact at the national and local level?

What kind of international institutional structures/instruments would be most helpful to continue to accelerate and support risk reduction work?

The HFA is a voluntary international instrument. Has the voluntary nature of the HFA played a positive or negative role in its implementation and buy-in at the international and national level?

Rationale

This question 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.

The fourth 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 alternative international instruments and tools to follow-up to the HFA in furthering DRR. It took place between the 26th of July and the 6th of August, 2010 on PreventionWeb.net, and was moderated by Dr. Mukesh Kapila, Under Secretary General of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and part of the Advisory Group for the Mid-Term Review of HFA.

Overall the debate sought new perspectives and insights by inviting participants to consider four specific questions: “what kind of international instrument/tool do you think would be most useful in furthering DRR to follow-up to the HFA beyond 2015?”, “would setting up specific international and national targets help improving DRR impact at the national and local level?”, “what kind of international institutional structures/instruments would be most helpful to continue to accelerate and support risk reduction work?” and “has the voluntary nature of the HFA played a positive or negative role in its implementation and buy-in at the international and national level?” It counted 213 registered users, and saw the active participation of 26 individuals affiliated with national institutions, international organizations, research institutes, non-governmental organizations or expressing their views in personal capacity.

The following is a thematic summary of the moderator’s reflections as informed by the debate.

Q1. To start with, what is the world of 2015+ going to look like? What are the possible key drivers that will shape for the better, or hinder for the worse, future joint effort on disaster risk reduction (DRR)?

With recent and ongoing research, the economic case for greater investment in disaster risk reduction is getting stronger and stronger. Scientific innovation and technological progress will also open up better and more cost effective means to tackle disaster risk. There will be a move towards fuller economic costing of infrastructural and other developments which have environmental risks associated with them, and we may also see financial and budgetary innovations to share risk cost burdens. However there could be significant populations not covered by risk reduction and mitigation measures unless proactive and inclusive public policies are promoted. The balance between local, national, and international risk sharing is not clear. We may also see much more debate on social and ethical issues in terms of who pays for the benefit of whom. Could the post 2015 DRR framework be designed in a way that incentivises cooperation rather than competition in addressing the risks of common concern and protecting the most vulnerable communities?

Q2. What is the justification and perceived benefit from, as well as costs and risks, associated with, a post 2015 international framework on DRR?

One of the lessons learnt is that while individual public policy frameworks do indeed make a difference in successfully pushing a particular endeavour, diminishing returns set in after time (for many reasons including familiarity and fatigue), not helped by multiple or even competing frameworks that come along that demand trade-offs to be made by policy-makers and investors. We may have too many frameworks in too many sectors jostling for attention. The implication of this relates to the close inter-linkage in significant areas (not all areas) between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation and mitigation, and even more so with sustainable development. DRR is, for *all* intents and *most* purposes, a development issue. Thus, post-2015, far greater leverage is likely to be obtained by ensuring the inclusion of DRR as a strong core, mainstreamed element of development paradigms, goals and targets in the successor framework to the Millennium Development Goals, than going it alone as a “new HFA”. It is however, conceivable and probably desirable, to maintain a strong focus on DRR as a subset of new development goals – so as to ensure that mainstreaming does not mean invisibility and that targeted DRR investments are catalysed where that is the best way to reduce disaster risk.

Q3. Regardless of the positioning (free-standing or mainstreamed or both) of any future DRR framework, what would be the features of its design that would maximise greater success? Specifically, what are the features of the current HFA that should be continued, what is missing, and what should be different?

The current HFA is achieving a great deal in terms of research and analysis of disaster risks including the prevalence, mapping and relative importance of different types of risk, as well as policy conceptualisation, national-level institution building, and civil society engagement. Anecdotal evidence of the benefits in terms of actual risk reduction is also increasingly available. But systematic benefits are yet to be convincingly demonstrated. To enhance future success, the DRR framework needs to offer approaches and incentives that enable scale-up. It must also emphasise greater reach to local and community level, as well as more specificity in relation to interventions in specific sectors of importance to human, social and physical development. The conceptual confusion between disaster preparedness, prevention, and reduction, and failure to distinguish between disaster reduction and disaster *risk* reduction has meant that investment in the latter i.e. the reduction of primary risk has

lagged behind the easier things to do eg. disaster *response* preparedness. Both are important, but the latter is not a substitute for the former.

Q4. Should we develop some “principles and values” for DRR? What would these look like, and what would be needed to get universal agreement on them?

A lesson learnt from other endeavours (e.g. human rights and international humanitarian law, refugee protection or guiding principle for assistance to internally displaced people and, conversely, failure of climate change agreements so far) is that a consensus on underlying values and principles is vital to develop any agreement. Thus a global consensus on underlying principles and values for DRR may be helpful to sustain meaningful cooperation. There is unlikely to be universal agreement on them unless equity and justice derived principles are addressed in a way that all governments can accept.

Q5. Should future DRR targets be set (current HFA does not) and, if so, what may they look like in terms of both types of indicators and the levels of ambitions that would be appropriate? Should such targets be at global level or should targets be left to individual countries to set in their own contexts?

together with:

Q9. The mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on HFA have been progressively developed over recent years. What lessons may be learnt and what may be the efficient and streamlined mechanisms for tracking progress that could be built into the new framework from the start?

Appropriately set targets are a necessary device to ensure confidence and credibility, and to guide sensible investment decisions. The tracking of targets is essential to accountability, lesson learning, and motivating greater buy-in of stakeholders and obtaining their investment in a common DRR enterprise. Ambition levels at which the targets are set need to stretch us but not be unachievable. The indicators of progress on implementing HFA published by ISDR in 2008 are a good basis and need to be systematically applied and learnt from in any revision in line with the post 2015 framework. There is greater value in setting specific nationally-owned targets by the national contexts of risks, hazard, and vulnerabilities. At the global level, we may think of setting norms and standards instead of targets.

Q6. Should the successor framework to HFA remain voluntary or carry more binding duties and obligations to be discharged by those signing up to it. What would be the pros and cons of a more legally-binding agreement, and how would that work?

The expressed opinions varied: debaters that came from a government background or with government affiliation were reluctant to envisage legally binding frameworks. Academic and civil society debaters argued for a legal base. Probably, if consistent progress is to be made, and the needs of under-served or most vulnerable people (who may not have a strong voice) are to be met, then a legal base will be necessary, sooner or later. It is timely to start the substantive debate and DRR law will probably grow through incremental developments and changing public expectations and norms (and a few high profile failures in voluntary DRR codes that are costly in human and economic terms). Perhaps one or two countries at the front line of DRR failures may set the trend in terms of model legislation.

Q7. How could a new DRR framework consider the challenge of financing, especially in the context of more legally binding obligations? Could investment norms be set in relation to a country's GDP, and the sharing or mitigating of risks? Should properly calculated investment targets be considered and linked to the individual components of the framework?

together with:

Q8. There have been recent moves to set targets for DRR funding in terms of a proportion (say 10-20%) of categories of spend (eg disaster response). Should such approaches be encouraged further and global norms negotiated?

The linkage between commitments made and resources available is often unclear. Further, it is realistic to assume that most investment will be from domestic budgets and international aid (*oda*) will be relatively modest, in comparative terms. In addition, identifying specific spend with an attributable DRR benefit but which is part of wider expenditure (eg sectoral spend on health or education or transport infrastructure) is methodologically difficult. More expert and evidence-based discussion is needed on this, as well as setting up a financial tracking system that includes clear and commonly agreed definitions of categories of DRR spend eg direct and indirect. On the issue of hypothecating a proportion of certain categories of spend (eg disaster relief spend) to DRR, this may be a useful tactic to initiate or benchmark a policy response. But over the longer term this is not a logical or satisfactory basis for allocating spend to DRR which needs to be based on an assessment of specific needs. The arbitrary linkage of DRR to disaster response spending may also send mixed messages when DRR spend should really be part of investment in sustainable development. Humanitarian relief spend is a growing but is still a very small proportion of overall spend and not therefore, an adequate base for benchmarking DRR expenditure.

Q10. If a new DRR framework is to have universal validity and support, it must be the product of a broad and inclusive consultative process that maximises global understanding and buy-in. How much interest would there be to do this and how could momentum be built-up and sustained to negotiate a good outcome? How would such a process be best managed?

The HFA was the product of an extensive consultation process that was initiated some time ahead of the conference that adopted it. As such, the process did its best to give more meaningful time for thinking, research, and wide-ranging participation. Nevertheless, an inclusive approach to the design of any future framework is necessary. Additional processes that allow more authentic expression of the voices of the poor and vulnerable would in fact enrich the outcome and give it additional weight and legitimacy. Cooperation between global, regional, national, and thematic stakeholders remains the most feasible way to manage the process. However, a stronger engagement of governments – while not diminishing the engagement of civil society – will be necessary to deliver an improved outcome.

*Dr Mukesh Kapila,
Advisory Group for the Mid Term Review of HFA
Under Secretary General, IFRC*

Transcript

Topic 4: What kind of instrument post-HFA?

Dear colleagues,

The previous weeks have generated a lively debate and provided much food for reflection. Please keep up the energy and creativity as we enter the last debate in the series. Welcome to this week's topic:

Peeking over the horizon beyond 2015, what type of international "instrument" or "tool" would be most useful in furthering disaster risk reduction to follow-up the HFA beyond 2015?

This question is deliberately broadly-worded to give you greatest scope to range widely in looking forward. The mid-term review of the Hyogo Framework for Action - of which these debates are a part - will provide a critical analysis of HFA implementation over the first five years of its existence with a view to inform its continued implementation through 2015. This is also a useful opportunity to do initial thinking on any future international framework on disaster risk reduction beyond 2015.

Accordingly, you are invited to reflect on the following issues and suggest others that may be directly relevant to the above question:

1. To start with, what is the world of 2015+ going to look like? This question is not about the growing consensus on the economic or moral case for greater investment in disaster risk reduction - which we may assume is almost beyond debate - but about the nature of the ways in which countries and communities across the world may compete or co-operate in addressing issues of common concern. This may be seen in the context of continued globalisation and changing world order, influenced by shifting social norms and values, scientific innovation and technological progress opening up new means to solve old problems, and, of course, economic and political perspectives. In sum, what are the possible key drivers that will shape for the better, or hinder for the worse, future joint effort on disaster risk reduction (DRR)?
2. The further basic assumption is that internationally agreed frameworks of shared understanding are necessary or, at least, useful in making and sharing global progress. We have several such frameworks on different topics of which HFA is one. What is the justification and perceived benefit from a post 2015 international framework on DRR beyond 2015? What would be the costs and risks? In particular, in the context of an increased recognition of the inter-linkages between sustainable development, climate change and DRR, is there advantage or disadvantage in a separate framework on DRR as compared to its incorporation (or "mainstreaming") into wider frameworks, for example, in the successor to the Millennium Development Goals? If we were to consider doing both, how would that work?
3. Regardless of the positioning (free-standing or mainstreamed or both) of any future DRR framework, what would be the features of its design that would maximise greater success? Specifically, what are the features of the current HFA that should be continued, what is missing, and what should be different?
4. A lesson learnt from other endeavours (e.g. human rights and international humanitarian law,

refugee protection or guiding principle for assistance to internally displaced people and, conversely, failure of climate change agreements so far) is that a consensus on underlying values and principles is vital to develop and sustain any agreement. Do we have such "principles and values" for DRR? What would these look like, and what would be needed to get universal agreement on them?

5. The current HFA does not set objectively measurable levels of achievement by which the extent of disaster risk reduction may be reliably assessed and compared. Should future targets be set and, if so, what may they look like in terms of both types of indicators and the levels of ambitions that would be appropriate? Should such targets be at global level or should targets be left to individual countries to set in their own contexts?

6. The HFA is a voluntary instrument and the mid-term review may provide insight into the extent to which this feature has been relevant or important in determining its relative success or otherwise - to date. Should the successor framework be similar in spirit or carry more binding duties and obligations to be discharged by those signing up to it. What would be the pros and cons of a more legally-binding agreement, and how may that work?

7. The linkage between commitments made and resources available is often unclear. How could a new DRR framework consider the challenge of financing, especially in the context of more legally binding obligations? Could investment norms be set in relation to a country's GDP, and the sharing or mitigating of risks? Should properly calculated investment targets be considered and linked to the individual components of the framework?

8. Most investment will be from domestic budgets and international aid (oda) will be relatively modest, in comparative terms. Nevertheless, there have been recent moves to set targets for DRR funding in terms of a proportion (say 10-20%) of categories of spend (eg disaster response). Should such approaches be encouraged further and global norms negotiated?

9. The mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on HFA have been progressively developed over recent years. What lessons may be learnt and what may be the efficient and streamlined mechanisms for tracking progress that could be built into the new framework from the start?

10. Finally, if a new DRR framework is to have universal validity and support, it must be the product of a broad and inclusive consultative process that maximises global understanding and buy-in. How much interest would there be to do this and how could momentum be built-up and sustained to negotiate a good outcome? How would such a process be best managed?

Some of these questions have been touched upon - here and there - in the preceding weeks. May I suggest that we come back to them this week in a structured way? Thus, it may be helpful if we do this by referring to the issue number on which you are specifically commenting. And, of course, raise other issues as the list above will not be complete.

Waiting to hear from you!
Mukesh

Dr Mukesh Kapila, Advisory Group for the Mid Term Review of HFA – MODERATOR
Under Secretary General, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

1. To begin with The VOLUNTARY nature of HFA does not help in any way... Let's face it only a few handful people in the disaster management sector are aware of HFA, hence steps need to be taken to

make it mandatory much on the lines of MDG in each country specially for DISASTER MANAGEMENT.

2. The principles of HFA is undoubtedly with all the good intention, but remains to be translated in most cases. The best way to spread the message of the translation of these principles anywhere in the world would be to disseminate information of the successful practice. This could be shown in the Global Platform where decision makers/NGO's are present and could be inspired!

3. EXCHANGE OF GOOD Practices wherein the HFA have been practiced needs to be highlighted as mentioned above.

Dr. Swati Mitra

Dear All,

Good day! I strongly believe that we need more of Ushahidi kind of platforms to tackle disasters in future. For those who are new to USHAHIDI, it is kind of platform which allows anyone to gather distributed data via SMS, email or web and visualize it on a map or timeline. The goal of Ushahidi is to create the simplest way of aggregating information from the public for use in crisis response.

Thanks and regards,
Pradip Dey

Dear Dr. Kapila and fellow colleagues, Thank you for the clear directions of your questions. The questions you pose are an excellent way of forward-looking into the execution of the future HFA. I have a few comments, knowing well that there are many good ideas on how to execute on a set of goal.

Question 1: what is the world of 2015+ going to look like?

There's a lot to comment here, and I'll highlight a few areas. First of all, I think it is very important to look at the economic and political climate of each country, and as how does that economic-political climate drive willingness to join the HFA - what drives them to join, what drives them away? What is that government's interests? As for the U.S., by reflecting on the government's response to the Gulf oil spill and comparing that with the government's velocity with regard to energy consumption and carbon cap and trade, it is very apparent that DRR and climate change are seen and approached very differently. I am not here to judge the government's response and it's prioritization of matters, but simply stating the fact that in order to capture their interests in joining and committing the international framework, we need to understand the priorities of each country. With that, of course, is the projection of the economic downturn, and we can get a clearer picture of what we should expect in terms of cross-national cooperation. I would also think about which countries would be good leaders in these efforts-- which country has the capacity and faces problems other countries can relate to, so that it can lead by example?

Question 2: are there advantages or disadvantages in a separate framework on DRR as compared to incorporating into wider framework, such as MDG? There is no question that DRR is closely linked with many of the inherent problems that the Millennium Development Goals is trying to address. However, in my experience, smaller goals are easier to achieve than large goals; clear and concise

goals are easier to achieve than broad and interpretable goals. One thing I learned from the operations of the Red Cross, and perhaps is my personal belief, is that the ICRC lends its success greatly to the fact that it has a clear mission, and it is adamant that everyone serving under the name of ICRC adheres to prioritizing that mission first. While the Hyogo Framework itself can refer to and relate to any number of other frameworks, I think the HFA will be most successful if its purpose and goals clearly reflect the concerns to DRR.

Question 4: Principles and values for DRR

Yes, we definitely need this, and consensus is important. I also think the content of these principles and values should come from and agreed upon by the actors themselves.

Question 5: Objectively measureable achievements - Should targets be set?

What are the types of indicators and levels of ambition, and should the targets be set at the global or country level? Different leadership come with different management styles, and I am definitely biased towards mine. I offer you here one suggestion, and I'm sure there are many other suggestions to come.

Yes, targets are absolutely necessary, otherwise you can't measure progress. Setting targets is a part of setting goals, and is a roadmap to getting to a common goal. International consensus on DRR is no easy task, and isn't going to take a single step to achieve. Therefore it is important to lay out the intermediate steps of how we are, as a global community, going to get to the final destination. To answer your question on indicators, level of ambition, and who should set targets, I have some comments that also loosely relate to Question 7 on commitments, question 9 on monitoring and reporting, and question 10 on universal validity and support.

I think indicators should be specific to the type of disaster. I can't give a concrete answer here, but I have a suggestion of where you can get concrete indicators.

I suggest, instead of looking at communities as countries or at the grassroots level, we look at the international community, and group them together by the type of disasters they face (e.g. earthquake, flood, hurricane, etc). The groups should be self-selected by their common challenges. If they cannot agree on a common challenge despite facing similar disasters, break them out into more than one group. Within themselves, each group includes the scientific community, policy makers, disaster response practitioners, and everyone else related to the specific disaster. Bear in mind that these people come from all over the world to share ideas of how to prevent and respond to a disaster, so there should be plenty of opportunity to share and learn. Borrowing from Muhammad Yunus' concept of peer monitoring and its application in micro-lending, incentives within the framework should encourage the individual entities within each group to be accountable for each others' progress. Each group should be allowed to set their own targets, so to make sure that targets are realistic within one coherent community with one common challenge. On top of that, there needs to be an incentive for each group to achieve their target - what's in it for them to stay in the game? Why should individual entities care whether others in the group perform? I suggest that small targets should be set within the larger target, and achieving each of these small targets will earn the group further funding for future projects – something you mentioned in question 7 and 8. Since they set their own goals, this should be a very fair set-up. That is to say, we are not unintentionally excluding certain groups by externally applying unrealistically high goals for a disadvantaged partner. On the other hand, to prevent the groups from setting too easy of targets, we require that each round of targets should increase in the volume of output, whatever that may be. The challenge for the advantaged entities, then, would be to assist the disadvantaged entities to get up to speed faster.

This is my concept of a set-up for a framework where we encourage collaboration across developed and less-developed communities, and that knowledge transfer and transnational cooperation is within everyone's interest. Furthermore, this arrangement avoids the problem of over – or under-shooting

targets, or externally applying indicators that are not relevant to the specific disaster or challenge that the community faces. To convince all of you that I'm not making this up out of thin air, my suggestion is adopted from a well-known management process described in Ken Schwaber's book "Agile Project Management with Scrum."

As I said earlier, this is just one idea out of many other good ideas out there, so I look forward to seeing the rest of your responses.

Warm regards from Seattle,

Joanne Ho

Dear Mukesh and all,

In terms of scientific and social benefit, it would be great if what ever the name of the successor of the HFA, it is highly suggested that the post HFA should be more or less use the 5 priorities (22 progress indicators). The driving force indicators may be changed (increased or reduced) such as the integration of CCA into HFA in the technical report by each member state can be put into the driving force. However, I think the 22 progress indicators should be kept the same for some period. The 22 technical indicators for progress are extremely important to be updated on two year basis. If this can be done on regular basis for twenty years, it would be great to see the volatility in the institutional commitment in the countries.

For example, we can also compare the longitudinal observation in World Governance Indicators: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>

It would be great to have similar global dataset on observed DRR indicators with long term data collection. Scientific and social benefit of having that done on regular basis is extremely huge.

I think to push for a more legally-binding agreement is not fully grounded on empirical evidence. The strength of HFA today is due to its voluntary mechanism. What we can expect is rather a bigger push for reporting on changes in indicator of progress. Therefore, the successor framework should carry similar spirit. But expecting a more legally binding one, I think we are creating a lots of paper tiger again. There are issues of huge gaps in regulatory quality context between countries. Rule of law is another factor that matters most should the HFA successor be pushed into more legally binding. Institutions in the developing and under developing world are too vulnerable with new burden to comply with a new international organization. In addition, in the decentralized countries, there are local complexities that are not easy to be resolved- therefore make a binding international agreement powerless.

Consequently, participation of member states is likely to be less once legally binding instrument is offered.

With this argument, I still support the promotion of IDRL from IFRC, with the key words Disaster Response Laws. But for an International Disaster Reduction Law (or say mitigation) or any form of legally binding DRR framework/laws at international level, lets mirror from another world conventions in Global Environmental Governance.

Best regards,

Jonatan Lassa

Question 2: What is the justification and perceived benefit from a post 2015 international framework on DRR beyond 2015?

As seen with the biennial national reports, much progress has been made in implementing the HFA. By 2015 all countries which have signed the HFA should have a national platform for DRR. It is then that the work usually escalates because communication between the players for DRR accelerates. Each platform makes its own goals and uses the platform's organisation to carry out activities which allow the country to achieve these improvements in DRR. It is important that no momentum is lost for this cause.

Since there is always competition for financial resources, having a United Nations framework for DRR after 2015 can make the difference in many countries regarding the type and amount of resources which can be devoted to DRR. Governments, NGO's and other actors can also benefit from the support that is provided by the UNISDR offices for implement a revised or new framework after 2015.

Question 5: Should such targets be at global level or should targets be left to individual countries to set in their own contexts?

After 10 years of the HFA there is a need for incorporating targets to more effectively monitor the level of achievement. The development of any such targets, need to involve the countries that will be implementing them. Targets have to be something that each country wants to adopt not something that is perceived as not relevant for them or unrealistic to achieve at this point in time. Discussions of targets could be handled from a regional perspective since there are often similar risks and similar views about management of these risks. While developing such targets, a new opportunity for closer communication and cooperation emerges within the region. Regional platforms and forums can provide a structure and assist by demonstrating methods and tools for achieving and following up on targets. Ultimately the decision about achieving targets comes from each country that has signed the Hyogo Framework for Action. Therefore, there needs to be some flexibility in those targets so that they can be adapted to the needs of each country.

Question 6: What would be the pros and cons of a more legally-binding agreement, and how may that work?

Legislation is the structure that allows us to work with DRR and make the process that we have made. However despite legislation's critical roll in DRR, to make a new instrument 2015 and beyond which is a legally binding agreement is inappropriate. Ultimately, the law making efforts are the responsibility of each country and each country should have the will to make the laws that protect their citizens, tourists, resources, etc. Many countries already have enacted some type of disaster related laws. It is important that they find the gaps and work towards making new laws to provide a better level of sustainable development, risk reduction, and protection for its citizens, visitors, and resources. Secondly, it is hard to reach the correct legal requirements that can be implemented in all countries. If that is accomplished, these requirements will likely be at a very low level and perhaps not strong enough to promote effective DRR. Some countries might decide to reach this level, agree that it is adequate and therefore, avoid a deeper investigation of the needs for DRR.

However, providing information on the content of effective disaster management laws as examples to other countries should be encouraged. It is also a worthwhile endeavor to investigate what laws already exist within the country and who is legally responsible and for what. The Swedish National Platform for DRR undertook such an activity in 2009. The consultant, a lawyer, examined all the Swedish laws related to all phases of the disaster management cycle. In her report and in seminars, she explained the responsibility of agencies, county and municipal authorities and the individual. The results brought about much discussion since the findings were not self-evident. After such a survey, it is easier for managers and politicians to see where the gaps are and the need for new legislation.

Janet Edwards

Greetings Colleagues

My inputs are in respect of Dr Mukesh Kapila's comments around "set objectively measurable levels of achievement."

I agree with one of the previous contributors that smaller objectives needs to be set for the monitoring of achievements. Smaller objectives can be easily monitored and measured and gives one a sense of accomplishment when one has achieved the objective. Smaller objectives will be very specific and it may be that a breakdown of the larger objectives into bite sized achievable ones, with a range of suggestions on how to achieve them and which are understood by ordinary disaster management officials and the communities which they serve, may help in ensuring that disaster risk reduction takes it rightful place in the world.

Communities, especially in developing countries, do not have the same focus of DRR as developed nations or nations / communities which experience regular disasters and so need to concentrate of DRR initiatives. Integrating DRR into projects that municipalities are undertaking to reduce the backlog of, e.g. housing may be the critical factor and may even be the new successor to the HFA. Many of my colleagues in the municipality where I am employed do not realise that they are busy with DRR in their water, housing, environmental development, roads and storm water systems, city development, etc. projects. It may be time for DRR to be expanded fully into these other fields in a manner which ensures that legislation governing these fields are changed to encourage and ensure compliance to reducing disaster risk.

ANTHONY R. KESTEN
EXECUTIVE MANAGER: DISASTER MANAGEMENT
DISASTER MANAGEMENT CENTRE DIVISION
COMMUNITY SAFETY DEPARTMENT
CITY OF EKURHULENI - REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Hi Mukesh and colleagues,

I am returning to the debate after a while, and will post a longer piece later. Some quick interim comments though.

We should certainly be mindful and foresighted enough to think ahead to 2015. At the same time, as I mentioned in my earlier message, in the five and a half years left in the HFA implementation decade, while playing catch up and accelerating implementation, there is a lot we can and should do, which can foreshadow and guide the instrument post HFA.

One point raised by several contributors, which I would like to reiterate and take off from, refers to the differential status of DM, DP and DRR in countries around the world. This is true for the quality of work done during IDNDR, the quality of systems that were developed by jan 2005, those that now exist and the capacity and resources being used and utilised to design and implement solutions and systems.

We must therefore have a framework that is flexible and usable by the range of situations that countries and communities find themselves in. The framework must allows for different starting points, and different choices while prioritising action, and it is this system which should be the basis of supporting action and monitoring progress.

In several countries and also in some subnational authorities and jurisdictions; countries have developed action plans for HFA implementation and DRR programs around these. These form the basis of setting national priorities, seeking technical assistance, and guiding departments of Government and partners in choosing actions and locations for undertaking initiatives.

In the Asian region, some recent examples have been Indonesia's National and local action plans for DRR, Sri Lanka's Road map for safer srilanka, Cambodia, Thailand and Philippines Strategic national action plans (SNAPs) and Myanmar's Myanmar action plan for DRR (MAPDRR). These have been developed thru reasonably consultative processes and are bold and ambitious, yet measured, and workable programs that are making slow but significant progress, and achieving traction in Government systems.

So we should measure and monitor progress against these road maps or goals that countries have set themselves.

But we, the development partners and technical support agencies have another responsibility as well. We need to orient our actions and programs in this direction, accelerate and innovate in the support we provide, and find new ways to 'program' our work. Let us also measure our progress and effectiveness in this functional role we play.

Here we will be found wanting. We are slow in getting 'our' work programs off the ground, in maintaining and monitoring our "matrix of commitments and initiatives" and in developing workable action programs to implement the declarations we help draft.

So in designing the "post HFA instrument" let us first soulsearch how we (practitioners in Governemnt and communities and their partners) work on the available instrument. Let us use the MTR period to recalibrate our strategies and action for implementation. In getting this right, we will struggle and create a way of working that begins to deliver on the urgent imperative of HFA, making countries and communities safer before disaster strikes.

I look forward to engaging with your responses and elaborating on my views in a subsequent post.

Warmly,

LOY REGO

Dear All,

Just a few comments on the way forward on Framework and Tool beyond 2015:

What is clear to me so far is the community process of doing DRR considering that communities around the world are not homogenous and they are facing multi-hazards (natural and manmade). The Formula model $DR = \text{hazard} \times \text{vulnerability} / \text{capacity}$ is a good Framework and a tool to use in DRR. Using the formula as a tool, you may generate the baseline data from the process of risk assessment and analysis. The same risk analysis should be used in monitoring and evaluation to measure if the risk was reduced or not. If the risk was reduced, the probability of disaster is low.

If all communities use the formula model for risk assessment based from their hazard context and bring out capacity gaps then it will help in establishing the RISK baseline information per community

and at the same time you can develop specific risk indicators to a specific hazard context. In this process our risk indicators are more specific and appropriate to hazard context. The only challenge is the link from community to international framework. But at least we already knew the framework and a tool at the community level which is the subject of our development debate. To make this DRR process happen and people from community championing it requires an enabling environment. Perhaps the other model to look at is on organizations/institutions (various levels) - a new model of work which is facilitating enabling environment for communities to develop their hazard specific Disaster Risk Reduction Measures (contingency and development plan). Thus, I feel the DRR Framework 2015 beyond should be more of a guideline to institutions/organizations (from international, national level down to the smallest operational Unit) on how to create/facilitate enabling environment for communities to own their risk assessment and their DRR measures.

Fit fall: UN Agencies make boundaries of DRR and CC and develop modalities towards their own agenda rather looking from the community perspective as integrated and convergent initiatives.

On "principles and values" for DRR: perhaps the global community should consider the following DRR principles highlighted at CMDRR manual by Cordaid and IIRR, Recognition that:

- Communities have accumulated local knowledge in addressing hazard events;
- Communities are survivors, not victims;
- Basic rights are foundations of safety;
- Community organizations are mechanisms for successful disaster risk reduction initiatives and the government is a major player;
- Communities have to take responsibility for their most at risk members;
- Resiliency is not merely accumulated assets or secured livelihood. It is also the will to survive and to stake a claim to justice and equity as members of society; and
- It is the communities that decide if they are in a state of disaster.

Thanks and looking forward to the conclusion of this debate.

Rustico "Rusty" Binas
Global Advisor on Disaster Risk Reduction
Cordaid

Dear Friends

Thank you for several thoughtful observations which provide good material for reflection. May I challenge us all to be more critical and to also respond to the points made by others and whether you agree or disagree. Also may I request, in particular, more comments specifically on:

Question 2: the linkage between post 2015 HFA and post 2015 MDGs. Desirable or not? How could a potential direct linkage work?

Question 3: what should be different or additional in the post 2015 DRR framework compared to the current HFA? Or is everything so good in the current HFA that we just rollover? Are we at risk of getting somewhat complacent among ourselves?

Question 4: most agree on the utility of some principles and values for DRR. Can we have some examples of what these might be?

Question 6: the few who commented so far don't favor giving legal teeth to the post 2015 DRR framework. But not sure the reasons given were convincing (at least to me). What do others think, and why?

Question 7: please say something!!

Question 8: please say something!!

Many thanks indeed for joining in - but please say more...

Mukesh Kapila – MODERATOR

Dear Mukesh,

Regarding Question 2: the linkage between post 2015 HFA and post 2015 MDGs. Desirable or not? How could a potential direct linkage work? I think there is a linkage, since that both of HFA and MDGs aim at the maximum benefits of humans, within their different categories, we can link between both of them, if we will take the MDGs to be overall umbrella that takes into consideration all cross cutting issues such as disaster risk reduction and management, and distribute this cross-cutting issue amongst the 8 MDGs. I think, if we succeed to do that, we will effectively cover all of them.

As for Question 3: what should be different or additional in the post 2015 DRR framework compared to the current HFA? Or is everything so good in the current HFA that we just rollover? Are we at risk of getting somewhat complacent among ourselves? I think, obligations and enforcement laws and regulation should be in place.

Regards,
Tamer Abou Gharara

Dear all,

It is my pleasure to share my views with you as follows:

- 1 - National level strategies for integration of DRR in national planning and implementation processes should be developed.
- 2 - Specific national and local capacities are needed to support promotion and implementation of DRR as well as support and resource allocation for promotion of DRR at all levels.
- 3 - Stronger and more result oriented international Framework to follow the outcomes of HFA is a must.
- 4 - An international mechanism for recognition of and support to national platforms for DRR will help significantly.
- 5 - Stronger commitment of states and other relevant stakeholders to promotion and implementation of DRR.

6 - Stronger engagement of UN system including more effective management support and resource allocation for promotion of DRR at all levels is urged.

Regards,
Azadeh, HFA Iran

Dear Moderator,

Just a few points to add:

Risk Versus crisis management I think, as it has been in the last few years, the issue of risk versus crisis management should be dealt with due emphasis. And, Governments & all partners should design an approach how to address both risks and crisis particularly in terms of resource mobilization. Where to focus more? Before or during? Look, for instance, at the recent scenarios! It seems that more of the global response has focused more on crisis management than risk management. Despite a number of global appeals by International organization such as IFRC, for disaster Risk Reduction Programs, the response from the global community (the back donors) has still been minimal while for a sudden onset disaster, there has been a dramatic response. This will indirectly tell us that despite the 2005 HFP, many governments and partners are not committed towards that end!

Is that a lack of commitment? Or any reason behind the curtain? Therefore, we have to either carry out advocacy works or scrutinize the issue further! I strongly believe that DRR Programs are by far the important approach that all nations' humanitarian organization and agencies should incorporate in their strategic plan. Not only that, they have to do seriously towards that end. It shouldn't remain as a paper document on shelf, which is currently being observed everywhere.

- Planning issues? PFR or not?

- How do we plan for DRR Programs?

I suggest going back and seeing some of DRR Programs and projects. Have they planned for results (PFR) or, was it easy or difficult to track and monitor the achievements? This should be answered in each and every evaluation of DRR Programs and projects?

- Is it a Community based DRR Program or not? A question to be answered! Before dealing with DRR Programs, we have to make sure that the community is part and parts of each step in the programs. This undoubtedly identifies the misconceptions & myths. And, paves the way to easily point out the real needs and priorities of that particular community, where we are planning to undertake DRR Programs/projects.

- Awareness creation – BCC - Advocacy - The issue of integration should be looked at. How was the experience in the past? - Have we exploited all kinds of media-electronic, print, to create awareness about the DRR and mobilize the community? To let the policy makers open their eyes to wards this end?

Regards,

Dr. Yeshitila Hailu Negash
Head - Health and Care Program Department
Ethiopian Red Cross Society

Dear all,

It's a great opportunity to share and discuss with you important issues related to Hyogo framework. First let me introduce myself, I'm a civil engineer working in the disaster management department in Palestinian civil defense who is the focal point for the Hyogo framework in Palestine. While playing this role we had noticed that the voluntary nature of the Hyogo framework make it weaker despite its great efforts for disaster risk reduction, we hope to see the Hyogo framework in 2015 in legally bound that could be done through:

- 1 - financial mechanism encouragement
- 2 - involve it in Sustainable development or important issues
- 3 - international mechanisms for pressure through decision maker

I think most countries have the same problems such as lack of communication and coordination and corporation and information exchange between its bodies and conflicting priorities that stand against the implementation and application of the Hyogo framework for action[^], so let us say good governance, good information, good coordination, and good cooperation.

Best regards,

Eng. Jumana jaghoub
Disaster Management Department
Palestinian Civil Defense

Dear colleagues,

There are no doubts that the risk of natural disasters grows everywhere and all time, especially in developing urban areas. Decisions, including the ones at national, regional and international levels, since the Tokyo declaration of 1988, concerning the necessity of disaster prevention and mitigation at all levels were accepted several times, and especially during IDDR in the end of the last century. That is why the conceptual idea, demanded policy and strategy of disaster reduction, as well as culture of prevention, are worked enough and also well-known to the people, making decisions in the majority of countries of the world. However, real risk reduction of natural disasters rests against problem of implementation, and implementation of priorities at national and, especially, at local level. And it is the "last mile" as Hareesh Shah named this major stage, in all countries, both in developing, and in developed, is very long, almost insuperable. It is necessary to admit, what even such magnificent examples of implementation as project «RADIUS» and the World Encyclopedia of dwelling are still not finished and they are thrown on the most important place - the real help (to the unified methods, techniques, rules, requirements, examples). The question is how to "pass" this major "last mile" most effectively from the point of view of an ultimate goal.

Doing the brief review of first 3 stages of project HFA, you come to an unpleasant conclusion that the main result of this project is idle talk and consequently low real efficiency. Natural disasters of the first decade of a new millennium have shown that people including professionals, have stopped in their progress to withstand disasters: new approaches, received knowledge and experience, generalized and developed during IDDR are used really insufficiently, and speeches at new international forums are oversaturated by slogans and declarations, they are unprofessional, impractical and as a result are not effective. Thus, fair and popular, especially after tragedy in Kobe 1995 aim of WSSI "time of

action" is not sequentially realizing till now, with huge work and diligence what should be done everywhere.

The main reason is the absence of unified techniques, rules of risk analysis, requirements, and criteria of admissible risk that would be shown on real examples, containing numerical values of risk. At the same time such implemented into practice and well checked up methods and technologies exist and allow presenting them below. What is necessary and sufficient tool for risk analysis and risk control?

1. It is impossible to tell about disaster, about its admissible and inadmissible size, and, especially, necessities to reduce disaster, without having possibility to measure this disaster. That is why the first tool necessary for the disaster analysis and management, is the disaster scale. This idea realized right after Spitak earthquake in 1988, allows to represent any disaster, irrespective of its caused reasons in the field of disaster, to know magnitude of this disaster, the social characteristics of calamity, abilities of this or that territory to sustain this disaster, to compare it to other occurred or probable disasters, to estimate an admissibility and an acceptability of disasters of different magnitude, to have possibility to appoint economically and socially admissible magnitude of probable disasters for the concrete urban area.

2. Developed and implemented aggregate apparatus for the practical risk analysis on the urban area, which helps to realize risk estimation and risk analysis, its awareness by the people, making decisions and responsible for disaster risk reduction and sustainable development. In the UN project "RADIUS" various approaches and techniques have been developed and on their base, as the result, plans of action have been worked for many cities in seismic prone areas. Many advanced and realized on the basis of GIS technologies (for example, the GIS impact "HAZUS", USA and GIS "EXTREMUM", Russia) are represented quite well and almost realized. In the absolute majority of cities risk assessment uses indefinite terms: "low", "moderate", "high", while it's necessary to have numerous values of risk. We will notice that the individual risk, as parameter № 1 of safety in many techniques of the risk analysis and management is represented socially fair. However, in our opinion, it would be important to have today the unified approaches in global sense, methods and techniques of risk analysis as otherwise, at least, it is impossible to compare values of seismic risk quantitatively worldwide, to establish uniform desirable criteria and risk parameters, to analyze productivity and successes of the different countries in sphere of natural disasters reduction. It demands as well the globalization of activity of the insurance companies, the uniform market and promotion of incentives of process of sustainable development. Unfortunately, good undertaking and work under the program "RADIUS" are unproductive in the sense of practice of urban developing because the majority of cities have no visible result in the form of seismic risk maps and initial map containing a shaking risk map and the complex maps considering probable natural and especially anthropogenic consequences of earthquake. Such maps should be informational and then a controllable basis for the further cities-planning activity and plans of social and economic development for the next 20-40 years (in the part of sustainable safety). In the purpose to supervise this process of sustainable development it is necessary to have special criteria and indicators of safety which are developed on bases of a scale of disasters magnitude "DIMAK", which are unified, checked up in practice and do not depend on political and economic system. Of course, permissible parameters of disaster risk for every 10 years are very depended of economic capacity of this or that country.

3. Other example of an insufficient practicality and implementation of the results is the World Encyclopedia of dwelling mentioned above. This very good and valuable EERI project demands very important end of its "last mile" which consists of using the unified approaches and the experience collected in the Encyclopedia, every separate/local urban area should develop the catalogue of vulnerability of mass building stock (housing, schools, hospitals). Without what risk estimations cannot be authentic, and the subsequent efforts on disaster reduction will not be fruitful. All above-stated is known to professionals because it is published in proceedings of the European and International conferences on earthquake engineering for last 20 years.

4. Resuming the above-stated, it is represented extremely important to collect highly professional international workshop where participants, having summarized and having generalized their knowledge and experience, will make accurate recommendations, what is necessary and sufficient and how to get a problem moving forward and most effectively to pass this "last mile" for real softening of probable natural disasters. Considering that final conference INDDR on the analysis and management of seismic risk was in 1999 in St.-Petersburg, Regional alliance for disaster analysis & reduction (RADAR), Association "Reliability and safety" (ARS) and Centre on EQE & NDR (CENDR) suggest to spend aforementioned workshop in June-July, 2011 in St.-Petersburg, having anticipated its by several discussions of a considered problem in a dialogue mode at a forum on the Internet. Of course, we have to use all opportunities to discuss this problem, including 14 ECEE (Ohrid, Republic of Macedonia).

We will be grateful for your opinion. Contacts: +7 903 746 39 98; +7 911 944 62 75, cendr_1@yahoo.com.

Sincerely yours,
Dr Mark Klyachko

Dear Moderator,

I would like to pass this information on Topic 4.

1. Be it on MDGs or HFA, It would be great to see Gender mainstreamed in DRR in ACTION rather than on paper and verbally.
2. Capacitate & empower the locally available traditional elders who could influence the community worth a lot as they have the local wisdom.

I think let us discuss on this issues.

Best Regards,

Almaz Yimer
MBA in Health Care Management; BSC in Public Health
Gender & Health Coordinator – ERCS

Many thanks for this summary.

Elisabeth Tossou

Dear All,

Good day! I think differently-able people, erstwhile called disable people, are one of the most vulnerable lots besides women and children. I feel we also need to discuss differently-able people vis-à-vis DRR. Capacity building and empowerment of such people in view of disaster management is also important.

Thanks and regards,
Pradip Dey

1. Even though the national level mechanisms and structures are being in place for DRR, which are largely dominated for early warning and emergency preparedness, there are so many challenges and practical difficulties in achieving some of the HFA targets. Priority 4 (Reduce the underlying risk factors) has shown least progress in all the reviews conducted across different geographical areas.
2. While recognizing the importance of the other priorities in overall risk reduction, priority 4 has been considered as the most crucial in overall vulnerability reduction and resilience building. It is important to enquire why the priority four is less progressive? Among many reasons to the same question, practical incompatibility of current DRR structures and the priority 4 is also identified as one such reason for this. HFA driven National disaster management centers/authorities do not have required mandate to influence the poverty reduction strategies and CCA programmes in many parts of the world. When the development planners are not in the process, getting their commitment in addressing underlying risk reduction is a challenge. Secondly, emerging economies and regions are finding it difficult to incorporate DRR and CCA into development process, due to the requirement of additional resources and the fear that it will hinder the current development pace.
3. It is important to consider the current practical challenges in deciding the beyond HFA era. One option could be to link HFA priority 4 to Millennium Development Goals or beyond MDG strategy that the Reducing Underlying Risk is a target rather a loosely agreed commitment.
4. Everyone has to work together to identify the strategies to influence development planners and Decision Makers to seriously consider the DRR and CCA in their development process even if it affects the overall growth rate. Convincing politician on this would be the greatest challenge not after HFA but within HFA.
5. Genuine efforts in empowering local level to engage in development planning and decisions making is also important to be looked at in any strategy as it has been widely recognize that the local level has not been appropriately engage in the HFA (localizing the HFA).

Buddika Hapuarachchi

The many and often complex and usually negative relationships between DRR and the achievement of the MDGs has long been recognized, yet little has been achieved beyond a good deal of rhetoric. It is commonly stated that many developing countries have to make the choice between funding long-term DRR commitments and shorter term development gains. Yet this choice is overly simplistic as short term gains are frequently compromised by unforeseen disasters.

DRR is not an additional expenditure to be over-layered onto development initiatives, but an essential component of good development planning. Until there is movement away from "silo" thinking where

different components of an essentially unified process actually come together in a practical way, vulnerability will continue to drive poverty. What is needed now is a move from discussing WHAT needs to be done to a greater concentration on HOW it can be done.

Pieter Van Den Ende

Dear all,

All action plan on climate change and DRR must integrate genre actions and incomes generating activities target on vulnerable populations. The strategy may be base on clean technologies promotion for reducing the coast and of production. The approach to be may target on local competencies development and using trough capacity reinforcement activities. That approach will strength vulnerable people as women and young and help for on vulnerability reducing and resilience building. In legal way actions target on human right promoting with advocacy will help in vulnerable people and their resources protion.

Elisabeth Tossou

Some of the countries with highest levels of poverty and low levels of human development are also those which are relatively most vulnerable to disasters. It is therefore critical to identify practices for integrating DRR relevant for these countries!!!

Regards,
Yeshitila Hailu

I tend to agree on the moving to the 'hows' in the beyond HFA phase or even in the remaining HFA years. As Discussion 2 threw up the limitations of the implementation, particularly in relation to priority 4, it also did discuss that we have moved forward in some areas, that we have institutions in place etc. etc. and this gives us a decent base. However, we cannot rest on our laurels, but we need to look for those examples that have beaten the odds, & draw lessons from such instances to base our 'hows'.

Given that Asia is going to be the locus of development in the coming years, our efforts in Asia to impact that process of development is imperative. If we fail in that, then our efforts in everything else will have to be twice as much.

So maybe we do not need new priorities, but as already discussed, we need to set ourselves specific targets for the existing ones, and put in our time and money on engaging the development sector in all our DRR/CCA efforts, from the local to the international. In the upcoming processes of Roadmaps, GAR, global platform etc. we will all need to pay particular attention to engaging more than just the DRR (& even CCA) community.

Ramona Miranda

Hi Budhika and Pieter, and Mukesh, and Rusty,

This is a belated response to Mukesh's question 2, but in some ways building on the wonderful and meaningful points of view expressed by two luminaries of practical action and insightful bottom up practical wisdom from a leader of cordaid.

In his initial moderator message Mukesh said:

"The further basic assumption is that internationally agreed frameworks of shared understanding are necessary or, at least, useful in making and sharing global progress. We have several such frameworks on different topics of which HFA is one. What is the justification and perceived benefit from a post 2015 international framework on DRR beyond 2015? What would be the costs and risks? In particular, in the context of an increased recognition of the inter-linkages between sustainable development, climate change and DRR, is there advantage or disadvantage in a separate framework on DRR as compared to its incorporation (or "mainstreaming") into wider frameworks, for example, in the successor to the Millennium Development Goals? If we were to consider doing both, how would that work?"

In his poignant follow up, (in what has now mysteriously become week 4 archival material) he urged us to debate more and in particular deal with some of the unanswered questions. One of them was concisely summarised below:

"Question 2: the linkage between post 2015 HFA and post 2015 MDGs. Desirable or not? How could a potential direct linkage work?"

To be a little polemical, we need to ask a preliminary question, how are the current HFA and MDGs linked. And in answering that we can become clearer.

The HFA talks of the MDGs. In 2003 in an ADRC organized forum in Kobe, one speaker talked of the planned 10th anniversary conference of Kobe in Jan 2005 and recognized that we had numerical benefits of synchronization of end dates. "Coming out of Kobe, we need another decade of action on disaster reduction. If this proposal is accepted, accepted, it would happily and coincidentally links DR and ISDR to the end date of the Millennium declaration targets and put us more squarely into the community that makes development choices and financial decisions".

As the GA debate in 2004 debated the proposal to have a 2nd world conference, and agreed to WCDR, no follow action and fresh resources were agreed except that there be post WCDR partnerships, registered with the CSD secretariat, and that the CSD process in its 2014 and 2015 session in NY would receive reports on progress made in achieving outcomes of the conference. The first and second brochures of the WCDR announced these post WCDR partnerships and encouraged organizations to register on the UN sectt website.

One of the first post WCDR partnerships to be registered was the Asian initiative on "Mainstreaming DRR into development policy, planning and implementation". This happily linked Disasters and development in a action oriented programmatic way, and focused on advocacy and capacity building.

Very soon practitioners in Governments and their NDMOs working on and under this initiative realised that you needed more than advocacy, and harder answers, as the advocacy wars were won, and the harder questions were asked by the development and investment ministries. "OK we buy your argument that we need to have BETTER DESIGNS THAT ARE RESISTANT but how do we do this. What solutions exist? How much do they cost? What is the incremental extra cost? Where will the

money come from? and how do we get our technical people, designers, architects, contractors to build better? How do we upgrade our building byelaws and how do we enforce our standards?" "or yes California and Japan can afford these development paths but can Chittagong and Bengkulu do so?" Finding answers to these questions was more difficult and still is.

So, to cut a long story short, here was one example of the disaster (DRR - HFA) and Development community struggling to understand each other and learning by doing. Very soon, pilot projects turned in to longer term implementation partnerships of learning by doing. And these Priority implementation partnerships (PIPs) continue to go on and bear fruit, lessons learned, new agendas and new sets of institutions working together.

Changing language was another lesson. Rapidly Mainstreaming DRR into development was transformed into "Partnerships for safer development and prudent governance" highlighting the virtues of contributing safety as an essential ingredient of "sustainable development" and the quality and benefit of prudence to the agenda of "good governance". Such a rebranding of the program helped change the discourse and the ownership of participants in this quest. Ministries of finance and planning could relate to the governance and development agenda and see the value added which the disaster people brought, and there was less of a attitude from development partners saying "don't come to us, go to our humanitarian section if you deal with disasters" or from the finance ministries who argued that disaster finance should come from the Prime Ministers relief fund, or the Presidents discretionary budget. Coincidentally again this epiphanic leap of faith took place in the wake of the midpoint of the MDG implementation period around 7/7/07 shortly before and after the first Global Platform.

Advocating the Disaster Proofing of the MDGs was a key slogan and promotional campaign launched at the 2nd Asian Ministerial Conference in Delhi, and the Asian Parliamentarians Conference on Population and Development monitoring MDG progress in Bangkok in November 2007. By this being taken up by the Millennium Campaign, it took the discussion and achieved traction in governments and civil society partners in the development industry. A small step at preaching to the unconverted and trying to convince the unconvinced.

Today when the MDG fraternity is measuring success at a two third of the journey period, and the Millenium + 10 summit will take place in NY in Sept 2010, there is talk of accelerating the pace of MDG implementation, making up for lost time, and celebrating and consolidating success. The shadow of Cyclone Nargis, the Wenchuan earthquake of 2008, the multiple disasters of 2009 including Ketsana and Padang, and of course the signature devastation of Haiti and Chile, looms large in the consciousness of delegates, delegations and their political masters. There is awareness that MDG accomplishments have been set back by the above catastrophic disasters, and also that implementing HFA will accelerate the MDG attainment. There is the sober realization that inaction on DRR is not an option, and will guarantee deceleration of MDG target accomplishment. And so HFA as a contributory accelerator of the MDGs is squarely on the agenda. Even more than Copenhagen and Cancun, the MDG summit and the next 5 years of MDG action plans and implementation frameworks and national MDG reports is the FERTILE SOIL ON WHICH TO ARGUE and EMBED and PREACH the DRR and HFA MESSAGE.

Thus in their current avatar the MDG and HFA are inextricably linked. This linkage must be recognised and embraced and capitalized on in the next half (5 and a half years) of the HFA implementation decade, which is the last third of the MDG attainment period.

Thus today our MTR process and debates must focus on the here and now and the next 5 years.

And another opportunity for cementing the link is the Rio + 20 process in which sustainable development institutions will be vying to confront and challenge themselves and others on how

successfully we have met the promise and challenge of Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Action (JPoA) of 2002. So in the national environmental coalitions and review processes of the national strategies for sustainable development, links must be made with HFA action plans and programs.

Let us worry about post 2015 in the CSD 2014.

So to give a very direct and controversial answer to Question 2: the linkage between post 2015 HFA and post 2015 MDGs. Desirable or not? How could a potential direct linkage work?

Answer: Desirable absolutely but in the here and now. The direct linkage has been working since 2005 and needs more embedding and interweaving in our hearts and minds. Let us learn from humble efforts of many around the world over the last 5, 50 and 500 years.

For now and till 2015, let us disaster proof the MDGs, contribute safety to sustainability and promote prudence in good governance and thus link the frameworks of Agenda 21, the YSSD, HFA, and MDGs in operational action over the next half decade.

Making this happen while also making development climate smart and linking CCA to DRR is an onerous responsibility.

And the Millennium Campaign is determined to 'standup and stop poverty' and 'keep the promise' and focus on achieving the goals by 2015. And refuses to countenance a post 2015 MDG for now, knowing how distracting and disturbing it will be for many foot soldiers. Let the ISDR system and its MTR consolidate and focus, allow countries and communities and all jurisdictions in between to set and work on their chosen targets and support them wholeheartedly. Let us not distract ourselves today by defining and measuring problems and proposing future solutions, when we need to focus on making our chosen frames work.

And so I end with a reflection inspired by the iron rock and the beam of light in the meditation room of an iconic temple of peace where I recently paid pilgrimage and homage, was shaken by the stillness of silence and heard the voices of our fallen giants and my conscience...

Be bold and brave and courageous and convincing as you gird for battle. Make your heart happy, and soften your soul. Work with meek wisdom in making peace with Mother Nature and the demonic tendencies of 'unplanned' development. Let us hold hands and share spaces. We must humbly volunteer ourselves and our professional strengths and our human fragilities. We must learn from our mistakes and stop doing what are "best forgotten" bad practices too often repeated. We must build trusting and lasting partnerships.

Loy Rego

Dear Mukesh and colleagues, My apologies for arriving so late at these discussions. I write as the UK Focal Point for HFA, but should say that the following are my personal opinions. All contributions to the discussion topics have been interesting, but I have particularly enjoyed the interventions of Loy Rego. I have no idea who s/he is, or who s/he represents, but s/he has introduced a great sense of pragmatism and reality into the discussions, about where we have come from, where we are now and where we are going. I say this because I think that whilst many have attempted to horizon scan beyond 2015, it is less clear to me what will be needed and what will be available for 2011! What does seem clear, for most of the world, is that it will be leaner and more cost conscious than what we have

had before. The terms 'essential' and 'desirable' will head our lists of what can and can't be done, and cost-benefit analysis will determine those projects which may go ahead.

If that is true, then it may be necessary to re-think the design of any future DRR framework. But in taking into account how we might change the framework, I think we should also have a look at what is going on elsewhere with other international organisations (such as the EU or NATO for example). The UN cannot work in isolation on the DRR issue. We cannot reinvent the same wheels in different places. The added value comes from taking a role which others cannot or do not cover.

To that end, I would commend to you some of the excellent work being done by the UNISDR (Europe) Office in building relationships between the EU, Council Of Europe and NATO. The EU announced their policy document on DRR at the last Global Platform. The policy suggested that you cannot hold DRR in isolation from preparedness for emergencies, response to and recovery from emergencies. All four areas are important in the emergency cycle and should be treated as a whole and not in isolation. UNISDR(Europe) have thus begun meetings with the EU and NATO to look at what each does in every part of that emergency cycle. In that way we begin to avoid repetition, endless meetings which discuss the same issues under a different umbrella, and a wide range of people in different organisations all doing the same work. I am sure that this could, and may already be, undertaken in different regions around the world.

My view is that the instrument post HFA must be a voluntary instrument. If the arguments presented are not good enough to persuade countries that the voluntary route is advantageous to them, then we have to look at the arguments. To that end we must produce for politicians and decision makers the best scientific and economic evidence base we can. We have to develop and encourage the work of the UNISDR Scientific and Technical Committee and the IPCC. The evidence has to be clear, concise and understandable to all who receive it.

My final point is about the mechanism for monitoring and reporting on the HFA. Given that it may be streamlined and developed further, perhaps there is also a need to change it from self-assessment. Having completed the initial monitor in 2008, nothing I wrote has ever been challenged, it was not an independent assessment of how the UK was doing. The scoring and opinion was largely mine. Would it not be better to develop a system where at a regional level we begin to assess each other. Just within Europe, for example, any one of those countries with whom I meet regularly could come and assess how we are doing. This need not be threatening or time consuming, but it would be independent and part of the learning process of where the UK weaknesses are, and where we need to improve. Currently, we're doing really well in the UK - I know because I wrote the 2008 report. And guess what? We probably will in 2010 as well...

Best wishes,
Steve Barnes

Dear All

Taking the opportunity to respond to what kind of instrument post HPA might be valuable I thought I would pick up on Steve Barnes's comment below and remind all of the final recommendations from the first UNISDR Science and Technical Committee report published for the Global Platform in 2009 - here is the link:

http://206.150.181.221/preventionweb/files/11543_STCReportlibrary.pdf

The Scientific and Technical Committee made the following recommendations:

(i) Promote knowledge into action

Greater priority should be put on sharing and disseminating scientific information and translating it into practical methods that can readily be integrated into policies, regulations and implementation plans concerning disaster risk reduction. Education on all levels, comprehensive knowledge management, and greater involvement of science in public awareness-raising and education campaigns should be strengthened. Specific innovations should be developed to facilitate the incorporation of science inputs in policymaking.

(ii) Use a problem-solving approach that integrates all hazards and disciplines

A holistic, all-hazards, risk-based, problem-solving approach should be used to address the multifactoral nature of disaster risk and disaster risk reduction and to achieve improved solutions and better-optimised use of resources. This requires the collaboration of all stakeholders, including suitable representatives of governmental institutions, scientific and technical specialists and members of the communities at risk. Knowledge sharing and collaboration between disciplines and sectors should be made a central feature of the approach, in order to guide scientific research, to make knowledge available for faster implementation, to bridge the various gaps between risks, disciplines, and the stakeholders, and to support education and training, and information and media communication.

(iii) Support systematic science programmes

Systematic programmes of scientific research, observations and capacity building should be supported at national, regional and international levels to address current problems and emerging risks such as are identified in this report. The international Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) Programme which is co-sponsored by ICSU, ISSC, and UNISDR, provides a new and important framework for global collaboration. The ISDR Scientific and Technical Committee should provide strategic guidance on research needs for disaster risk reduction and oversight of progress.

(iv) Guide good practice in scientific and technical aspects of disaster risk reduction

The ISDR Scientific and Technical Committee should be strengthened to serve as a neutral, credible international resource to support practitioners at all levels, from local through national to international levels, by overseeing the collection, vetting and publicising of information on good practices carried out on the basis of sound science and up-to-date scientific and technological knowledge, as well as on those inadequate practices or concepts that may be hindering progress. The Committee should further develop its recommendations for follow-up on the areas of concern highlighted in the present report, including on the themes of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, preparedness and early warning systems, health impacts of disasters, and the association of disaster risk and socioeconomic factors.

Steve states below that: [we] "must produce for politicians and decision makers the best scientific and economic evidence base we can. We have to develop and encourage the work of the UNISDR Scientific and Technical Committee and the IPCC. The evidence has to be clear, concise and understandable to all who receive it."

I believe as a member of the UNISDR Scientific and Technical Committee we can well contribute to this work to support best scientific and economic evidence base which has to be clear, concise and understandable to all who receive it.

Best wishes,
Virginia

Professor Virginia Murray, FFOM, FRCP, FRCPPath, FFPH

Consultant Medical Toxicologist and Environmental Public Health
Centre for Radiation, Chemicals and Environmental Hazards, London

Visiting Professor in Health Protection
MRC-HPA Centre for Environment and Health
King's College London

Member of the UNISDR Science and Technical Committee

Dear Steve, Virginia, Mukesh, ISDR colleagues, the MTR team, HFA focal points worldwide, National Platform Secretariats as well as UNDP DRR team in Geneva, regional centers and national offices, and the GFDRR team in DC and all over the world

May I pick up a bit on Steve and Virginia's comments.

I am glad that Steve expresses very frankly his 'non official view ' as a Government representative and focal point on HFA in country. Its time more focal points express views unofficially or otherwise, particularly on their experience of HFA reporting, HFA implementation, preparation of national action plans, facilitation and running of national platforms et al.
here in addition to listing problems, lets share what worked and why, along with additional ideas fro the next few years.

Another issue could be the link between the national and regional processes, and what may be the creative possibilities for peer review and benchmarking in a region, or a regional approach to accelerating HFA with regional characteristics. More views are also needed from sub national Governments on their experiences and frustrations with the challenge of information and resources and tools.

I know that these were the subjects of the first two weeks and that many people from Africa and a few from Asia and Latin America contributed, but more needs to be said.

We need to hear the voices of those responsible for implementation, and those who face the challenge of synthesizing conflicting pulls and pushes and dealing with indifference at many levels. Particularly with the proven programming, organizing, and tactical and strategic approaches that worked for them.

We also need to hear the frank views of the UNISDR regional and national staff, and equally importantly the views of the UNDP DRR and the GFDRR teams worldwide, and those in the struggles at the regional and country level UN and WB offices whose battles to advance and mainstream DRR programming are often lonely and difficult.

These challenges and recounting of tales of heroic victories and creative bright ideas of what may work can guide us to developing a practical road map for the way ahead, diverse and many colored. This feedback is what the MTR process needs.

So, I plead and push for the ISDR country and regional offices to cajole and arm twist your colleagues to write. In case people are challenged by the technology of this on line debate, or the challenge of having to publicly acknowledge the views expressed, perhaps we can have a system of anonymous or pseudonym posts. So too I plead fro those who work in regional DRR centers in different parts of the world to give input. In case Geneva is worried about spam, let your regional outreach offices or the

regional UNDP centers or the GFDRR teams or regional DRR centers serve as moderators and veters of the posts.

I hope my suggestions are not too outrageous. I will also try to send this out to some colleagues directly off line to encourage them to contribute. I know the debates in person in national, regional and even global meetings are much more intense and rich, so lets mimic that spirit.

This may require some additional effort on behalf of many people but that's what DRR volunteerism is all about. And if this effort pays fruit, then we may need to persuade Geneva to extend this one or two more weeks.

If nothing else works, let us remember recent DRR champions in Asia who passed away suddenly this year at an early age, Dave Hollister of the US and Asia in March and Lionel Hewasam of Sri-Lanka in July. Let us do this as a way of paying tribute to them and contributing to the hard task of teasing out what works and what doesn't and sharing these lessons learnt with others.

Warmly,
Loy Rego

Dear Colleagues,

Talking about a post HFA structure and appreciating the engagement, I feel the need to ask a few questions. I'm going to post them as I'm a strong believer in the need of DRR and thus interested in an improvement of the impacts we make.

In total 270 people signed up to the MTR online debate. Some contributing to that last session. These are the figures for the MTR. Do we get into the situation twenty years ago when people came out of the jungle still believing that the war was going on, at the same time the world being busy with something else? Do we need a reality check?

Following closely the climate debate which takes place just right now in Bonn, do we really need some kind of mandate or do we need some more thorough thinking about the different processes internationally following 2015 and how to integrate/make the link and hook on?

When do we start the most important question: How to make it!
Welcoming your comments.

Karl-Otto Zentel

LS,

Thank you for asking a pertinent question and for giving outsiders the opportunity to take part in the review. My contribution is mainly related to part of the 2nd point from the Moderator's opening remarks, which prompted my interest in the review: Citing: "In particular, in the context of an increased recognition of the inter-linkages between sustainable development, climate change and DRR, is there advantage or disadvantage in a separate framework on DRR as compared to its incorporation (or

"mainstreaming") into wider frameworks, for example, in the successor to the Millennium Development Goals? If we were to consider doing both, how would that work?"

My contribution is aware of, perhaps partially repeats, the comments of Loy Rego, and the recommendations by the "clouds but little rain" study.

My comment contains these elements (focused on local level delivery by (often Small & Midsize) "Agencies":

a) Decoupling of implementation vs. knowledge development & consolidation, with the implication that:

b) Local level implementation channels/framework should be shared among the "strategies" (MDG, EFA, HFA, UNFCCC..."making up the cloud"...),

c) Each strategy/initiative will keep a leaner think tank/platform for knowledge sharing (among experts and practitioners, probably with a pool of on-demand experts to be called in according to local level urgency, problem mess)

Decoupling is to mitigate the risk that the expert's bias will determine the local level agenda, with, as different experts/programmes succeed one another, a chaotic impression left. Also note expertise push vs. pull.

d) Local level implementation cycles start with an assessment/quick scan owned by local takeholders, facilitated by an implementation/clinician expert who ensures that the relevant "framework" dimensions, e.g. DRR, health. Are properly addressed, that "diagnosis" is performed, and that agreed priorities are feasible,

e) Selected priorities will determine the "therapeutic approach" and the pull for expertise (rather than the current predominant situation of expertise "push"). - Fit therapy will bring rain.

f) Each "Strategy" must develop (autonomously?) and it is continuously challenged to proof its value added, it has these means to affect the "implementation channels/framework" o It must define its footprint in the "framework, diagnostics and therapeutics" and provide means such that the implementation expert can defend the strategy's cause to local level stakeholders; o It must maintain a pool of instruments and experts, training modules to deliver, if called in; It may use "incentives" to overcome lack of local level interest.

This approach-pattern is currently (partially) at work (for German SME's) at <http://prozeus.de/> (in German), and a generalization of it as a guideline for e-business standard diffusion in Europe is currently on the table (each complex standard typically has its own implementation channels, creating the cloud-but-little-rain impression at SMEs). Concluding: This is how considering both "separated and mainstreaming" could work, and clouds can bring more rain. Later on I want to contribute this comment (reworked version) also at <http://un-gaid.ning.com/group/towardsaglobalmdgbreakthroughplan>

Kind regards,
Jan Goossenaerts

Dear All,

The fact that there has been progress in DRR over the last two decades before and after the appearance of the Hyogo Framework for Action is obvious. Perhaps the issue is less about what the HFA itself can achieve post-2015 but more about what the UNISDR can do, as the main mechanism for coordination, advocacy and providing information for policy-makers in the implementation of the HFA. To illustrate, the UNISDR's 2009 Global Assessment Report got it right in saying "Given the strong interlinkages between disaster risk, poverty and climate change, the principal recommendation of the Report is that countries need to adopt overarching policy and strategy frameworks for risk reduction, focused on addressing the underlying risk drivers described above, and supported by both resources and political authority. In risk prone countries, the implementation of such frameworks must be the key development priority of the state as a whole, rather than of a particular department or ministry (p.15)." However, none of the strategic objectives or outcome indicators of the UNISDR's 2010-2011 Biennial work Programme appear to strategically reflect these two statements. Whether or not the HFA remains voluntary is less of an issue compared to the quality of accountability linked to it. The UNISDR should have a stronger role in holding governments to account in fulfilling their commitments to implement the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Jessica Faleiro
Research & Policy officer - DRR,
Tearfund UK

Dear All,

With regard to the post-HFA instrument, I have the following opinions:

1. As HFA is a voluntary instrument, it has not been able to push countries to achieve their HFA targets. It should be made a legal instrument and binding by law.
2. Authorities should be given to regional organisations such as SAARC, ASEAN... to monitor the progress of HFA. HFA progress should be made one of the criteria for the development support.
3. At national level, priority should be given to introduce Disaster Impact Assessment (DIA), national and local level risk assessments, human resource development in the field of DRR, and setting the measurable targets for disaster resilient communities.

Best regards,
Shesh Kafle

The debate is tending to "policy" and sounds far too academic to be effective. It remains a mystery as to why such an obvious need is still just "cooking" - that is the pro-active investment in retrofitting, training and capacity building for DRR. If Implementation is to be done the notions of crosscutting and the like will only weaken the urgency for as we know, hopefully, when a topic becomes "cross-cutting" it means no one will do it, it begs for resources and it is there for atmospherics. Dedicated resources are necessary to move to Action Plans to do the assessments of risk, the planning for retrofitting and new investments in mitigation infrastructure that are required. If it is funding then let us say this needs attention and do something about it. The foundations' and the national governments' budgets need to

reflect

the costs of resilience. It is an investment in the preservation of the gains, big and small, achieved over the past years and the prevention of further loss as best as one can. To do otherwise is just plain ignorant. It is government but it is industry and community as well. ISDR needs to take the lead in national resilience budgeting and garnering resources from the Multi-laterals if hazards are to be addressed usefully.

Earl Kessler

Dear all,

I would like to share my view points to the first and second points below in addition to what colleagues have already developed on these topics before. Definitely, DRR, CCA and poverty alleviation efforts have to be considered and addressed as priorities in all development strategies. During these years of HFA implementation, Priority 4 experienced a very little progress because efforts were and are being deeply made to cover emergency preparedness and disaster response activities. Of course, these are very important but at the same time, we have to accept the fact that such activities have very little positive impacts, if not negative, to development efforts undertaken. In continuation to the Geneva 2nd global platform recommendations, I would add two points:

1) As some colleagues said, we need internationally legal and coercitive regulations along with incentives (e.g. donors giving funds with very little rate to governments considering in their development strategies DRR, CCA and poverty alleviation as priority) to better mainstream HFA targets, especially Priority 4, 2) DRR and risk factors are mainly research based. We can see for example the case of Japan with earthquake solution strategies. So, we need to more actively and really associate academia institutions to do this job in order to obtain scientifically acceptable results. Of course, they can work in association with NGOs so that these outcomes are as practical and accessible as possible.

Best regards,

Mahefa

Dr Randrianalijaona Tiana Mahefasoa
Climate Change Adaptation and DRM Economist – DIRECTOR
Multidisciplinary Disaster and Risk Management Graduate Training Programme

Dear Colleagues;

I was hoping to stimulate a more diverse debate by my comments. Unfortunately it did not happen.

Going for Post HFA, it needs an internationally approved framework for the follow-up. Otherwise a cross cutting topic like DRR might get lost. There is a need for a reference document when entering the ongoing international debates. At the same time, to be successful, it needs to utilize what is already there before talking about something new. Looking back, we need to realize that most of the topics we are talking about already have been in the documents during IDNDR. We have to ask ourselves: Is this something new? Why do we continue to discuss about the same topics? Is it a matter of substance or a matter of structure?

A lot of different structures have been established since Kobe and even before. How to utilize what is already around? How to build a work programme which is forward looking integrating the upcoming

international events and summits and performing on the added value of the broad spectrum of stakeholders. That might be the challenge.

Karl-Otto Zentel

Dear Karl-Otto Zentel,

Sorry to see that there is little debate regarding post HFA. I personally think that what ever the name of the successor of the HFA, it is highly suggested that the post HFA should be using the same progress of indicator (lets continue to have observable 22 progress indicators as we have now. They can be sharpened but it would be great to see a longitudinal observation of the indicators. The driving force indicators may be changed (increased or reduced) such as the integration of CCA into HFA in the technical report by each member state can be put into the driving force.

However, I think the 22 progress indicators should be kept the same for some time in the future. The 22 technical indicators for progress are extremely important to be updated on two year basis. If this can be done on regular basis for twenty years, it would be great to see the volatility in the institutional commitment in the countries. In my previous email, I have mentioned that we can also compare the longitudinal observation in World Governance Indicators: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>

Alternatively, UNISDR and other interested research institutes can continue develop a global monitoring on DRR Implementation index, including global DRR Index, combined by regular updating of disaster risk related index using more or less the same progress of indicators, with different method of reporting/updating. It would be great to have similar global dataset on observed DRR indicators with long term datacollection. I am myself willing to dedicate for such kind of work.

Since institutional commitment on DRR is highly volatile, a long term and regular reporting on the progress by member states are necessary.

Best regards,

Jonatan Lassa
PhD cand. based at UNU Bonn

Dear Colleagues

In closing this debate may I thank you all very much for the comments received - I am glad that we extended the discussion to a second week where we had yet more focused inputs. Over the next few days, I will try to summarise your contributions in relation to the questions we posed for this debate, and post the conclusions reached. Meanwhile, I hope that our interactions will continue in many other practical ways as we move forward.

Thank you again for joining in.

Mukesh Kapila – MODERATOR
