



Asia-Pacific Input Document for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)

*Risk sensitive development as the cornerstone of
resilience and sustainability*

26th June 2014, Bangkok

Acknowledgements

This document reflects the inputs received from an extensive multi-stakeholder consultations process involving governments, organizations and various networks in the Asia-Pacific region from March 2012 to date (detailed in the Annex1). The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) Asia-Pacific is honoured to facilitate the process towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (also referred to as HFA2), as requested by the Member States through the General Assembly Resolution 66/199.

The governments that provided inputs to the Phase I of the HFA2 consultation process: Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, People's Republic of Bangladesh, Kingdom of Cambodia, The Cook Islands, The Republic of Fiji, The Republic of India, Japan, Republic of Kiribati, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, The Republic of Maldives, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Republic of Nauru, Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, Niue, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Republic of Palau, Republic of the Philippines, Independent State of Samoa, Solomon Islands, Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, Republic of Vanuatu and Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

The governments that provided inputs to the Phase II of the HFA2 consultation process: Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Australian Government, People's Republic of Bangladesh, Kingdom of Bhutan, Kingdom of Cambodia, The Republic of Fiji, The Republic of India, The Republic of Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, The Republic of Maldives, Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, Kingdom of Thailand, Kingdom of Tonga, and Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

The organizations and networks that provided inputs into the consultation process: Action Against Hunger France, ActionAid Pakistan, All India Disaster Mitigation Institute, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Australian Business Roundtable for Disaster Resilience and Safer Communities, Balangoda Urban Council Sri Lanka, Bullock and Haddow LLC, Church Worldwide Service Japan and Asia-Pacific, The Disability Inclusive DRR Network, The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, The International Centre for Water Hazard and Risk Management (ICHARM), International Research Institute of Disaster Science (IRIDeS) at Tohoku University, Japan CSO Coalition for 2015WCDRR, Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation, Japan Water Agency, Japan Women's Network for Disaster Risk Reduction, Kokusai Kogyo, Local Government at Resilience Conference Colombo, Mercy Corps Indonesia, Network of Asian River Basin Organizations, Nippon Foundation and Japan Disability Forum, Pacific Asia Travel Association, Peace Boat Disaster Relief Volunteer Center, Practical Action Sri Lanka, Queensland University of Technology, Rise Together Japan, Rural Development Policy Institute Pakistan, Save the Children Japan, SM Supermalls, The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Disaster Management Centre, South Pacific Applied Geosciences' Commission (SOPAC), United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), UNICEF and Save the Children on behalf of the Asian Coalition for School Safety, World Vision Pakistan, The World Bank, Centre for Disaster Resilience at the University of Salford UK.

The organizations that developed the key area papers: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre, Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network, Duryog Nivaran, Kyoto University, and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

The 7 key area papers are available at <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net>.

Government and inter-governmental organizations, academia, institutions and networks that provided formal peer review comments: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Government of Australia; Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India; Secretariat of the Pacific Community Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SPC SOPAC); Regional and Sustainable Development Department, Asian Development Bank; Japan Water Agency; Pacific Center for Environment and Sustainable Development, University of the South Pacific, Fiji; Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Thematic Working Group of the UN Regional Coordination Mechanism (RCM-TWG-GEEW).

Organizations that provided comments through the ISDR Asia Partnership (IAP): All India Disaster Mitigation Institute; Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network; Cabinet Office of Japan; Centre for Poverty Analysis, Sri Lanka; the Disability Inclusive DRR Network; Geo Science Australia; Government of Nepal; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; International Research Institute of Disaster Science (IRIDeS) at Tohoku University; Japan Space Exploration Agency; Kyoto University Graduate School of Global Environmental Studies; Taskforce for Disaster Response, Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation; Disaster Information Management and Public Collaboration Division; Rural Development Policy Institute, Pakistan; International Research Institute of Disaster Science at Tohoku University; United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific; United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Asia-Pacific, United Nations Development Programme Asia-Pacific Regional Centre; the World Meteorological Organization; World Vision – East Asia.

Contents

Acronyms	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Learning from HFA.....	6
3. Analysis of HFA2 consultation inputs in the Asia-Pacific	8
<i>Integrate sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and response to climate change.....</i>	9
<i>Prioritize risk prevention and risk reduction.....</i>	11
<i>Partner with the private sector.....</i>	12
<i>Promote local level action.....</i>	14
<i>Strengthen resilience to disasters.....</i>	15
<i>Strengthen the role of women.....</i>	18
<i>Enhance risk governance and accountability.....</i>	20
4. Recommendations.....	22
Annex 1	28

Acronyms

AMCDRR	- The Asian Ministerial Conference for Disaster Risk Reduction
ADPC	- The Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre
ADRRN	- Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network
CBDRM	- Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CEDAW	- Convention for Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women
CSOs	- Civil Society Organizations
DRR	- Disaster risk reduction
HFA	- Hyogo Framework for Action
HFA2	- Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
IAP	- ISDR Asia Partnership
IFRC	- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IGO	- Inter Governmental Organization
LDCs	- Least Developed Countries
PPP	- Public-Private Partnership
SDGs	- Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	- Small Island Developing States
SMEs	- Small and Medium Enterprises
UNESCAP	- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNFCC	- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNISDR	- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

1. Introduction

The Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA): Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters is approaching the end of its time frame. At the request of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly¹, the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) has facilitated consultations with countries and organizations at all levels and in different regions on the next phase of the HFA (Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, hereafter, HFA2). Informal consultations in the Asia-Pacific have culminated in the development of this document, which will be used to guide discussions at the 6th Asian Ministerial Conference for Disaster Risk Reduction (6th AMCDRR) and become a key contribution from the Asia-Pacific region to the HFA2 discussions at the Preparatory Committee meetings for the 3rd UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in March 2015, in Sendai, Japan.

The information presented is based on a region-wide process of consultation and evidence-gathering. During the global Phase I consultation process for HFA2 (March 2012 – May 2013), UNISDR Asia-Pacific received contributions from 25 national² and 7 local governments, 3 Inter Governmental Organizations (IGOs), as well as 11 other stakeholders (such as civil society organizations (CSOs), academia and business) to provide insights and direction for HFA2. Phase I consultations³ concluded that the HFA remains a valid guidance framework to be further reinforced. They also identified seven key areas to be considered in the Asia-Pacific region in HFA2. These reflect the issues raised at the 5th AMCDRR in October 2012 and were endorsed by governments and partners at the ISDR Asia Partnership (IAP) meeting in November 2013.

Accordingly, Phase II consultations initiated in May 2013 explored the seven broad key areas that emerged in Phase I. Detailed contributions on these key areas were received from 16 national governments⁴, 4 local governments, 2 Inter-Governmental Organizations and 25 other stakeholders. These, along with other inputs⁵, were analysed by different regional institutions to develop the seven key area papers⁶ that are listed below:

1. Building community resilience – turning vulnerability into resilience (IFRC 2014)
2. Sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk reduction integration (ADPC 2014)
3. Local level action towards disaster risk reduction (ADRRN 2014)
4. Women as a force in resilience building, gender equality in DRR (Duryog Nivaran 2014)
5. Reducing exposure and underlying risk factors (Kyoto University 2014)
6. Strengthening risk governance and accountability (ADRRN 2014)
7. Incentivising DRR in the private sector (ESCAP & ADPC 2014)

¹United Nations General Assembly Resolution 66/199

²Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Cook Islands, Fiji, India, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Micronesia Federated States of, Nauru, Nepal, Niue, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and Viet Nam

³Asia-Pacific Synthesis Report: Consultations on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)
<http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/33369>

⁴Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Laos, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tonga, and Viet Nam. This also includes regional reporting from the Pacific.

⁵Such as the HFA Monitor Reports from Asia-Pacific (UNISDR 2013), the Global Assessment Reports (UNISDR 2011, 13), the Asia-Pacific Disaster Reports (UNISDR & ESCAP 2010, 2012), AMCDRR outputs

⁶Available in the AMCDRR website <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>

2. Learning from HFA

Considerable progress in disaster risk reduction (DRR) has been achieved in the Asia-Pacific region over the past 10 years resulting in lower mortality risks for extreme weather-related hazards. However, economic losses have been on an upward trajectory (ESCAP&UNISDR 2012). Much of this can be attributed to rapid economic growth and private and public investments in hazardous areas such as tsunami- and cyclone-prone coasts, flood-exposed river basins and earthquake-prone cities. This has contributed to the generation and accumulation of intensive risks⁷ in hazard exposed areas and increased risk of complex disasters⁸. The transmission of these risks through global supply chains has affected businesses, governments and society. Extensive risks⁹ are also increasing due to poorly planned urban growth, risk insensitive development choices, environmental degradation, poverty, inequality, and governance issues.

The HFA Monitor has been used as an important tool for collecting information to self-assess and to provide means of verification to capture the progress and challenges of HFA implementation by nations¹⁰. This process shows that Priority Area 1 of the HFA, “Ensure that DRR is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation,” and Priority Area 5, “Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels,” have seen the most progress in the region, while there has been less progress in Priority Area 2, “Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.” Priority Area 3, “Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels,” and Priority Area 4, “Reduce the underlying risk factors,” have seen the least progress. Below is a brief summary of the trends in the Priority Areas seen through the HFA Monitoring process (UNISDR 2013)

Priority Area 1, “Ensure that DRR is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation,” has seen dedicated legislation and policies prepared and the establishment of institutions to reduce disaster risk. It has also seen increased devolution of authority to local levels and the establishment and use of National Platforms and multi-stakeholder platforms. Gaps remain in obtaining dedicated disaster risk reduction funding, in institutional capacity and in the translation of policies into action, particularly at the local level.

Priority Area 2, “Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning,” has seen the establishment of tsunami, cyclone, and other hydro-meteorological early warning systems, especially at the national level. The geographical coverage of regional multi-hazard early warning systems has increased through collaboration at national and regional levels. The focus now is on creating effective and comprehensive implementation of systems, especially to include remote local communities. More work is still needed to address extensive risks and trans-boundary risks. Other tools, such as multi-hazard risk assessments and cost-benefit analysis are gaining momentum. Capacity and information is needed to guide these activities, with many countries noting that generating, sharing, managing, and using data remains a complex task.

⁷ “Intensive risk” describes the risk of high severity, mid to low frequency disasters, mainly associated with major hazards (UNISDR 2013b).

⁸ Disasters that are compounded by multiple natural hazards and/or technological hazards

⁹ “Extensive risk” describes the risk of low severity, high frequency disasters, mainly but not exclusively associated with highly localized hazards (UNISDR 2013b)

¹⁰ Countries assess the progress by self-assessment on a scale of 1-5 for each of the five Priorities for Action and three strategic goals.

Priority Area 3, “Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels,” has seen improvements in information generation and dissemination, awareness-raising and school education on disaster risk reduction. Commitment and actions to strengthen the resilience of schools and hospitals has been strong in a number of countries. Opportunities remain to build knowledge, capacities and tools to address complex tasks such as multi-hazard and vulnerability assessment, predictive risk modelling and cost-benefit analysis through tertiary education and stronger cooperation with academia.

Priority Area 4, “Reduce the underlying risk factors,” has achieved the least progress. Priority 4 saw cases of disaster risk reduction being mainstreamed into areas such as climate change and environmental protection legislation and projects to address specific vulnerability issues, with varying success. While some awareness of the inter-relationships between disaster and climate risks, vulnerability and development has been created, limited progress has been made in integrating disaster risk reduction into development policies and practices. Understanding and addressing the complex and inextricable linkages between vulnerability, social inclusion and equity and finding ways in which development interventions can be steered to safeguard economic assets from disasters appear to be challenging to many.

Priority Area 5, “Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels,” has seen considerable progress in Asia-Pacific. Many countries identify improvements in their preparedness legislation and strategies and have response systems that connect at all levels as well as contingency plans, procedures and resources to deal with major disasters. The increasing complexity of disasters, especially those that are cascading, technological or involve system failures, highlights the importance of maintaining readiness and capacity to mount effective disaster response. The increase in disaster-related economic losses and the growing humanitarian impact, even after countries have implemented many components of the HFA, reveals the need to shift from seeing disasters as external shocks to recognising risks inherent in development policies and practices.

At a practical level, this means dealing with the underlying risk factors, transforming development to manage risks, sustainably seizing opportunities to strengthen resilience, maintaining effective disaster response capacities and ensuring sustainable development. This will involve sound, risk-sensitive macroeconomic frameworks and policy choices, which consist of ex-ante disaster risk reduction and ex-post response, recovery and reconstruction to minimize disaster impacts. By shifting the focus to systematically addressing underlying risk drivers and strengthening resilience, a transformation towards risk-sensitive development is achievable. The seven key area papers prepared through the Phase II consultation process articulate this shift, and provide support to the ideas of risk prevention and the pursuit of development pathways that minimise disaster risk generation; actions to address accumulations of disaster risk; and to actions that assist nations and communities to absorb loss and damage, minimise disaster impact and bounce forward.

3. Analysis of HFA2 consultation inputs in the Asia-Pacific

The HFA2 consultations in Asia-Pacific indicate that the overarching guiding principle for HFA2 should be: *Risk sensitive development as the cornerstone to build the resilience of nations and communities and achieve sustainability*. Building on the current HFA, consultations identified areas to further strengthen in HFA2 (in particular Priority for Action Areas 2, 3, and 4) and areas in which to promote continued efforts where progress has been more substantial (Priority Areas 1 and 5). The analyses of the consultations are presented under the following subheadings:

- § Integrate sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and climate change
- § Prioritize risk prevention and risk reduction
- § Partner with the private sector
- § Promote local level action
- § Strengthen resilience to disasters
- § Ensure social inclusion
- § Strengthen the role of women
- § Enhance risk governance and accountability

Integrate sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and response to climate change

The Asia-Pacific region is faced with high levels of risks from hazards, climate change and development challenges. The 4th and 5th sessions of the AMCDRR and Pacific Platforms for Disaster Risk Management in 2011 and 2012 thus explicitly called for the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into climate change adaptation and development policies and planning. In this next phase of the HFA, it is important to go beyond mainstreaming, making integration of sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and climate change the development pathway. This is more relevant to developing countries including the least developed countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) that are particularly vulnerable to both disaster and climate change.

A number of examples of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into climate change work and development plans are cited in the reflection on the HFA. At the national level, many countries have set up mechanisms to deal with climate change and disaster risks and some have even prepared Joint National Action Plans to consolidate efforts. The Pacific region is in the process of preparing a Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development to integrate climate change and disaster risk management efforts. While progress is being made, much climate change and disaster risk reduction work still occurs independently of each other, and limited progress has been made in integrating disaster risk reduction and sustainable development efforts. Although there are a number of countries integrating disaster risk into development plans, more needs to be done to strengthen these policies and translate them into action.

The post-2015 setting provides a rare opportunity to strengthen the integration through building coherence of related international frameworks: the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Many consultative inputs commented on the need for convergence of these three interlinked frameworks. While a complete convergence may not be possible or necessary, a fundamental recognition of the need for integration, an interface in terms of broad outcomes and the use of shared terms, baselines, indicators and monitoring and reporting processes (e.g. through a post-2015 HFA Monitor system) would encourage governments to promote and support improved integration.

Integration needs to be supported at the highest political level. Governments need sound macro-economic frameworks that incorporate comprehensive disaster risk reduction with a long-term development vision. Integration can be limited by lack of policy coherence, weak governance, lack of capacity and limited financial resources. There are currently structural and procedural barriers that hinder integration, particularly where responsibilities are divided between different government bodies and where coordination is weak between the national and local branches of government. Achieving integration requires reforming institutions and procedures and strengthening institutional capacity across all government sectors and levels.

Integration is supported by the shared responsibility for disaster risk reduction. The HFA promoted multi-stakeholder National Platforms and other multi-stakeholder networks to bring government, non-government, civil society organizations, the private sector and the scientific community together to focus on disaster risk reduction and to integrate their various efforts. Such mechanisms have the potential to bring about convergence of institutions currently working in

silos. Functional linkages with key development sector ministries (e.g. Finance and Planning) and critical line departments (e.g. the department of roads and highways, energy, urban development, health and social welfare, water and irrigation, mining and tourism) need to be a focus, along with capacities and resources, especially for developing countries, for integration and clear mandates for integrated planning and monitoring.

Integration requires countries to strengthen the coherence between disaster risk management plans and sectoral development plans. The key steps to integration include joint programming of activities and the alignment of donor funding streams. Devolution of responsibilities to local governments can have a positive effect, provided constraints on funding and capacity at the local level are addressed. More on this can be found in the section on 'risk governance and accountability.' Tools for integration are available and need to be better utilised. This includes disaster loss and damage databases, Environmental Impact Assessments, vulnerability mapping and social security schemes, and disaster risk management checklists.

Integration at the policy and programming levels needs to be informed by well-developed and well-coordinated, disaggregated data, statistics and information. In many cases, information generated for sustainable development (e.g. vulnerability maps), climate change (e.g. predictive climate models), and disaster risk reduction (e.g. risk maps), are not used in a coherent and holistic manner or made readily accessible. Overall, much information is not yet standardised, which makes the layering of data difficult. The use of different terminology between the topics further contributes to this informational disconnect. If these issues can be addressed, strategies to enhance data sharing and unification can be more easily pursued.

Prioritize risk prevention and risk reduction

Policy and action need to consider prioritizing the prevention of new climate and disaster risks and reduction of existing risks. This is especially relevant to the Asia-Pacific region, where new risks could be generated through rapid economic growth and urbanization.

New developments in sectors such as residential real estate and manufacturing are increasingly being located in high-risk areas as the availability of land becomes more limited. Many are not resilient to the hazards they are exposed to, resulting in a backlog of unsafe construction, infrastructure and unplanned settlements. Building codes, zoning regulations and land use plans that incorporate specifications for mitigating hazards are developed, but these are only effective if they are understood, enforced and regularly revised using updated information.

Approximately 33% of urban dwellers in the Asia-Pacific region live in slums (ESCAP & UNISDR 2012). Many of these settlements are located in unsafe fringe areas that expose large numbers of poor people to natural and technological hazards. The underlying issues associated with unplanned settlements need to be addressed, especially where there is large-scale migration to cities. This highlights the importance of understanding and addressing the underlying risk factors that lead to greater levels of vulnerability and poverty in the region.

To strengthen resilience, HFA2 should consider the protection of livelihood and productive assets, food security, social inclusion and local level action. The call therefore is for holistic risk management through risk-sensitive development and “building back better” and safer in disaster recovery and reconstruction. Therefore, the institutionalization of recovery planning as part of a legitimate continuum process linking prevention, preparedness, response and recovery that is integrated with development should be considered. Recovery planning that incorporates prevention of future risks requires financing and should be guided by national, regional and international standards.

The complexity and interconnectedness of risk is also on the rise. To prevent technological and cascading disasters (where one event causes another), it is important that the vulnerabilities of key infrastructure (e.g. bridges, electricity, schools and hospitals) are well understood and addressed. New critical infrastructure investment decisions need to be risk-sensitive and to meet legal standards around risk levels. High-risk sites (e.g. due to chemical, biological, nuclear hazards) require the most detailed and regular assessment and management. The complex, trans-boundary nature of disaster risks also needs to be well understood. This requires regional and global cooperation to facilitate improved information generation and sharing on topics such as real time data for forecasting of flood and drought patterns of trans-boundary rivers, management of river basins, and climate regions. Regional cooperation should also provide space for local government as well as community-to-community collaboration in disaster risk reduction.

Many countries identify the challenge of managing risk information and translating it into action. To bridge the gap between risk information and decision making, there needs to be better collaboration between scientists and decision-makers. All actors, including civil society, private sector, academia, the scientific community and citizens have a role to play in risk information generation and use. In achieving this, tertiary education plays an important role.

The HFA has seen some progress in the collection and use of risk information, but much more needs to be done. Opportunities exist for greater use of tools such as risk models and space technologies. Risk models can use the information from a range of sources to place the losses from past disasters into the context of future risks and examine risk more holistically, while space technologies can be particularly effective when assessing issues such as trans-boundary risks.

Partner with the private sector

The actions of the private sector have an important bearing on the success of risk reduction and risk prevention efforts. The investment decisions of the private sector can critically influence physical and economic risk. For example, while development of the Asia-Pacific region has reduced vulnerability to disasters, it has also contributed to the generation of new risks and increased exposure, for example, through new developments and urbanization in hazard-prone areas. In many cases, these investments do not take disaster risks into account. Engagement and partnership with the private sector are vital, not just to protect investments and economies from disruption and losses, but more importantly to create a safe and resilient society where the business operates.

Businesses are increasingly recognizing the significance of resilience to disaster and climate risk. Businesses are often affected both directly (e.g. through damage to infrastructure and stock), and indirectly, through reduced productivity (e.g. via damaged supply chains or employees absenteeism). These disruptions can have vital impacts on immediate and future profitability (e.g. due to loss of clients). Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that are embedded in communities provide employment but are particularly vulnerable to hazards. SMEs have less capacity to invest in disaster risk management and often struggle to survive after disaster. Therefore, SMEs, especially woman entrepreneurs, need to be actively targeted in risk planning processes at the local level and to be engaged in programmes designed to improve their resilience. Public policy needs to create an enabling environment that supports and encourages SMEs to integrate disaster resilience into their business through processes such as business continuity planning.

The private sector's engagement in HFA implementation so far has been limited. Over the coming years trillions of dollars of new business investments will continue to be made in hazard-prone areas of the region. Such investments need to be urgently made risk-sensitive, otherwise the impacts of disasters on economies in the region will continue to grow¹¹. Both the private and public sectors have a lot to lose from accumulating risks and depend on each other to remain functional during and post-disaster. HFA2 should encourage improved engagement and partnership of the private sector in risk prevention and risk reduction, disaster preparedness and recovery.

The HFA2 needs to call on businesses to become more resilient, responsible, and accountable. The importance of well-informed legislation such as land use plans and building codes to ensure risk-sensitive investments is underscored. The HFA2 should also promote the analysis of how economic incentives (e.g. tax) can be better used to promote disaster-resilient practices that have public benefits. Mechanisms that promote partnership with the private sector, such as National Platforms

¹¹ Losses from future earthquakes and cyclonic winds alone are estimated at USD\$189 billion per year, with a bulk of this expected to come from the Asia-Pacific region (UNISDR 2013b)

should be encouraged to create an open dialogue where opportunities (e.g. information sharing) and barriers (e.g. legislative and knowledge) to resilience can be explored and roles and responsibilities on both sides better articulated.

While there are examples of public-private partnerships (PPPs) and corporate-social responsibility (CSR) programmes, these need to be expanded. More needs to be done to promote the private sector's partnerships with other stakeholders to address disaster risks and impacts. For example, the business community's comparative advantage (e.g. logistics, procurement and community ties) could be better used in preparedness and response strategies of government and non-government actors.

In many Asia-Pacific countries, risk-sharing mechanisms such as insurance and re-insurance remain minimal, with inadequate legal and institutional structures for disaster risk insurance and low insurance penetration. This leaves a large section of the economy and the population unprotected. Even when mechanisms do exist, few governments have sound risk financing schemes that can take care of catastrophic liabilities, which means serious financial strain on government budgets, and diversion of funds from social development. A more concerted effort is required to improve risk financing in the region and to identify the appropriate roles for public and private sectors to deliver these services.

Promote local level action

Even though HFA emphasizes that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority, the achievements of the HFA largely remain at the national level. To address this, the consultations place a strong focus on translating national policies into local implementation. Strong local level institutions - urban and rural, with adequate authority, capacity and resources for implementation, legal oversight support, inclusive multi stakeholder participation in planning and decision making processes, clear accountability and transparency systems are identified as key for effective local level action.

Effective local approaches require better understanding of local risks, vulnerabilities and strengths. Local officials and practitioners need to be equipped with simplified and common terminology, practical tools and mechanisms including creative media for generating and using risk and vulnerability information. Special attention is required for systematic utilization of traditional knowledge and local coping mechanisms.

Strengthening the effectiveness of local institutions requires devolution of authority, as appropriate, fostering local leadership and improved governance structures between national and local levels, with adequate human resources and financial capacity, supported by enabling legislation and enforcement of standards for risk sensitive local development. Knowledge and awareness building of local officials, local government leaders, elected representatives and parliamentarians is a must for ensuring that risk sensitive local development strategies are supported with adequate legislation and enforcement.

Participation of communities, local action groups and local leaders are areas which showed slow progress in HFA. Pro-active engagement of youth groups, volunteer networks, women, older persons, persons with disability and all marginalized sections needs to be facilitated in safe environments through long term investments. by building appropriate social and community institutional structures. This includes strengthening community-based social institutions and volunteer networks; partnerships between local government, community, CSO and private sector; citizen awareness, capacity building and governance mechanisms with enhanced accountability. This is also integrate the diverse needs of various social groups and their traditional coping mechanisms into local development and disaster risk reduction strategies.

The consultations emphasize the importance of developing local level multi-stakeholder platforms, mirroring the national platforms promoted in HFA, as a mechanism to strengthen the links between community, local government, local actors and networks. This should be developed with clear roles, responsibilities and governance arrangements.

Strengthen resilience to disasters

The HFA2 consultations point out the need for a shift in approach from reducing vulnerability to building resilience, of both communities and the economy. In an age of climate change and increased complexity of disasters, resilience building is one vital and no-regrets strategy, leading to sustainable development. The focus on resilience has emerged from experiences that show resilient communities have been able to respond and recover from disasters more quickly and effectively. Key attributes of resilient communities include the ability to assess and manage risk; preparedness to face threats; and capacity to absorb shocks. Communities that exhibit strong social cohesion and connectivity with external agencies are more likely to be resilient and most likely to progress collectively to achieve sustainable development (IFRC 2012).

The consultations highlighted that a long term vision and strong leadership, supported by sustained resource allocation, is required to ensure a resilience focus in the national and local development plans. An institutionalized multi-sectoral approach of national and local programmes should replace the prevailing largely isolated, ad-hoc and project centred approach at present. Comprehensive risk assessments are important in determining national and local priorities and intervention strategies. Underscored was the need for a community resilience framework to help identify barriers to resilience, prioritize actions and measure progress aligned with the sustainable development goals and their associated monitoring processes

Resilience building strategies should address risk drivers encompassing livelihoods, food security and the natural environment as integral aspects. Social protection is one mechanism that can address risk drivers and build resilience. Consideration should be given to integrating disaster and climate risk management into enhanced social protection schemes and programmes that are resilient to shocks while improving standards for safety, health, assets and well-being. The same applies to poverty reduction initiatives such as employment guarantee schemes, conditional cash transfers, micro finance and insurance. A minimum 'social protection floor' to access essential services and income, including protection from the risks of disasters, is now being recognised as a universal human right that must be guaranteed to every individual (ILO 2011).

Resilience of critical infrastructure such as schools and health facilities is of vital importance, not only to ensure continued basic social services but also to prevent long term social and economic impacts when, for example, education is disrupted by disasters. Comprehensive safe school includes safe learning facilities, disaster preparedness and integration of disaster risk reduction into curriculum. Such a comprehensive approach, which has children and youth at the centre and mobilizes communities (parents, local government and others), contributes significantly to building community resilience.

To build resilience, there is an urgent need to develop the capacities of the communities to undertake collective action to manage disaster and climate risk as part of their daily life. This includes more capacity and stronger local institutions to respond effectively to emergencies. The response capacity of local institutions is equally important. When critical needs are addressed with prompt delivery of humanitarian assistance, communities are better placed to restore livelihoods and safeguard coping mechanisms. This is especially important for communities facing smaller but recurrent disasters (i.e. extensive risks).

Ensure social inclusion

Resilience building requires meaningful participation of various segments of communities. The HFA2 consultations highlight the need for greater inclusivity, which requires improved accessibility, especially of marginalized and at-risk groups. This includes, for example, women, youth, children, older persons and persons with disabilities, urban and rural poor as well as other disadvantaged groups. Often, these groups have limited opportunities and voice in decision making and their capacity to strengthen resilience is undermined. While all these groups fall into a common 'marginalized category', the factors of marginalization vary and intersect, therefore require careful consideration. For example, a person can be excluded and vulnerable due to a combination of factors (e.g. girl child/woman/older person with disability).

Inclusion of all socio-cultural groups is vital for ensuring that their specific needs and concerns are duly incorporated. Inclusion efforts need to have programmes to support their productive contribution and access to information, knowledge and facilities, creating an enabling environment and encourage collective action. The strong position expressed by the groups who are identified as specifically vulnerable is, for HFA2 to turn 'vulnerability into capacity', moving away from identifying at-risk groups as 'victims'.

Existing mechanisms, such as community based disaster risk management (CBDRM) provide a good example of how the principles of 'inclusiveness' can be realized. To do this, requires specific financing at the local level; enhancing institutional and individual capacities, empowering civil society organizations and creating safe and open environments for dialogue. Institutionalizing CBDRM needs to go hand in hand with a political commitment to strengthening local governance. Volunteerism is proposed as one effective way of promoting inclusion, especially of young women and men.

Age is one key factor of vulnerability and marginalization but also resilience. Asia-Pacific is home to 750 million young people¹². 25.3% of the region's population are under 14 years old. During and post-disaster, where support systems may be fractured, children are more exposed to sexual and other forms of abuse, trafficking, exploitation, violence and denial of their basic rights to education, safety and participation. This can lead to long term impacts on their intellectual, psychological and cognitive development. However, children and youth have capacity to build their own resilience and contribute to building resilience of their communities. Inclusion and empowerment are essential for their potential to contribute to social and economic development and resilience building.

Eight per cent of people of the Asia-Pacific are over 65 years of age. This is projected to more than double by 2025, with a higher ratio of women because of their longer life expectancy and proportion in rural areas. The implications of these demographic changes need to be addressed in disaster risk reduction and resilience building efforts. Facilitation of care (e.g. shelter, mobility and medicinal needs) and the engagement and contributions of older persons in disaster risk reduction is flagged in international declarations. The resourcefulness of the elderly is reflected in their

¹² UNESCAP, Social Development in Asia and the Pacific, 2013
<http://www.unescapsdd.org/youth>

knowledge, experience and coping strategies and their vital roles as carers of children and income earners.

Asia and the Pacific is home to around 650 million persons with disabilities¹³. Their specific concerns in facing and coping with disaster risk as well as the productive role they are capable of in the economy and society need to be taken into account. The considerable number of people with disabilities who have less education and are denied participation in community and family activities because of social stigma should be addressed. Universal design principles should be promoted. Efforts for awareness and capacity building and support to participation are also required to better engage people with disabilities in all phases of disaster risk management, to improve overall resilience.

Any inclusivity strategies in HFA2 should be based on the UN's Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights. They recognize that vulnerability is a structural issue and call for a transformation of those economic, social and cultural practices that perpetuate it. In particular it is important that these principles are applied in the context of risk prevention and risk reduction and incorporated into all policy and legislation that enables and holds governments and stakeholders accountable.

¹³ UNESCAP, Social Development <http://www.unescap.org/our-work/social-development>

Strengthen the role of women

The call inclusivity covers the need to include women. Consultations point to a requirement for a clear, stand-alone message that the inclusion of women (half the world's population, 49% in Asia-Pacific and more than half in some countries in Asia)¹⁴ must be given specific focus so that the under-utilisation of women's potential towards resilience building of communities and nations is addressed¹⁵.

Gender-based social, economic and cultural constructs marginalize women across all community groups irrespective of class, caste, economic standing, status, ethnicity and age. In the Asia-Pacific region deeply entrenched attitudes of patriarchy discriminate against women and make them differently vulnerable to disaster risk in comparison to men within the same social groups. Such vulnerabilities are reflected in terms of higher female mortalities, injuries, sexual and other forms of violence.

Rooted patriarchal values and perceptions prevalent in the region often extend to formal decision making and governance structures resulting in discriminatory property laws, access to education, information, opportunities of skills and capacity development. Varying social practices such as lower value placed on girl child, restrictions on mobility for women and girls, high risk of getting raped and sexually abused act as barriers to limit women's participation, women's assumption of leadership roles and their social and economic productivity. These biases act to maintain women's role as producers, natural resource users and managers at far below the optimum levels. Limited gender awareness among the media also contributes to the portrait of women more as vulnerable group rather than capable actors.

For women's role in disaster risk reduction to be strengthened, it is important to address the issues that are particularly severe for women such as limitations of access, participation and contribution and gender-based violence. It is important that planning, investment and implementation is informed by sex and age disaggregated data and gender analysis at every level, and that resourcing, and budgeting for actions that include women and promote gender equality are developed.

Interventions need to recognize that inclusion of women and girls require specific measures to address the diverse social and cultural aspects and the related issues of mobility and access that arise from existing gender based roles and identities. This includes measures to build the confidence of women themselves, and awareness of men in the community. It means ensuring women's rights are upheld as in the international agreements such as the Human Rights Convention and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), providing women with non-traditional skills and including women in decision making positions that will support social acceptance of women's role.

The focus on women in disaster risk reduction cannot and should not happen independently of other processes. It is important that the above actions are mainstreamed into the DRR, climate

¹⁴ Women out-number men around the world as they have greater life expectancy, but in the Asia-Pacific men outnumber women with 44 million 'women missing' in the region. This is primarily due to the strong preference of male child that has encouraged the practices of sex selection in birth, female infanticide and neglect of girl child.

¹⁵ The HFA Monitor shows that gender as a cross-cutting issue has not been sufficiently understood or evaluated. Initial data from 2009-2011 HFA Monitor suggested that 62 out of 70 countries had yet to compile sex-disaggregated data on vulnerability and capacity

change and development integration at national and local levels, in strengthening local level action and in setting up accountability mechanisms at all levels. This would require ensuring that women are represented/targeted in different points of the processes (e.g. in risk information and other data gathering processes, in the information dissemination, in the technology transfer processes).

Accordingly, the call for HFA2 is to make inclusion of women and gender equality an integral and a central criterion in moving towards the mutually supportive strategic goals advanced in the HFA2 as opposed to the cross cutting approach adopted in HFA. For measuring progress of the outcomes, it is proposed to agree on a common or complementary set of goals, targets and indicators within the overall governance and accountability framework aligned with the global and national commitments to the CEDAW and Beijing Platform for Action.

Enhance risk governance and accountability

Ensuring strong risk governance and accountability mechanisms is essential to take disaster risk reduction to the next level. Risk governance is the way in which national and sub national actors coordinate their actions to manage and reduce disaster and climate risks. Effective risk governance provides an enabling environment for resilience building through well-coordinated political, economic, and administrative aspects to ensure risk-informed development policies and resource allocation for policy implementation (UNISDR 2013d).

Specific governance challenges experienced during the HFA include the translation of national policies into action, especially at the local level, addressing disaster risk in development planning and implementation, addressing trans-boundary risks and effective enforcement of legislation and regulations. Governance reforms are needed across all the sectors that have a role in risk reduction.

Effective risk governance consists of coherent policies, functional institutions, legislation, regulations and effective legislative oversight. It also promotes the application of universal principles of transparency, accountability, inclusion and citizen empowerment. Such a governance system will allow for better coordination, information sharing, capacity-building and resource allocation while embracing transparency, accountability, inclusion and empowerment in policy and decision making. Disaster risk reduction being a cross cutting development issue requires the engagement of many institutions operating at different levels. Ensuring policy coherence between sustainable development, climate change and disaster reduction and setting clear mandates and responsibilities of the institutions at different levels therefore becomes critically important. Such coherence would enable better coordination and, at the same time, set boundaries for the many institutions involved.

Adequate authority, access to resources and technical and managerial capacity of local level institutions are noted as important aspects for building stronger linkages between national and local governments, aligning national policies with the local needs and ensuring local actions. Enhanced local authority can better support functions such as land use planning, construction safety compliance and social safety mechanisms, taking the specific local needs, hazards and vulnerabilities into account to achieve risk sensitive development.

HFA2 is called to reinforce the accountabilities of all public and private sector entities to assume their full responsibility to achieve disaster and climate risk management outcomes and to be answerable for the consequences of the policies, decisions, and actions they make in this sphere. The consultations make specific reference to 'two way accountabilities' between government and citizens and suggest social accountability mechanisms as pathways for improved governance, development effectiveness and empowerment of citizens. Creating participatory spaces through partnerships and community engagement strategies is key for citizens to assume their responsibilities and to hold local authorities accountable. The importance of adequate legal support, rights and access to information, transparent communications and inclusive policies for citizen empowerment has been emphasized.

Strengthened legislation and regulatory frameworks are proposed as key instruments to hold all parties accountable for risk sensitive development, and to ensure that the integration of disaster risk reduction into development planning and programmes is made into a legal obligation.

Legislative oversight including parliamentary oversight is critical for enforcement of legislation and for strengthening accountabilities of government and all other actors. Legislation should put emphasis on accountability and transparency principles. Law implementation guidelines should include a clear set of measures to reinforce these principles such as public awareness, public access to information, social auditing as a legal obligation of authorities, and the role of media and participation of civil organizations in oversight.

Accountability cannot exist without clearly defined monitoring, reporting and review systems, which underscore performance. Consultations emphasize the need for clear targets and indicators in HFA2 which drive and hold actors accountable for disaster and climate risk management actions. To this end, coherence of the targets and indicators with the Sustainable Development Goals and harmonization of monitoring and review mechanisms, especially at the national level, is of significance.

4. Recommendations

These recommendations are primarily aimed at the HFA2 process, building on the observed achievements and considering gaps in the implementation of the 5 Priorities for Action of HFA. It is stressed that the remaining work in HFA should continue to be a priority in HFA2. While these recommendations are mainly aimed at governments, they are also addressed to other important stakeholders such as civil society organizations, the United Nations system, the private sector, media, community groups, academia and the scientific community, whose support to governments are important in achieving targets and goals.

1. Develop and implement strategies for integration of disaster risk reduction, response to climate change and sustainable development

- Standardize disaster risk reduction-climate change and sustainable development terminologies, data, statistics and information in accessible formats
- Develop strategies and mechanisms for information, data sharing and communication across development sectors at the regional, national and local levels
- Support the strengthening of multi-stakeholder platforms for disaster risk reduction (national and local) and increase engagement and role for the finance, planning, foreign affairs and other relevant agencies
- Support strengthening policy and legislation for integration at all levels.
- Support strengthening the coordination and implementation mechanisms and capacities of the key development sector ministries/departments to enable integrated vulnerability and risk assessment and appropriate implementation
- Build coherence between the post-2015 frameworks for disaster risk reduction and concurrent processes on the Sustainable Development Goals and climate change arrangements.

2. Prevent and reduce risks

- Ensure that all disaster related legislation is understood and enforced (e.g. environmental resource management legislation, land use planning, building codes and other structural standards including universal design principles)
- Foster enforcement of regulations in new developments and address the underlying issues associated with unplanned human settlements
- Reinforce disaster and climate risk-sensitive planning, implementation and monitoring at all levels as important to development, especially for critical infrastructure,, by:
 - Ensuring the use of disaster, climate risk and socio economic information in the preparation and review of all national and local development plans, projects
 - Reviewing, improving and strengthening regulations and capacity for use of tools such as land use planning and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) , Disaster Impact Assessments (DIA) and Vulnerability and Risk Assessments in development planning, monitoring and evaluation at all levels
- Strengthen research to expand knowledge on new, complex and cascading disasters

- Strengthen early warning systems, disaster preparedness and response capacities
- Bring stronger focus on risk prevention, risk reduction and resilience building in post disaster recovery and reconstruction by supporting principles and practice of 'Building Back Better' and safer as well as learning from past disasters.

3. Strengthen risk information and knowledge

- Collect, analyze and use risk information in decision making. This should include:
 - Collection and analysis of hazard, risk, vulnerability information for natural, system, technological, human induced and critical infrastructure risks.
 - Ensure the collection and analysis of sex, age and disability disaggregated data to increase knowledge and understanding of the underlying risks and social vulnerabilities and to address them in the development and disaster risk reduction planning and implementation processes
 - Use nationally reliable and internationally comparable historical loss and damage data and future scenarios tools such as risk models to inform development planning at national and local levels
 - Collection of disaster loss data from stakeholders through national disaster loss database
 - Basic range of disaster related statistics for measuring and accounting for disaster loss should be developed and adopted
 - Development of open access and open source disaster management tools so all stakeholders are better able to understand and manage disaster risks they face.
- Assess systemic risks to address the potential causes of cascading disasters
- Use of new technologies and techniques in risk assessment activities such as risk modeling and space technologies and applications, which should be accessible, available and affordable.
- Promote the use of science and technologies in decision making.
- Strengthen collaboration with science, technology and academia to build capacity of decision makers and increase DRR professionalism through tertiary education.
- Promote exchanges and innovation of technologies between the science community and academia
- Strengthen capacities of the national and local governments and other stakeholders including individuals and the private sector for generation of user-friendly and accessible information, analysis and application for planning and implementation
- Provide guidance for research and support in risk and vulnerability information generation and sharing (with tools, methodologies), especially the use of open source and open access platforms.
- Strengthen regional cooperation mechanisms for data and information sharing.

- Promote linkage of and develop databases of global disaster risk reduction experts, maximize the use of local experts and local knowledge.

4. Partner with the private sector to prevent and reduce risks

- Identify opportunities and barriers for improved collaboration and partnership between public and private sectors (e.g. through CSR and PPPs) and other multi-sector partnerships
- Strengthen incentives and regulations to facilitate disaster resilient private investment and improved business resilience (e.g. tax incentives, building codes, land use planning)
- Engage large, medium and small businesses in a dialogue on risk management to share knowledge and information, build capacity, and identify opportunities for building resilience via mechanisms such as National Platforms
- Enforce regulations in industrial areas and labour-intensive industries
- Build capacity of SMEs, targeting women and young entrepreneurs including in the informal sector, to increase their business resilience
- Identify ways of strengthening and promoting the adoption and use of tools such as risk transfer and risk insurance

5. Strengthen local level action

- Improve implementation at the local level through:
 - Ensuring national development and disaster risk reduction policies and laws are connected to provincial and local levels
 - Prioritizing the enforcement of regulations
 - Strengthening knowledge of local risk, vulnerability and capacities, including local wisdom, traditional knowledge and coping mechanisms
 - Focusing on specific and systemic aspects of risk and vulnerabilities in urban environments, including critical infrastructure
- Build the capacity of the local government officials for their roles and responsibilities in risk sensitive planning and implementation, ensure the inclusion of women officials

6. Ensure social inclusion

- Ensure accessibility, especially of socially excluded groups, to enable inclusion and meaningful participation
- Review related laws and policies to ensure the inclusion of women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities
- Promote inclusion, meaningful participation, and positive contributions in risk reduction activities and processes, particularly of marginalized and at-risk groups (women, youth, children, older persons, persons with disabilities and other disadvantaged groups) through:
 - targeted capacity building
 - providing safe spaces for open and honest interaction

- strengthening the role and utilization of community groups, partnerships and volunteer networks

7. Strengthen measures for achieving resilience to disasters

- Focus on and support long term risk sensitive national and local development plans for systematic and sustained resilience building
- Ensure that chronic risks such as food and energy security, livelihood, productive assets and health are addressed in national and local development plans
- Promote comprehensive school safety as an important part of community resilience building
- Strengthen community-local government partnerships, volunteerism and local level multi-stakeholder platforms
- Strengthen community based disaster risk reduction for supporting social inclusion and ownership
- Support the active role of young people and persons with disabilities as leaders in disaster risk reduction and resilience building
- Use national and local social safety mechanisms and ensure an appropriate social protection floor to increase resilience of the most vulnerable groups
- Ensure effective preparedness for communities to respond rapidly, recover better and remain resilient, including to new and deteriorating emergencies
- Develop community resilience framework, common definitions and indicators to measure community resilience

8. Strengthen the role of women

- Use sex, age, disability and geographically disaggregated data and gender analysis as an important planning tool for developing local and national development and disaster risk reduction plans.
- Strengthen awareness, skills, availability of tools and finances for inclusion of women and gender integration in the regular development planning, implementation and monitoring systems.
- Ensure equal opportunities for the leadership and participation of women and women's groups in decision making positions in planning and implementation.
- Strengthen the role of women as leaders in local level resilience building
- Strengthen national and local policies, legislation and regulatory frameworks in support of gender equality, women's empowerment and protection from violence as stipulated within the global agreements for gender equality.
- Build gender awareness and strengthen capacities of government officials and other actors including the media to address gender and women inclusion.

- Strengthen the capacity and skills of media to highlight the positive role of women in disaster risk reduction
- Develop targets and indicators to measure progress on inclusion of women and gender equality in disaster risk reduction and to measure women's resilience with the progress measure systems of the Sustainable Development Goals and climate change.

9. Enhance risk governance and accountability

- Develop clear accountability mechanisms across development and disaster risk reduction sectors (horizontally) and from the local to the national governments (vertically). These should be supported by:
 - Clear delegation of authority between different levels of governance, including the local level
 - Regular, adequate and reliable budgetary allocations to the local levels
 - Technical capacities for planning and implementation at all levels
 - Enforcement of effective and integrated disaster laws and regulations
- Increase awareness of the public on its rights to risk information to ensure their protection in the events of disaster.
- Develop indicators to measure the effectiveness of DRR, climate change and Sustainable Development Goals integrated approach towards resilience building with reference to different community groups (e.g. women, children, youth, persons with disabilities and other specifically vulnerable groups).
- Include disaster and climate risk aspects in the development sector laws as a measure of accountability for integration and strengthen the legislative oversight functions
- Develop monitoring and reporting mechanisms, based on established terms of reference, targets and indicators for each level of governance as appropriate
- Further develop financial tracking mechanisms to ensure transparency and accountability of governments and other stakeholders

5. References

- Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC) (2014) *Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Integration HFA 2, Key Area 2*. <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>
- Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network (ADRRN) (2014) *Local level action towards disaster risk reduction. A Paper exploring the ways of strengthening Local level Action to reduce Risks and Disasters in the Asia Pacific in HFA 2 Post 2015 agenda*. <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>
- Duryog Nivaran (2014) Towards Post-2015 Agenda for DRR (HFA2). Women as a force in resilience building, gender equality in DRR. Consultations in the Asia-Pacific. <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>
- Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC) (2014) *Inputs to HFA2, Key Area 7 – Engaging Asia Pacific Businesses in Disaster Risk Management*. <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>
- ESCAP & UNISDR (2012): *Asia-Pacific Disaster Report -Reducing vulnerability and exposure to disasters*; United Nations, Bangkok
- International Federation of Red Cross and Crescent Societies (IFRC) (2014) *Key Area 1 Report: Building Community Resilience*. <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>
- IFRC (2012) Of networks, norms, and trust. The role of social capital in reinforcing community resilience.
- Kyoto University (2014) *HFA 2 Key Area 5 Input Paper. Reducing Exposure and Underlying Risk Factors*. <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>
- ILO (2011) *Social Protection Floor for Fair and Inclusive Globalization*. United Nations
- UNISDR (2012) Disasters and social vulnerabilities in the Asia-Pacific; Issue, challenges and opportunities, *A Study of the Integration of the Issues of Vulnerable Groups with Special Focus on Gender in the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action 2005-2015 in the Asia-Pacific Region*
- UNISDR (2013b) *Global Assessment Report 2013*. UNISDR Geneva.
- UNISDR. (2013c) *Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction by the UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) for Disaster Risk Reduction*. United Nations, Geneva.
- UNISDR (2013d) UNISDR Advisory Group for Parliamentarians on Disaster Risk Reduction, Policy Guidance note for Post 2015 Governance for Disaster Risk Reduction, United Nations (unpublished).

Annex 1

Asia-Pacific Input Document for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)

An Overview of the Consultation Process

1. This final draft of the “Asia-Pacific Input Document for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)” captures the inputs from the consultations and evidence gathered in the region over a two year period, following the global launch of consultations in March 2012.
2. The consultation process, facilitated by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) as requested by the **United Nations General Assembly Resolution 66/199**, is based on the principles of: **inclusive** - reaching out to the governments and all stakeholders; **bottom-up** – promoting local and national level consultations; **integrated** - into sector and thematic discussions, especially with the processes to prepare the post-2015 development agenda and Sustainable Development Goals, Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC-COPs).
3. During the Phase I consultation process (March 2012 – May 2013), 25 national governments¹⁶, 7 local governments, 3 Inter-Governmental Organizations and 11 stakeholder groups (e.g. civil society organizations, academia, business) from the Asia-Pacific provided inputs, raising broad issues to be addressed in the HFA2¹⁷ reflecting on the learning from the HFA implementation.
4. These include consultations held at the 5th Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (5AMCDRR) in Yogyakarta, Indonesia in October 2012. The Yogyakarta Declaration called on all governments and all disaster risk reduction stakeholders to provide inputs to the HFA2 and to mainstream DRR into the post-2015 development agenda.
5. ISDR Asia Partnership (IAP), as the regional coordination mechanism for Disaster Risk Reduction provided a platform for the consultations in the region. IAP is the mechanism that brings the governments and stakeholders in the region together to provide technical and operational support to the Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR) as adopted at the 2nd AMCDRR in Delhi in 2007¹⁸. The Delhi Declaration recognized the AMCDRR as the Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia.
6. Phase I consultations confirmed that the HFA remains a valid guidance framework to be further reinforced, and emphasized the need for HFA2 to “*identify accountability measures for more effective implementation, political commitment to deliver at all levels, awareness, education and public access to information, improved governance, the promotion of resilient investments, and the*

¹⁶ Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Cook Islands, Fiji, India, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Micronesia Federated States of, Nauru, Nepal, Niue, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Viet Nam.

¹⁷ See reports of all Phase I consultations at <http://www.preventionweb.net/posthfa/consultation-process>

¹⁸ The Delhi Declaration of 2007 <http://nidm.gov.in/amcdrr/declaration.asp>

allocation of resources especially to build local capacity; and promote a bottom-up approach – Yogyakarta Declaration¹⁹.

7. Phase I consultation inputs were summarized in the “Asia-Pacific Synthesis Report: Consultations on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction”²⁰. A draft of this report was discussed and further inputs were obtained in April 2013 at the ISDR Asia Partnership (IAP) meeting. The final report was presented at the 4th Session of the Global Platform on DRR in May 2013 as contribution from the region and served as a reference for the governments and stakeholders from the region to contribute to the global deliberations.
8. Phase I consultations highlighted seven broad key areas to build on in a post-2015 framework. These are: 1) Building community resilience – turning vulnerability into resilience, 2) Sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk reduction integration, 3) Local level action, 4) Women as a force in resilience building, gender equality in DRR, 5) Reducing exposure and underlying risk factors, 6) Strengthening risk governance and accountability and 7) Incentivizing DRR in the private sector.
9. The global Phase II consultations (May 2013 – present) aim to explore the broad issues raised in Phase I to identify specific recommendations on **What** are the priority actions to be undertaken in HFA2, **How** to implement them, by **Who** and with **What targets and indicators** to underpin accountabilities.
10. Accordingly, UNISDR Asia-Pacific prepared a scoping paper for Phase II consultations in the Asia-Pacific Region, to further explore the seven broad key areas. The scoping paper was discussed and endorsed at the Executive Committee of the 6th AMCDRR in August 2013 and subsequently at the IAP meeting in November 2013, to call for contributions from the governments and stakeholders.
11. Using the detailed contributions from 16 national governments²¹, 4 local governments, 2 IGOs, a regional paper from the Pacific and 25 other stakeholder groups, seven key area papers were developed by regional institutions²². The papers also incorporated extensive inputs from many national and local governments and communities who participated in surveys and consultation workshops organized by the regional institutions as part of the HFA2 consultation process.
12. The scoping paper, all contributions and drafts of the seven key area papers were made publicly available²³. The seven key area papers were peer-reviewed by a total of 25 experts including a number of national governments before finalization.
13. The draft “Asia-Pacific input document for the post-2015 framework for DRR (HFA2)” was prepared with the consultation inputs captured in these seven key area papers, along with other inputs²⁴. The first draft was circulated to all IAP members and discussed at the IAP meeting held in April 2014.

¹⁹<http://5thamcdrr-indonesia.net/yogyakarta-declaration-2012>

²⁰<http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/33369>

²¹ Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Laos, Maldives, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tonga and Viet Nam. This also includes regional reporting from the Pacific.

²² These institutions are: IFRC, ADPC, ADRRN, Duryog Nivaran, Kyoto University and ESCAP

²³<http://www.unisdr-apps.net/confluence/display/AMCDRR/6+AMCDRR-TS+Leads+and+HFA2+Area+Coordinators'+workspace>

²⁴ Such as the HFA Monitor Reports from Asia-Pacific (UNISDR 2013), the Global Assessment Report (UNISDR 2013b), the Asia-Pacific Disaster Reports (ESCAP& UNISDR 2012), AMCDRR outputs and HFA2 guidance notes

14. This final draft document has incorporated feedback from 7 peer reviewers, including national governments, recommendations of the IAP meeting and comments from 21 organizations, academia and individuals.

15. The final draft of the “Asia-Pacific Input Document for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)”²⁵ will serve as the basis for the deliberations on the HFA2 at the 6thAMCDRR. Being an integral part of the Bangkok Declaration, its final version will form an important outcome of the Asia Regional Platform on DRR, whose deliberations “*provide critical contribution to the consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction*” as highlighted by the **United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/68/211**. The Resolution also emphasizes “*the importance of regional coordination in the framework of the preparatory process in order to promote broad participation in the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction*” including the Preparatory Committee meetings.

²⁵ Available on the 6thAMCDRR website <http://6thamcdrr-thailand.net/6thamcdrr/Key-Documents>