



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL HUMANITARIAN AID AND CIVIL PROTECTION - ECHO
ECHO A - Strategy, Policy and International Co-operation

Unit A/3 – Policy and Implementation Frameworks

EU CONSULTATION ON POST-2015 HYOGO FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION (HFA2)

**Rue Joseph-II, 79 - Brussels
16 December 2013**

MINUTES

Participants: Dominique Albert (ECHO); Paola Albrito (UNISDR); Alice Azemar (Association Française pour la Prévention des Catastrophes Naturelles); Steve Barnes (UK); Charles Baubion (OECD); Flavio Bello (GR); Mags Bird (VOICE); Jozias Blok (DEVCO); Jean-François Bonnet (FR); Andrew Bower (ECHO); Saskia Bruynooghe (EP); M.M.N. Buijtendijk (NL); Zorica Bukinac Cimpersek (SI); Gunter Ceuppens (BE); Christos Cheretakis (GR); Sine Tarby Christensen (DK); Ian Clark (ECHO); Pavel Danihelka (Technical University Of Ostrava); Thomas de Lannoy (ECHO); Rossella Della Monica (WB); Rowan Douglas (Willis); Zoe Druilhe (FAO); Johan Eldebo (World Vision); Viktoria Endredi (ECHO); Valentina Evangelisti (OXFAM); Joe Galby (ECHO); Spyros Georgiou (GR); Corsmas Goemans (NL); Markus Held (ECHO); Natasa Horvat (SI); Ivaylo Iaydjiev (ECHO); Joanna Jaskowiak (Council); Sofia Käll (ECHO); Ioannis Kavvadas (ENV); Max Lamesch (LU); Eric Lebegue (CASSIDIAN); Mette Lindahl Olsson (SE); Henriette Mampuya (WB); Marie-Pierre Meganck (FR); Yordanka Mincheva (ECHO); Roland Nussbaum (MRN); Olivia O'Connell (Save the Children); Marcus Oxley (Global Network); Denis Peter (RTD); Axel Rottländer (DKKV); Pedro Santos de Oliveira (DEVCO); Simone Schuller (AT); Gosia Sendrowska (EEAS); Julia Stewart-David (DEVCO); Sten Van Leuffel (PLAN); Gabriella Varga Grafjodine (HU); Mireia Villar Forner (UNDP); Sylvie Wabbes (FAO); Emily Wilkinson (Overseas Development Institute); Sami Zeidan (CLIMA).

Opening of the meeting

The European Commission opened the stakeholder consultation by placing the work on HFA2 in the context of current discussions and ongoing consultation process at international level. The Commission aims to adopt its Communication on HFA.2 by March 2014, leading to Council Conclusions under the Greek Presidency in May or June 2014. This process aims to contribute towards shaping a stronger common European voice as Member States (MS) negotiate the post-2015 framework at UN level. It was clarified that the Council Conclusions will only recommend a position that can be taken on board voluntarily by MS given the non-binding nature of the international framework.

The stakeholder consultation centred on discussion groups during which participants discussed key issues to be addressed by the future framework. The aim was not to discuss new EU policy but rather to build on past EU policy achievements that have contributed to the implementation of the HFA (new EU civil protection legislation, the EU disaster risk management framework, EU financial support and policy to disaster risk management in developing countries) through an action-oriented approach.

What is HFA and the consultation process towards defining its successor? (UNISDR)

The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) "Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters" is a 10-year plan adopted by 168 UN Member States which voluntarily committed to work on its five priorities for action with the objective to make the world safer from natural hazards and build disaster resilience. Adopted in 2005, HFA is due to expire in 2015. UNISDR presented the consultation process leading to a new framework. A post-2015 framework should focus on resilience, reduction and avoidance of risk accumulation by building on previous and existing frameworks (lessons learnt from the HFA, IDRD, Yokohama Strategy). Possible principles of the new framework include: focusing on addressing underlying risk drivers; having natural, man-made and multi-hazard events in the scope of the framework; disaster risk management to be considered as safeguard to the

enjoyment of human rights; stronger trans-boundary and cooperative efforts for risk drivers driven by globalisation; and the availability of open source information to increase accountability. The new HFA should pass positive and inspirational messages focusing on presenting Disaster Risk Management as an investment rather than a cost. Risk avoidance, risk reduction and resilience should be the three goals of the new HFA, in correspondence with existing processes under the UNFCCC (climate change mitigation, adaptation and loss & damage). Priorities should include reflecting public and private policies which include elements of anticipatory risk management, corrective risk management and resilience and address cross-cutting questions such as governance, knowledge management, and financial regulation. The HFA Monitor System remains the most significant global repository of information on progress made in DRR; a monitoring system under the new framework should be based on five families of indicators: measuring the reduction in human and economic losses; country risk profiles, country's economic resilience; underlying risk drivers; public policy on cross-cutting issues. Finally, expected outcomes of the World Conference on DRR (Japan, 2015) include completing the assessment and implementation of HFA, reaching an agreement on post-2015 framework, a voluntary commitment of stakeholders, a political declaration of the World Conference.

In response to questions raised by the audience, UNISDR clarified the need to have a comprehensive coverage of hazards and to include natural as well as technological/man-made disasters; that avoidance of risk accumulation and resilience are distinguished as two objectives to reinforce focus on sustainability; and finally that in an effort to scale up DRR, five families of indicators should be used for the analysis.

What and how can the EU contribute to shaping the post-2015 DRR framework? (Commission)

The European Commission presented its plans about the timely adoption of the Communication in taking stock of the policies developed over the past 10 years and progress made in building resilience and disaster risk management within the Union internal policies and external action. The Communication will be an opportunity to present existing key EU achievements in the area of disaster risk management: revised EU civil protection legislation leading to enhanced prevention, preparedness and response; development of a cross-sectoral disaster risk management framework covering risk assessment, good practices data availability and comparability; solidarity clause.

The Commission also went over a number of achievements in mainstreaming disaster risk management into key EU policies and its funding instruments including close synergies with climate change adaptation; use of insurance as a tool for disaster management; integration of disaster risk management in cohesion policy; development of Danube and Baltic regional strategies; science and innovation for disaster management (Horizon 2020 and FP7 projects); environmental protection including flood protection, industrial accidents prevention, environmental impact assessment, green infrastructure; critical infrastructure protection, cross-border health etc..

The Commission's work on resilience integrated in the EU humanitarian aid and development cooperation policy was also presented. The elaboration of a resilience agenda and implementation framework was touched upon, as well as the elaboration of resilience Action Plan to address the root causes of vulnerability. The Commission's priorities are to continue ongoing work on resilience, research and learning and provide tools and methodology to implement the agenda. Three observations were made on the need for resilience work to be country-owned and led, for an equity- and people-centred approach and for coherence and complementarity with the work of other stakeholders. Clarifications were provided to the audience on the inclusion of man-made disasters in the work on DRR, in work on fragility for instance, as well as on the implementation of the EU strategy for DRR for developing countries.

National Perspective from the Member States' consultation processes (Sweden)

Sweden held its post-2015 consultation in November 2012, focusing discussions on the observed challenges and successes, long-term investment in DRR and the essential as well as missing elements of the current framework. The consultation discussed how best to strengthen the HFA, looking at links

between DRR, climate change adaptation and sustainable development; ensuring its openness and flexibility by not being too detailed; the value of current EU developments (civil protection mechanism; Adaptation Strategy; etc.) in providing a good basis; and the need to make HFA priority 4 (reducing underlying risk factors) more transparent. The HFA for the future should inspire more engagement from other sectors, stimulate knowledge, training, and best practices, add targets and goals, be relevant for small accidents, and include man-made, technological risks and conflicts. The National Platforms should be maintained as a useful arena for cooperation and coordination of work at a local level. Cooperation with neighbouring countries should also be enhanced.

The view from civil society (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction)

Global Network focused on the need for greater attention and support for the day-to-day work carried out at a local level, of particular importance as economic costs are rising and impacts are in relative terms greater on poorest countries. 'Mega disasters' get greater attention and provide unique insights which may trigger actions of relevance to the many small scale chronic issues at a local scale. The argument was put forth that the HFA is unlikely to achieve expected outcomes by 2015, thus raising questions over a need of rethinking, whether the framework is fit for purpose and whether it is efficiently executed. While HFA may influence government thinking, systemic change and capacity improvements are required at local levels.

An effective post-2015 disaster risk management framework will require two mutually-reinforcing strategic objectives focusing on extensive risk: to support changes in social-economic development pathways to reduce the creation of new risks; to support accelerated actions to reduce existing risk stock to acceptable levels. Furthermore, the HFA strategic objectives should be framed under a sustainable development goal as DRR remains primarily a development challenge. All in all, policy should reflect local practices and recognise the holistic nature of risk. It is therefore important to strengthen resilience based on principles of community resilience, promote a holistic approach and integrate HFA in the broader work on Millennium Development Goals/Sustainable Development Goals

What is at stake for the private sector? (Mission Risques Naturels)

Mission Risque Naturels, a member of the French national DRR platform, representing the French insurance industry on issues related to risk knowledge and reduction, addressed the case of disasters as a threat to business sustainability. Disaster Risk Management was also presented as an opportunity for business development. The role of Public-Private Partnerships projects on information sharing and knowledge management, and risk transfer was addressed. The work of the French National Observatory of Natural Risks was briefly introduced, as well as other EU-funded disaster risk management projects relevant to the private sector: Enhance; know4DRR; and Starflood.

Key principles for HFA2 (discussion groups)

Discussion 1: Accountability, transparency and governance

- All important and interlinked, must be overarching principles and tools for success;
- Importance of ownership and incentives for stakeholders at all levels, while keeping the voluntary character of the framework; flexibility and context specificity needed, while improving policy coherence;
- DRR to be perceived as a sustainable development issue with a rights-based approach
- Need for strong and effective multi-stakeholder and multi-level vertical and horizontal cooperation with inclusive participatory mechanisms (bottom-up from local/urban level, cooperation between authorities across all sectors, civil society and private sector, scientists and media);
- Further strengthen the national platforms for DRR; similar fora and more capacity needed at local level;

- Better address transboundary risks and cooperation, further strengthen the role of European Union in implementation of the framework
- Agreed principles for governance of critical risks and responsibilities assigned to stakeholders with accountability
- For transparency need to improve data sharing and availability to understand and assess risk and make citizens aware
- Improve accountability through peer reviews, simplify self-monitoring with reduced burden; ensure better and evidence based tracking of progress and benchmarking to account for success and outcomes;

Discussion 2: **Targets and goals**

- Identify most relevant targets and goals and how are these measurable;
- Necessary from both bottom-up and top-down perspectives;
- Show/achieve progress, lever progress at different levels, and reach out to a wider public;
- Realistic indicators should be defined;
- Current tools are not adequate but should not be ruled out as to avoid cost of non-action;
- Could address: GDP, livelihood, availability of risk information and trends in investments;
- Timeframe for goals and targets should not exceed 10 years.

Discussion 3: **Integrating DRR into the wider international agenda**

- Need to ensure coherence and sustainability in post-HFA and the post development framework (post MDGs/SDGs) – common targets, indicators to define progress
- DRR agenda should be connected to sustainable development, environment and climate, but also desertification, food security, SIDS discussion, G8 work, or OECD Ministerial Council Meeting in May 2014 focussing on "resilient economies and inclusive growth");
- Need to better define DRR and resilience to improve links with other connected agendas;
- Need to bring the "positive" message that investment in disaster risk management contributes to sustainable economic development and poverty reduction;
- Need to bring people centered approach/ social justice and equity in the discussions
- EU/ Commission to play a key role in connecting these agendas

Discussion 4: **Empowering local communities**

- Place at the centre of the DRR process (*underlined in civil society presentation*);
- Efforts should focus on involving and motivating local communities;
- Strengthening capacities through information, real participation and community rights;
- Use of simulation in testing and modelling community empowerment;
- Need to strengthen governance and build on notion of 'working as one';
- Indicators could be created to provide proof of progress;
- Push for private sector involvement in engaging with local communities.

Discussion 5: **Contribution of DRR to economic growth**

- Previous shocks change behaviour to DRR and integrate it in private sector's 'DNA' –e.g. NL;
- Create (public) coordinating body to coordinate responsibilities in DRM;
- EU/Commission to play a facilitating role, through the creation of monitoring indicators, benchmark tools, the expansion of the existing exchange of experts programme and the CLIMATEADAPT portal;
- EU to raise awareness and promote of an ecosystem approach: show link between environmental mismanagement and economic impacts as one of main causes of disasters.
- Integrate DRR into spatial planning: look at good practices in FR and IT;
- Awareness-raising of the banking sector of what is a manageable risk;

Discussion 6: **Role of research and innovation**

- Cross-use, optimise use of and transfer existing scientific knowledge;
- Importance of understanding what end-users want (both public and private);

- Connect science to policy: use of existing structures such as National Platforms;
- Promote technological and process innovation;
- Use science in the monitoring and evaluation of HFA deliverables.

Closing of the meeting

The European Commission commended the contributions of stakeholders during the consultation meeting and informed participants that comments and suggestions for the Communication would be taken into consideration. A deadline of 10 January was also given for any written comments to be submitted to the Commission.
