

Proposal of Monitoring System for “Post-2015 Framework for DRR”

A global discourse on the successor to HFA is well underway. PrepComs I took place in July 2014 and the second PrepComs will be held in November 2014. The agreement will be finalised at the Third UN World Conference on DRR in Sendai, Japan, in March 2015. The HFA2 is very likely to agree global targets and define indicators for DRR. The pre-zero draft in August 2014 has proposed five global targets and an elaborate monitoring framework for tracking progress. Current proposal of monitoring system submitted to PrepCom I remains to be reviewed but offer a good basis for further discussions.

1. Key improvements of new monitoring system from current HFA Monitor

Increased objectiveness by redefining indicators and integrating input indicators with output and outcome indicators. As self-assessment tool, the HFA Monitor results are explicitly subjective and cannot be used to benchmark or compare countries. The proposal aims to overcome the subjectivity by clarifying indicators and monitoring input, output and outcome. Outcome level indicators monitor the achievement of target while input level indicators measure the progress in priority for action. Output level indicators bridges the gap between input and outcome and facilitates understanding of risk mechanism.

Improved structure, flexibility, accountability, and commitment in selection of targets and indicators. Indicators at input and output levels are organized along three proposed goals of pre-zero draft: preventing disaster risk generation, reducing existing risk and strengthening resilience. It is proposed that Member states will develop National Plans towards the Post-2015 Framework for DRR and choose targets and indicators appropriate to their risk profile and other national contexts. Input indicators are categorized by responsible sector to increase accountability and commitment.

Strengthened link with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Climate Change Convention. In 2015, the three key global policy agreements – HFA, MDGs, CC Convention – will complete their term and replaced by successor frameworks. The outcomes of the Post-2015 Framework for DRR will have a critical influence on the achievement of SDGs and vice versa. The Climate Change agenda is also closely linked to the Post-2015 Framework for DRR given that climate change is an underlying risk driver. The proposal aims to take advantage of the unique opportunity in 2015 and tries to align the monitoring system with the SDGs and Climate Change Convention.

Move toward decision making support tools. The HFA monitor was not utilized to influence decision making in many countries. New monitoring system aims to be useful for decision makers by facilitating systematic understanding of disaster risk mechanism and identifying weak policy areas to prevent new risk generation, reduce existing risk and strengthen resilience. Annex 1 illustrates the architecture of the proposed monitoring framework.

2. The current status of proposal development

Based on discussions in a series of regional platform, *the technical workshop on indicators, monitoring and review process for the post-2015 framework* in PrepCom I, expert consultations, UN System consultations, pilot studies implemented in Armenia, Japan and Mozambique, the UNISDR is currently revising the document submitted to the technical workshop.

The UNISDR is planning to organize the expert meeting in October and prepares for the second PrepCom in 14-17 November 2014. The UNISDR will make the revised document open to stakeholders including Member States and others in the process and welcome the feedback and inputs.

The main challenges identified and considered in this stage are as follows;

- **Balancing simplicity and comprehensiveness:** The proposed indicator system is very comprehensive in trying to capture the link between policy, underlying risk drivers, and loss/impact. In PrepCom I, there was a strong call to keep the monitoring system simple and easy to apply. The framework must strike a balance between comprehensiveness and manageability of monitoring system to minimize administrative burden of reporting authorities.
- **Reviewing linkage between global and national targets:** The issue was raised on how to effectively link global and national targets. Member States in PrepCom I and experts emphasized the need that national targets should be flexible to be tailored at every country's specific situation. The monitoring system should pay attention to how national targets contribute to achievement of global targets.
- **Clarifying linkage between the Post-2015 Framework for DRR, SDGs and CC:** The proposal of monitoring system on Post-2015 Framework for DRR should be adjusted to the progress of SDGs and CC consultation while at the same time aiming to influence the development process of two other frameworks.
- **Strengthening linkage to local level monitoring:** There was a lot of emphasis to focus on monitoring action at the local level. There have been monitoring of national government's efforts so far under HFA but now the opportunity ahead is to capture local efforts. The challenge is that we cannot take "one-size first all" approach given diverse country structure and context.
- **Reviewing terminology, data availability and technical capacity:** Many experts emphasized the importance of clarity and relevance in terminology and concepts. Member States noted there are still many gaps, particularly in the availability of disaster loss data and baseline data. Some emphasized the lack of national capacity and the need for technical support. Feasibility of the monitoring system must be checked, especially through pilot studies under implementation.
- **Clarifying continuity from HFA Monitor and considering periodicity of reporting cycle:** Input indicators basically include HFA Monitor indicators but the restructuring based on three goals made the continuity obscure. It is asked to explain continuity from HFA Monitor. Member States also have different opinions on reporting cycle.

3. Actions needed from Member States and other key stakeholders

This should include:

- a. **Greater awareness of the HFA2 and its monitoring system proposal.** This short note is one effort in that regard but further information sharing will be required over the coming months. Key sources include: on [HFA2 \(http://www.wcdrr.org/documents/wcdrr/Pre-zero_draft_post2015_frmwk_for_DRR_8_August.pdf\)](http://www.wcdrr.org/documents/wcdrr/Pre-zero_draft_post2015_frmwk_for_DRR_8_August.pdf); on [monitoring system proposal \(http://www.preventionweb.net/documents/posthfa/Mutual_reinforcement_of_2015_Agendas_UNISDR.pdf\)](http://www.preventionweb.net/documents/posthfa/Mutual_reinforcement_of_2015_Agendas_UNISDR.pdf)
- b. **Greater coordination at national level.** The discourse on the new monitoring system shall be led by different parts of the national systems – beyond National disaster Management Authorities. There is an opportunity to improve coordination among various stakeholders.
- c. **Greater coordination at international level.** Key stakeholders at international level should actively provide inputs and seek coherence.

Annex I

Proposed architecture of monitoring mechanism for post-2015 Framework for DRR

