

#Post 2015

Framework for DRR

Preliminary Report on the first round of DKKV Post2015 Consultations (March 2013)



| A. Consultations and the existing Hyogo Framework for Action | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. What key elements do you think are missing in the consultation process?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation events with the private sector are very few - Unclear how exactly the decision-process with regard to the final document will look like (who decide in the end which of the various aspects mentioned in various consultation will be included) - Defined reference to UNFCCC/SDG-Post MDG (in terms of integration/delineation) |
| <p>2. What are the opportunities and challenges in the national consultation process?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involvement of operative bodies (red cross, fire brigades association). - “Amalgam” ministerial bodies such as German Working Group on water issues of the Federal States and the Federal Government (LAWA - http://www.lawa.de/About-LAWA.html). - Active national platform with a variety of different stakeholders (knowledge and expertise) - Finding one position/ agreeing on the same focus areas. - Stronger exchange between different countries and national consultation processes would be interesting. - Not very clear how the national recommendations and consultations really influence international HFA policies. |
| <p>3. What are the key successes (or achievements) in disaster risk reduction since implementation of the HFA in 2005 and</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening the international recognition of DRR and disaster management. - Strengthening the development of more systematic and pre-emptive approaches for DRR. - Strengthening the role of DRR stakeholders (in civil society as well as on governmental level). - Stakeholders recognized the importance of risk assessments, the role of educational and awareness raising campaigns for DRR. - Focus of various DM/DRR stakeholders to strengthen the preparedness for response capacities. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>what contributed to the successes?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing orientation towards prevention (but: the pendulum has partly swung too much away from humanitarian aid, and we need a balanced approach including “conventional” disaster relief). - Most progress in HFA - disaster mortality has decreased. - Substantial achievements have been made in developing national policy and legal frameworks. However, this progress does not always translate into effective disaster risk management. - Institutional arrangements for disaster risk management have evolved from traditional single-agency ‘civil protection/defense’ structures to multi-sector systems and platforms. However, finding appropriate institutional arrangements to ease the incorporation of disaster risk management into development planning and public investment remains a challenge. - Substantial progress has been reported on early warning. However more progress has been made on warning for major hazards than on developing relevant local systems and communicating early warning through appropriate channels. - The climate debate and the increased frequency and intensity of hazards and the high economic losses in the past years raised awareness and therefore contributed to the achievements in DRR. - Topic of DRR was intensified in the academic/scientific discourse, progress in development of e.g. indicators and risk assessment tools. - Strong emphasis on the necessity to address vulnerability in order to create resilience. |
| <p>4. How do you view the post2015 development agenda (post MDGs) and proposed sustainable development goals as they relate to disasters?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRR and the post HFA process should not be seen as a process in isolation. DRR should be integrated into the post-HFA process with a standalone target on risk identification, mitigation and preparedness, underlined the importance for advocacy for the most vulnerable. - Strong connection with the post-2015 MDGs, especially to reduce the so far missing linkage with the “development community”. DRR is relatively well embedded/ranked in SDGs/Rio+20 priorities (backed by G20 decisions as well). Much better than in previous UN processes (WSSD, Agenda 21). The post-MDG and SDG process is important and the efforts should continue to support the integration of DRR. Maybe more jointly with CCA and conflict under a resilience (against shocks) banner. Since conflict and disaster are already grouped together in the post-MDG thematic consultations. However, we should be aware that many, many other areas are trying to get their footprint into the post-MDG process (expectation management). - DRR should be integrated more prominent into other goals (especially regarding water, health and livelihood) and it should be recognized to contribute significantly to resilience, the reduction of disaster risks and CCA. - “Window of opportunity” in 2015 to strengthen the role of DRR in international negotiation paths. - DRR and commitment to HFA is highlighted as urgent topic in the outcome paper of the UN General Assembly “The future we want” (2012 Rio+20 Summit). DRR is seen as an important factor in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MDGs follow the old development paradigm, limited acknowledgement of DRR. - MDG and sustainable development goals /discourses would benefit from the notion of resilience (disasters and crises are often part of development processes / and hence, cannot be totally avoided - therefore learning and innovation in crises is key). |
| B. Identified substantial issues in the Mid Term Review and outcomes of early consultations. | |
| <p>1. Emphasis has been placed on the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors? Has this been successful? Can you provide examples?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The progress on the integration or mainstreaming of DRR into development planning and sectors has been slow. - Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD), Risk Maps, however, the definition and understanding of vulnerability in this directive is very limited/ fragmented; other policies – e.g. structural funds still do not sufficiently consider DRR and CCA. - Other “tools” for DRR oriented development planning will be available by the end of this year (2013), the implementation until 2015 may be difficult, but progress is visible. - Mainstreaming is important but as the Global Assessment Report found out, least progress has been achieved in area 4 (reducing the underlying risk factors), which is directly linked to mainstreaming. Finding appropriate institutional arrangements to ease the incorporation of disaster risk management into development planning and public investment remains a challenge -> risk governance! It will be important to unpack pillar 4 in the post-HFA. - All bi-lateral technical cooperation projects have to be assessed according to climate risk (which often includes disaster risks). If in the so-called “climate proofing” these risks are considered as relevant measures need to be designed. - Mainstreaming of DRR on national and local level increased in the past years (e.g. Philippines: integrating of DRR into national framework -> DRRM Act 10121, Problems: effectiveness on local level; DRR councils have been established in many communities but efficiency is doubted due to lack of financial issues and lack of trained staff) - Connection of DRR/CCA in projects on local level is increasing. - DRR is often not sufficiently acknowledged in development strategies and funding. - DRR and CCA have also to be integrated in reconstruction policies after disasters. |
| <p>2. What progress has your government made in linking disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central government approaches (KOMPASS of the German Environmental Protection Agency, UBA) has been difficult to be reconciled with the federal governance structure (as an integrative approach of climate adaptation); - Successful bottom-up initiatives of cities, regions, etc. as well as large-scale scientific efforts (KLIMZUG, KLIMZWEI) have progressed. - The BMU published (Nov. 2012) the Adaption Action Plan for the German Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change. This seems to be a sound basis with significant scientific input and knowledge sharing for future policy of the Federal Government in this field. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - German government has supported the development of the key Report of the IPCC Managing the risk of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. - Internal working group between different ministries/agencies involved in DRR and CCA established. - In the so called ESUEH-Strategy of the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development says: “With a view to limiting the negative impact of climate change, disaster risk management strategies are modified where required to include other climate adaptation measures. “ -> adaptation of DRR approaches e.g. “climate-proofing”. |
| <p>3. Can you identify the good practices in your country in land use planning? How much risk assessment is taken into account in urban planning in your country?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD implementation, diverse bottom-up initiatives (NRW). - The only reasonable unified approach to risk assessment is in flood protection, which is part of land use planning (assessing vulnerability towards floods in the areas of critical infrastructure, general public and agriculture/environment in Germany). Most other risks are not assessed systematically, and specifically not part of land use planning, even if codes (wind, earthquake) are implemented. The process of European risk assessment is anticipated but moving very slowly. - E.g. regional planning and urban planning in Cologne takes risk management quite serious (e.g. flood proving; scenarios for flooding are considered in the regional development plan that provides boundary conditions for urban planning at the local level). - Urban heat island effects are discussed and acknowledged in urban planning, e.g. in Stuttgart or Frankfurt city. - The academy of Spatial Planning has developed guidelines on how to integrate DRR into urban and regional planning. |
| <p>4. What has been done in making schools and hospitals resilient to disasters in your country? How were the actions carried out?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For new construction code regulations are taken into account which includes ranking schools and hospitals in the highest importance class (for instance regarding earthquakes). However, as codes apply to buildings that are built after code became effective many older structures are neglected. There is no systematic assessment program of safety of schools and hospitals. In case of hospitals it is not only the structural safety that needs to be considered but also the supply with basic operational needs such as power, communication, medication, and the accessibility under adverse conditions. The fire safety is usually handled well. |
| <p>C. Important elements for the future of disaster risk reduction.</p> | |
| <p>1. What is the approach that has made progress on reducing disaster risk?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connection of vulnerability and capacity assessments on local level. - Identification of small scale mitigation activities and a special focus to preparedness for response with a strong link to early warning. - Integrating already observed changes of weather extremes and addressing future climate change risks. - Cooperation between civil society stakeholders with governmental agencies (agriculture, water, health and education) on |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>local and regional level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference (in terms of both integration and delineation!) to Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will be the path to progress. Risk governance is the key to mitigate disaster risk, and will become ever more important (compared to relief and infrastructures). - The HFA mid-term review and the GAR provide excellent analysis. - Participatory, inclusive approaches (gender, elderly, people with disabilities, children) became more relevant, integration of local knowledge enhances, knowledge about the dominant risk profile essential in reducing risks. - Disaster Risk Reduction activities on the local level with local stakeholder participation are most promising; they need central government approval and support, but the definition of needs and the implementation must be local. - ICLEI shows how DRR, specifically in view of climate change can be spread to many smaller cities and communities, who have little own capacity in developing strategies and concepts, but are able to capitalize on experience made elsewhere. |
| <p>2. How would you incorporate more accountability in disaster risk reduction?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updating and strengthening of the indicators of the HFA - Improve the reporting and monitoring mechanism - Proper verification of the self-assessments in a more formal way (including outside verifications on a regular basis) and targets with outcome oriented indicators/ results should be developed since so far the indicators are based on processes Clear targets should lead to greater accountability and transparency. Reporting on national spending and availability of resources at local level should be included. The self-reporting mechanism should at least be strengthened by peer reviews. - Integrating/Delineating (in terms of clear definitions) the tracking systems for UNISDR and UNFCCC and Post-2015 UN Development Agenda - Set-up systems to measure disaster losses. This will help in high quality DRR planning and to focus more on the extensive risks that according to the views from the frontline is the most common risk pattern in many countries and that affects many more poor and marginalized people. Their losses remain invisible as these every-day disasters remain invisible. - Stronger monitoring and cooperation between different agencies and initiatives for the development of risk and vulnerability indicators - At present ISDR seems to promote mainly one approach (DesInventar) that is not really applicable to Europe) |
| <p>3. What are the top three significant elements that should be addressed in a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduc-</p> | <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More intensive support to DRR initiatives on local level (especially in fragile context) with a resilience lens and linkage of local DRR stakeholders with district and national wide stakeholders and integration of national DRR policies into local DRR policies. - Increase funding for DRR, provision of staffing, training and technical support. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <p>tion?</p> | <p>Linking/ Mainstreaming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linkage of DRR with the post 2015 development agenda and mainstreaming of DRR into development goals on agriculture, health, water and sanitation, food security, education and underlining the importance of DRR for successful CCA and linkage with the UNFCCC process. - Improved linkages between local and national DRR and CCA programs and strategies (e.g. NAPAs and DRR) Linking of CCA/MDGs-SDGs to DRR goals/tools/resources - Data and knowledge sharing in the EU/globally - Mainstreaming DRR in other policies such as climate change adaptation, water resource securitization, city development, agriculture development, land use, etc. - Incorporation of the private sector (also as a driver of risk); development in cities is frequently dominated by private investment and easily overrules existing plans. The fairly large role DRR started to play in the World Economic Forum is encouraging. - Acknowledge that no sustainable development is possible without recognizing the issues linked to risk. - Communication and Risks Risk communication standards - Principles of Uncertainty Communication - Identifying risks / completing gender-differentiated risk assessment at sub-national and local level, in developing public awareness strategies, in addressing the underlying risk drivers and considering risks in public and private investment planning. <p>Development of DRR policy as an economic opportunity for creating favorable and more competitive conditions for living and investing; shifting the question from how much can be saved by DRR to how much can be won by DRR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk governance - Joint initiatives for risk and vulnerability monitoring in the context of extreme events and climate change (linking DRR and CCA) <p>Evaluation of past risk reduction strategies (e.g. effectiveness of early warning systems)</p> |
|--------------|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>4. What kind of post-2015 framework would you like to see?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRR as an essential key for successful CCA and as part of development. It should target the integration of disaster and climate risks and try to break down the separated pillars. - Community based DRR as an important factor for resilience and the basis for district and national wide risk management - Stronger focus on the most vulnerable - Stronger focus on changing risks and future climate change risks - Accountability and reporting based on outcome-based results , improved indicators and formal verification instead of self-assessments - Increased funding, training and technical support - Coordinated framework of UNISDR/UNFCCC and Rio+20 (integration or defined delineation, overcoming the current “definitional fog” and counter-productive duplications and interactions (for example: ODA additionality in UNFCCC) - It should set a clear policy framework combined with a target oriented, simple but smart business or action plan. - In general it should follow a multi-hazard risk view that to some extent includes conflict settings as well. It should equally focus on intensive and extensive risks and target all levels – national, district, local, focuses on the vulnerable and recommit governments and private sector to integrate DRR in all their public and private investment plans. - Emphasize importance of continued improvement of data base and scientific knowledge, with respect to research into hazard process as well as all aspects of risk management, particularly emphasis on root cause analysis. - Stronger involvement of universities and the acknowledgement of their role also in developing countries - Indication of the importance of governance for risk reduction. |
|---|--|

Please note: This document is reflecting the preliminary views of six members of the National Platform of Germany (DKKV) and cannot be considered as a final statement of DKKV for the Post2015 consultations. However, it provides a tendency and the main topics that DKKV is going to address in the final document, which will be prepared in the course of 2013.