

TASW event at the DRR Global Platform

20th May 2013

Working Groups

Background

Summary of UNISDR paper: Synthesis Report on Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)- APRIL 2013

Areas of focus for HFA2

The current HFA has substantively contributed to further disaster risk reduction, but the goals and priorities for action are still far from being achieved. Most progress has been reported in Priority Areas 1 and 5, indicating improving capacities to prepare for and respond to disasters. However, progress is consistently lower in HFA Priority 4 which aims to address directly the underlying drivers of risk.

Priority for Action 1 around Governance, Local Level Implementation and Multi-stakeholder Participation could also be a strong focus for a post-2015 framework. Gender perspectives in disaster risk reduction could also be better addressed in a post-2015 framework.

The almost universal view so far has been to preserve and reinforce the core elements of the current HFA. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should build on the current HFA and focus on those elements that are still in need of further action.

HFA2 should reflect an enhanced understanding of risk as informed by the evidence. The effects of climate change and accumulated exposure are bringing greater emphasis on high-impact events that are occurring with greater frequency. Also, the trans-boundary nature of risk has become more evident, particularly as these relate to the effects that disasters abroad can have on the national economy.

Several recurrent themes were evident in the consultations held by ISDR on HFA2. The first is characterized by the common aim of building leadership through community engagement and fully capacitated local government – described here as **local action**. The second category reflects a range of issues related to breaking down barriers between the disciplines, sectoral issues and institutional mechanisms – these are described here as **integrated approaches**. The third category is the **enabling environment** which facilitates and establishes the conditions and incentives for building resilience. It includes a range of measures such as risk informed decisions, risk assessment and analyses, public awareness, capacity development, governance and accountability, monitoring and resources.

Stakeholders noted that integrated approaches yield co-benefits, economically and socially. They provoked discussion of how mainstreaming and integrated approaches that addressing underlying risk factors can be a catalyst for pro-poor development. Health, for instance, is regarded as core to social justice and is a key driver of community and national social and economic development.

By managing risks to health, people are able to maintain their effective livelihoods and contributions to community development.

What should a post-2015 framework (HFA2) on disaster risk reduction be like?

Many views and several options have been expressed ranging from a more nuanced version of the existing HFA; some overall guiding principles; a set of normative standards; a framework with a target regime; a legally based instrument for disaster risk reduction; or a combination of the above. There is also a case for pursuing greater leverage for disaster risk reduction as a part of development plans, goals, and targets in the successor to the MDGs as well as outcomes of the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development.

Conclusion:

Whatever form a post-2015 framework takes it should offer the opportunity to scale-up disaster risk reduction efforts that can be measured against development outcomes. It should emphasize greater outreach at local and community levels and reflect on the substantive issues, especially the economic case for greater investment in disaster risk management. Finally, discussions that define a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction need to be broad, consultative and inclusive of all stakeholders.

The ongoing progress in building capacity for disaster preparedness, including at the community level and in sectoral ministries such as health, education and agriculture, should also be sustained and advanced in HFA2.

HFA2 can therefore be positioned to become an instrument that addresses how to implement issues that have not progressed substantially since 2005 and provide guidance that motivates all countries to address new and emerging issues.

Working Groups Themes and Questions:

Given this background, how should pandemic preparedness be incorporated into the revised HFA post 2015?

Please specifically consider:

- Key *public health* measures related to early warning and monitoring; medical interventions; social distancing measures, cross-border policies; and risk communications;
- Protection and continuity of essential services and critical infrastructure; and
- Community-based resilience and preparedness capacity.

I. Expected HFA post 2015 Outcomes; Strategic Goals; and Priorities for Action

- A. What **outcome** for multi-sectoral pandemic preparedness should be incorporated in the HFA Framework?
- B. How should pandemic preparedness be reflected in the *strategic goals* of the HFA?
- C. How should pandemic preparedness be reflected in the *priorities for action* of the HFA?
- D. Which *cross-cutting issues* of the HFA that will be particularly important to pandemic preparedness?

II. HFA post 2015 Implementation and Follow Up

- A. What are the key critical **activities** concerning multisectoral pandemic preparedness that need to be incorporated into the Framework and under which priority for action?
- B. How to incorporate pandemic preparedness into a long-term, predictable and sustainable **financing** for health emergency and HFA?
- C. What should be the continuing **role of TASW** with respect to the HFA?