

2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction



#MEXICOGP2017

22-26 May 2017 - Cancun, Mexico



UNISDR

The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

In support of the Sendai Framework
for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 - 2030

Multi-stakeholder Consultation Process

Summary and Reflections on the Online Dialogue

The dialogue was conducted from 16 May to 5 June 2016, and involved more than 300 participants from 60 countries. Each of the three questions posed in the dialogue was discussed for a week before being summarised. The dialogue welcomed general comments, specific cases and good examples on each of the questions as well as suggestions for specific elements of strategies to be formulated in order to meet the challenges related to the questions discussed. Jerry Velasquez of UNISDR moderated the dialogue and developed this summary.

June 2016, UNISDR

Background

The Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction of March 2015 adopted the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 as the global blueprint for reducing disaster risks and managing multi-hazard risk at all levels, within and across sectors.

Countries have already started implementing the Sendai Framework. The first target date is to increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies and plans aligned with the new Sendai Framework by 2020. The sharing of practical experiences is important to further support the implementation process.

The 2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, scheduled for 22-26 May, 2017 in Cancun, México, represents the first opportunity to identify critical elements and aspects of the Sendai Framework that require attention, action and guidance in order to drive implementation towards its expected outcomes. Particular attention should be given to creating the enabling mechanisms that will build the foundations to support the achievement of the imminent 2020 targets of the Sendai Framework and the Sustainable Development Goals up to 2030.

UNISDR initiated consultations with countries and stakeholders at the beginning of May 2016 to identify issues that will be addressed at the 2017 Global Platform. These consultations took the shape of strategic discussions, with heads of states and governments, ministers, civil society leaders and CEOs at special high-level sessions and plenaries, and technical discussions, with government experts, representatives from civil society, technical and scientific institutions, the private sector and the media during multi-stakeholder working sessions, and special events.

To facilitate consultations, a paper with issues and questions was circulated for feedback.

This document outlines the summary of contributions and comments provided by Members of Parliaments from Central Africa, the private sector, the disability group and civil society to the online dialogue.

Questions:

- 1. What activities and programmes could be effective in curbing the increase in economic losses due to disasters?**
- 2. What priority actions are required to meet the 2020 target of increasing the number of countries with national and local**

disaster risk reduction strategies and plans aligned with the Sendai Framework?

3. What activities and programmes would need to be developed or scaled up to accelerate vulnerability reduction and achieve resilience in the context of development?

Members of Parliament from Central Africa made the following contribution to the online dialogue:

Q1:

In Central Africa, communities have expressed the need for the implementation and promotion of multi-hazard early warning systems to make sense to people in the areas at risk. MPs emphasised the need for messages to be in a language that the citizens can understand, in order to lead to action.

The importance of mapping risk areas in order to prioritise action was highlighted.

It is crucial to raise awareness and sensitise the communities with the latest information on reducing risk. It is also important that Central African countries have access to the latest technologies and innovations, and that they share best practices. The development of advocacy tools with support from government, including regional and local authorities, to influence investment in prevention is key for an effective disaster risk reduction policy.

Redefining risk governance means that Central African countries need to strengthen their institutions with clear roles and responsibilities in order to eradicate corruption as much as possible.

Governments are urged to develop contingency plans, since many countries lack a special fund for emergency relief.

Governments and communities are urged to protect and sustainably manage forests and natural resources in order to strengthen communities' natural defences against hazards and to honour commitments to stop climate change.

Q2:

Implementation of the Sendai Framework through the following actions:

The organisation of information and awareness seminars in national parliaments through UN agencies, in order to highlight the importance of disaster risk reduction.

A guide for MPs to further improve targeted parliamentary action on disaster risk reduction. This guide is crucial for a better understanding of issues and thus a better elaboration of policy, specific disaster risk reduction laws and budget creation for reducing risk.

Identification of a clear process for implementing recommendations, and the creation of follow-up mechanisms for the development and execution of public programmes and private investment.

Q3:

Development-integrated approaches are needed to establish synergies among the outcomes of the 2015 global meetings in order to lay the foundations for sustainable development driven by agriculture, habitat, and a society resilient to disasters. It is important not to work in silos: disaster risk reduction is as much part of sustainable development as it is part of climate change. We need an action plan.

A contribution from the Disability Stakeholder Group to the online dialogue:

Q1 and Q2:

Disability stakeholders welcome and support the recommendations within the summary document of the online dialogue concerning the Global Platform. There is a need to address inclusion as a crosscutting issue of broad benefit, and the role of disabled people's organisations as contributing actors to disaster risk reduction is particularly welcome. These points relate to Priority 1 of the Sendai Framework: understanding disaster risk. The establishment of an evidence base to inform risk-sensitive decision making is a necessary pre-condition for understanding disaster risk. Such an evidence base requires disaggregated data. This issue, and the centrality, of data have not been well addressed within the online dialogue.

The Sendai Framework consultative process established broader recognition of the disproportionate risk that persons with disabilities face. The relationship between disability and risk was further reflected in the need for disability-disaggregated data. Without data we are ill-equipped

to know who, where, when and why individuals and communities are at increased risk. Equally, we are constrained in achieving, and implementing the results of, Priority 1.

Disability stakeholders are also concerned that after the first year of the Sendai Framework, progress towards fulfilling commitments to disability disaggregated data at the policy level has been hesitant at best. As an example, the current working draft of the Asia Regional Plan for Implementation of the Sendai Framework only includes targets for data disaggregated by gender at the national level by 2018. By 2020, the addition of age is proposed. Data disaggregated by disability remains absent at the national level. In contrast, there is reference, under Priority 1, to the need for local governments to collect data disaggregated by age, gender and disability by 2018. While data at the local level is important, the targets lack consistency. Firstly, there is no linkage from the local target to the 2020 national target to include disability alongside gender and age. Secondly, the Sendai Framework is explicit that national governments have the prime responsibility for its implementation SFDRR (II.19.a). It is hoped that these issues will be addressed in subsequent drafts of the Asia Regional Plan. However, the example illustrates that data disaggregated by disability has yet to be given full and considered attention.

It is a point of concern for disability stakeholders that the importance of data disaggregated by disability is addressed within both the Global Platform consultations and the meeting itself. Without fulfilling the Sendai Framework commitments to disability-disaggregated data, we cannot be said to be fully engaged with seeking to understand disaster risk. Furthermore, the realisation of the inclusive and whole-of-society approach to disaster risk reduction, as promoted by the Sendai Framework, is curtailed.

Q3:

It is understood that a major obstacle to collecting disability data is the perception that disability is a 'technical' concern. This thinking suggests that data collection is complex and resource intensive. This is not the case, given the growing evidence base informed by research and practice.

The use of 'types' of disability as the basis for data collection is challenging for both disaster risk reduction actors and, more broadly, governments. Such an approach can give rise to multiple categorizations and a lack of consistency across, and within, countries. An alternative is to approach disability from the perspective of functioning. A functioning

approach to disability is less concerned with categorizations and instead focuses on what a person is able to do in their lived environment. Understanding disability from a functioning perspective is directly relevant to disaster risk reduction as it enables the disproportionate risk that persons with disabilities face to be readily identified and directly acted upon. That is, a functioning approach facilitates both the collection of data and its application.

It is increasingly clear that asking people one direct question concerning disability does not provide practitioners and policy makers with sufficient data to make informed, and risk sensitive, decisions.

The Washington Group¹ questions are increasingly being demonstrated to be a practical way to better understand the barriers and risks that persons with disabilities face. Through such understanding we are also better placed to understand disaster risk and realize the inclusive and resilient societies envisaged within the Sendai Framework.

It is therefore important to promote practical methods, and applications, relating to disability data collection within disaster risk reduction using a functioning approach and the Washington Group questions.

In addition, it is vital to strengthen the meaningful contribution of, and partnerships with, disabled people's organizations towards understanding disaster risk and to ensure data collection is contextually appropriate.

Furthermore, it is necessary to ensure that local and national level targets, and indicators, be developed including disability disaggregated data, in a manner that creates coherence between the Sendai Framework and Sustainable Development Goal monitoring and reporting.

Finally, promotion and support of sharing and learning is key between national statistical offices, national disaster management offices and relevant multilateral and international actors on disability-disaggregated data collection.

A contribution from the Private Sector-UNISDR ARISE to the online dialogue:

The UNISDR Private Sector Alliance for Disaster Resilient Societies (ARISE) is a group of 140 private sector organizations partnering with the United Nations. It harnesses the power of the private sector to meet the goals of the Sendai Framework. ARISE facilitates transnational and cross-industry collaboration.

Members share knowledge from their global experiences and network to conceptualise, design, and execute projects and products that reduce disaster risk and are shared with the wider private and public sectors globally.

Q1:

In reversing the rise of economic losses due to disasters, both the public and private sector should collaborate and form a comprehensive disaster risk reduction plan that specifically targets the vulnerability context. Both sectors must be aggressive in taking a firm stance towards risk assessments and work together to create and implement programmes based on the outcomes of the said assessments.

Private-public alliances such as UNISDR-ARISE must be enabled to provide policy recommendations to ensure representation of all sectors, notably small and medium enterprises (SMEs), into disaster risk reduction policy building.

Governments must collaborate with all sectors in their development strategies, in order to limit the creation of new vulnerabilities. The public and private sectors must create a common goal and work together towards achieving the greater purpose of resilience. Risk assessments must be put into practice and policy and advancements in technology must be widely received to lessen the possible exposure to hazards.

To scale up efforts, risk assessments and business continuity planning must be included in every sector's operational planning. These initiatives are a 'must-do' for all organisations. Government should create incentives for companies, especially SMEs, who include a business continuity plan in their operation.

It is also necessary to develop hazard -reduction policy and integrate it into the mainstream of community activities and practices, both nationwide and regionally.

National government should reflect the needs of local governments, especially those in highly vulnerable areas, and programme risk transfer to the insurance sector .

The pivotal role that insurance can play in risk management and policy making is often overshadowed by lack of information among policy makers. This problem could be solved by appointing a Chief Risk Officer for each city or country. Similar to a Chief Resilience Officer, such a post allows both national and sub-national agencies to collaborate with

insurance sector actors in more real-term basis. It also ensures that government units actively include risk assessment and mitigation in policy making.

Q2:

Public-private partnership must be highlighted as a priority in order to accelerate the achievement of the seven global targets of the Sendai Framework.

It is key to prioritise local updates and improvement of their respective hazard and risk assessments, and data-gathering, and use this information in decision-making processes and in developing plans for disaster risk management.

It is also essential to prioritise strategies in education as part of the ARISE work themes. For example, in primary schools, information on disaster preparedness, warnings, and response should be part of the curriculum; in colleges and universities, disaster reduction should be incorporate in all courses; and for professionals, continuing education in disaster reduction should be provided.

Q3:

Disaster awareness and preparedness are urgent activities that are needed in order to scale up efforts to promote a people-centered approach to disaster risk reduction. In June 2016, Philippines-based SM Supermalls and ARISE Philippines supported the Philippine government in the 2nd Metropolitan Manila-wide earthquake drill. This drill was supported by organisations across sectors and joined by about 6.5 million people.

It is important to develop a multidisciplinary programme to redefine problems outside the normal boundaries of disaster risk resilience that will also include the following fundamentals: risk assessments; information and education campaigns; mitigation; emergency response, recovery, and building back better; forecasting and warning and international collaboration.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and its potential role in risk reduction is crucial, in the view of the private sector. IUCN's Red List for endangered species is now being extended to include eco-systems. It is clear that changes to eco-systems can cause an increase in exposure to disasters and thus to increases in human and

material or economic losses. The Red List could provide a mechanism to incorporate eco-systems into wider risk modelling and assessment.

The role of national and sub-national disaster risk reduction legislation is also key. An enabling regulatory environment empowers both private actors, such as construction companies or insurers, and local government units, such as municipalities and cities, to play a positive role.

Case Study

After Super Typhoon Haiyan swept the Visayas region of the Philippines in November 2013, displaced survivors were anxious to overcome the devastation. The SM Group saw the need to go beyond immediate relief assistance and embark on providing long-term rebuilding and reconstruction efforts. This led to the 1,000 disaster-resilient SM Cares Housing Program for Haiyan Survivors in a private sector-led commitment.

To raise the funds and build more homes, SM Prime called on its stakeholders for assistance. All SM Supermalls have SM Cares Housing Program booths where customers can donate. SM employees nationwide also pitched in with personal donations. Private sector organisations expressed their support for the SM Cares Village.

The first village in Bogu, Cebu was turned over to its beneficiaries in November 2014. The fourth and last village in Ormoc City was handed over last July 2016.

Rebuilding hope, more than just rebuilding houses, was the idea behind SM Cares Village. This is why it features a community centre, a playground, and a basketball court so that residents can start going back to their normal lives in their new community.

Building back better is the main directive of SM Prime Holdings. In support of ARISE's work on resilient cities, the 1,000 SM Cares houses are designed to be disaster-resilient with concrete ceilings and proper ventilation and composed of 3,000 psi re-cast walls to accelerate the conventional building method and respect building codes.

In December 2014, the SM Cares Village in Bogu, Cebu was hit by Super Typhoon Hagupit. The village withstand the storm without significant damage.

A contribution from the Civil Society Stakeholder Group to the online dialogue:

CONTRIBUTION FROM PARTNERS FOR RESILIENCE Alliance (PFR)

Q1:

Policy dialogue between governments, communities, the business sector, scientists, civil society and humanitarian and development practitioners must contribute to the development of disaster risk management strategies and policies. This dialogue should strengthen approaches that governments adopt or consider in developing risk reduction strategies and policies that contribute to effective implementation of the Sendai Framework, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement on climate change.

The Partners for Resilience Alliance, an initiative co-financed by the Government of the Netherlands, has a proven record of projects implemented through an integrated risk management approach that prioritises community participation, inter-sectorial and inter-disciplinary interventions and contributes to policy dialogue with various stakeholders. Policy dialogue aims to influence the development of disaster risk reduction strategies to address shocks from climate change, eco-system degradation and malpractice from both private and public investments.

Policy dialogue on integrated risk management involves highlighting evidence-based good and bad practices, influencing practice in investments and projects and supports concrete contribution to development of disaster risk management strategies at national and sub-national levels. This is done through close engagement with governments, communities and other stakeholders with the goal of building community resilience to avert or reduce risks and of enhancing economic growth. Policy dialogue when conducted effectively will promote cooperation amongst partners, enhance knowledge and capacities on risk reduction practices, ensure broad-based buy-in and ownership of policies and

thereby contribute to effective implementation of those policies and strategies.

It is important to identify relevant stakeholders in development planning at the local, provincial and national levels to design and implement integrated risk reduction programmes. Much can be learned from well-established cross-sectoral planning mechanisms, such as integrated water resources management, integrated coastal zone management and land-use planning.

It is also essential to engage relevant stakeholders – municipal governments, national environmental and disaster management agencies, river basin authorities, coastal zone managers and local communities – with regard to shared transboundary resources, and develop coordinated risk reduction strategies. Equally, it is important to involve technical experts from humanitarian, development and environment fields and policy makers from relevant disciplines, such as economics, land-use planning, hydrology, and engineering). Providing communities and civil society organisations that represent them with the space to engage in dialogues with other communities, government units and organisations is a key way to identify sustainable and appropriate options for risk reduction.

Regarding early warning and forecasting, most references are to hydro-meteorological hazard early warning systems, pointing to their predominance. It would be advisable to introduce the topic of multi-hazard early warning systems, and to properly reflect geo-hazard early warning systems as well. Partners for Resilience would like to underscore that efforts should be in line with target (g) of the Sendai Framework. As discussed extensively within the International Network for Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems, geo-hazards should not be left behind. This seems to be a very important gap to address and to have included in the entire strategic plan, and this issue unfortunately is not being represented with the importance that it deserves in the documents addressing the Sendai Framework's implementation.

Q2:

Communities at risk of disasters must be empowered to lead, participate in and contribute to dialogue in the formulation and development of risk reduction plans to build and strengthen their resilience. Community-based disaster risk reduction programming is key to strengthen local- or district-level contingency planning. Strengthening local civil society organisations facilitates the role communities play in leading policy dialogue on risk reduction and thus forms a key initiative. The involvement and

participation of communities in risk reduction policy and programme planning, and its implementations acknowledges that communities are closer to the risks they face and that they themselves also know the solutions that must form key aspects of risk reduction actions.

The integrated risk management approach stresses the centrality of communities in risk reduction and collaboration amongst inter-disciplinary stakeholders to address shocks to climate change, eco-system degradation and malpractices in development and investments.

What measures can be taken to harmonise policies and align tools and metrics across the post-2015 development agendas nationally and locally?

The post-2015 development agendas are largely inter-linked in their overall objective to mitigate risk, prevent creation of new risks and increase resilience of vulnerable people.

Efforts to avert or reduce risks of future disasters must ensure a coordinated and inter-disciplinary inclusive dialogue in the formulation of implementation policies, strategies and plans. Using livelihood profiles collected as part of disaster prevention strategies for development purposes is also important, ensuring cross-departmental data utilisation.

As an example, the High Level Summit on Sendai Implementation which took place in Italy in June 2016 provided an opportunity to strengthen the coherence of policies, given that it specifically addressed inputs for the preparatory processes of the October 2016 Habitat III Conference in Quito, the COP22 climate change conference in Marrakesh in November 2016, and the 2017 Global Platform. However, the agenda outlined already suggests a heavy dominance of governments leading in the dialogue and excludes other crucial stakeholders who influence risk reduction action, including communities, the business sector, critical disciplines in science and countries that are most vulnerable to disasters. The effective alignment of tools and metrics across the post-2015 development agendas must be inclusive of voices at all levels to ensure that practice, both positive and negative, is considered in the shaping of inter-linkages between the international agreements.

What concrete measures should be taken to address small recurrent disasters to help reduce the vulnerability of least developed countries and small islands developing states? What urgent actions are required build the resilience of vulnerable countries and communities to meet the 2030 development agenda

It is critical to intensify integrated risk reduction programmes that combine eco-system rehabilitation with other disaster risk reduction measures, at multiple scales, from the village level up to the wider landscape or watershed.

It is also important to scale up collaboration in the formulation of collective inter-disciplinary policies, investments and practices from the humanitarian, development and environment sectors to help achieve this, and to increase support for the role of civil society to broker and facilitate integrated approachesⁱⁱ.

Q3:

It is vital to assess past development initiatives across sectors to establish which ones are increasing disaster risks, and to take corrective action as much as possible. People also need to be informed in advance about the existing risks.

There is also a need to redefine civil society organizations to include community-based organizations, volunteers and organized voluntary workers. Civil society organizations' support should be sought to analyze sectoral policies and programmes in order to identify cross-sectoral hazard. In this regard there should be a data matrix on the influence of civil society organizations in the public policy formulation and implementation phases.

The absence of disaster risk reduction consciousness in development discourses, so far, has been largely ignored.

Engagement of local people is also critical. Every disaster practitioner around the world is part of a local context. Engagement of local people in policy decision-making and implementation processes are thought to be important for the success of any human intervention against disaster. However, in practice this engagement is largely absent. How do we ensure proper engagement of local people in both local and international approaches to disaster risk management and reduction?

Contemporary development discourses do not leave any room for development practitioners to integrate local people as a partner in a development initiative. They are merely considered as beneficiaries of development outputs. A two-folded reality arises because of this. Local people are reluctant to be part of locality development issues that relate to their own lives and livelihoods, and over time become dependent. Development practitioners miss the opportunity to explore and utilise local

people's emotional links to issues of relevance pertinent to global and local issues.

In the arena of disaster prevention, risk reduction, resilience building and advancement, the issue of integrating local people as a partner and stakeholder is crucial. Uncertainty is the greatest risk to the locality. Local people create a synchronized system of perception, protection, survival, resilience and adaptation mechanisms, according to predictable seasonal and everyday disasters, without much policy support. World disaster practitioners are equipped with tools that perceive natural and human-induced disasters as a threat to human civilisation and thus take precautionary measures and actions to save lives, livelihood and assets. But in doing so, local people's experiential and experimental strategy is largely ignored.

There is a need for greater mutual trust based on clearer perceptions, shared benefits, perceiving each other's mindset, guided by social and legal frameworks. This will be the key factor in bridging the existing gap between a bureaucrat and a community's people. More interaction is to be the key entry point for bridging the gap.

The disaster sector is in a good position, given that these issues are of life and death in a locality. Transforming the official responsibilities of a bureaucrat into emotional liabilities and transforming the emotional liabilities of local people into partnership responsibilities is crucial for preparing and implementing disaster policy, plan and actions.

ⁱ For information about the Washington Group please see: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/washington_group/
^{li} More recommendations can be found in: [Advancing implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction \(2015-2030\) through Ecosystem Solutions](#), developed by the Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction, a global alliance of 22 member organizations of UN, civil society and specialised agencies, including partner [Wetlands International](#).