



Cabinet Office



Department  
for International  
Development

## **Report of the UK National Dialogue on the future Hyogo Framework for Action**

### **Introduction**

More than 160 states, including the UK, have voluntarily signed up to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-15. The Framework aims to build resilience to disasters and substantially reduce disaster losses through five priorities for action. In 2012, states agreed on the importance of developing a successor framework, which will be adopted at the third Global Conference in March 2015 in Sendai, Japan. To inform the development of this new framework, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) invited states to conduct national dialogues on the HFA to share views on the current the framework and thoughts on the post-2015 arrangement.

The Cabinet Office and Department for International Development jointly organised the UK's national dialogue, which was launched by the Rt Hon Alan Duncan, Minister of State for International Development on 24 October at an event hosted by the Wellcome Trust and UKCDS. The Manchester Fire and Rescue Service hosted a second national dialogue event on 4 December. More than 100 representatives from academia, government, scientific community, local responders, emergency planners, private sector, non-governmental organisations and civil society (see annex A for full list of attendees) shared their views on the current and future HFA at these two events (see annex B for agenda).

This report summarises the discussions from both events and emerging recommendations for the post-2015 HFA (hereafter 'HFA2'). It is not necessarily a statement of UK Government policy.

### **Setting the context**

At the launch, the Minister noted HFA's positive effect raising, "awareness on disaster risk and securing greater investment by countries in disaster risk management" and in improving early warning systems to forecast and communicate potential shocks, so that people could evacuate or be better prepared. He argued that reducing the disaster risk should be a component of efforts to reduce poverty and the impact on economic growth, as well as to safeguard development activity.

Given the domestic and international relevance of HFA, he described the UK's coastal flooding risk and wider investment in flood prevention. He noted that a National Risk Register was produced annually to raise awareness of public

exposure to risks and that more than 1.2 million people had now signed up to receive flood warnings. He observed that the international impact of disaster risk and climate change could represent the greatest threat to UK interests, for example, by affecting trade and investment, and food supply chains and prices. Increasingly frequent and severe disasters would result in greater calls on UK aid.

A set of presentations summarised the experience of the current HFA.

### **Assessing the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)**

Participants recognised the HFA's positive role globally in encouraging closer working among stakeholders, leading to an increased profile for disaster risk reduction at local, national and international levels. The HFA had recognised the need to integrate women, children and disability into the disaster risk reduction framework, but there was still more to be done. The HFA had been less successful at addressing the underlying risks and vulnerabilities and encouraging local level dialogue. Although the private sector had an important role to play in disaster risk reduction, its involvement had been limited so far in the developing world. The scientific community's role had gradually increased, though it still had much more to offer.

Within the UK, while awareness of HFA was limited, a lot was being done to address the HFA priorities for action, as required by the Civil Contingencies Act (2004). Participants recognised the successes of the UK peer review, but felt that more could be done in the UK to raise awareness about hazards and threats.

### **Priorities for HFA2**

Participants stressed the importance of **ensuring alignment with the post-2015 development agenda**. Parallel activity on the broader post-2015 development agenda, climate change and other areas, offered an opportunity to integrate disaster risk reduction more widely. This should underpin the approach taken to prepare the HFA2 and provided a unique chance to get disaster risk reduction into the blood stream of development and to encourage a greater emphasis on sustainability. To ensure that the HFA2 secured political interest and commitment, while retaining sufficient flexibility to reflect changes to the risk picture, it was suggested that HFA2 should have the same 15 year timeframe as was expected for the post-2015 development agenda.

Recognising the **inter linkages between different sectors and their bearing on disaster risk management**, participants stressed the importance of a cross-sector approach under HFA2, for example, the health sector should have closer links with disaster risk reduction.

There was considerable support for **improving accountability within the new framework**, with an assortment of options suggested to encourage states to fulfil their commitments. These included developing minimum standards for resilience, and providing more support and encouragement for

states to use the existing HFA monitor process. On balance, participants did not support statutory regulation, favouring instead the careful use of incentives such as foreign direct investment, credit availability, other funding streams, electoral accountability, and external recognition. Participants felt that the state should be primarily accountable for disaster risk reduction, but that the private sector, local community and even individuals should take more responsibility.

Without a baseline or evidence base, it would be difficult to measure progress and allow international benchmarking. Accountability and monitoring could only be greatly improved if the HFA2 helped generate **a credible baseline, a regularly updated assessment or scorecard, and promote greater transparency**. This was an area where the UK had expertise to share.

HFA2 could encourage states to progress towards assessing multiple risks and their consequences, and consider scenario planning. Some participants suggested creating Chief Risk Officers or National Risk Boards, based on private sector models. As risk was constantly changing with varying levels of societal and economic impact, assessing relative priorities given to different risks would be important, as well as their communication to the public.

Participants suggested identifying strategic indicators for monitoring the implementation of HFA2, and called for the rapid establishment of national and local level baselines. Specific criteria and indicators would be needed for different issues resulting in a basket of soft and hard indicators and metrics. Suggestions including OECD and World Bank markers on disaster risk reduction and disaster loss data. UNISDR's National HFA Monitor, while not perfect, allowed states to assess their progress and provided the UN with data on global progress. However, participants preferred peer reviews, followed by independent external reviews and then development of statistical indicators rather than self-reporting.

The importance of **tackling the causes of vulnerability** and **focusing on the most vulnerable** emerged as two linked priorities for HFA2. These issues applied to both emergency planning and development. Participants suggested that HFA2 could encourage a rights-based approach and consider addressing land use planning and tenure. Recognising that the poorest were the most vulnerable to disasters, HFA2 could encourage improved mapping of vulnerability. HFA2 should ensure a participatory and inclusive process. Participants felt that gender was an important issue for HFA2 and suggested that HFA2 should recognise the additional vulnerabilities faced by women, particularly within fragile and conflict affected states. While scientific effort tended to focus on hazards, more attention could be given to vulnerability.

Along with political and economic considerations, **multi-disciplinary science had a role to play in reducing disaster risk and evaluating the future HFA2**. To achieve this, more support was required to build capacity of scientists at the national and local level and to integrate all aspects of science, including social science. In addition, more should be done to improve the interface between science and policy.

Generating **greater local government and community-level engagement** would continue to be important for HFA2. Noting the importance of local political leadership and engagement in disaster risk reduction, there was support for a greater focus on community-based approaches, particularly on prevention and preparedness. It was felt that the cumulative effect of everyday disasters was often greater than single large-scale events. Taking a community-based approach would enable greater local community involvement and act as a driver for community-based resilience, generating the evidence base for disaster risk reduction, and sharing best practice.

Participants stressed the importance of **improving communications on disaster risk reduction** to encourage engagement at all levels. This included cascading information from the central to local levels as well as promoting a bottom-up approach to ensure greater understanding of HFA2 messages and sharing of experiences. Particular consideration was needed in ensuring the reach to vulnerable groups. Education, awareness raising and training were important components. More should be done to improve early warning and risk information.

Participants recognised the **important role of the private sector in improving resilience**. HFA2 should consider how to strengthen this involvement by encouraging public-private partnerships. Participants noted the insurance industry's important role not only offsetting risks, but also in rewarding increased resilience with reduced premiums and stimulating reform.

## **Conclusions**

The Cabinet Office and Department for International Development would like to thank all those who participated in these two events for their time and valuable contributions.

The nine priority areas for the future framework are summarised below:

- ensuring alignment with the post-2015 development agenda;
- improving the inter-linkages between different sectors;
- improving accountability within the new framework;
- ensuring HFA2 had a credible evidence base, including the generation of a baseline, regular risk assessment or scorecards, and promoting greater transparency;
- tackling the causes of vulnerability and focusing on the most vulnerable;
- encouraging the use of multi-disciplinary scientific advice;
- enabling greater local government and community-level engagement;
- improving communications on disaster risk reduction; and
- strengthening the private sector's role in improving resilience.

These nine areas are offered to the UNISDR and other international partners for consideration during the work to develop the post-2015 HFA.

## Annex A: Combined attendance list from both events

First name	Last name	Organisation
Paola	Albrito	UNISDR
David	Alexander	University College London
Panagiotis	Angeloudis	Imperial College London
Ursula	Antwi-Boasiako	DFID
Colin	Armstrong	UKCDS
Steve	Barnes	Cabinet Office
Nina	Becker	ODI
Keith	Best	Freedom from Torture
Laura	Bowen	British Red Cross
Rebecca	Bowers	Cabinet Office
Pat	Boyle	Met Office
Helen	Braithwaite	Department for Communities and Local Government
Julie	Calkins	University of Leeds
Terry	Cannon	Institute of Development Studies
Andrée	Carter	UKCDS
Roger	Carter	Leeds
Kevin	Claxton	Brighton & Hove Public Health Directorate
Victoria	Clements	DFID
James	Crask	PwC
Kate	Crowley	CAFOD
Stefanie	Dannenmann-Di Palma	UNISDR
Paul	Davies	Met Office
Michael	Dayson	Operation Florian
Barry	Dixon	Operation Florian
Han	Dorussen	Essex University
Dan	Dumbarton	Save the Children UK
James	Enoch	UKCDS
Jeremy	Farrar	Wellcome Trust
Nicole	Fassina	World Society for the Protection of Animals
Maureen	Fordham	Northumbria University / Gender Disaster Network
Kate	Green	Civil Contingencies and Resilience Unit (AGMA)
Stephen	Hagerich	British Red Cross
Nick	Harvey	DFID
Debbie	Hillier	Oxfam
Adrian	Hilton	Climate North East
Matthew	Hogan	Greater London Authority
Kirsty	Hogan	Cabinet Office
Mark	Holleley	Cabinet Office
Virginia	Howells	Save the Children UK
Scott	Hughes	PwC
Maggie	Ibrahim	World Vision UK
Mike	Inman	Central Bedfordshire Council
Chamindi	Ishara Malalgoda	University of Salford
Steve	Jordan	Manchester Fire and Rescue Service
Udayangani	Kulatunga	University of Salford
Owen	Landeg	PHE
Razi	Latif	DFID
Nancy	Lee	Wellcome Trust
Emma	Lester	Southampton City Council

<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Ian	Lisk	Met Office
Emma	Lovell	ODI
Serena	Luchenski	PHE
Lawrence	Luscombe	PwC
Fiona	Macalister	Independent Preventive Consultant
Rob	MacFarlane	Cabinet Office
Joe	McFarland	Consultant
Fiona	McKay	Department for Communities and Local Government
Sev	McGinty	PwC
Steve	McGuirk	Manchester Fire and Rescue Service
Janet	Meehan	British Red Cross
Yordanka	Mincheva	European Commission
Tom	Mitchell	ODI
Virginia	Murray	PHE
Asha	Musoni	DCLG
Katherine	Nightingale	Christian Aid
Gregory	Nnamdi Iloka	University of Northumbria
Sae	Ochi	WHO
David	O'Connor	Cabinet Office
Peter	Old	RAPID UK
Huw	Owen	Cardiff Council
Cumhur	Ozhaptan	Disaster and Emergency Management, Turkish Republic
Marcus	Oxley	Global Network
Rachel	Pounds	Save the Children
Tine	Ramstad	Norwegian Refugee Centre
John	Rees	BGS
Jamie	Riley	Liverpool City Council
Susanne	Sargeant	BGS
Peter	Skelton	Handicap International UK
Emmeline	Skelton	PwC
Dan	Sparks	Development Initiatives
Keith	Strickland	Cabinet Office
Swenja	Surminski	LSE
Peter	Tallantire	Cabinet Office
Melanie	Teff	Refugees International
Julian	Templeton	Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University
Menaha	Thayaparan	University of Salford
Ralph	Throp	Scottish Government
Sally	Tyldesley	The Royal Society
Mike	Underhill	Joint Regional Liaison Officer HQ
Fabienne	Uehlinger	University of Bristol, School of Veterinary Sciences
Melanie	van Limborgh	Chelsea and Westminster Hospital
Marcus	Van Someren	Environment Agency
Tim	Waites	DFID
Becky	Whay	University of Bristol, School of Veterinary Sciences
Ian	Whitehouse	Cabinet Office
Jenny	Wilson	UKCDS
Duncan	Wingham	NERC
Clare	Wormald	DCLG

## Annex B: Combined agenda from the two events

<i>Coffee and registration</i>	
Welcome remarks	<p>Professor Jeremy Farrar, Director of the Wellcome Trust</p> <p>Professor Duncan Wingham, UKCDS Chair and Chief Executive of the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)</p> <p>Steve McGuirk, County Fire Officer and Chief Executive, Manchester Fire and Rescue Service</p>
<b>Keynote Speech - Setting the context</b>	<p>Minister of State for International Development, Rt. Hon. Alan Duncan MP /</p> <p>Peter Tallantire, Cabinet Office</p>
Disaster Risk Reduction Post 2015	<p>Paola Albrito / Stefanie Dannenmann - Di Palma</p> <p>United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, UNISDR</p>
<p><b>Setting the scene - HFA so far.</b> Presentations from expert panel:</p> <p>The role of science/Science and Technical Advisory Group</p> <p>Ensuring the HFA works for all</p> <p>The role of the private sector</p> <p>The UK / Finnish Peer Review</p>	<p>Virginia Murray, Public Health England</p> <p>Debbie Hillier, Oxfam / Marcus Oxley, Global Network</p> <p>James Crask / Scott Hughes, PwC</p> <p>Yordanka Mincheva, European Commission / Helen Braithwaite, DCLG</p>
Questions for the panel	Facilitator – Tom Mitchell, ODI
<i>Coffee</i>	
<p><b>Dialogue Groups</b> HFA so far – good, bad and the need to persevere? <b><u>3 Questions for discussion</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What have been the most successful parts of HFA?</li> <li>2. What have been the least successful parts of HFA?</li> <li>3. Which are the most important elements to take forward under HFA2?</li> </ol>	<p><b>4 Groups</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Academia and Science and Technology</li> <li>2. INGOs and NGOs</li> <li>3. Private Sector and Government departments</li> <li>4. Local and Community</li> </ol>

Group Chairs report back	
<i>LUNCH</i>	
<b>Case study:</b> Saving the lives of fishermen	Paul Davies / Pat Boyle, Met Office
<b>What does the UK want in HFA2?</b> <b>Thematic dialogue groups</b> (2 topics, 45 minutes each) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local and Community capacity building</li> <li>2. Accountability/monitoring/evaluation</li> <li>3. Integrating social groups into DRR, e.g. women, children and disabilities</li> <li>4. Private sector and insurance</li> <li>5. Integrating science into DRR and DRM</li> <li>6. Root causes of vulnerability</li> <li>7. Assessing and targeting risk</li> <li>8. Strengthening DRR in key sectors, health, climate change, education and agriculture</li> </ol>	
<i>Coffee</i>	
<b>What does the UK want in HFA2?</b> <b>Thematic dialogue groups</b> (2 topics, 45 minutes each) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local and Community capacity building</li> <li>2. Accountability/monitoring/evaluation</li> <li>3. Integrating social groups into DRR, e.g. women, children and disabilities</li> <li>4. Private sector and insurance</li> <li>5. Integrating science into DRR and DRM</li> <li>6. Root causes of vulnerability</li> <li>7. Assessing and targeting risk</li> <li>8. Strengthening DRR in key sectors, health, climate change, education and agriculture</li> </ol>	
Group chairs provide feedback of top 3 issues from afternoon. Discussion and questions	
Wrap up and next steps	Tom Mitchell, ODI
Close	