



General Assembly

Distr.: General
21 May 2014

Original: English

Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction

Preparatory Committee

First session

Geneva, 14-15 July 2014

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

Considerations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

Compilation report on consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

The compilation report, which is issued pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 66/199, 67/209 and 68/211, presents information and an overview of the consultations on a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. The purpose is to inform the preparatory process of stakeholders' views in the development of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to be considered at the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, Sendai, Japan 14-18 March 2015.

The compilation report covers the consultations with governments and non-government organizations, regional intergovernmental organizations, United Nations and international organizations and groups (including communities, business and industry and others) during the period from March 2012 through to May 2014. The report includes progress and lessons of each of the priorities for action of the existing Hyogo Framework of Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters as well as new perspectives on risk and its reduction.

Stakeholders are calling for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to build on the Hyogo Framework for Action with renewed emphasis on key existing components as well as to focus on new areas – for example the economic case, increased accountability, and on more local level efforts. Through the views expressed in the consultations and here compiled, a vision, scope, approaches and principles to risk reduction for the next 20 to 30 years emerges.

* This document was submitted late due to the need to include as much information from consultations as possible.



I. Introduction

1. The Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters guides the work on disaster risk reduction. The Hyogo Framework for Action was itself a product of several years of work stemming from the International Framework for Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction of 1989, and further articulated by both the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action of 1994 and the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction of 1999. These processes represent the broader reference work for disaster risk reduction and resilience.

2. At the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in January 2005, countries adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action, and later in 2005 the General Assembly endorsed the Hyogo Framework for Action through resolution 60/195. The Hyogo Framework for Action responds to the need for a comprehensive, integrated, multi-disciplinary approach to identifying and implementing disaster risk reduction measures.

3. In December 2011, the General Assembly, through resolution 66/199, requested the secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) to facilitate the development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and welcomed the offer made by the Government of Japan to host the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2015. In December 2012, the General Assembly, through resolution 67/209, encouraged all relevant stakeholders to actively engage in the consultation process for the development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. This included sharing lessons on managing disaster risk through, for example, the convening of national multi-stakeholder consultations and participation in regional platforms.

4. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction, and the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, officially launched the consultations in March 2012. At the same time, the background paper “Towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction” was released outlining the composition of consultations including online and local, national, regional and global events.

5. In the first year leading up to the fourth session of the Global Platform in May 2013, the consultations focused on general substantive issues for a successor framework, including emerging trends, challenges and solutions. The “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction,” presented at the Global Platform in May 2013, summarized these early rounds of views expressed. The Global Platform itself was the key global meeting in the consultations. The document “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Report from 2013 Global Platform Consultations” captured stakeholder opinions at the consultation meetings and events at the 2013 Global Platform.

6. From June 2013 onwards the consultations focused on the possible elements of a post-2015 framework. The General Assembly through resolution 68/211 in December 2013 outlined the modalities for the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and its expected outcomes. The document “Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction,” released in December 2013 provided the main substance for regional platforms and other consultations for the first half of 2014 prior to meetings of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Preparatory Committee for the Third World Conference scheduled for 14-15 July and 17-18 November 2014 in Geneva, Switzerland.

7. The compilation report on the consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction provides an overview over the period from March 2012 to May 2014. The consultations together with countries' reports through the Hyogo Framework for Action monitor, the findings of the biennial Global Assessment Reports on Disaster Risk Reduction of 2009, 2011 and 2013, and the relevant deliberations of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as a growing literature and practice on disaster risk and resilience, also provided a wealth of knowledge and guidance for the development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

8. The compilation report has two main substantive parts. One focuses on the results of the consultations under each of the five existing Hyogo Framework for Action priorities for action. These views are based both on lessons learned in implementation, which validate the continued relevance and value of the Hyogo Framework for Action, as well as constraints which could be strengthened in a successor framework. The other substantive part focuses on new areas and perspectives on risk and its reduction.

II. Results of Consultations by Priorities for Action of the Hyogo Framework for Action

A. Hyogo Framework for Action Priority for Action 1 – Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation

9. Stakeholders readily identified that the implementation of Hyogo Framework for Action Priority for Action 1 remained incomplete and viewed it as a work in progress. A number of areas were identified for further progress ranging from more support for local level, strengthening national and regional coordination, resourcing, and a more inclusive approach.

Support for the local level: decentralization and community participation

10. The great majority of stakeholders reiterated that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should focus on local governments and actors as primary implementers. Stakeholders requested a simple post-2015 framework that reflects the realities of local decision makers and citizens. Local governments, mayors and community organizations are at the frontline of disasters and knowledge of resilience building.¹ To promote government action, the post-2015 framework should emphasize the generation of social demand for disaster risk reduction at the local level by civil society.² Participation, monitoring and implementation are best undertaken at the local level and in this way effective decentralization with strong governance can support disaster risk reduction efforts.³

11. Many stakeholders called for effort to clearly demarcate the responsibilities at the central, provincial, district or municipal levels and to strengthen the processes of decentralization of responsibilities and resources to local government through improved regulation and mechanisms for accessing resources.⁴ A post-2015 framework should also support strengthening and enhancing of linkages between national and local governments, including the alignment of national policies with local needs, as decentralization facilitates reaching at-risk populations.

Promote community participation

12. Community participation is fundamental to successfully align national policies with local disaster risk reduction needs.⁵ Communities regard three main factors as crucial to building community resilience including: an informed constituency organized for collective action; a body of knowledge and practices that enables communities to combat the effects of disaster and climate risk particularly with regard to livelihoods; and government-community partnerships to enhance accountability and responsiveness.⁶

13. A community-led approach to resilience needs to combine action to advance knowledge, demonstrate solutions, mobilize communities and build relationships with decision makers. Guidelines for the involvement of local communities and their participation in local planning processes could be developed to drive the implementation of the post-2015 framework.⁷ If necessary, policies and laws could be enacted to ensure the full participation of communities.⁸

Strengthen national institutions

14. Stakeholders made clear the need for improved national governance to manage disaster risk but views varied on the institutional arrangements. Some proposed the establishment of a multi-stakeholder mechanism to enable international, national, local and private sector partnership for the support, funding and implementation of national disaster risk reduction policies,⁹ while the establishment of a dedicated ministry tasked with the coordination and implementation of disaster risk reduction-related activities across sectors and other ministries (like environment, health, education, agriculture and others) was also advocated for.¹⁰

15. Measures are needed to strengthen existing national platforms for disaster risk reduction as they often suffer from insufficient authority to influence country-level policies.¹¹ For many, national platforms should be backed by formal policies and legislation that establishes clear mandates, roles and functions.¹² A good model identified is the formal establishment and connection of national platforms to the highest political level (for example cabinet or the office of the Head of State).¹³

16. A review of national platforms called for a strengthening of their role to include: advocating for disaster risk reduction at the national level; raising public and political awareness; advising on climate change adaptation and sustainable development integration; fostering the exchange of experiences and expertise, for example through twinning arrangements and peer-reviews; enhancing the collaboration with the private sector and local communities; and facilitating the application of science and evidenced-based decision-making in disaster risk reduction.¹⁴

Policies and legislation

17. The main progress made in living up to the expectations of the Hyogo Framework for Action in recent years has been qualitative, grounded in policies, legislation and planning that lays the foundation for more quantitatively measurable achievements in the future. Since the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action, 121 countries have enacted legislation to establish policy and legal frameworks for disaster risk reduction.

18. Legal and policy frameworks are important, but they do not always translate into effective risk reduction. Principles must be applied that require organization and resources. In many cases, the resources are lacking for implementing the legal and policy frameworks in the way that legislators intended. Moreover, most of the legal and policy frameworks continue to have a pronounced focus on disaster management. There is an increasing awareness that disaster management legislation may not be the most suited instrument to

address questions of prevention and reduction of disaster risk and is better addressed in development and investment-related regulatory frameworks.

19. Overall, there is growing recognition that the prevention and reduction of disaster risk is a legal obligation, encompassing risk assessments, the establishment of early warning systems, and the right to access risk information. In this regard, the progressive development and codification of international law concerning the “protection of persons in the event of disasters” is highly relevant and has been welcomed.¹⁵ Parliamentarians also have a strategic role to play in strengthening integrated risk governance through legislation, oversight and allocation of resources vis-à-vis the communities they represent.¹⁶

Call for guidelines, criteria and standards

20. Stakeholders voiced the need for good practices in disaster risk reduction to be enhanced.¹⁷ In particular, the need for standard setting for building codes, land use, and preparedness were commonly expressed.¹⁸ To be most effective, standards need to be based upon agreed criteria and good practice.¹⁹ Such standards increase the reliability and communicability of what is shared and could establish common terminology and language. The specific standards on risk information need to be flexible and not overly prescriptive while helping to build consistency, comparability, credibility and inter-operability.²⁰

Resources for disaster risk reduction

21. While many stakeholders acknowledged the lack of funding for disaster risk reduction,²¹ often compounded by constrained fiscal space,²² the true scale of resources invested in disaster risk management from both public and private sources is unknown. Much of the investment is embedded within sector-based investments at both the national and sub-national levels. Without an overview of funding for disaster risk reduction, funds commonly remain inadequate or used inefficiently. An enhanced capability to evaluate the current level of investment in disaster risk management will enable a more accurate estimate of additional funding required to effectively reduce disaster risk.²³ Proposals have been made for governments to allocate a proportion of their development budget for disaster risk reduction.²⁴ Annual budgeting for disaster risk reduction activities could also be institutionalized at the federal, state and local level.²⁵ This is most likely to succeed where robust national public investment planning systems are supported by risk assessment²⁶ showing fiscal impact and incidence, detailed cost benefit analyses (against actual expenditure) at the pre-investment stage, and by clear, reinforced risk governance arrangements.

22. Ministries of finance and planning are considered fundamental for the systematic consideration of disaster risk in public investment, but sustained risk-sensitive investment will be contingent on ownership by sector-based ministries.²⁷ The role of the national institution responsible for disaster risk reduction could promote the use of relevant financial instruments (for example in national development planning and investments),²⁸ and advise on the allocation of resources to critical areas of risk reduction. If countries are to be proactive on disaster risk reduction, a better understanding is required of what losses governments, and particularly ministries of finance (as the institution with overall fiduciary responsibility for the determination, distribution and evaluation of the national budget), are willing and able to bear.²⁹

23. Funding streams from the national government could be further established to support local government and community-level activities to reduce disaster risk and build resilience.³⁰ The lack of human resources with technical expertise was also highlighted as a particular gap for local governments. Other practices like implementing a multi-year common strategic approach or innovative funding approaches, such as insurance schemes,

could also be promoted and adapted to specific contexts.³¹ Funding for disaster risk reduction should be included in both humanitarian and development funding streams and the link between the two should be explicit.³²

Support for regional cooperation

24. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should encourage regional mechanisms and programmes for cooperation. The aim would be to start to address transboundary risk through, for example, regional-level risk assessments and planning. Stakeholders identified that regional and sub-regional collaboration to capture good practices, fill information gaps, transfer technical knowledge and establish collaborative arrangements.³³

25. Stakeholders called for regional intergovernmental organizations to play an important role in the implementation of a post-2015 framework. For example, the European Union plays a vital role in Europe to drive the implementation of risk management policy as is the case with other regional intergovernmental organizations such as the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). More concerted effort can be made to strengthen the institutional capacity of sub-regional and regional institutions and deepen political commitments for making the existing cooperation arrangements more effective – and especially at the regional platforms for disaster risk reduction. Measures to build regional cooperation on interconnected issues that are essential for sustainable development should be introduced, such as for food and energy security, gender equality, health, environment and climate risk.³⁴

Integration and mainstreaming disaster risk reduction

26. Stakeholders almost universally called for more integration and mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction – and especially with development and climate.³⁵ One proposal was for a post-2015 framework to acknowledge as a principle that disaster risk reduction is a development issue with a long-term approach to be undertaken through programmatic activities and funds.³⁶ Stakeholders in the Asia-Pacific recommended the establishment of high-level national steering committees or task forces to manage integration of disaster risk reduction across the many sectors and areas of work. Similarly, at regional level, countries could establish a regional integration strategy, framework or plan, as is being done by Pacific Islands Countries and Territories through a new Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development.³⁷

27. Other integration methods included: the use of environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments, the development and inclusion of targets in local development plans, and the allocation of a percentage of budget for disaster prevention and risk reduction as measures to promote integration. Joint programming, development of partnerships that meet implementation needs across agreements and alignment of donor funding streams (as relevant) could also encourage integration.³⁸ One very concrete suggestion was for a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to be aligned with the assessment of loss and damage that is part of the climate change adaptation agenda under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change process.³⁹

Inclusive approach

28. Through the inclusive approach to disaster risk reduction many groups ranging from national and local governments, inter-governmental organizations, Red Cross and Red Crescent, non-governmental organizations, mayors and parliamentarians, representatives of local communities, indigenous peoples, children and youth, persons with disabilities, and leaders from business, academia and science have engaged in risk reduction efforts. The multistakeholder nature of global and regional platforms for disaster risk reduction have

promoted inclusion through sharing information and best practices, seeking partnerships, and determining priorities and policies.

29. The General Assembly, through resolution 68/211, recognised the Global Platform as the main global forum for consultations on a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, largely due to its encouragement of all actors and stakeholders. At the fourth and most recent session in May 2013, newcomers included representatives from the cultural heritage profession, standards-setting bodies and auditors, civilian-military cooperation, persons with disabilities, and animal welfare groups to discuss their contribution to a preventative approach to risk management.⁴⁰

Business and industry (private sector)

30. The private sector is in a unique position to influence the accumulation of risk as it is responsible for 70 to 85 percent of all investment in the world, much of it in the form of infrastructure in cyclone- and tsunami-prone coastlines, flood-prone river basins and in earthquake-prone cities.⁴¹ Investing in hazard-prone locations usually offers business comparative advantages that translate into higher productivity, profitability and competitiveness. Multiple investments over decades, however, have accumulated high levels of disaster risk, which now negatively affect that competitiveness. Disaster risk is still not considered fully in large companies and small enterprises usually do not undertake systematic risk assessments. New perspectives on business risk management are now emerging. A number of large global businesses are now demanding risk assessments from small businesses that are key suppliers, and a few are undertaking risk assessment as a basis for their supply chain management, for example.⁴²

Persons with disabilities

31. Persons with disabilities participated actively at the fourth session of the Global Platform in May 2013 and in the 2013 International Day for Disaster Risk Reduction. An extensive survey of the needs of persons with disabilities in disaster risk reduction was undertaken in 2013.⁴³ The common call is for persons with disabilities to be included in disaster risk reduction policy, planning and implementation at all stages of mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. One concrete area raised in the consultations is the lack of data and evidence on the impact of disasters on persons with disabilities to ensure a factual basis for decisions and planning.⁴⁴

Children and youth

32. The voice of children and youth is being promoted and listened to in regional and global disaster risk reduction fora.⁴⁵ School children are also more involved in assessing their school's safety. Building on the 2013 Global Platform's session on "The Resilient Future We Want" and the Chairs' Summary, a worldwide mobilization of children and youth around disaster risk reduction has been ongoing since early 2014 through social media with the engagement of a growing number of youth-led movements. Children and youth have been invited to identify their priorities and to build long-term commitments to a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.⁴⁶

Gender in disaster risk reduction policy and planning

33. Stakeholders called for a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to address gender issues as a primary and integral factor.⁴⁷ The Asia-Pacific region in particular called for resourcing, financing and budgeting for action that includes women and promotes gender equality. Investment should be informed by sex- and age-disaggregated data at every level.⁴⁸ National governments could mandate context-specific gender analysis for all

levels of disaster risk reduction planning and ensure there is capacity to implement such analysis.

Leadership of women

34. A post-2015 framework needs to acknowledge that women must be part of disaster risk reduction, from prevention to rehabilitation, and it should define a stronger role for women to enable them to take leadership roles in disaster risk reduction.⁴⁹ Women's ministries or focal points for women's affairs could ensure the availability and use of appropriate tools, methodologies and expertise in disaster risk reduction planning stages and should sign off on the plans; in turn these plans could be used as indicators of progress established through memoranda of understanding between the ministry of women and the national disaster reduction institution. This will also ensure that disaster risk reduction programmes conform to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women and other related international conventions. Women's inclusion in planning should be monitored through the post-2015 framework's monitoring system.⁵⁰

B. Hyogo Framework for Action Priority for Action 2 – Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

35. Stakeholders identified the need to establish and consolidate sound risk data and risk assessments to nurture a culture of data-supported decision-making. Risk assessments are required at all levels (global, regional, national and local) depending on the type of decision-making required. The need for risk information targeted at local-level needs as well as access to open-source information were identified as priorities. Enhancing risk knowledge should be a key element of the effort to engage more directly the evidence of the scientific community in a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.⁵¹ A common message under the Hyogo Framework for Action priority for action 2 is to continue to strengthen early warning systems and share good practices around monitoring risks.

Risk information

36. A major emphasis was placed on the use of statistics around disaster losses to make the economic case for investment in disaster risk reduction.⁵² It is essential that national disaster databases document not only the impact of large, intensive disasters but also the accumulated losses from everyday events. Stakeholders reiterated the need for disaggregated loss data, and to account for indirect losses in employment and production, investment, savings and capital formation, welfare and social impacts.⁵³

37. Additional concerns included the need to standardize loss data to ensure it is collected and shared in comparable formats and for loss data and all risk information to be accessible to all, as the latter are public goods in the same way as data on health, education, employment and the economy.⁵⁴

38. Stakeholders emphasized repeatedly the need for demographic and sex-disaggregated data for risk and loss assessments as well as clarification on responsibility for implementing and monitoring sex-disaggregated indicators. They also noted the need to develop methodology, tools and clear guidance, as well as making expertise available for gender-sensitive disaster risk assessments, environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments. The process and methodologies used for risk assessment should be participative and inclusive and appropriate to the needs and applications of users. The work of United Nations resident coordinators at local level could be supported through the United Nations' Common Country Assessments in the context of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks.⁵⁵

Strengthen early warning systems

39. Stakeholders called for a post-2015 framework to strengthen early warning systems, in particular for hydro meteorological hazards and related disasters. The essential elements of such systems include the forecasting, formatting, presenting and communicating of warnings. The accompanying public education and capacity-building need to be given special attention. Public weather service programmes require continuous support for the application of new technology and scientific research in data acquisition and use, especially for nowcasting and multi-hazard warnings.

40. Other fora suggested including environmental monitoring, such as ecosystems mapping, establishing mechanisms for early action such as adapting decision-making procedures and financial regulations, increasing community surveillance to monitor threats at the animal/human interface and develop community plans for response and recovery, and jointly producing and disseminating early warning information between scientific and local communities ensuring it is timely and culturally sensitive and delivered in a manner that enables action by all.⁵⁶

Local-level data and risk information

41. Stakeholders recommended that a post-2015 framework include a clearer programme of risk communication at the local level.⁵⁷ This would require prioritizing local data collection and the strengthening of local databases by governments, with support from United Nations agencies as relevant to generate comparable statistics and build local government capacity. Participatory mechanisms could be adopted for collecting and updating local data, and data collection methods should be context specific and gender sensitive.⁵⁸

42. Also identified were several requirements in relation to the role of scientific information: there is a need to include local and indigenous knowledge in scientific information; to promote international and national institutions to help connect science to policy; and to improve how scientists and technical specialists communicate risk to enable decision-makers to systematically incorporate risk information into their decisions.⁵⁹

43. At the initiative of countries at the World Climate Conference in 2009, the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) was established based on extensive consultations and expert inputs. Hosted by the World Meteorological Organization, GFCS has developed four priority areas for early attention that present immediate opportunities for improved decision making. These are disaster risk reduction, agriculture and food security, health and water. Partners have called on climate services to be further recognized as contributing to reducing disaster risk post-2015.⁶⁰

44. Among emerging risks, some stakeholders proposed that a post-2015 framework should include the protection of cultural heritage,⁶¹ while others called for the framework to recognize and provide guidance for different operating environments.⁶² Particularly noted were the accumulation of risk in urban areas, fragile countries characterized by political instability and borne out of social inequality (not only a fragile country issue – global increasing inequality is a major issue in the sustainable development goals discussions as well), and issues for countries in protracted crisis and conflicts leading to displacement, some of which will be exacerbated by climate change.

Open access to information

45. Open-access risk information, produced using open source platforms, is essential to underpin dialogue between business, governments and communities on the design of effective disaster risk reduction strategies. Governments could consider introducing minimum standards for data accessibility and availability.⁶³ Collaboration between the public and private sectors, including the insurance industry, on generating and applying open access risk information could also be significantly strengthened and innovative model of risk information access further explored and exchanged.⁶⁴

46. New technologies and social media could be harnessed to raise disaster risk reduction awareness and develop innovative communication campaigns and tools, such as disaster risk reduction open days at school, and develop guidelines for risk assessment and preparedness for example in nurseries, schools and hospitals.⁶⁵

C. Hyogo Framework for Action Priority for Action 3 – Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

47. A reinvigorated approach to public awareness and advocacy was frequently mentioned as a key area for a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.⁶⁶ New policies that promoted risk as “everybody’s job” were identified as a key message for a post-2015 framework. The role of the media in disseminating risk information and promoting transparency was particularly highlighted.⁶⁷

48. Good practices in risk dissemination included ensuring that information communicated is simple, practical and tailored to stakeholder needs; dissemination methods are accessible to women and consider women’s communication methods and networks; communications take a multi-hazard approach; and to use new technologies and social media, innovative communication campaigns and tools.⁶⁸ The recipients of risk communication include various community groups with particular needs and priorities, including groups with special needs (such as the elderly, children and youth, and persons with disabilities) and those experiencing the greatest inequality and exclusion, who need to lower their exposure to risk.⁶⁹

Capacity building

49. Requests for information and tools on implementation were a strong theme in most of the consultations. Accordingly, many stakeholders called for more attention to capacity-building and in particular at the local level.⁷⁰ Target audiences identified for training included local governments and communities, community leaders and the media. Some stakeholders called for capacity-building efforts to move away from technical workshops to much more structured training within higher education, for example at masters and doctorate levels.⁷¹ Others emphasized that capacity-building efforts need to integrate sustainability and climate risk.

Culture of safety and education

50. On the topic of education, stakeholders reiterated the need to ensure the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into curricula at primary, secondary and tertiary levels, and to promote an integrated approach with sustainable development and climate risk.⁷² Disaster risk reduction in education could be promoted through youth networks and high school students, including the use of peer education methodology.⁷³ The Africa region

in particular called for the development of networks of higher education institutions to be promoted.⁷⁴

51. The high level dialogue and communiqué at the Global Platform in 2013 agreed to advocate for all new schools to be safe.⁷⁵ As requested in the communiqué, an initiative for safe schools is being developed to mobilize the political support and commitments of countries and partners to be announced at the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in March 2015.

52. A Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector has designed a model for safe schools that promotes disaster-resilient learning facilities; school disaster and emergency management; and risk reduction and resilience education.⁷⁶ These priority areas came out strongly in the consultations. A digital platform and crowd-sourcing initiatives have also been developed to mobilize children, teachers, school staff, local governments and communities in assessing their school and in collecting data to track progress in school safety at the global level. Regional intergovernmental organizations are also supporting and promoting school safety implementation at the sub-regional and national levels.⁷⁷

D. Hyogo Framework for Action Priority for Action 4 – Reduce the underlying risk factors

53. Evidence through country monitor reports points to priority for action 4 – to reduce the underlying risk factors – as showing the least progress under the Hyogo Framework for Action.⁷⁸ In the consultations on a post-2015 framework, this area required the most attention and focus especially taking into account the management of risk and sustainability within development efforts.⁷⁹

54. To address the underlying risk factors, the post-2015 framework could focus efforts on the reduction of exposure of people and assets with an emphasis on preventing disaster risk and building resilience. Measures to reduce exposure could provide further guidance to overcome implementation barriers in the underlying risk factors. For instance, to address the increasing exposure caused by rapidly growing cities, there is a need to systematically improve spatial, urban and land-use planning to reduce economic exposure.⁸⁰ There would also need to be much more sector-specific implementation plans.

Disaster risk reduction in key sectors like agriculture, food security, health and education

55. There is some progress in integrating disaster risk reduction in agriculture recovery plans, usually focusing on strengthening the national disaster risk reduction system. The agriculture sector requires the presence of clear cross-sector national policies that make mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development sectors an explicit and strategic priority. Also helpful is a good understanding of the nexus between disaster risk and sustainable agriculture development and the global agenda on climate change adaptation. At the same time there remains a persistent focus on disaster management rather than risk reduction. Progress has also not translated into enabling institutional mechanisms within the sector or financial allocation for disaster risk reduction in agriculture.

56. Disaster risk reduction in the education sector emerged as a priority in regional conferences and benefits from a number of targeted campaigns and commitments. The monitoring of the Hyogo Framework for Action in 2013 refers to 30 percent of countries that have been able to include disaster risk reduction in curricula at all education levels despite the lack of indicators, frameworks and monitoring system.⁸¹ Calls have been made

for disaster risk reduction to remain a priority in the follow-up programme of the United Nations Decade on Education for Sustainable Development.⁸²

57. Health was amongst the top three overall priorities for communities and was referred to as a pre-requisite for disaster risk reduction. At least 130 countries have national health emergency preparedness plans and 40 have established the necessary core-capacities to put in place International Health Regulations. A suggestion is for the International Health Regulations to be embedded within a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.⁸³

58. Consultations have called for countries and communities with better capacities to manage the health risks associated with emergencies and disasters, bridging the health and multi-sector Emergency Risk Management. Health is not just about saving lives. Overall, there is a need to recognize the impacts of disasters on the wellbeing of people and to underline how to manage health risks through stronger health systems. There is progress on the resilience of health systems, including safer hospitals and related health indicators. Some 77 countries across the world have reported that they are implementing safe hospital activities.⁸⁴ A Global Safe Hospitals initiative is gaining momentum following the call from the High Level Communiqué of the Global Platform in May 2013 to rally behind safe schools and safe health facilities.

Urban risk and infrastructure

59. The importance of promoting resilient urban development and of investing in resilient infrastructures programmes – linking risk reduction to sustainable development – was raised in several consultations.⁸⁵ As a consequence of demographic pressure, urbanization and the impacts of climate change, urban planning and infrastructure development will need to be rethought. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction could call for more comprehensive urban planning policies that take into account new risk trends and involve inter-disciplinary expertise in the development of safe and robust infrastructures. Urban risk assessments particularly need to be strengthened leading to building codes and enforcement.

Ecosystems-based disaster risk reduction

60. While the current Hyogo Framework for Action recognizes the role of sustainable ecosystems management in disaster risk reduction, stakeholders recommended it be strengthened and elaborated.⁸⁶ An ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction/climate change adaptation approach could be promoted and supported by national policies and integrated in local level/community-led initiatives (for example flood and drought prevention through rain harvesting, preservation/restoration of vegetation surrounding urban areas). In addition to an ecosystem-based approach, linkages between the environment and disaster risk reduction could be made explicit in specific sector plans and policies.

Strategic use of environmental impact assessments

61. Many consultations highlighted the need to strengthen the integration between the environment and disaster risk reduction. To this end several stakeholders⁸⁷ suggested the integration of disaster risk reduction within project environmental impact assessments and also in strategic environmental assessments (used for strategic planning and policies) to ensure that both public and private investments, including in post-disaster reconstruction contexts, are aware of disaster risk and bound to take proactive action to mitigate the risks in an environmentally sustainable manner as per national legislation.

Sector approaches

62. A post-2015 framework may want to look at key sectors and themes in which progress needs to be bold and promotes a sector-by-sector approach to reducing underlying risk. For instance, countries could identify key sectors and set targets for risk governance in specific sectors, make financial commitments to reducing risk in those sectors, systematically incorporate disaster risk reduction in post-disaster recovery in those sectors, and undertake monitoring and reporting for the sectors.⁸⁸ This approach tackles directly the difficulty of making progress under Priority for Action 4 by drilling down to enact policies and implement programmes in the sectors of greatest national priority. It would require active engagement of the priority sector's stakeholders to understand its dynamics, capacities and constraints so as to introduce disaster risk reduction measures systematically.⁸⁹

Changing risks, development and exposure

63. The Hyogo Framework for Action does not explicitly recognise the changing nature of risk; it is therefore important for a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to emphasize the benefits of taking action now to address the long-term drivers of trends in risk) and the need to anticipate the long-term risks and impact on policy and investment decisions of today. This should be underpinned by flexible approaches based on regular monitoring and integration of new information.

64. A post-2015 framework could therefore focus on fostering holistic, sustainable development approaches that do not create new risk. Since knowledge of disaster risk is essential to inform investment planning, development strategy and policy decisions, guidance is required on how improvements in the quality, availability and accessibility of risk information can facilitate a sustainable approach.⁹⁰ Building resilience through sound development strategies, practice and planning is emerging, evidenced by the strong references of disaster risk reduction as a prerequisite for sustainable development in the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, (Rio+20), "The future we want," and the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation.

E. Hyogo Framework for Action Priority for Action 5 – Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

65. During consultations, stakeholders underscored the connections between prevention, mitigation, preparedness, recovery and reconstruction.⁹¹ Better preparedness for disasters saves both lives and assets. Preparedness measures therefore are integral to good response, recovery and reconstruction efforts as well as development policy and planning.⁹² A further benefit is that preparedness and risk reduction helps to bridge the separate humanitarian and development efforts.

Preparedness coordination

66. Stronger and more strategic international crisis management, emergency preparedness and cooperation mechanisms will be required in the future as transboundary and multi-hazard disasters become more apparent and complex. Collaboration needs to be made more simple with a well-organized approach to disaster response and management.

67. Stakeholders urged for better coordination based on approaches such as linking of relief rehabilitation and development.⁹³ To the extent possible, the local level could be the starting point for prioritization and coordination of government and institutional activities

in preparedness coordination. Mechanisms are needed to ensure closer cooperation between international, national and local stakeholders in emergency preparedness measures, particularly in situations of chronic vulnerability or protracted crisis that require an integrated approach that addresses short, medium and long-term needs simultaneously.

68. Financing for preparedness could be better coordinated and planned, and innovative financing mechanisms sought, including public-private partnerships, which are critical for emergency preparedness and response.⁹⁴ As preparedness is part of a disaster risk reduction approach, funding also needs to be part of a common-sense approach to planning and development.

Capacity for preparedness

69. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction needs to be aware of the capacity limits of governments and stakeholders. At regional level, intergovernmental organizations should enhance their role as regional leaders and provide capacity enhancement of Member States.⁹⁵ It is important to recognize, however, that the capacity and level of political commitment on preparedness in regional intergovernmental organizations varies across organizations. At national level, capacity building in preparedness, including at the community level and in sectoral ministries such as health, education and agriculture, needs to be strengthened, including through multi-year programmes (long-term approach).⁹⁶

Self-help and volunteers

70. Some of the consultations highlighted the importance supporting mechanisms and legislation that consider self-help in disasters and that are compatible with people's self-help capacities.⁹⁷ This includes recognizing self-organizing community groups as critical actors in "ground response" and help. In particular, engagement of youth and children in disaster preparedness activities and greater capacity building for youth volunteers on disaster response were highlighted as opportunities to increase resilience at local level.⁹⁸

Inclusive approach in preparedness

71. The planning and execution of emergency plans and preparedness practices needs to include a range of stakeholders (during evacuation processes, in rescue operations, when undertaking post-disaster needs assessments). The inclusion of women and their perspectives on what needs to be delivered in emergency situations is fundamental. Similarly persons with disabilities need to be included and be actively participating in the planning, preparedness and implementation process. The issue of access was highlighted for more attention particularly during emergencies when people require access to emergency services.⁹⁹

72. The need for emergency response teams and volunteers (emergency, humanitarian and civil) on how to respond to and communicate with communities during disaster response was also highlighted. An important measure is alternative communication skills tailored to people with disabilities, for example via sign language interpreters. Stakeholders recommended support for the development of standards and protocols for the protection, rescue and care of people where and when they are at immediate risk of a disaster.

Environmental emergencies

73. Preparedness for environmental emergencies (for example oil spills and chemical contamination) was highlighted by some stakeholders. It was also identified that the environmental impacts of disasters and disaster response need to be an integral part of overall disaster preparedness and contingency plans.¹⁰⁰

Pandemics

74. A post-2015 framework could promote increased international cooperation for dealing with the spread of pandemic disease. A multi-hazard, cross sector and whole-of-society approach to pandemic planning and preparedness is required.¹⁰¹ Communities should be encouraged to put in place plans for ensuring the continuity of essential services under pandemic conditions and to rapidly restore any essential services affected during the spread of infectious diseases. To advance pandemic preparedness, regional intergovernmental bodies can be further resourced to strengthen institutions, infrastructure and tactical capacities together with communication and early warning capacities.

Recovery and reconstruction

75. Recovery and reconstruction efforts can be difficult and traumatic after a catastrophic event with expectations to meet, funds to raise and priorities to set. For smaller and more regular disaster events, people often rebuild with limited resources and lack of political support leading to extended periods or relapse into poverty (or less growth). An internationally agreed framework for cooperation that covers recovery will be useful in assisting disaster-affected nations both in guidance and to help build more capacity¹⁰². A well-planned, inclusive and strategic approach to recovery and reconstruction helps stakeholders with their competing or diverging priorities to rally around.

76. Such frameworks need to provide non-prescriptive and adaptable guidance on: (a) Institutional Frameworks for Recovery; (b) Recovery Policy and Planning; (c) Recovery Financing, and; (d) Recovery Management and Monitoring. The aim is also to develop and include concrete and measurable indicators to monitor progress of implementation and achievement of recovery goals, and to specify the need for systems that enable the transparent generation of reliable and actionable knowledge about the recovery process and enforce appropriate accountability for the recovery and its consequences.¹⁰³

77. It is unrealistic to expect all governments to maintain a body of staff possessing all areas of expertise required to meet the technical needs of a recovery planning effort. However, such resources do exist, in part, throughout various countries within a region and at regional organizations. The solution lies mostly in identifying such technical experts, connecting resources and needs, and the facilitation of opportunities for assistance.¹⁰⁴ Partnerships, especially with the private sector, can enhance impacts of recovery. Appropriate engagement of the public and private sector, mass media, civil society and external organizations can also facilitate effective long-term recovery.¹⁰⁵

III. Focus areas of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

78. Governments and other stakeholders expressed a number of views during the consultations on the overall scope and main elements that should be emphasized and reiterated in a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. The following areas benefitted from general agreement in multiple consultations.

Continuity between Hyogo Framework for Action and the post-2015 framework

79. All stakeholders reiterated the value and need for the Hyogo Framework of Action while emphasizing that its implementation was far from complete.¹⁰⁶ The Hyogo Framework for Action should, therefore, continue to guide disaster risk reduction. A post-2015 framework could provide further guidance on new, important areas to focus risk reduction efforts over the next 20 to 30 years.¹⁰⁷ Implementation of the post-2015

framework should be a continuing process leading on from the Hyogo Framework for Action, leveraging lessons gleaned from implementation to address gaps and scaling up achievements. It should also build on the achievements of other international agreements.

Coherence and mutual reinforcement

80. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction needs to be coherent and mutually reinforcing with other main relevant post-2015 processes, including the sustainable development goals, climate agreements, the World Humanitarian Summit and World Reconstruction Conferences and other related international processes.¹⁰⁸ A post-2015 framework should identify mechanisms both at the international level and at the national levels to facilitate mutual reinforcement, for example through political recognition and policy coherence of existing work and agreements; integration of plans and programmes; shared targets, indicators, reporting and monitoring systems; mobilizing of voluntary commitments; and promotion of partnerships and cooperation across agreements and frameworks.¹⁰⁹

Climate risk

81. Stakeholders unanimously emphasized the need to refer to climate risk, and in particular adaptation and resilience, more fully into a post-2015 framework. Stakeholders recognized that it was necessary to take concrete steps to reduce the creation of risk by climate change as a disaster risk reduction priority. A post-2015 framework could promote approaches that address both climate variability and climate resilience, as well as address prominent risks identified in the Fourth and Fifth Assessment Reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation.¹¹⁰

82. Stakeholders called specifically for the integration of climate change adaptation into national disaster risk management frameworks, the integration of disaster risk reduction into climate change adaptation strategies, the development of joint action plans, and the proposal to promote national resilience strategies that integrate climate risk and development concerns. Joint problem-solving mechanisms that connect disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation communities were proposed as solutions for furthering the resilience-building agenda in the future.¹¹¹

Broadening the scope

83. There is wide agreement that the post-2015 framework should bring greater attention to small disasters or extensive risk—highly localized, frequently occurring disasters that are under-supported under-estimated in their social and economic impacts and hence by national planning and investment priorities as well as in internationally supported efforts.¹¹² At the same time, the effects of climate change and accumulated exposure to risk will require attention to high-impact events, as they are increasing in frequency and intensity.¹¹³ A post-2015 framework will need to guide risk reduction actions for catastrophic, intensive events, which receive greater attention, as well as the many small-scale extensive events at the local level.¹¹⁴ More research is required to determine if a set of actions will see results in reducing the risk in both intensive and extensive cases.

84. The economic and social impact of disasters travels quickly and immediately through a globalized and highly interconnected economic, financial and trade system as well as through social media. Therefore, the transboundary-nature of risk has become more evident. Disasters are local in impact and global in outcome. Stakeholders identified transboundary risk as a challenge to be addressed beyond 2015.¹¹⁵ Regional platforms for disaster risk reduction provide an opportunity to focus on transboundary related concerns

and develop further cooperation for example through regional plans, agreements and approaches. Regional intergovernmental organizations were also encouraged to work on preventive measures for transboundary hazards.¹¹⁶

85. There was consensus among stakeholders that natural, man-made and technological impacts of disaster risks were within the scope of a post-2015 framework. A new understanding of the relationship between natural and technological or man-made risks is emerging. Stakeholders, for example, identified risks such as those related to nuclear power and toxic waste, including mercury pollution,¹¹⁷ displacement, and in the protection of cultural heritage.¹¹⁸ Natural risks can lead to technological risks,¹¹⁹ resulting in multi-hazard risks. Man-made climate risks alters natural climate-related hazards and leads to new risks such as vector borne diseases. The potential disaster risk can also be applied to fragile states and conflict situations over resources (for example water and grazing land).¹²⁰

Focus on the local level

86. Stakeholders repeatedly emphasized that the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action had not provided enough support at the local level. A post-2015 framework should fill the gap by focusing on local risk and its reduction. Furthermore the language of the framework should be simple and aimed at mayors, local authorities and local stakeholders. The post-2015 framework needs to provide guidance to promote community involvement, be conceived from the bottom-up and to encourage the private sector's participation at local level.¹²¹ In addition, local-level stakeholders requested a post-2015 framework to define specific implementation measures for them.

87. Given the world's trend toward urbanization, urban risk was identified as a primary focus for the post-2015 framework particularly in the Arab region and Africa. The development of instruments to ensure that adequate budgets were available to local government is crucial, together with decentralization and clarification of roles and responsibilities, to enhance local-level action.¹²²

Strengthen governance, accountability and monitoring

88. Stakeholders called for appropriate risk governance, defined as the system of norms, institutions and interactions that determine how decisions are made and enforced. The governance of critical risk areas will be a priority in future.¹²³ Identified gaps and challenges relate to the division of clear responsibilities across public and private actors and the setting of appropriate accountability mechanisms regarding how public decisions are enforced and private investments made. Stakeholders identified the need for coordination and the facilitation of joined-up approaches that support integrated methodologies and the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development.¹²⁴

89. A more robust approach to risk governance structures that enables regular monitoring, flexible and adaptive planning, and learning and effective responses to new information is required.¹²⁵ Stakeholders universally agreed that monitoring mechanisms for disaster risk reduction should be enhanced in the post-2015 framework to enable comprehensive reporting on implementation of disaster risk reduction efforts and thus improve accountability.¹²⁶ The monitoring system should continue to link with the current Hyogo Framework for Action reporting and future indicators based on the analysis of past country reports. Stakeholders have called for and proposed sets of goals and targets with criteria and indicators. The introduction of disaster related targets and criteria ensures increased political support for disaster risk reduction, as well as visibility and accountability for delivering integration of risk management in other sectors.¹²⁷

90. There were many calls for simplified monitoring that reduces the burden on countries and is aligned with other reporting processes. Better monitoring and evaluation

frameworks, baseline information and indicators to enable progress measurement and benchmarking to account for success and outcomes were seen as important tools.¹²⁸ Suggestions were also made for promoting the use of voluntary peer reviews for disaster risk reduction.¹²⁹

Economic case for disaster risk reduction

91. A post-2015 framework needs to make the economic and business case for disaster risk reduction, by showing how disaster losses impact on economic growth and business and national competitiveness, and how business and economic investments can determine the increase of existing, and the accumulation of new, risk. Global foreign direct investment is projected to reach US\$1.9 trillion in 2014 and an even larger sum of new domestic investment is expected.¹³⁰ These trillions in investments will be flowing into hazard-exposed areas, largely determining the future of risk. Equally, whether the increase in exposure, generated by such investments is managed through sound risk management strategies, will largely determine whether the investments contribute to long-term economic growth and sustainable development.

92. Although the Hyogo Framework of Action identified important ways to reduce risk (such as risk assessment, access to information and addressing the underlying risk drivers), further consideration is needed on prospectively managing risk through risk-sensitive public investment planning and business investment. Thinking on how to scale up spending in support of risk reduction efforts in a way that effectively provides domestic investment is also needed.¹³¹ For this, it will be important to show how disaster losses jeopardize the financial resilience of nations, impacting on mid- to long-term growth, fiscal stability and the national balance of accounts.

93. The case for investing in disaster risk reduction needs to be brought to the attention of strategic, planning and finance managers using more research around the economics of disasters, the approach of the private sector and use of tools to support cost-benefit analysis. Current investment practice, where risk continues to be externalized from planning and economic forecasting, has to be reformed to make transparent the negative consequences of risk-generating investment and business behaviour. To do this effectively, disaster risk has to be considered along the whole investment chain, from asset owners and investment fund managers, insurers and reinsurers, and business information service providers, to small and medium enterprises, large national and international corporations, national governments, market regulators and consumers. The real price of risk has to be assessed through cost-benefit analysis, environmental impact assessments and social analysis that make use of exposure and vulnerability analysis in hazard-prone regions.

Role of the private sector

94. The private sector has a high stake in disaster risk reduction and needs to be involved as a partner in its implementation.¹³² The major disasters that struck Japan and Thailand in 2011 and the United States of America in 2012 revealed how disasters can impact businesses. Disasters can interrupt or paralyse output through damage to factories, offices and other resources. They can also destroy systems upon which businesses depend, such as transport and energy networks, and affect the labour market directly and indirectly. The effects of business interruption can have pervasive effects on business competitiveness, as they increasingly affect global supply chains, and can lead to bankruptcy, particularly for small and medium enterprises.¹³³

95. Since businesses are also vulnerable to disasters, companies have a vital interest in risk reduction efforts.¹³⁴ It is more cost-effective to prevent or prepare for disasters than it is to respond to and recover from them. By reducing risk, particularly extensive risk, a

business can be much more competitive in the long run. Companies can leverage operational business strategies, such as supply chain management and business continuity planning, which promote corporate sustainability and shareholder value. These measures, when carried out in partnership with the public sector, also strengthen the foundations of resilience and lead to economic opportunities for large as well as for small to medium enterprises.¹³⁵ Building resilience is also an important new market opportunity: there is a need for services for resilient infrastructure, risk management consultancy, and risk sharing instruments, among others.

96. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction could promote stronger engagement with the private sector by jointly identifying an enabling environment for businesses. Such an environment may include economic incentives (such as tax waivers, subsidies, grants, loans), as well as legal and regulatory framework (such as building code, resilient land use planning and zoning).¹³⁶ Strategies are needed in particular to encourage risk-sensitive investment of small and medium-sized businesses and support greater engagement between the private sector and local communities.

97. The role of the private sector in delivering the post-2015 framework needs to be spelled out more clearly and in a differentiated manner for local and national levels. Evidence has shown that involving relevant actors in early stages of planning and development of regulation, particularly at the local level, enables more realistic implementation frameworks and can create effective checks and balances and higher levels of compliance. This is particularly the case for key industries such as the construction sector, utility companies and information and communication technology businesses. The international community needs to recognize that, today, these industries invest in and operate the majority of critical urban, and increasingly also rural, infrastructure. Therefore, identifying concrete roles and responsibilities for actors in these industries will be critical to the success of reducing future disaster risk.

98. Insurance can potentially play an important role in disaster risk reduction but only where the enabling environment allows for appropriate pricing and coverage. Governments and insurance companies are yet to take full advantage of this potential.¹³⁷ Stakeholders identified the role of the insurance sector as particularly relevant. A post-2015 framework could provide guidance on ways to couple disaster risk reduction and risk transfer mechanisms, taking into account the expertise of the insurance industry in risk assessment and underwriting, as well as the role that risk transfer mechanisms will play in the future.¹³⁸

99. A post-2015 framework could make it clear that disaster risk is an opportunity and not just a threat.¹³⁹ The emphasis needs to change from the possibility of a disaster event (something to face) to the possibility of an action (something to do). Businesses need to be involved in the effort to create a more safe and secure environment and move beyond disaster risk reduction as corporate social responsibility. Disaster risk reduction is an investment with an increasing potential for high rates of return.¹⁴⁰

Science and technology

100. Stakeholders identified that science and technology contribute to improving understanding of hazards and risk, and provide new insights and methods for reducing risk. It was noted, however, that policies and programmes for disaster risk reduction were not always based on science. The importance of bringing scientific and technology discoveries to the local level was identified for consideration in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.¹⁴¹

101. Science and technology are required for disaster risk reduction in three main areas: to develop, communicate, transfer, prove and mainstream methods to reduce risk; to

support education, research and innovation; and to build the evidence base needed to inform and persuade decision-makers and the public to undertake disaster risk reduction measures.¹⁴² Recommendations included promoting regular and closer interaction between scientists and policy- and decision-makers at local and national levels, improving the transformation of scientific knowledge for public use and capacity building, and promoting stronger scientific and technical capacity to support policy making and programmes. Initiatives such as the Global Framework for Climate Services can help anchor a post-2015 framework in an applied approach to science.¹⁴³ Enhancing risk knowledge should be a key element of an effort to improve the integration of the scientific community in a post-2015 framework.

Equity and inclusivity

102. Disasters undermine people's personal safety and security, as well as economic and social rights including a standard of living adequate for health, wellbeing and education. To effectively reduce disaster risk, governments require the collaboration of all sectors of society, as all members of society can both increase and decrease risk through their behaviour. Yet all members of society do not enjoy equal opportunity to reduce their risk and some are marginalized into situations of increased risk. Poverty, gender, age, disability and ethnicity are often the factors that exclude people from reducing their risk and thus protecting their rights. Disasters also reinforce, perpetuate, and increase inequalities.¹⁴⁴ The principle of equity and the legal imperative to protect human rights has led to the call by some for a rights-based approach.¹⁴⁵

103. Protecting all of society from disaster risk requires addressing the risks faced by each of its members, which in turn requires all members of society to participate. The principle of inclusivity in implementing disaster risk reduction is thus closely related to that of equity. Women, poor men and women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, the infirm, indigenous people and others that may be marginalized must understand the risks they face to take action to reduce them. Disaster risk reduction and development policies that do not reflect the realities and priorities of the communities that will need to implement them are generally unsuccessful.

104. To enable disaster risk reduction measures to succeed, continuous engagement of all stakeholders, including people whose livelihoods are at risk, is the best starting point of disaster risk reduction efforts.¹⁴⁶ Community-based disaster risk reduction has been identified as a low-cost/high-impact investment that can save lives and assets. Supporting these types of programmes ensures that the poorest, most vulnerable and marginalized communities understand the practical actions required to protect themselves in a disaster and, in the long term, build resilience.¹⁴⁷ Taking a whole-of-society approach to disaster risk reduction is not only fair but a prerequisite for effectiveness.

105. Stakeholders emphasized that a post-2015 framework would need to reiterate the importance of engaging all civil society including farmers, trade unions, local authorities, business and industry and the scientific community, along with government and parliament in the reduction of disaster risks.¹⁴⁸ Throughout the consultation, children and youth and persons with disabilities in particular identified themselves as strong independent stakeholder groups wishing to be included in disaster risk reduction planning and implementation of a post-2015 framework.¹⁴⁹

106. A post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction will need to include gender equality measures and women's empowerment particularly in areas of risk assessments and communication of risk, planning and programming, and the monitoring of progress through disaggregated data and gender analysis. The allocation of resources will be important for

gender analysis to be part of policy development, programmes for disaster risk reduction, preparedness and reconstruction.¹⁵⁰

Developing guidelines, criteria and standards for good practices

107. Throughout the consultations there were strong calls for guidelines, standards and benchmarks to be established as part of the implementation of disaster risk reduction in a post-2015 framework. Main examples include the standardizing of risk assessments, loss accounting, land-use planning and zoning, and to establish up to date hazard informed building codes.

Simplification and practicality

108. A number of stakeholders indicated that the framework should be simpler, focus more on practical implementation and be supported by overall guidance and criteria for implementation.¹⁵¹ Most stated that a post-2015 framework needed to provide more concrete hands-on guidance for defining and prioritizing measures for disaster risk reduction. At the same time others warned that the framework needed to be open and flexible and indeed not too detailed.¹⁵²

Promotion of the framework

109. In general, the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action has been hampered by lack of knowledge of disaster risk reduction. To ensure the successful implementation of a post-2015 framework, greater focus on promotion, communication and awareness-raising will be necessary, particularly at the local level where these concepts should be owned by communities.¹⁵³ Many stakeholders urged for the language of the framework to be simple and accessible to everyone.¹⁵⁴

110. Furthermore a commonly agreed terminology around disaster risk reduction, climate change and sustainable development could be developed.¹⁵⁵ The concepts should also have a more positive connotation, for example “building resilience.”¹⁵⁶ A post-2015 framework should continue to promote the concept of resilience and seek its acceptance broadly and across disciplines.

Principles of the framework

111. Some stakeholders proposed that the principles for a post-2015 framework should improve accountability, transparency and governance. Hence monitoring and reporting, access to and dissemination of risk information, coordination and partnership formation among sectors, inclusivity, enhancement of local capacities and regional collaboration were identified as principles for a post-2015 framework.¹⁵⁷

Status of the framework

112. The expectation from most stakeholders is that a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction will remain a voluntary and legally nonbinding instrument. Some called for a post-2015 framework to be a binding international convention whose implementation is mandatory to ratifying parties, and ratification would become a requirement for international disaster risk reduction assistance.¹⁵⁸

United Nations cooperation and coordination

113. Countries are calling for the United Nations system capacity to support countries in disaster risk reduction to be strengthened, in particular at regional level and also at country level with the important role of United Nations resident coordinators being highlighted. There is also a call for strengthening regional cooperation, and in this regard the United Nations regional commissions and regional United Nations Development Group structures are important for supporting policy development in countries. The role of multilateral banks including regional development banks and the World Bank was also highlighted.

114. Consultations within the United Nations system have led to engagements for stronger commitment and accountability by United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes to integrate disaster risk reduction into their country development programmes and to adopt risk-based approaches to their relief and recovery programmes.¹⁵⁹ These commitments are reflected in the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience, which was endorsed by the Chief Executives Board in April 2013. Countries and partners continue to call on the United Nations system to strengthen its support on disaster risk reduction implementation and for UNISDR to continue to coordinate and monitor the United Nations system support for risk reduction efforts.¹⁶⁰

Secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)

115. Stakeholders identified the need for a strengthened role of UNISDR, and to increase its resources and visibility.¹⁶¹ They indicated the need for UNISDR to be the guardian of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Particular duties include to arrange for the monitoring and reporting on the implementation, including trends and patterns in disaster risk, loss and impact; support countries in monitoring loss and risk; facilitate learning, dissemination and exchange of information and lessons; and, to support development of risk-informed policies, including for local governments. UNISDR has also been requested to support the development of cooperation mechanisms, especially at the regional level, and to mobilize resources for developing countries, by closely engaging with donors and other financing institutions and mechanisms.

116. Requests were also made concerning support for the establishment and improving effectiveness of national and local risk governance, including national platforms.¹⁶² This includes emphasis in: enhancing coordination of multilateral organizations and strengthening coherence with disaster risk reduction objectives in their programs and policies; the development of risk management financing instruments; and the development of methodologies and standards for quality control of policies and programmes as well as for monitoring and reporting. UNISDR was also asked to continue carrying out advocacy initiatives to foster a culture of prevention, generate political momentum, and boost civil engagement.¹⁶³

Notes

In cases where they are available, weblinks to references have been uploaded on the website for the Third United Nations World Conference at <http://www.wcdrr.org>

¹ UNISDR, "Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)," Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

² See: "Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report," Bangkok, Thailand, 27 November 2013; Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, "Views From the Frontline, Recommendations for a post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework to strengthen the resilience of communities to all hazards," 2013.

³ See: Paraguay, "National Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction held in Paraguay," Asuncion, Paraguay, 3 April 2014; and Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), "Draft report of the meeting of the High Level Working Group for Disaster Risk Reduction of the Union of South American Nations," Santiago, Chile, 9 April 2014.

⁴ See: "Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report," 27 November 2013; Lebanon, "National Consultation on Post-2015 Framework on DRR," Beirut, 4 June 2014; UNISDR, "Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)," and German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), "Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015."

⁵ See: "Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report," 27 November 2013; and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), "ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction," Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013.

⁶ Community Practitioners Platform for Resilience, "What Communities Want: Putting Community Resilience priorities on the Agenda for 2015," New York, United States of America, 2013.

⁷ See: German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), "Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015," Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; and Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), "Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale," Libreville, Gabon, 25 Octobre 2013.

⁸ UNISDR, "Survey on Living with Disabilities and Disasters, Key Findings," Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

⁹ See: Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), "ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction," Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013; and Senegal, "Consultation nationale sur le cadre d'action post-2015 pour la réduction des risques de catastrophes," Dakar, Senegal, September 2013.

¹⁰ See: Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), "Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale," Libreville, Gabon, 25 Octobre 2013; and United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Saving Lives Today and Tomorrow: Managing the Risk of Humanitarian Crises*, New York, United States of America, 2014

¹¹ See Sweden, as cited by the European Commission in minutes of the European Union consultation on post-2015 Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2), 16 December 2013, Brussels, Belgium; and National Platform Review Working Group members, "Findings of the Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction 2012-2013," Geneva, Switzerland, September 2013.

¹² See: African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, "Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," 25-26 November 2013, Nairobi, Kenya; and National Platform Review Working Group members, "Findings of the Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction 2012-2013," September 2013, Geneva, Switzerland.

¹³ African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, "Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," 25-26 November 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.

¹⁴ National Platform Review Working Group members, "Findings of the Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction 2012-2013," September 2013, Geneva, Switzerland.

¹⁵ See the work of the International Law Commission on "Protection of persons in the event of disasters," available at <http://legal.un.org/ilc/guide/6_3.htm>.

¹⁶ "Chair's Summary, Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Resilient People, Resilient Planet," Geneva, Switzerland, 23 May 2013.

¹⁷ See: German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), "Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015," Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; "Chair's Summary, Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Resilient People, Resilient Planet," Geneva, Switzerland, 23 May 2013; and UNISDR, "Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," Canberra, Australia, 27-28 June 2013.

¹⁸ "Chair's Summary, Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Resilient People, Resilient Planet," Geneva, Switzerland, 23 May 2013.

¹⁹ Federal Foreign Office of Germany, "Chair's Summary of the Conference on Preparedness," Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013.

²⁰ UNISDR, "Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," Canberra, Australia, 27-28 June 2013.

²¹ Kellet, J. and Caravani, "Financing Disaster Risk Reduction: A 20 year story of international aid," London, United Kingdom, September 2013.

²² See examples from the 2011-2013 National Hyogo Framework for Action Progress Reports from Pakistan and the British Virgin Islands available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>>.

²³ See: Romania, 2009-2011 National Hyogo Framework for Action Progress Report; Italy, 2011-2013 National Hyogo Framework for Action Progress Report; Italy, 2011-2013 National Hyogo Framework for Action Progress Report; and Nepal, 2011-2013 National Hyogo Framework for Action Progress Report.

²⁴ African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, "Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," 25-26 November 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.

²⁵ Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), "ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction," Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013.

²⁶ Orihuela, J.C. "Understanding Existing Methodologies for Allocating and Tracking DRR Resources in 6 Countries in the Americas: (Colombia), Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama and Peru," Geneva, Switzerland, 2012.

²⁷ UNISDR, "Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action - Summary of Reports 2007-2013," Geneva, Switzerland, 2013.

²⁸ Pakistan, 2011-2013 National Hyogo Framework for Action Progress Report.

²⁹ Gordon, M. "Exploring Existing Methodologies for Allocating and Tracking Disaster Risk Reduction in National Public Investment," Geneva, Switzerland, 2013.

³⁰ African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, "Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," 25-26 November 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.

³¹ Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), "ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction," Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013.

³² NGO Voice, "Funding Disaster Risk Reduction," Brussels, Belgium, 2013.

³³ See: Central Asia and South Caucasus, "Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction," Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014; Federal Foreign Office of Germany, "Chair's Summary of the Conference on Preparedness," Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013; European Commission, "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience," Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR), "Fourth Annual Meeting: Final Outcome Document," Oslo, Norway, 25 September 2013; and African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, "Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction," 25-26 November 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.

³⁴ Central Asia and South Caucasus, "Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction," Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

³⁵ See: UNISDR, "Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)," Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), "Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Integration in HFA2, Key Area 2," Bangkok, Thailand, May 2014; Ranger, N. and Fisher, S., "Incorporating climate change and growth into the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction: A Policy Paper," London, United Kingdom, April 2013; ISDR Asia Partnership, "Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region's input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations," Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014; and Coppola, D. Bullock and Haddow, LLC, Asia Pacific Disaster Centre, "Integration

of Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Development in the Pacific: Informing the HFA2 process,” Washington, D.C., United States of America, 2013.

³⁶ African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 25-26 November 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.

³⁷ Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, “Statement of the joint meeting of the 2013 Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and Pacific Climate Change Roundtable,” Nadi, Fiji, 11 July 2013.

³⁸ See: “Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report,” Bangkok, Thailand, 27 November 2013, and Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, “Views From the Frontline, Recommendations for a post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework to strengthen the resilience of communities to all hazards,” 2013.

³⁹ See: EFDRR Working Group on Governance and Accountability, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May, 2014; and “Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report,” Bangkok, Thailand, 27 November 2013.

⁴⁰ “Chair’s Summary, Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Resilient People, Resilient Planet,” Geneva, Switzerland, 23 May 2013.

⁴¹ UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

⁴² ISDR Private Sector Advisory Group, “Statement of Commitment by the Private Sector for Disaster Prevention, Resilience and Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2011; and UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

⁴³ UNISDR, “Survey on Living with Disabilities and Disasters, Key Findings,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

⁴⁴ United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), “Discussion on the Post-2015 Development Framework on Natural Disaster Reduction: Disability Inclusion in both Policy and Operational Frameworks,” New York, 20 July 2013.

⁴⁵ See reference to Children’s Charter in UNISDR, “Proceedings of the Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Invest Today for a Safer Tomorrow,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013. See also: UNESCO Youth Forum: Youth Looking Beyond Disasters, “Christchurch Communiqué (12 December 2011), Sendai Communiqué” (19 August 2012), “Kobe Communiqué” (11 September 2013), and “Manila Communiqué” (6 April 2014); and International Federation of Medical Students Association “Consultation on HFA2 at the 2013 Global Platform,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013; Voices of Children from Tohoku, “Sharing our experiences to improve disaster risk reduction in the world,” Geneva, Switzerland, 19 May 2013.

⁴⁶ United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), *Disaster Risk Reduction in School Curricula: Case Studies from Thirty Countries*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2012.

⁴⁷ Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014.

⁴⁸ ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.2014.

⁴⁹ UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

⁵⁰ Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014.

⁵¹ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

⁵² See: UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; and Central Asia and South Caucasus,

“Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

⁵³ Canberra, Australia, “Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 28 June 2013; and Central Asia and South Caucasus, “Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

⁵⁴ See: European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; Canberra, Australia, “Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 28 June 2013; and (UNISDR), “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.

⁵⁵ United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience.

⁵⁶ See: United Nations System Influenza Coordination System Office (UNISIC), event report for workshop on “Towards A Safer World Network of Pandemic Preparedness Practitioners: Taking Stock of Achievements – Charting Future Directions,” June 2013; African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; Peru, “National Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Lima, Peru, 20 March 2014; and Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014.

⁵⁷ See: UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction online dialogue, and UNISDR, *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters – Mid Term Review*, Geneva, Switzerland, March 2011.

⁵⁸ Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014.

⁵⁹ See: African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; Peru, “National Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Lima, Peru, 20 March 2014; Federal Foreign Office of Germany, “Chair’s Summary of the Conference on Preparedness,” Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013; Coppola, D. Bullock and Haddow, LLC, Asia Pacific Disaster Centre, “Integration of Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Development in the Pacific: Informing the HFA2 process,” Washington, D.C., United States of America, 2013; European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; Canberra, Australia, “Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 28 June 2013; Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014; and Partnership for Ecosystems for Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), “PEDRR Input into Post-2015 Global Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

⁶⁰ See the Global Framework for Climate Services available at <<http://www.gfcs-climate.org/>>.

⁶¹ See: German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; and Italy and Turkey’s input in the paper by EFDRR Working Group on Local Level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May 2013.

⁶² See: Senegal, “Consultation nationale sur le cadre d’action post-2015 pour la réduction des risques de catastrophes,” Dakar, Senegal, September 2013; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and UNISDR, “Options for increasing the effectiveness of development assistance for disaster risk reduction under the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action,” Geneva, Switzerland, 13 September 2013; and German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013.

⁶³ See: German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; and “South East Europe Knowledge Management Workshop on Hyogo Framework for Action priority 3 (with special focus on children in disaster risk reduction): workshop report,” Budva, Montenegro, 3 October 2013.

⁶⁴ Canberra, Australia, ““Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 28 June 2013.

⁶⁵ “South East Europe Knowledge Management Workshop on Hyogo Framework for Action priority 3 (with special focus on children in disaster risk reduction): workshop report,” Budva, Montenegro, 3 October 2013.

⁶⁶ On this point, Croatia, Finland, Greece and Mexico are cited in UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013. See also “Report on Regional Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Americas,” Santiago, Chile, 28 November 2012; and European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR), “Fourth Annual Meeting: Final Outcome Document,” Oslo, Norway, 25 September 2013.

⁶⁷ See: UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; and Central Asia and South Caucuses, “Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

⁶⁸ See: African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014; Canberra, Australia, “Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 28 June 2013; “South East Europe Knowledge Management Workshop on Hyogo Framework for Action priority 3 (with special focus on children in disaster risk reduction): workshop report,” Budva, Montenegro, 3 October 2013.

⁶⁹ Central Asia and South Caucuses, “Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

⁷⁰ ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.2014; UNISDR Office for the Asia-Pacific, “Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report,” Bangkok, Thailand, 27 November 2013; European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; and UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

⁷¹ Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), “ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013.

⁷² Partnership for Ecosystems for Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), “PEDRR Input into Post-2015 Global Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

⁷³ Central Asia and South Caucuses, “Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

⁷⁴ African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013.

⁷⁵ UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013; “Global Platform High-Level Dialogue Communiqué,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013; and “Global Platform Children’s session on ‘The Resilient Future We Want,’” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013..

⁷⁶ The Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector is chaired by UNESCO with the involvement and active engagement of UNICEF, UNISDR, World Bank/GFDRR, Save the Children, Plan International, IFRC,

⁷⁷ See announcements from the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA) supporting national action on school safety:

<http://www.cdema.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=354:nemo-and-usaidofda-to-host-consultation-to-review-school-safety-document-for-st-vincent-and-the-grenadines-&catid=56:st-vincent-and-the-grenadines&Itemid=282> and

<http://www.cdema.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1266:10-bvi-schools-receive-safe-school-certification-from-ddm&catid=46:british-virgin-islands&Itemid=272>.

⁷⁸ See: ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.2014; ISDR Partners’ Meeting March, 2013; and UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

⁷⁹ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; ISDR Inter-Agency Group on Disaster Risk Reduction, “United Nations Consultations on HFA2 and the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction: Draft Summary of Discussion and Action Points,” Geneva, Switzerland, 4 March 2014; and ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.2014.

⁸⁰ UNISDR, “Towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Tackling Future Risks, Economic Losses and Exposure. Developing the Elements of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, 14 November 2013.

⁸¹ UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

⁸² See work by the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development 2005-2014 on education for disaster risk reduction available at < http://www.desd.org/efc/Education_for_Disaster.htm>.

⁸³ Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), “Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale,” Libreville, Gabon, 25 octobre 2013.

⁸⁴ World Health Organization, “Programme Budget 2012-2013: Performance Assessment Report,” Geneva, Switzerland, 12 May 2014.

⁸⁵ See: African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), “Report from the Disaster Risk Reduction Sub-regional Platform: Focus on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Frameworks and the Hyogo Framework for Action,” Gaborone, Botswana, 29 November 2013; Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), “ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013; Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), “Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale,” Libreville, Gabon, 25 octobre 2013; and Inter-parliamentary Union, “Towards Risk-Resilient Development: Taking into Consideration Demographic Trends and Natural Constraints,” Resolution adopted unanimously by the 130th IPU Assembly, Geneva, Switzerland, 20 March 2014; ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, *Financing the Resilient City: A demand-driven approach to development, disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation*, Bonn, Germany, June 2011; and . Climate and Development Knowledge Network, “Close to home: subnational strategies for climate compatible development,” April 2014.

⁸⁶ Partnership for Ecosystems for Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), “PEDRR Input into Post-2015 Global Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013; European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; and EFDRR Working Group on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction, “Working Paper: How Does Europe Link DRR and CCA?” Brussels, Belgium, September 2013.

⁸⁷ See: European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries,” Brussels, Belgium, 23 February 2009; Partnership for Ecosystems for Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), “PEDRR Input into Post-2015 Global Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013. Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), “ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013; and Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), “Report from the Disaster Risk Reduction Sub-regional Platform: Focus on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Frameworks and the Hyogo Framework for Action,” Gaborone, Botswana, 29 November 2013.

⁸⁸ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Agriculture: An Assessment of Progress Made Against the Hyogo Framework for Action: Input Paper Prepared for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015,” 23 January 2014.

⁸⁹ High Level Programmes Committee Senior Management Group on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience, meetings on the post-2015 Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Development Agendas, Geneva, Switzerland, March 2014 and New York, April 2014.

⁹⁰ Canberra, Australia, “Background Paper and Outcome Statement: Making Better Use of Disaster Risk Information: Lessons for a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” 28 June 2013.

⁹¹ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

⁹² Federal Foreign Office of Germany, “Chair’s Summary of the Conference on Preparedness,” Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013.

⁹³ See: European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries,” Brussels, Belgium, 23 February 2009; UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; Federal Foreign Office of Germany, “Chair’s Summary of the Conference on Preparedness,” Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013; and NGO Voice, “Funding Disaster Risk Reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, 2013.

⁹⁴ See: United Nations System Influenza Coordination System Office (UNISIC), event report for workshop on “Towards A Safer World Network of Pandemic Preparedness Practitioners: Taking Stock of Achievements – Charting Future Directions,” June 2013; and United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), *Saving Lives Today and Tomorrow: Managing the Risk of Humanitarian Crises*, New York, United States of America, 2014.

⁹⁵ See: African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; and ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.

⁹⁶ See: UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; Federal Foreign Office of Germany, “Chair’s Summary of the Conference on Preparedness,” Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013.

⁹⁷ See: Federal Foreign Office of Germany, “Chair’s Summary of the Conference on Preparedness,” Berlin, Germany, 11 June 2013; and Senegal, “Consultation nationale sur le cadre d’action post-2015 pour la réduction des risques de catastrophes,” Dakar, Senegal, September 2013.

⁹⁸ See: Senegal, “Consultation nationale sur le cadre d’action post-2015 pour la réduction des risques de catastrophes,” Dakar, Senegal, September 2013; Kroeker Maus, D. and J. Cornforth. 2014. “Analysis of proposals in the SDGs e-inventory related to the themes of the Seventh Session of the Open Working Group on SDGs,” London, United Kingdom, January 2014.

⁹⁹ See: All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI), *Addressing HFA2 – Building Community Resilience*, South Asia disaster.net, Issue No. 105, February 2014; and UNISDR, “Survey on Living with Disabilities and Disasters, Key Findings,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

¹⁰⁰ Partnership for Ecosystems for Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), “PEDRR Input into Post-2015 Global Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

¹⁰¹ United Nations System Influenza Coordination System Office (UNSIC), event report for workshop on “Towards A Safer World Network of Pandemic Preparedness Practitioners: Taking Stock of Achievements – Charting Future Directions,” June 2013.

¹⁰² Central Asia and South Caucasus, “Summary report on regional consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1-2 April 2014.

¹⁰³ International Recovery Platform, “Recommendations for Recovery and Reconstruction in Post-2015 Global Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary of Consultations, Kobe Japan, 2013.

¹⁰⁴ International Recovery Platform, “Role of Regional Organizations in Disaster Recovery Planning: Needs and Capacity Assessment and Blueprint for Future Action,” Kobe Japan, 2012.

¹⁰⁵ International Recovery Platform, “Recommendations for Recovery and Reconstruction in Post-2015 Global Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary of Consultations, Kobe Japan, 2013.

¹⁰⁶ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

¹⁰⁷ “Chair’s Summary, Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Resilient People, Resilient Planet,” Geneva, Switzerland, 23 May 2013.

¹⁰⁸ See: Overseas Development Institute (ODI), *Disaster Risk Management in Post-2015 Development Goals*, London, United Kingdom, April 2013; Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, “The Sendai Report: Managing Disaster Risks for a Resilient Future,” Washington, D.C., United States, 2012; World Bank, “World Reconstruction Conference: Proceedings,” Washington, D.C., United States, 2013; UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; ISDR Inter-Agency Group on Disaster Risk Reduction, “United Nations Consultations on HFA2 and the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction: Draft Summary of Discussion and Action Points,” Geneva, Switzerland, 4 March 2014; and UNDP in partnership with UNICEF, OXFAM, GFDRR, UNISDR and IFRC, “Disaster risk reduction makes development sustainable,” New York, United States of America, March 2014.

¹⁰⁸ UNISDR, “Coherence and mutual reinforcement between a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, Sustainable Development Goals and the Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC,” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2014; UN Water, “A Post-2015 Global Goal for Water: Synthesis of key findings and recommendations from UN,” New York, United States of America, 27 January 2014; High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, “A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development,” New York, United States of America, 2013; and High-level Meeting and Global Thematic Consultation, “Conflict, Violence And Disaster And The Post-2015 Development Agenda,” Helsinki, Finland, 2013.

¹¹⁰ See reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC): *Fourth Assessment Report. Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2007; *Fifth Assessment Report. Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*, Cambridge, United Kingdom, March 2014; and *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Adaptation: A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, United States, 2012.

¹¹¹ On this point, Niger and Vanuatu are cited in the UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013. See also “Summary Report: Post-HFA Mayors’ and Local Government Consultation,” Bonn, Germany, 14 May 2012.

¹¹² See: Sweden, “Summary of the Swedish National Post-HFA Consultation,” Stockholm, Sweden, 12 February 2013; German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC), “Input paper on Key Area 1: Building Community Resilience; for 2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2) from Asia-Pacific Region,” Bangkok, Thailand, May 2014; EFDRR Working Group on Local Level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May 2013; and UNISDR, “Towards the

Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Tackling Future Risks, Economic Losses and Exposure. Developing the Elements of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, 14 November 2013.

¹¹³ *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Adaptation: A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, United States, 2012.

¹¹⁴ European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014.

¹¹⁵ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ See: Peru, “National Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Lima, Peru, 20 March 2014, and Paraguay, “National Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. Held in Paraguay,” Asuncion, Paraguay, 3 April 2014.

¹¹⁸ See: Germany; Italy and Turkey in the paper by EFDRR Working Group on Local Level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May 2013; and UNISDR, “Proceedings of the Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction: Invest Today for a Safer Tomorrow, held in Geneva, Switzerland, 19-23 May 2013.”

¹¹⁹ Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), “Draft report of the meeting of the High Level Working Group for Disaster Risk Reduction of the Union of South American Nations,” Santiago, Chile, 9 April 2014.

¹²⁰ Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), “Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale,” Libreville, Gabon, 25 Octobre 2013; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and UNISDR, “Options for increasing the effectiveness of development assistance for disaster risk reduction under the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action,” Geneva, Switzerland, 13 September 2013; German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013. World Meteorological Organization (WMO), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), “High Level Meeting on National Drought Policy,” Geneva, Switzerland, March 2013..

¹²¹ See: European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; and Norway in the paper by EFDRR Working Group on Governance and Accountability, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May, 2014. ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014

¹²² International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC), “Input paper on Key Area 1: Building Community Resilience.

¹²³ See: China National Commission for Disaster Reduction, “Review and Prospects of Comprehensive Disaster Reduction in China for the Past 25 Years,” Beijing, China, May 2014; World Bank, World Development Report: Risk and Opportunity – Managing Risk for Development, Washington, D.C., United States of America, 2014; and World Economic Forum, *Global Risks 2014*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2014..

¹²⁴ See: European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries,” Brussels, Belgium, 23 February 2009; UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

¹²⁵ Ranger, N. and Fisher, S, “Incorporating climate change and growth into the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction: A Policy Paper,” London, United Kingdom, April 2013.

¹²⁶ See: UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; “Asia-Pacific Local Governments Regional Consultation on a Post-2015 Framework for DRR (HFA2): Summary Report,” Bangkok, Thailand, 27 November 2013.

¹²⁷ See: Inter-Agency Standing Committee Sub-Working Group on Preparedness, “Progress Report on Action Points from 77th IASC Working Group,” Geneva, Switzerland, 2012; Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and IASC, *Dare to Prepare: Taking Risk Seriously*, London, United Kingdom, 2013; and Oxfam and Christian Aid, “Disaster Targets and Indicators for the Post-2015 Development Framework,” London, United Kingdom, 25 March 2014.

¹²⁸ European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014.

¹²⁹ See: United Kingdom, “Peer Review Report 2013: Building resilience to disaster, Assessing the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015),” London, United Kingdom, 2013; African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; and European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014.

¹³⁰ UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

¹³¹ See: World Bank, *Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters*, Washington, D.C., United States, 2010; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); and UNISDR, “Options for increasing the effectiveness of development assistance for disaster risk reduction under the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action,” Geneva, Switzerland, 13 September 2013.

¹³² See: African Union and UNISDR Regional Office for Africa, “Summary Statement of the Africa Consultative Meeting, Developing an Africa Position for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Nairobi, Kenya, 25-26 November 2013; European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; Bosnia and Herzegovina in the paper by EFDRR Working Group on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction, “Working Paper: How Does Europe Link DRR and CCA?” Brussels, Belgium, September 2013; German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013; PricewaterhouseCoopers, “Working together to reduce disaster risk,” Geneva, Switzerland, 2013; United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) and UNISDR Office for the Asia-Pacific Office; *Asia – Pacific Disaster Report: Reducing Vulnerability and Exposure to Disasters*, Bangkok, Thailand, 2012; UNISDR Hyogo Liaison Office, “Private sector strengths applied: good practices in disaster risk reduction from Japan,” Kobe, Japan, 2013; UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013; and ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.

¹³³ UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

¹³⁴ See: PricewaterhouseCoopers, “Working together to reduce disaster risk,” Geneva, Switzerland, 2013; and UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

¹³⁵ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

¹³⁶ United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) and UNISDR Office for the Asia-Pacific Office; *Asia – Pacific Disaster Report: Reducing Vulnerability and Exposure to Disasters*, Bangkok, Thailand, 2012.

¹³⁷ UNISDR, *From Shared Risk to Shared Value – The Business Case for Disaster Risk Reduction, A Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013.

¹³⁸ European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; Ranger, N. and Fisher, S., “Incorporating climate change and growth into the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction: A Policy Paper,” London, United Kingdom, April 2013; ISDR Asia Partnership, “Asia-Pacific Input Document for HFA2: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters --A synthesis of the region’s input papers based on stakeholder papers and consultations,” Bangkok, Thailand, April 2014.2014.

¹³⁹ European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014.

¹⁴⁰ UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

¹⁴¹ UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013.

¹⁴² Basher, R., “Science and Technology for Disaster Risk Reduction: A review of application and coordination needs,” Geneva, Switzerland, 31 March 2013.

¹⁴³ See: ISDR Scientific and Technical Advisory Group, “Using science for disaster risk reduction: report of the ISDR scientific and technical advisory group,” Geneva, Switzerland, May 2013; and UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

¹⁴⁴ Inter-Agency Group on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Latin America and the Caribbean, “Post-2015 Gender Equality in the Future We Want,” Panama City, Panama, 2013.

¹⁴⁵ See: Peru, “National Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Lima, Peru, 20 March 2014; Senegal, “Consultation nationale sur le cadre d’action post-2015 pour la réduction des risques de catastrophes,” Dakar, Senegal, September 2013; United Kingdom, “Peer Review Report 2013: Building resilience to disaster, Assessing the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015),” London, United Kingdom, 2013; European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014; Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), “ECOWAS Regional Workshop on Information Sharing and Early Warning Coordination Mechanisms for Disaster Risk Reduction,” Niamey, Niger 11-14 November 2013; and Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), “Report from the Disaster Risk Reduction Sub-regional Platform: Focus on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Frameworks and the Hyogo Framework for Action,” Gaborone, Botswana, 29 November 2013.

¹⁴⁶ Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid, “10 years CORDAID Community managed DRR: The essence, results and way forward-,” The Hague, Netherlands, September 2013.

¹⁴⁷ Inter-Action; “Disaster Risk Reduction Policy Brief,” Washington, D.C., United States of America, January 2013.

¹⁴⁸ See: Inter-parliamentary Union, “Towards Risk-Resilient Development: Taking into Consideration Demographic Trends and Natural Constraints,” Resolution adopted unanimously by the 130th IPU Assembly, Geneva, Switzerland, 20 March 2014; Sweden, “Summary of the Swedish National Post-HFA Consultation,” Stockholm, Sweden, 12 February 2013; UNISDR, “Summary Report: Strategic Forum on Civil Society in the Post 2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Geneva, Switzerland, 14 February 2014; European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014.

¹⁴⁹ See: Voices of Children from Tohoku, “Sharing our experiences to improve disaster risk reduction in the world,” Geneva, Switzerland, 19 May 2013; UNISDR, “Survey on Living with Disabilities and Disasters, Key Findings,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013; “Chair’s Summary, Fourth Session of the Global Platform for

Disaster Risk Reduction: Resilient People, Resilient Planet,” Geneva, Switzerland, 23 May 2013; and UNISDR, “Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2): Report from the 2013 Global Platform Consultations,” Geneva, Switzerland, October 2013.

¹⁵⁰ Duryog Nivaran, “Input paper on Key Area 4: Women as a force in resilience building; gender equality in disaster risk reduction: a report of the consultations in Asia-Pacific,” Bangkok, Thailand 2014.

¹⁵¹ See: UNISDR, “Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2),” Geneva, Switzerland, April 2013; German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV), “Recommendations of the Recommendations of the German Committee for Disaster Reduction (DKKV) for the new Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA2) beyond 2015,” Bonn, Germany, 22 October 2013, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and UNISDR, “Options for increasing the effectiveness of development assistance for disaster risk reduction under the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action,” Geneva, Switzerland, 13 September 2013, United Nations System Influenza Coordination System Office (UNISIC), event report for workshop on “Towards A Safer World Network of Pandemic Preparedness Practitioners: Taking Stock of Achievements – Charting Future Directions,” June 2013.

¹⁵² Sweden, “Summary of the Swedish National Post-HFA Consultation,” Stockholm, Sweden, 12 February 2013.

¹⁵³ See: Senegal, “Consultation nationale sur le cadre d’action post-2015 pour la réduction des risques de catastrophes,” Dakar, Senegal, September 2013; Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), “Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale,” Libreville, Gabon, 25 Octobre 2013; Coppola, D. Bullock and Haddow, LLC, Asia Pacific Disaster Centre, “Integration of Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Development in the Pacific: Informing the HFA2 process,” Washington, D.C., United States of America, 2013; and EFDRR Working Group on Governance and Accountability, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May, 2014.

¹⁵⁴ Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and UNISDR, “Options for increasing the effectiveness of development assistance for disaster risk reduction under the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action,” Geneva, Switzerland, 13 September 2013.

¹⁵⁵ Coppola, D. Bullock and Haddow, LLC, Asia Pacific Disaster Centre, “Integration of Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Development in the Pacific: Informing the HFA2 process,” Washington, D.C., United States of America, 2013.

¹⁵⁶ EFDRR Working Group on Governance and Accountability, “Local level implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: Recommendations for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,” Brussels, Belgium, May, 2014.

¹⁵⁷ European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience,” Brussels, Belgium, 8 April 2014.

¹⁵⁸ Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), “Rapport de la 2ème Session de la Plateforme Afrique Centrale pour la Réduction des Risques de Catastrophe en Afrique Centrale,” Libreville, Gabon, 25 Octobre 2013.

¹⁵⁹ High Level Programmes Committee Senior Management Group on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience, meetings on the post-2015 Disaster Risk Reduction and Sustainable Development Agendas, Geneva, Switzerland, March 2014 and New York, April 2014.

¹⁶⁰ See General Assembly resolution 68/211 and the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), “The future we want.”

¹⁶¹ See various country statements at the fourth session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, 19-23 May 2013 available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/globalplatform/2013/programme/statements>>.

¹⁶² National Platform Review Working Group members, “Findings of the Review of National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction 2012-2013,” Geneva, Switzerland, September 2013.

¹⁶³ See various country statements at the fourth session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, 19-23 May 2013 available at <<http://www.preventionweb.net/globalplatform/2013/programme/statements>>.