

Towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
***A prospective retrospective: considerations on, and lessons learned from,
the international frameworks for disaster risk reduction***
14 November 2013

Purpose

1. Based on a comparative review of the main international frameworks for disaster risk reduction adopted by the United Nations since 1971, this paper aims to provide elements for future considerations on substance, form and review mechanisms for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. It complements the preliminary outcomes of the consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.
2. The review looks at how a number of questions have been addressed across those frameworks, and how they relate to the considerations expressed by the consultations on the future framework to date.

Setting the context

3. The question of international cooperation concerning disasters has been always present in the deliberations of the United Nations governance bodies. The focus of the deliberations has evolved over time, and has shifted from addressing the consequences of specific disasters, toward a more comprehensive, strategic and preventive approach. In this evolution, one may note three major cycles, and more specific phases within.
4. A review of these cycles and of the key documents adopted offers significant guiding elements for the development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and to address some of the questions raised to date concerning substantive focus, form, linkages with other frameworks, legalities, and implementation mechanisms. It also helps identify what role UNISDR may be called to play to ensure the implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and more broadly to support international cooperation to reduce disaster risk.
5. The three major cycles are: 1946 to 1970; 1971 to 1999; and 2000 to date. These cycles are marked by two fundamental milestones, namely the establishment of UNDRO (Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Coordinator) in 1971, and the

adoption of the Strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction” (renamed International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) in 1999.

Summarily, these cycles are characterised as follow:

- Cycle 1: 1946-1970: cooperation established in the aftermath of, and to tackle, specific disasters;
- Cycle 2: 1971-1999: establishment of the first policy frameworks and institutional arrangements dealing with disasters with a marked emphasis on disaster preparedness, response, and mitigation;
- Cycle 3: 2000-todate: establishment of policy frameworks and institutional arrangements with an increasing emphasis on disaster risk.

6. Each major cycle has been timed by specific milestones and initiatives. The focus of the following review will be mainly on cycle 2 and 3.

Cycle 2 – from 1971 to 1999

7. In this period, the UNDRO was established (1971) and a more systematic approach to international cooperation to tackle disasters starts. The focus is very much on technical questions and measures, such as early warning and vulnerability analysis. Science is given a considerable space. The question of prevention is singled out already in the **functions of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator** (GA RES 2816 XXVI, let. “f”): “To promote the study, prevention, control, and prediction of natural disasters, including the collection and dissemination of information concerning technological developments;”.
8. The work carried out under the aegis of UNDRO lays the foundations for two major and specific work streams: a) the pre-disaster planning for response and b) prevention. The Expert Group Meeting held in Geneva in July 1979 well captures this in the Foreword of the meeting report (annex 2 to this paper).
9. In the 1980s the ground is prepared for the definition of the first two major policy frameworks dealing with disasters: a) **the International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR) of 1989** [A/RES/44/236], and b) the Guiding Principles for Strengthening the Coordination of Humanitarian Emergency Assistance of the United Nations of 1991 [A/RES/46/182 – which also led to the creation of the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator, the IASC, etc]. Major mechanisms, such as UNDAC in 1993, and INSARAAG in 1991 were established.
10. The adoption of two separate policy frameworks on disaster reduction and emergency assistance confirms the need for dedicated focus on two important areas of work - prevention and preparedness/response respectively - as their requirements are specific, albeit, of course, interlinked.

11. In **1994**, this approach is further confirmed by the adoption at the first World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction of the **“Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World”** which includes principles, a strategy and a plan of action. The Conference, proposed by the Scientific and Technical Committee established by the IDNDR, is to serve as a “substantive contribution to the mid-term review (by the ECOSOC) of the implementation of the International Framework of Action for the Decade called for in (GA) resolution 44/236”. The question of resilience is spelled out by the Strategy, noting that “there is a strong need to strengthen the resilience and self-confidence of local communities”. It is also important to note the warning sounded by the Yokohama Strategy: “In recent years emphasis has again been placed primarily on disaster response both within the United Nations and beyond. This has slowed down the momentum of the Decade’s initial phase, based on the consensus of the importance of action before disasters strike”.

Cycle 3: from 2000 to today

12. The current cycle is opened by the adoption in 1999 of **the Strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction”**, named thereafter the **International Strategy for Disaster Reduction**. It is developed in the context of the stocktaking exercise of the implementation of the International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction of 1989 and the development of successor frameworks for the new millennium. The ISDR places a clear emphasis on the need to focus on risk management.
13. This approach is further reemphasised by the 2nd World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005 through the adoption of the **“Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”**.
14. An innovation is represented by the development of **regional frameworks** for disaster risk reduction which start being developed: they include The Beijing Action for Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia (2005); the Delhi Declaration on Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia (2007); the Kuala Lumpur Declaration on Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia (2008); the Incheon Declaration on Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and the Pacific and the Incheon Regional Roadmap and Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction through Climate Change Adaptation in Asia and the Pacific (2010); An Investment for Sustainable Development In the Pacific Island Countries – Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management A Framework for Action 2005- 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (The Madang Framework); The African Union Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction of 2004, and its Programme of Action 2005-2015; The Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2020 (2010); the Andean Strategic Plan on Disaster Prevention and Relief; Caribbean Comprehensive Disaster Management Strategy followed by the Enhanced CDM Strategy and Framework 2007-2012; the Inter-American Strategic Plan for Policy on Vulnerability Reduction, Risk Management and Disaster

Response (IASP); the Inter-American Plan for Disaster Prevention and Response and the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance.

15. Also, the first international agreement with a specific focus on disaster risk reduction is adopted by the ASEAN on 26 July 2005: the “ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response”.

Considerations on content

16. The considerations that follow are not exhaustive; rather they aim to identify core questions which may be relevant in the definition of the content of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, in light of the indications emerged from the ongoing consultations.

Integrating disaster and risk considerations in development planning

17. The question of integrating disaster and risk considerations in development planning is a common thread throughout all the main frameworks since the 70s. It is mainly articulated as a call, as an objective, also echoed in many General Assembly resolutions. It looks as it has become a principle for planning. What is less evident is how this principle, this clearly understood need, can be translated into practical measures. This is probably an area where the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction can be of help. This aspect is of particular strategic relevance in light of the fact that the post-2015 development agenda is under consideration. The post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction has the potential of being fundamentally a practical framework for the sustainability of development, and as such an integral part of the future sustainable development paradigm.

Disaster management and risk management

18. The question of disaster management and risk management has been addressed throughout the frameworks, the more articulated being HFA, yet it has not been clearly spelled out. This is another point where the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction can help by articulating more what risk management is, implies, and requires, especially in terms of pre-empting (to the extent possible) the accumulation of new risk, and where this needs to happen, has to be the result of a conscious, well-pondered and transparent choice.
19. HFA one is rather explicit on disaster management through its Priority 5, which needs to be understood and implemented through the guidance of the other four priorities, as relevant and applicable. In practice, it means that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction may not need to enter into the specific of disaster management, as the existing policies and international agreements define

quite well what needs to be done, especially to support the development and complement national capacities.

Exposure and vulnerability

20. Risk is the result of hazard's characteristics, exposure and vulnerability. The call for, and need to focus on, vulnerability is expressed with clarity throughout the frameworks and also regularly echoed by the General Assembly, and addressed through many measures across all fields. On the other end, the focus on exposure, although present in embryonic forms in the frameworks, is much less evident and articulated; this is another area where the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction can provide specific and additional guidance, especially concerning "extensive" risk.

Multistakeholder participation

21. The multistakeholder nature of the work necessary to reduce disaster risk is rendered with clarity throughout all the instruments, in varying degrees. The importance and leadership role of local governments and communities as well as the private sector, together with other groups, is spelled out. Science has been long recognised as a key player. The guidance is clear. Implementation indeed is where the challenge is, and is not necessarily typical of disaster risk reduction only.
22. The question is no longer who the stakeholders are, rather on what models are the most appropriate to ensure their engagement. And this is a fundamental question of governance, and as a consequence of definition of responsibility and accountability. As such this is not necessarily an area where the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction could contribute radically "new" guidance. At the same time, the future framework could restate the principle of multistakeholder participation as critical to effective risk governance, and identify specific measures which, having been tested, could be adopted as guidance samples.
23. From an institutional point of view, reducing disaster risk has been the prerogative of the executives at national and local levels, and as such it is important to bring to the fore the role of the other powers, namely legislative and judiciary, as well as other bodies of the public administration. It also needs to be recognised that the interaction among the powers leaves policy and procedural gaps, which concur to create risk, and thus need to be filled otherwise.

Natural hazards and manmade hazards

24. The question concerning the separation of natural hazards from technological/manmade hazards has characterised the debate during the implementation of the past frameworks. Whereas there is now an understanding that it is very hard to approach and tackle these two sets of hazards separately from a policy and program perspective, it may still be necessary to expressively state the need for comprehensive risk management frameworks. This question is also interconnected with the management of transboundary risk, and the broader question of risk governance. Against this background, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction could contribute policy guidance to support the development of comprehensive and practical risk management approach, thus also enhancing cooperation at regional level.

Commitment and Principles

25. The consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, and in particular the 2013 Global Platform, have called for the new framework to be “underpinned by a clear set of principles and commitment to addressing the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable”. Two aspects are of relevance here: “commitment” and “principles” and need to be addressed separately.
26. The “commitment” question is new vis-à-vis the past instruments, which are indeed characterised by a rather “top-down” prescription of actions to be undertaken by stakeholders at different levels. The “commitment” brings on the table a new dimension, of proactive engagement and leadership by all those who have a stake, beyond states, which is not necessarily typical of international instruments. The word “commitment” has the potential to generate a polarised approach and be considered as non viable option by those who assign to the word a binding nature, which would imply a duty to act also for those who, while being characterised as part of a given group, are not be present at the Conference.
27. Therefore, it will be important for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to pre-empt the concerns and call for commitments as means to exemplify how implementation can be carried forward by various stakeholders, taking on the responsibility to act and to build an institutional and operating environment where effective action to reduce disaster risk can be undertaken at all levels. The expression of commitments could be presented as an indication, guidance on how to start implementing the new framework. It would be a reference point susceptible to be adjusted, integrated and modified at all levels and whenever appropriate.
28. The request for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to be underpinned by principles raises the question of whether principles do not exist and need to be formulated, or they do exist but are not enough, or they exist and are sufficient

and rather there is a need to maybe recall them and make the link with disaster risk reduction more explicit.

29. Albeit differently, the question of “principles” is addressed in the past frameworks, the General Assembly resolutions and Secretary-General reports. It is delicate as it interfaces also with the question of “right and duties”, including human rights, which is increasingly raised. Indeed, it is not clear from the consultations to date to what type of principles reference is made: legal or else.
30. The IDNDR is a fairly simple and straightforward document outlining objectives and goals, measures and actions to be undertaken at national level and by the UN system, and the necessary organisational arrangements. While not naming principles as such, it may be argued that the IDNDR points to certain modalities of work which need to guide action, and as such may be considered as principles of a kind. They include: protection of life, assets, and economic and social welfare; vulnerability reduction; widening of focus to include prevention; development of national programs; science-informed guidance and programming and decision-making; transfer of knowledge across countries; sharing of risk information; integration of risk and disaster consideration into development planning; the active participation of local governments and the private sector; public awareness and education on risk and the measures necessary to address it; engagement of media; focus on particularly relevant infrastructures of public economic and social relevance such as medical infrastructures, food storages, shelters, etc; multi-stakeholder nature of the work; and transboundary nature of risk, hence of programs.
31. The General Assembly resolution 46/182 on Strengthening the Coordination of Humanitarian Emergency Assistance of the United Nations, in its section on “guiding principles” indicate that “special attention should be given to disaster prevention and preparedness by governments concerned as well as by the international community.” It also states that: “Economic growth and sustainable development are essential for prevention of and preparedness against natural disasters and other emergencies.” In other words, it calls for development to be of preventive nature vis-à-vis disasters, and for a risk management approach that includes natural and manmade hazards.
32. The Yokohama Strategy explicitly defines a set of 10 principles, which at a close look very much restates those of the IDNDR and 46/182. It also makes explicit that: “environmental protection... is imperative in the prevention and mitigation of natural disasters”; “Each country bears the primary responsibility for protecting its people, infrastructure, and other national assets from the impact of natural disasters”; and “Preventive measures are most effective when they involve participation at all levels, from the local community through the national government to the regional and international level”. Moreover, it points out that

“Some patterns of consumption, production and development have the potential for increasing the vulnerability to natural disasters”, and recognizes the importance of “traditional methods to reduce the impact of natural disasters” and “to strengthen the resilience and self-confidence of local communities”.

33. The Strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction” is developed around the principles at the basis of the IDNDR, including Yokohama. It is worth noting that it considers “risk and disaster prevention a public value” to pursue. In addition, in defining “responsible parties” for its implementation, it indicates that “Governments have the primary responsibility for protecting citizens from risks and disaster, however, local communities and elements of civil society most threatened by hazards emerge as key initiators of important risk and disaster prevention actions. They must work through partnership, and together, receive necessary encouragement and support to realize the vision of disaster resilience. Regional/sub-regional and international collaboration is essential, especially with regard to the dissemination of experience and information, scientific and technical applications, continual advocacy and the coordination of strategies to assist in the development of national capabilities”. The strategy puts a clear and strong emphasis on the fact “risk management” requires the “integration of risk prevention into sustainable development”.
34. Finally, also the HFA, while not expressly identifying and defining principles, seems to be developed around the same principles of the preceding frameworks.
35. To complement the above, it is important to recall the 2013 Global Platform’s “recognition that the prevention and reduction of disaster risk is a legal obligation, encompassing risk assessments, the establishment of early warning systems, and the right to access risk information”. Along the same line, the UN International Law Commission, in its progressive development and codification of international law concerning the “Protection of persons in the event of disasters”, has defined the “Duty to reduce the risk of disasters” as “Each State shall reduce the risk of disasters by taking the necessary and appropriate measures, including through legislation and regulations, to prevent, mitigate and prepare for disasters. Disaster risk reduction measures include the conduct of risk assessments, the collection and dissemination of risk and past loss information, and the installation and operation of early warning systems”. The ILC also indicated the existence of a “duty to cooperate” which “extend(s) to the taking of measures intended to reduce the risk of disasters”.
36. Furthermore, human rights law provides an important legal basis to the ongoing work to reduce disaster risk. In particular, art 11 of the “Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities”, provides that “States Parties shall take, in accordance with their obligations under international law, including international humanitarian law and international human rights law, all necessary measures to ensure the

protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk, including situations of armed conflict, humanitarian emergencies and the occurrence of natural disasters”. Overall, it can be argued that the existence of risk and occurrence of disasters hamper the enjoyment of the rights protected by the Conventions, with the consequent obligation to take all relevant measures; at the same time, the full application of the Conventions is instrumental to ensure the reduction of disaster risk and the pre-emption of accumulation of new risk.

37. In conclusion, it seems that there is no lack of a principle basis to the disaster risk reduction work. Therefore, while the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction may not need to list the existing or elaborate new principles, it may be helpful to generally recall the principles enshrined in the preceding frameworks on disaster risk reduction and in relevant international instruments, together with the recognition of an existing legal obligation to reduce the risk of disasters.

Financing for disaster risk reduction

38. On financing for disaster risk reduction, the focus is mainly on international funding to support international cooperation, including the work of the United Nations.

39. On national financing for disaster risk reduction the references are very limited:

- The Framework of the IDNDR is silent on national funding;
- The Yokohama Strategy calls for the “Adoption of a policy of self-reliance in each vulnerable country and community comprising capacity-building as well as allocation and efficient use of resources” and “Encourage continued mobilization of domestic resources for disaster reduction activities”;
- The 1999 strategy commits to “Seek innovative funding mechanisms dedicated to sustained risk and disaster prevention activities” and to this aim to “Study feasibility of specific alternative funding and resource allocation modalities that can ensure continued commitment to sustained risk and disaster prevention strategies”. And the Declaration notes that “Appropriate financial resources will be needed to ensure the development and implementation of prevention and mitigation policies and programmes in all countries particularly developing countries. Innovative approaches should be explored including the funding of international initiatives. However, full use should be made of existing regional and national financial mechanisms involving those communities most directly exposed to risks. All bilateral and multilateral development assistance should include disaster reduction components”;
- The HFA under key activities for priority four includes: “Promote the development of financial risk-sharing mechanisms, particularly insurance and reinsurance against disasters” and “Develop and promote alternative and innovative financial instruments for addressing disaster risk”.

40. Against this background, it may be relevant for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to focus on the question of national financing for disaster risk

reduction, including possibly adopting or adjusting as relevant the targets suggested by the 2009 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, namely “10% of humanitarian relief funds to disaster risk reduction work”, “10% of post-disaster reconstruction and recovery projects and national preparedness and response plans” and “at least 1% of all national development funding and all development assistance funding to be allocated to risk reduction measures”.

Integration of disaster risk reduction, climate variability and change, and environment and ecosystem preservation

41. On the policy and program integration of disaster risk reduction, climate variability and change, and environment and ecosystem preservation:

- The Framework of the IDNDR “recognis[es] the importance of environmental protection for the prevention and mitigation of natural disasters”;
- The Yokohama Strategy “recognis[es] that there are close linkages between disaster losses and environmental degradation, as emphasized in Agenda 21 adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development” and noted as a Principle that Environmental protection as a component of sustainable development consistent with poverty alleviation is imperative in the prevention and mitigation of natural disasters; it also noted that “experience has demonstrated that, the concept of the disaster reduction should be enlarged to cover natural and other disaster situations including environmental and technological disasters (Na-Techs) and their interrelationship which can have a significant impact on social, economic, cultural and environmental systems, in particular in developing countries”; it recommended the “Adoption of integrated policies for prevention of, preparedness for, and response to, natural disasters and other disaster situations including environmental and technological hazards” and suggested to “consider the possibility of incorporating in their developmental plans the conducting of Environmental Impact Assessments with a view to disaster reduction”;
- The 1999 strategy recommends to “link efforts of hazard, risk and disaster prevention more closely with the Agenda 21 implementation process for enhanced synergy with environmental and sustainable development issues” and to “establish risk monitoring capabilities, and early warning systems as integrated processes, with particular attention being given to emerging hazards with global implications such as those related to climate variation and change, at all levels of responsibility”;
- The HFA is rather articulated concerning environmental questions and indeed its expected outcome is “The substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries”. Priority 4 notes that “disaster risks related to changing social, economic, environmental conditions and land use, and the impact of hazards associated with geological events, weather, water, climate variability and climate change, are addressed in sector development planning and programmes as well as in post-disaster situations”, and includes a number of activities concerning “Environmental and natural resource management” and “Land-use planning and other technical measures”. Concerning

climate change, HFA indicates as a key activity under priority 4 to “promote the integration of risk reduction associated with existing climate variability and future climate change into strategies for the reduction of disaster risk and adaptation to climate change, which would include the clear identification of climate-related disaster risks, the design of specific risk reduction measures and an improved and routine use of climate risk information by planners, engineers and other decision-makers”. Finally, HFA recommends to states to “Promote the integration of risk reduction associated with existing climate variability and future climate change into strategies for the reduction of disaster risk and adaptation to climate change; ensure that the management of risks associated with geological hazards, such as earthquakes and landslides, are fully taken into account in disaster risk reduction programmes” and to “mainstream disaster risk reduction measures appropriately into multilateral and bilateral development assistance programmes including those related to poverty reduction, natural resource management, urban development and adaptation to climate change”;

42. Against this background, while keeping firm what already indicated by HFA, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction may need focus in particular on practical measures to support the integration of mutually supportive agendas, and in particular how to integrate in practical measures disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation.

Private sector's engagement

43. As far as the integration of the private sector is concerned:
- The Framework of the IDNDR recommends that policy measures be taken at the national level “to encourage their local administrations to take appropriate steps to mobilize the necessary support from the public and private sectors and to contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the Decade”;
 - The Yokohama Strategy calls for “integration of the private sector in disaster reduction efforts through promotion of business opportunities”;
 - The 1999 strategy is silent on the point;
 - The HFA as a key activity under Priority 4 includes to “promote the establishment of public–private partnerships to better engage the private sector in disaster risk reduction activities; encourage the private sector to foster a culture of disaster prevention, putting greater emphasis on, and allocating resources to, predisaster activities such as risk assessments and early warning systems”. It calls on public and private partnerships as a means for resource mobilization;
44. Against this background, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction may define more specific measures to realise public and private partnerships, and for the private sector to consider integrating disaster risk management in their business models in order to pre-empt the creation of new risk and reduction of the existing risk through business investments.

An emerging question?

45. There is an increasing interest in, and demand to look into, the interface between conflict and disasters (impact of conflict due to land dispute on vulnerability and exposure, thus risk). This is complemented by a call for comprehensive risk management frameworks, which include, for instance, conflict as a risk.
46. There are also very practical consequences that conflicts impose on the capacity of a country and community to manage disaster risk, from prevention to preparedness and response. The question is complex and cannot be abandoned *a priori* – it may be important to find an appropriate context to consider it.

Considerations on form

Relation among the existing instruments

47. Considering that the IDNDR ceased to exist with the coming to an end of the Decade, the current international framework for disaster risk reduction is defined by three key documents: the Yokohama Strategy, the Strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction”, and the HFA. Are they all still applicable?
48. The consultations on the development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to be adopted at the upcoming 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2015, have pointed out to the need for the new framework to build on HFA.
49. Against this background, a set of questions need to be addressed: a) whether the Yokohama Strategy and the the Strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction” are still relevant, and, depending on the conclusion, how they would relate to the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, and b) how the relation between HFA and the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction needs to be addressed and described from a formal point of view.

Review mechanisms and procedures

50. The International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction included a formal mechanism and procedure for review under its section F: “The Economic and Social Council, during its second regular session on 1994, will carry out a mid-term review of the implementation of the International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction and report its findings to the General Assembly”.

51. The Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World does not indicate a specific review process and mechanism, nor does the General Assembly resolution endorsing the Yokohama Strategy and the mid-term review carried out by the ECOSOC. The only request is for the UN Secretary-General to report on progress to the General Assembly. The Yokohama Strategy though called for a review conference and the ensuing General Assembly resolution decided to convene a 2nd World Conference no later than the year 2000.
52. In 1995, the Secretary-General, in reviewing the functions of the IDNDR secretariat, indicated: "Facilitating, monitoring and adapting the implementation of the action plan for the International Framework of Action for the Decade, on the basis of the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action." The General Assembly taking "note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General concerning the specific measures for the implementation of the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation and its Plan of Action,... request[ed] the secretariat of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction to continue to promote and monitor their translation into concrete activities".
53. The Strategy "A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction", named thereafter the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, indicated that it "should be closely monitored by the risk and disaster reduction community, and a global review of progress and accomplishments should be undertaken by all concerned parties within a period of five years".
54. The monitoring of implementation was left to the Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction established as part of the successor arrangements for the IDNDR, which in 2001 devised a "Framework for Action for the Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction". This framework was developed as a synthesis based on "the IDNDR experience, the Yokohama Strategy, and the Strategy A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction", taking into account the indications of the Declaration "The Geneva Mandate on Disaster Reduction" of the Programme Forum held in Geneva in July 1999. This was the "International Strategy for Disaster Reduction".
55. However, in preparation for the 2nd World Conference, the review of implementation focused only on the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action, with no explicit reference to the Strategy "A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction", thus apparently leaving a gap vis-à-vis what requested therein.
56. The HFA provides that "the follow-up on the World Conference on Disaster Reduction will, as appropriate, be an integrated and coordinated part of the follow-up to other major conference in fields relevant to disaster risk reduction. This should include specific reference to progress on disaster risk reduction taking, into

account agreed development goals, including those found in the Millennium Declaration. The implementation of this Framework for Action for the period 2005-2015 will be appropriately reviewed". HFA also requested to "provide reports and summaries to the Assembly and other United Nations bodies, as requested or as appropriate, based on information from national platforms, regional and international organizations and other stakeholders."

57. Against this background, it emerges that a variety of models for review were developed, with a varying degree of involvement of the UN Governance bodies, like the ECOSOC and the General Assembly. Whereas the more recent model developed through the HFA Monitor and the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, established as a successor mechanism of the Inter-Agency Task Force for Disaster Reduction, has provided an interesting degree of flexibility, it has not generated substantive discussions within the General Assembly and the ECOSOC, thus de facto limiting the oversight of these bodies and the possibility to review the implementation of this framework in synch and integrated fashion with other relevant frameworks, such as the MDGs.
58. Considering the deliberations of the Rio+20 Conference, and the subsequent related pronouncements of the General Assembly, concerning disaster risk reduction and its integration in future development frameworks, as well as the establishment of a High Level Political Forum, including its role vis-à-vis the post-2015 development agenda and goals, there is an opportunity to consider how to integrate the review of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction in existing mechanisms and procedures of the relevant UN governance bodies, thus avoiding duplication and maximising benefits.

Implementation tools

59. The relation among the mentioned disaster risk reduction frameworks vis-à-vis their implementation is rather interesting – in essence, the succeeding are meant to support the implementation of the preceding.
60. The Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action were meant to serve "the transformation of the International Framework of Action for the Decade into a decisive intersectoral Plan of Action".
61. In 1999, in defining the framework for the new millennium (which then became the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction), the Declaration "The Geneva Mandate on Disaster Reduction" indicated that the new course would be chartered by both the Yokohama Strategy and the strategy "A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction". As indicated earlier, to support the implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, the Inter-

Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction devised a “Framework for Action for the Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction” in 2001.

62. In 2003 a 10-year review of the Yokohama Strategy was initiated, and the report of the Secretary-General pointed to a new initiative: “The review of the Yokohama Strategy ... [is] expected to motivate further actions of Governments and communities through an expanded programme for the period 2005-2015, to coincide with the targets of the Millennium Development Goals ... This programme should be discussed and adopted at the Second World Conference on Disaster Reduction...”.
63. Implementation and operational plans of the main frameworks had been developed at different levels within and outside the United Nations system.
64. Targets and indicators have been developed at different stages and according to a variety of modalities, with the first set reportedly elaborated under the aegis of the Scientific and Technical Committee established under the IDNDR.
65. Reporting on implementation has taken place under all the frameworks with a varied modality. The most systematised and coordinated seems to be the one developed under HFA, namely the HFA Monitor. The HFA calls for consultations to be facilitated by UNISDR “with the view to developing generic, realistic and measurable indicators, keeping in mind available resources of individual States. These indicators could assist States to assess their progress in the implementation of the Framework of Action. The indicators should be in conformity with the internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration”.
66. Against this background, and considering the calls of the ongoing consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction - namely the need for the new framework to build on HFA - it is important that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction clarify and articulate the meaning of “built on HFA”, hence its relation with HFA. In particular, it will be necessary to clarify whether HFA is superseded or complemented by the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction; and in case of the latter, it will be important to clarify what this may mean in terms of implementation plans, target and indicators, and monitoring and reporting mechanisms. Reverberations will also be on the regional plans and frameworks developed around the HFA.
67. This seems to be particularly relevant in light of past experience with the strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction”, which remained somehow unaccounted for, as confirmed by the preparation for the 2nd World Conference which focused only on the Yokohama Strategy.

Length of the document

68. The 1989 International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction of 1989 and the 1999 Strategy “A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction” are relatively short (2 pages each) and practical documents. The “Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World” and the HFA are indeed rather lengthy documents (11 and 17 pages respectively), which explain, articulate and clarify policy questions, and give guidance for further action.
69. Considering that HFA will remain, and in light of the relatively focused new questions to be addressed, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction would not need to restate past agreed upon questions. Indeed it could consist in a relatively short document along the lines of the 1989 and 1999 frameworks, inclusive of an introduction that clarifies its relation with HFA and the existing regional strategies for disaster risk reduction, refers to other instruments which may be of relevance to reduce disaster risk, and have a section on implementation and review with clear references to the role of relevant UN governance bodies. Other important questions may be contained in the political declaration of the Conference.
70. Finally, considering that the General Assembly has called for the development of a “post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction”, while the consultations have indicated the need to extend HFA and that innovations to HFA have been considered as HFA2, it may be helpful to clarify the relation between the “post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction”, HFA, and HFA2. A pragmatic approach would be to consider the “post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction” as consisting in HFA+HFA2.

Conclusions

71. This review seems to point to the question of whether a new cycle is now opening, focused on the actual integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development, environment and climate change.
72. An important shift has taken place since the adoption of the GA Resolution: the realisation that disaster risk reduction is for all countries and no longer a question of aid to “other” or developing countries.
73. Given the wealth of guidance generated and consolidated in HFA, which remains, HFA2 can focus on a set of very specific questions in a pragmatic manner.
74. Finally, as continued and strengthened implementation is what matters, the integration and refinement of targets and indicators, existing reporting, monitoring and periodic review mechanisms is of particular relevance. As such the post-2015

framework for disaster risk reduction may include a specific section on follow-up requesting UNISDR to ensure action is taken.

Summary elements for HFA2

In the light of the preceding analysis, HFA2 could contain:

- (a) Guidance on how to integrate disaster risk reduction into development planning to make it sustainable, and state that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction will be an integral part of the future sustainable development paradigm post 2015;
- (b) Give guidance on practical measures (even 2 or 3 may be enough as pointers) to support the integration of mutually supportive agendas, and in particular how to integrate in practical measures disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation;
- (c) Place emphasis on and articulate “risk management” in simple steps, what it is, implies and requires; “disaster management” can be left to HFA priority 5, and 46/182;
- (d) Place emphasis on and articulate “exposure” in simple steps, what it is, implies and requires; and state that the measures to reduce vulnerability indicated by HFA remain valid;
- (e) Clarify that future risk management needs to integrate natural and tech/manmade hazards;
- (f) Give guidance to shift from an approach to reduce disaster risk by the state central institutions in partnership with “other” stakeholders, to a new approach where risk governance is explicitly conceived and designed with the participation of all stakeholders with a definition of roles and responsibilities to be explicitly made by countries through appropriate measures;
- (g) Give guidance on practical measures (even 2 or 3 may be enough as pointers) to realise public and private partnerships, and for the private sector to consider integrating in their business models in order to pre-empt the creation of new risk and reduction of the existing risk through business investments.
- (h) Recall and refer to the existing principles and legal foundations of disaster risk reduction evidenced by the International Law Commission, and existing also in other relevant international instruments – without elaborating on them;
- (i) Give guidance on practical measures (even 2 or 3 may be enough as pointers) on financing for disaster risk reduction at national and international level and adopt (duly revised if needed) the targets of “10% of humanitarian relief funds to disaster risk reduction work”, “10% of post-disaster reconstruction and recovery projects and national preparedness and response plans” and “at least 1% of all national development funding and all development assistance funding to be allocated to risk reduction measures”;

From the form and implementation perspectives, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction may include:

- (a) A statement that the new post 2015-framework for disaster risk reduction consists of HFA and HAF2; and that a unified monitoring mechanism with specific targets and indicators (HFA Monitor 2) will be developed which will imply an update of the one used for HFA to ensure an effective measurement of impact and progress in implementation;
- (b) A formal periodic review process by relevant UN governance bodies, and a request to the General Assembly to take the relevant decision;
- (c) A call for a framework to address the next 20 to 30 years and to be duly reviewed and possibly updated every 4 years (in synch with the High Level Political Forum's review of the post-2015 development agenda);
- (d) Overall, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction could be a relatively short document of around 5 (max 7 pages). The "commitment" part would not be included, but annexed as a way to give an indication of how the implementation will start right after its adoption.