



Plan of Action Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction in Central Asia and South Caucasus region

Advances and Challenges

Analysis of survey

Preface

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (Sendai Framework) emphasizes the need to monitor and review progress in disaster risk reduction to both document the developments related to reaching its Seven Targets as well as through the regional level progression in the developed Road Maps and Actions Plans.

In preparation for the 2nd Central Asia and South Caucasus (CASC) Sub-Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction scheduled to be held on 26-27 June 2018, in Yerevan, Republic of Armenia, UNISDR facilitated a stock take on the implementation of the 2015-2020 CASC Plan of Action for Sendai Framework implementation that was adopted at the first sub-regional platform held on 11-12 July 2016 in Dushanbe, Tajikistan.

The main objective of this succinct synthesis report is to identify key trends in terms of progress made and challenges faced at both national and regional levels in addressing the CASC Action Plan over the past two years.

Acknowledgements

UNISDR gratefully acknowledges the countries that have responded to the survey on the progression in implementing the 2015-2020 CASC Plan of Action for Sendai Framework implementation on the implementation of the HFA.

The countries participating to the survey are: Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

Analysis of Survey Findings

The Central Asia and South Caucasus region has pro-actively embraced the actions identified in the plan 2015-2020 CASC Plan of Action for the Sendai Framework Implementation adopted in July 2016 at Dushanbe, Tajikistan.

As a first activity identified in the Plan, all countries beside one (work in progress) appointed the official governmental Sendai Framework focal point and communicated it to UNISDR through official channels. In the majority of the countries the Minister of Emergency situation is the identified Governmental counterpart; while in two countries the coordination of the framework is undertaken at the deputy Prime Minister level and in one country the Minister of internal affairs leads the implementation. This indicates that the topic is part of the government agenda and in some countries with the highest level of seniority therefore facilitating the coordination process.

All countries reported on earthquake being the most common hazard. This indicates the relevance for the region to work on issues such as on building codes, land use regulation,

building codes enforcement and other means of providing regulatory oversight at the local level. *The focus on ensuring that new infrastructure developments will be based on risk-informed decisions represents a key potential for region to build a resilient approach in its development.*

However, many other risks of natural and man-made nature have been identified confirming that the multi-hazards approach is the need for moving forward the disaster risk reduction agenda. Of particular relevance is the understanding of the cascade effects by looking at the risk dimension. This element, as highlighted in the Sendai Framework is embedded in the example of Fukushima, where a natural hazard (the great east japan earthquake), resulted in a tsunami that triggered a nuclear emergency. *The capacity of CASC region to address this holistic perspective of cascade effects mixing natural with manmade risks, will strongly impact the increasing of people safety and resilience.*

The survey indicates that there are some existing barriers towards the implementation of the Sendai Framework with a strong emphases and focus on the priority 2 of the Sendai Framework that is related to governance of risks and priority 3 related to investments in disaster risk reduction.

Building resilience to disasters requires the engagements of all sectors and actors in society. However, countries and governments are strongly functioning with a sectorial approach that can create natural barriers in a common understanding towards a risk-sensitive approach. The survey indicates that operating in silos is a common challenge for the region. While the coherence of the 2030 Agendas (Sendai Framework, SDGs, Paris Agreement and the New Urban Agenda) creates a consistency in reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience therefore supporting the collaboration between sectors, the need of multi-sectoral National Platforms is key for the region.

All the countries have indicated that a National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction has been developed. In the majority of the cases these are of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder nature. *Ensuring that this fundamental governance of risk mechanism is embracing and structurally reflecting the new elements of the Sendai Framework in terms of scope, key players and coherent approach with the other 2030 Agendas agreements is a fundamental next step.* This will ensure that relevance, impact and the vision of the country in addressing its resilience towards their sustainable future become a tangible reality.

The inclusion of the private sector and the engagement in public private partnership by the countries in the region would allow to garner support and ensure that future investments, 85% of which are undertaken by the private sector at the national level, will be risk-sensitive. *The inclusion of the private sector in the National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction can be an important step in viewing this private public engagement in building resilience to disasters.*

Lack of financial resources has been highlighted as a barrier to progress in building resilience to disasters. This challenge is politically accompanied by the limited public perceptions about risks. Increasing the public knowledge of risk could address the

investment challenges. *However, member states would benefit by paying special attention to cost benefit analysis of disaster prevention measures including climate change to help support resource allocation.*

Efforts have been made by all the countries in reaching out all actors at the national level. This encouraging progression needs to be built upon through active work with the media in terms of communication skills and by strengthening capacities towards disaster risk reduction at the institutional level.

All countries in the region have progressed towards including disasters risk reduction considerations as part of their emergency management plans or as dedicated strategies, an important achievement. *The relevance of unpacking these strategies towards tangible actions and programmatic planning that are financially resourced for its success is a fundamental next step in fully addressing the expectations of the Sendai Framework target 'e'.*

All countries indicated that they have an existing mechanism to collect information on disaster losses. Data collection, use and accessibility of data remains one of the most critical mechanism to decide on priority investments and actions that could address both extensive and intensive risks.

The next important steps to are to focus on reflecting the Sendai Framework considerations on the disaggregation of data collected byaligning them to the methodology that fully addresses the scope of the Sendai Framework. Accounting for disaster losses and damage is crucial in building a case for financial investments and appropriate public policies in disaster risk reduction, as resulting cost-benefits analyses can demonstrate the financial feasibility of such investments.

The engagement of the region in embracing the Sendai Framework is proven by the high level of countries (all except one) indicating that they started the reporting towards the global targets by using the online Sendai Framework Monitor. The collection of data for the global targets does require a multi-stakeholder engagement with a key role from the statistical offices.

Aligned with the local level focus of the Sendai Framework, countries in the region have made progress in triggering and supporting local governments efforts in developing local level strategies and plans. This important progression in acting locally, allows to better analyse and view challenges and progression in building resilience to disasters.

The engagement in the region towards the use of the Making City Resilient Campaign and its tools accompanied by other awareness campaign indicates the region appreciation of acting at the local level. *Risk assessments, urban planning, disaster loss data collection and engagement with the private sector progresses in ensuring risk-informed developments is of key relevance and should turn into the possibility of experience-sharing among municipalities, such as twinning activities.*

The survey further indicates that regional cooperation is a reality when fostering the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. Regional events are the common denominator together with sharing of best practises in discussing the topic. Cross border disaster management is part of a common practice in the region, reflecting the important recognition that disaster have no borders. Capacity building is featured among a prevalent activity together with technical cooperation and some bilateral programmes. The lowest indication of regional cooperation is related to data sharing. *Progressing towards data sharing will be of strong added value in the region particularly in terms of common hazards and in shaping up future technical cooperation and cross border disaster management.*

ANNEX

Survey Questions:

1. Has your government appointed the Sendai Framework focal point and communicated it to UNISDR through the official channels?
2. What according to you are the three top risks that have a high impact on your country?
3. What is the most critical barrier / challenge that hinders implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction?
4. Have the key messages of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction been disseminated among all relevant actors in your country?
5. Does your country have a national strategy / plan for disaster risk reduction in line with the Sendai Framework targets and indicators?
6. Does your country have multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder national platforms for disaster risk reduction?
7. Has your country established a mechanism to collect, analyze and disseminate information on disaster losses and risk?
 - 7.1. If yes, does the system collect sex, age and disability disaggregated data?
8. Has your country reported against the global targets of the Sendai Framework using the online Sendai Framework Monitor?
9. Has your country introduced systems for development of local level strategies/plans for disaster risk reduction?
10. Are there campaigns at local level aiming to raise awareness on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction?
11. What kind of regional cooperation exists to foster implementation of Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction?