



Review of the Zero Draft of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction¹

**Overseas Development Institute and,
Climate and Development Knowledge Network**

Contents

Introduction and Summary	1
The Preamble	4
The Organising logic.....	6
Progress monitoring and accountability.....	7
The interface with the SDGs	8
The interface with climate change.....	9
The interface with conflict	10
The interface with the environment.....	13
Vulnerability and inclusion.....	14
The interface with Resilience.....	15
Science and technology	16
Stakeholders and leadership.....	18
Finance.....	19
International Cooperation and Global Partnership	20

Introduction and Summary

On November the 17th and 18th, governments meet in Geneva to pore over the [latest draft](#) of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR). This meeting represents that last major

¹ We would like to recognise contributions from ODI and CDKN staff, including Tom Mitchell, Katie Peters, Emma Lovell, Aditya Bahadur, Elizabeth Carabine, Lindsey Jones, Virginie Le Masson, Catherine Simonet and Emily Wilkinson. Please send all correspondence to Tom Mitchell (t.mitchell@odi.org.uk)

gathering before the World Conference on DRR in Sendai, Japan in March 2015. As with the ‘pre-zero draft’, experts at ODI and CDKN have been analysing the draft text and making suggestions for where it needs to be improved.

In our [analysis](#) of the pre-zero draft, we identified some areas of promise, including the commitment to setting global DRR targets, the inclusion of environmental dimensions of disaster risk and the foregrounding of science and technology. We also identified major shortfalls, as expected of a pre-zero draft, including a fundamental confusion in how goals, targets, outcomes and priorities for action were linked and the absence of a serious discussion about the interface between DRR and poverty, growth, climate change and conflict.

The Co-Chairs outline how the preparation of the latest zero draft benefitted from a range of inputs from governments, major groups and others stakeholders, as well as from regional dialogues and other consultation meetings. Nonetheless, while the zero draft has advanced – particularly a stronger narrative around inclusion of vulnerable groups in DRR – it does not represent the leap forward that was needed and has even regressed in some areas.

Some of the fundamental criticisms made by ODI/CDKN and by a set of governments have not been addressed, including the introspective preamble that fails to place DRR in a development, climate and growth-oriented narrative and an organising structure that is still disjointed. The *Global Partnerships* section is narrowly construed, misses key actors and places far too much emphasis on the mandate of UNISDR. The interface with climate change, conflict and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is only treated fleetingly, and there is little practical guidance on the role of international and regional organisations. The list can go on.

A full set of comments is linked here. These draw on the ODI/CDKN ‘Guide to the Future DRR Framework’, which is released in its [second edition](#) in November 2014. This Guide offers government representatives and other stakeholders the opportunity to assess the evidence base on which our comments are made.

The 12 points below acts as a summary to the longer feedback provided here.

- 1. The Preamble** reflects a familiar and safe narrative around DRR. It should be recast to reiterate the centrality of DRR to sustainable development, poverty reduction, economic growth and climate action. Equally, it should draw stronger links with the SDGs, including by recognising the dependency that the post-2015 framework for DRR has on other policy processes to effectively address the drivers of disaster risk. The benefits DRR brings for security, investor confidence and economic growth, irrespective of whether a loss occurs, should be highlighted.
- 2. The organising structure** of the entire framework has seen improvement in the zero draft, but still lacks coherence. The four priorities for action do not directly relate to achieving the goal, the targets do not measure key aspects of the outcome – particularly the reduction of losses of assets, the fourth priority, around preparedness and relief, is not reflected in the language of the goal and the priority on investments in resilience runs of the risk of being the framework’s millstone. These concerns and others outlined in our full feedback encouraged us to develop a counter organising structure to help promote debate. Our two-page [graphical representation](#) of the post-2015 DRR framework tries to be more coherent, practical and results oriented, while incorporating a role for all stakeholders. It also draws direct links with the SDGs by including the DRR target under SDG Goal 1 as the headline.

3. **Progress monitoring and accountability:** The zero draft includes some key points on how the framework will be monitored but needs to go further in chalking out a clear plan to measure progress. This includes issues such as the importance of regional institutions in progress monitoring, the need to synchronise monitoring cycles between the SDGs and the post-2015 framework for DRR, the value of providing a basket of indicators from which countries can choose those most relevant to their circumstances, the importance of monitoring extensive risk and need for ‘normalising’ data for key variables to allow for comparisons between time periods. The headline targets clearly need more work.
4. **Interface with SDGs:** The zero draft mentions the process to forge the SDGs, but is woefully inadequate in outlining the manner in which these two highly overlapping frameworks will align. Subsequent drafts of the framework need to underline the links between finance mechanisms for both frameworks, the overlaps in science and data required to make progress on both, the importance of sharing and targets and indicators and the need for synchrony in monitoring cycles.
5. **On Climate Change:** Not much has changed since the pre-zero draft, with few concrete recommendations aside from overarching calls for greater mainstreaming of climate-related issues into planning processes. Improved emphasis on creating links with parallel Post-2015 frameworks on development and climate change, encouraging the uptake of climate information in long-term decision making, and strengthening adaptive capacity at all levels is needed. It also cannot ignore how even the most optimistic emissions trajectory will significantly alter the frequency and magnitude of many hazards.
6. **Conflict, fragility and insecurity** are not treated sufficiently, threatening the viability of achieving the five proposed global targets. This is a fundamental oversight as for many contexts conflict, fragility and insecurity are fundamental underlying drivers of (natural hazard-related disaster) risk and vulnerability. Until explicit recognition is given to the need to adequately tailor DRR approaches to such difficult contexts, of the need for different constellations of actors, and an appropriate level of ambition, contexts of conflict, fragility and insecurity will not be adequately supported to achieve progress in DRR.
7. There have been significant improvements in the **consideration of environment** in terms of emphasis on environmental impact assessments (EIA), sustainable development, environmental sciences, and ecosystem functions and services in reducing risk. Improvements should involve including more detailed ecosystem-based measures, recognition of community-based approaches and integration of EIA and risk assessment combined with strategic environmental assessment of plans and policies.
8. **Vulnerability and Inclusion:** The zero draft explicitly promotes the integration of a gender, age, disability and cultural perspective into DRR, and there is greater recognition of the need to tailor activities to the ‘needs of users, including social and cultural requirements’. Nevertheless, it still misses language and requirements that would help create/enforce stronger accountability for action on social inclusion and adequate attention to social vulnerability (including within the monitoring process).
9. **Finance** needs to be articulated more clearly across the priorities for action. The document lacks a strong financial orientation, mainly due to the absence of commitments at national and international level. Systematic inclusion of financial commitments and instruments at all scales and within each of the priority areas is required to support the implementation of an adequate system to finance action, particularly in countries most in need.

10. While the inclusion of positive text on the role of **science and technology** is very welcomed, the lack of detail on ways implementation can be scaled up must be addressed, and the somewhat bizarre references to the work of the UNISDR STAG and the work on terminology must be rethought.
11. **Stakeholders:** Non-government stakeholders are given higher priority in the zero draft but more is needed on the specific roles, responsibilities and incentives for state and non-state actors. There must be recognition that the state is not monolithic and local governments are often responsible for critical risk reduction activities. These roles should also be embedded in the priority areas and not just in a separate section.
12. The section on **international cooperation and global partnerships** is surprisingly thin on detail, failing to sufficiently cover the key roles of bilateral donors, multi-lateral development banks, UN agencies, regional bodies, the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery/World Bank, private sector bodies, city associations, parliaments and a new architecture for monitoring progress and guiding standards. Additionally, while it is difficult to contest the centrality of UNISDR in facilitating co-ordination efforts on the post-2015 framework for DRR, the current focus on UNISDR to the exclusion of other key international actors is entirely out of balance.

The Preamble

In a rather similar way to the pre-zero draft, The Preamble (points 1-10) charts a well-rehearsed narrative for the DRR community, seen time and again over the last decade: the Hyogo Framework for Action has helped to raise awareness, evidence says that the risk of dying from some hazards is going down; there are better opportunities for learning and sharing but ... risk is going up due to more vulnerable people in exposed areas and not enough attention has been given to tackling risk drivers linked to demographic change, weak governance, poverty and inequality, climate change, conflict etc. It points out that the 2015 policy processes – SDGs/climate – offer an opportunity for coherence and then ventures four priorities for action – understand risk, strengthen governance mechanisms, invest in social, cultural and environmental resilience, and enhance preparedness, response, recovery and reconstruction.

While the narrative is conceptually sound, it fails to sufficiently anchor DRR in the development processes that matter and neglects to make a strong case for why governments and other stakeholders should take action now to make DRR a core consideration in their poverty reduction, climate change, economic growth and wider development concerns. For example, disasters are increasing in frequency, posing a threat to economic growth, with the ability to devastate the economies of cities, states and countries. The Ebola crisis in West Africa is a timely reminder. In addition, as foregrounded by the SDGs, disasters pose a significant threat to the headline global target of achieving zero extreme poverty by 2030, as they can both keep people poor and impoverish those climbing away from extreme poverty. At the same time, DRR is a frontline defence against the growing impacts of climate change and accelerating climate extremes and is a critical element of preventing descents into violence and insecurity given how vulnerabilities that can trigger both disasters and conflict often intersect. To effectively tackle disaster risk, all investments in development and economic growth must seek to minimise the creation of new risks and reduce existing risks and DRR must be treated as a central pillar of resilience and sustainable development strategies at all scales.

We treat issues of coherence with the SDGs and the climate change agreement below, but the post-2015 DRR framework must be humble in recognising that alone it can do little to tackle the underlying risk drivers and should seek close partnerships with the more high profile and comprehensive agreements to achieve its aims.

At the moment, the word 'poverty' is only mentioned once in the preamble and only twice more in the rest of the document. Impoverishment is not discussed and 'inequality' just once. Growth, in the context of economic growth is mentioned just twice and only once in the Guiding Principles.

There are specific points that also need to be addressed, including:

In point 2, the zero draft reads 'there is growing evidence that reducing disaster risk is a cost effective investment in preventing future losses'. While spending on DRR makes good sense if a disaster happens, basing an argument around DRR investments only being good value if a disaster occurs has little traction with finance ministries strapped for cash, particularly in the context of hazards with a return period beyond electoral cycles. Instead, it is vital to point out that all investments should seek to minimise the creation of new risks and reduce existing risks, as this will help to minimise disaster losses should a disaster occur but also bring a range of short- and-medium term benefits, including confidence that a country or city is a safe place in which to live, invest and do business.

In point 3, the zero draft reads: 'Disasters are increasing in frequency and intensity, and those exacerbated by climate change are significantly impeding progress toward sustainable development'. Why do only those disaster exacerbated by climate change impede progress toward sustainable development? It is also very difficult to identify where climate change has played a role in a disaster, when science is just enabling us to have a view on whether climate change has influenced the probability of a hazard with a particular frequency or magnitude to occur. Additionally, not all disasters are increasing in frequency and intensity. We would recommend rewording this to draw on the IPCC SREX report in highlighting that 'climate change is already influencing the frequency and magnitude of some hazards in some regions and even the most optimistic projections of greenhouse gas emissions indicate that climate change will have a growing impact on the frequency and magnitude of hazards in the future'.

In point 4, there is no indication why the timeframe of 'at least the next 50 years' has been chosen. It would be appropriate to at least footnote a rationale for this. In addition, in point 11, the document goes on to suggest it covers a timeframe of 20 years. As we have continually argued, it makes sense to anchor the post-2015 Framework for DRR's reporting cycle and timespan to that of the SDGs given its dependency on countries making progress on the SDGs. Accordingly, the post-2015 Framework for DRR should likely run until 2030, meaning a 15 year timeframe.

In point 9, there is no mention of the World Humanitarian Summit. This would be an apt point to include it particularly as point 10 then highlights that the post-2015 Framework for DRR will cover preparedness, response, recovery and reconstruction.

We also do not understand why references are added to some statements but not others, particularly given that some of the figures and statements in the preamble are based on somewhat fragmented data sets. A more thorough approach to referencing would help the draft process by conveying confidence to governments and other stakeholders that all contextual statements are traceable to firm evidence.

The Organising logic

In our feedback on the pre-zero draft, we highlighted that the organising structure of the document was incoherent and confusing. This point was also made by a number of governments, including the Government of Japan. The zero draft has changed from the pre-zero draft, advancing the level of coherence, but there are still improvements to be made.

The zero draft includes an outcome: *The substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives, and in the social, economic and environmental assets of persons, communities and countries*. It has a set of five global targets to track progress against the outcome: reducing: (a) disaster deaths, (b) the number of people affected, (c) economic loss, (d) damages to schools and hospitals; and (e) increase the number of countries with DRR strategies. It also includes a goal: *The prevention of disaster risk creation, and the reduction of the existing disaster risk through economic, social, cultural and environmental measures which address exposure and vulnerability, and thus strengthen resilience*. And it includes four priorities for action: (1) understanding disaster risk, (2) strengthening governance and institutions to manage disaster risk, (3) investing in economic, social, cultural and environmental resilience, (4) enhancing preparedness for effective response and building back better in recovery and reconstruction. Each of these actions is divided into (i) national and local levels and (ii) global and regional levels.

There are a range of problems with this organising logic:

- The global targets do not comprehensively measure progress towards the outcome, and have a relatively poor fit with the goal. For example, the outcome talks about the ‘substantial reduction in social, economic and environmental assets of people and communities’, but just measuring deaths, number of people affected, aggregate economic losses and damages to school and hospitals does little to consider the change in assets of all kinds held by vulnerable people. For this reason, we would expect a target to focus on the asset mix of people before and after a disaster. In our recent publication on ‘Setting, Measuring and Monitoring DRR Targets’, we suggest a target based on tracking changes in poverty levels of those exposed to hazards.
- The four priorities for action (or the targets for that matter) do not directly relate to achieving the goal, which is focused on minimising risk creation and risk reduction by addressing exposure and vulnerability. While it is possible to spot some actions that do directly consider risk creation and risk reduction, others are jumbled or delinked.
- The third priority for action ‘investing in economic, social, cultural and environmental resilience’ risks being the silo in which all the tough ‘risk drivers’ type work needs to take place and will almost certainly suffer in the same way as thematic priority 4 on drivers of risk from the Hyogo Framework for Action. We recommend reorganising the structure to avoid this catch-all.
- It could be argued that the fourth priority (preparedness, relief, reconstruction ...) is not reflected in the goal at all.
- We do not see the value in ignoring the target agreed by the SDGs Open Working Group process, and for the purposes of coherence, believe it should be included as a high level target or outcome in the post-2015 framework for DRR. It reads: *By 2030 build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters*. While it focuses on poverty and those in vulnerable situations, it is broadly applicable and universal in nature. Other targets from the SDGs OWG zero draft are also relevant and should be carried into the post-2015 framework for DRR. Having two sets of similar outcomes, goals and targets is a recipe for confusion and a drain of monitoring resources, though this is the path that the zero draft sets us on.

- There is no mention of culture in the outcome, but it is included in the goal. Further the wording of priorities for action in point 10 and point 19 differs with respect to the wording of the 'preparedness priority'.

The organising logic of the post-2015 framework could be improved by adopting (and potentially adding to) the targets related to DRR already agreed through a comprehensive government-led process in the SDGs OWG draft document. It could also be improved by reverting to a formulation of a goal of the post-2015 framework for DRR that focuses on minimising the creation of new risks, reducing existing risks and dealing with residual risks (now expressed in the preparedness, relief, recovery priority for action). This formulation has already received the backing of a number of governments after we made the proposal following the pre-zero draft. This could naturally flow to three priorities for action – minimise the creation of new risks, reduce existing risks and managing residual risks through preparedness, relief, reconstruction etc. To do this successfully, stakeholders would need to understand risk and have the sufficient capacity to act on this understanding, promote inclusive risk governance and ensure the flow of resources to do the job. These cross cutting elements would be vital to achieving progress on three priorities for action.

We have taken this model and developed a [2-page summary](#) to show how it could be applied to different sectors in a fairly practical way and how these sectors could also develop targets to highlight progress in efforts to minimise new risks, reduce existing risks and manage residual risks. While not perfect or complete by any means, it does provide a clearer and more implementation-focused way of developing the structure of the post-2015 framework for DRR.

Progress monitoring and accountability

The Zero Draft includes some key points on the manner in which the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction will be monitored but needs to go further in chalking out a clear plan to measure the progress made by countries on disaster risk reduction.

- First, the Zero Draft calls for a “contribution to the development of international monitoring mechanisms, such as the HFA Monitor, that are intended to support and complement national and local monitoring systems” (26F).
- Second, the Zero Draft provides a greater role for the UNISDR in the monitoring and review of this framework through periodic progress reports on implementation (40G).
- Third, the Zero Draft also underlines the importance of country to country peer reviews as well as peer reviews between local governments (26E).
- Fourth, in line with ODI/CDKN’sⁱ suggestion the Zero Draft suggests a role for the High Level Political Forum for Sustainable Development in reviewing progress (40K).
- Fifth, one very positive development viz a viz monitoring in this draft is the highlighting of the need to establish baselines of disaster risk against which to measure progress (22A).

Overall, the draft demonstrates scant regard for a fuller explication of arrangements for monitoring progress. This is surprising because - unlike the pre-Zero Draft - this version does not highlight the role for regional organisations in monitoring; nor does it assert the importance of synchronizing reporting cycles of the post- Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, climate agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). As such, this draft marks a regression from the previous draft.

Substantial improvements are needed in subsequent drafts to ensure the robust monitoring of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

First, issues present in the pre-Zero Draft but subsequently removed from the Zero Draft need to be reinserted. For example, ODI/CDKNⁱⁱ have underlined the importance of regional institutions in monitoring as they can ensure regional cross comparisons and standardisation - a point that the pre-Zero Draft recognised. The importance of regional organisations needs to be recognised in section E. Similarly ODI and other stakeholders have also repeatedly stressed the importance synchronising the monitoring of progress on the SDGs, the 2015 Climate Agreement and the Post-2015 Disaster Risk Reduction Framework to ensure adequate cross learning and to reduce the transaction costs of monitoring three interrelated global frameworks on national and local governments. The Zero Draft only acknowledges the potential synergies between the monitoring mechanisms of these frameworks without going into a sufficient detail (see next section).

Second, subsequent drafts need to include significantly more detail on indicators and targets to monitor progress. Previously ODI/CDKNⁱⁱⁱ advocated for the adoption of a ‘basket of indicators’ from which countries can pick and choose those that would be of most relevance to their individual contexts. This proposal is still supported. The need for the UNSIDR to supply a basket of indicators can be added to point 40G.

Third, there still remains very little clarity on how often the monitoring will take place, who will compile the data and whether there will be any system for addressing poor progress. The details for this need to be included under Priority 2 or under ‘implementation and follow up’.

Fourth, while extensive risk is mentioned the current draft a more explicit push to monitor the reduction of this is needed. This need could be inserted in point 3 of the preamble.

Fifth, while the current draft mentions the need to establish baselines, it does not provide any clarity on how this should be done. Tracking progress on disaster losses also requires the normalisation of data for key variables to allow for comparisons between time periods and the establishment of a baseline to assess progress^{iv}, this must be adequately captured in subsequent drafts. This detail needs to be added to point 22A.

The interface with the SDGs

The Zero Draft includes mention of the process to forge the sustainable development goals currently underway but is woefully inadequate in outlining the manner in which these two highly overlapping frameworks will align.

Currently the Zero Draft mentions the process to forge the SDGs in the Preamble and argues that this provides a “unique opportunity to ensure coherence and alignment across policies, practices and partnerships for implementation,” (A9). It then briefly mentions the need for collaboration and alignment under Priority 2. The next mention of the Sustainable Development agenda is somewhat unclear. The Zero Draft states that international monitoring mechanisms such as the HFA monitor can be useful to monitoring progress on the SDGs, but does not provide sufficient detail on how this might happen. The SDG process is then recognised briefly under Priority 3 where the draft again underlines the need for coherence between the sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk reduction policies, plans and programs. The Zero Draft acknowledges the potential synergies in the monitoring mechanisms for the SDGs, the new climate framework and the Post-

2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction in the section on ‘Implementation and Follow Up’ (40G).

As such the Zero Draft does not go far enough in ensuring coherence between the SDG framework and the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. The critique outlined in the ODI/CDKN document ‘Ambitious or Coherent?’ remains valid.^v

Therefore, we feel that subsequent drafts of the framework still need to firstly, underline that there can be shared mechanisms to finance the frameworks (especially as the recent draft report from the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Finance calls for commitments to DRR Finance). Point 40F calls on international institutions to ensure optimum use of resources for DRR and could go a step further in clearly outlining the need for shared financial mechanisms between these frameworks.

Second, subsequent drafts should be more specific about the overlaps in the science and data needed for the future frameworks on DRR and sustainable development and outline the need for shared mechanisms to supply this. Point 22E highlights the importance of dialogue between different scientific communities and could include a clearer call for shared mechanisms between these frameworks.

Third, the latest set of draft SDGs contains numerous targets on risk and resilience but the Zero Draft does not demonstrate a cognizance of this development. Therefore, subsequent drafts need to go into much more detail on how the two frameworks will share targets and indicators to lock into each-other more tangibly. Point 40 G should be expanded to include this issue in subsequent drafts.

Finally, as mentioned in preceding sections, subsequent drafts also need to highlight the need for synchrony in the monitoring of the SDGs and the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction to ensure adequate cross learning and to reduce the transaction costs of monitoring for governments. This issues needs to be accommodated as a separate issue under point 40.

The interface with climate change

While it is reassuring to see that climate change is recognised as an impediment to sustainable development, the Zero Draft does little to inspire concerted action. Indeed, not much has changed since the pre-Zero Draft, with few concrete recommendations aside from overarching calls for greater mainstreaming of climate-related issues into planning processes.

The emphasis on supporting links between the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and other overlapping frameworks on sustainable development and climate change is warmly welcomed. However, a push to ‘ensure coherence and alignment across policies, practices and partnerships for implementation’ (point 9) can do little to drive forward progress without specific reference to potential entry points for action, and a more nuanced understanding of the roles, mandates and political economy factors shaping each. We suggest the following amendment to the text:

- ‘The concurrent post-2015 processes on sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk provide the international community with a unique opportunity to ensure coherence and alignment across policies, practices and partnerships for implementation. *In harmonising effective engagement and implementation, an Intergovernmental Preparatory Committee on coordination amongst Post-2015 frameworks on climate, development and*

disasters is to be initiated. Participating member will represent delegates from across the three frameworks.’ (point 9)

In addition, the Zero Draft is weak in recognising the implications that climate change is likely to have on long-term development objectives, and how changing risk profiles can be better integrated within efforts to promote disaster risk reduction on different timescales. Failure to do so can result in heightened risk of ‘lock-in’ or maladaptation (adaptation actions that increase vulnerability in the long-term). Strengthening communities’ capacity to adapt to change is therefore a key starting point, yet adaptation is given scant attention throughout. While the text pushes for actors to ‘adopt and implement national and local plans, across different timescales aimed at addressing short, medium and long term disaster risk’ (point 25B), greater recognition of the close links between disasters and climate (particularly on long-term time horizons) will be key to promoting robust decision making. It is here where science can play a key role, and the Zero Draft misses an opportunity to promote greater linkages and learning between the scientific communities of practice that concentrate on early warning and seasonal forecasts (typically associated with disaster risk reduction) and longer-term climate forecasts (typically associated with climate change adaptation). The following additional statements are proposed:

- *‘i) Promote the use and uptake of climate information in national and local plans, including the embedding of weather and seasonal forecasts as well as long-term climate information into decision making processes. Enhance national and local capacities to generate, understand and disseminate disaster-related scientific information to all stakeholders.’*
- *‘j) ‘Ensure that all long-lived infrastructural investments and long-term national and local development plans take future disaster risk profiles and climate information into account within decision making processes’ (point 25).*

Though the Zero Draft acts as useful starting point, it is still a long way off ensuring that the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction is effective in addressing the overlaps between disasters and climate. Greater focus should be placed on how higher-level objectives of mainstreaming and greater cross-sectoral coordination can be put into practice, and recognition for supporting adaptive capacity (the ability of people and communities to adapt to the changing risks they face) at all levels.

The interface with conflict

Conflict, fragility and insecurity are not treated sufficiently in the Zero Draft, threatening the viability of achieving the five global targets [point 13]. This is a fundamental oversight as - for many contexts - conflict, fragility and insecurity are fundamental underlying drivers of (natural hazard-related disaster) risk and vulnerability.^{vi} Until explicit recognition is given to the need to adequately tailor disaster risk reduction (DRR) approaches to such difficult contexts, of the need for different constellations of actors, and an appropriate level of ambition, contexts of conflict, fragility and insecurity will not be adequately supported to achieve progress in DRR.

The Zero Draft makes nominal reference to this issue:

- In the section on lessons learnt and gaps identified, the draft notes that, as a result of disasters, ‘The security of people, communities and countries may also be affected’ (point 3).
- In considering the need for more people-centred, preventative approaches to disasters the draft states that: ‘More dedicated action needs to be focused on tackling underlying risk drivers and compounding factors, such as demographic change, the consequences of poverty and inequality, weak governance, inadequate and non-risk informed policies, limited capacity especially at the

local level, poorly managed urban and rural development, declining ecosystems, climate change and variability, and conflict situations’ (point 5).

Treating conflict, fragility and insecurity as an add-on to a broader set of conditions in which vulnerability to disasters are complicating factor, or as a consequence of a disaster, shows scant regard for the added complexity enacting DRR in challenging contexts represents. For this reason, the comments made by ODI/CDKN in regards to fuller inclusion of these issues in the Pre-Zero Draft still stand.^{vii}

To its credit, the Zero Draft includes emphasis on strengthening governance and institutions for DRR; in regards to the effective and efficient management of disaster risk. However, greater recognition is needed of governance and institutions as critical determinants of the conditions of vulnerability – and weaknesses in governance as a contributor to underlying risk factors. The Zero Draft fails to recognise many populations vulnerable to natural disasters are situated in contexts where effective governance structures are not in place.

Systematic inclusion of conflict and fragility – as proposed by government and civil society stakeholders throughout the consultation and drafting process – is still required. Calls to this effect are outlined in: the most recent Africa Regional Platform, the Global Platform, and in statements received in the open-ended informal consultations from UK, Netherlands, Indonesia, Joint UN Statement^{viii}, UNDP, OCHA, Major Group Science and Technology, Major Group Children and Youth, WHO, French DRR working group, GNDR, and Oxfam.^{ix}

Suggestions to improve the Zero Draft (in chronological order):

- Insert in point 7. Cases requiring ‘special attention’ should include fragile and conflict affected contexts:
 - ‘Global, regional and transboundary cooperation remains pivotal in supporting States, local authorities, communities and businesses to reduce disaster risk. Existing mechanisms require further strengthening. Developing countries, in particular small island developing States, landlocked developing countries, least developed countries, {insert} *fragile and conflict affected contexts* and Africa need special attention and support through bilateral and multilateral channels for capacity building, financial and technical assistance, and technology transfer’.
- Insert in point 15E. In line with recognition in point 5, that conflict is a compounding factor for disaster risk, special provision for DRR in difficult contexts needs to be recognised:
 - ‘Disaster risk reduction requires an all-of-society engagement and empowerment, equality, and inclusive, accessible and non-discriminatory participation, paying special attention to at-risk groups in line with internationally agreed human rights. A gender, age, disability, {insert} *conflict sensitive* and cultural perspective should be integrated into disaster risk management’.
- Insert in point 15G. The adoption of conflict sensitive and Do No Harm approaches to the design and implementation of DRR measures are required to ensure investments in DRR do not inadvertently create or exacerbate tensions:
 - ‘While the drivers of risk may be local, national, transboundary or global in scope, disaster risks have local and specific characteristics which must be understood, given the differential capacities of countries and communities, for the determination of measures to reduce disaster risk. {insert} *Where relevant, the integration of conflict analysis and the adoption of conflict sensitive and Do No Harm approaches to the design and implementation of disaster risk reduction measures will be required’.*
- Insert in point 15L. The inclusion of fragile and conflict affected contexts to those requiring ‘special attention’ is recommended; because the processes, approaches and outcomes of

supporting DRR in fragile and conflict affected contexts will be markedly different to those in peaceful and stable societies:

- ‘Developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States, and landlocked developing countries, {insert} *fragile and conflict affected contexts* and Africa require specific support tailored to their needs and priorities’.
- Insert in point 22F. There is a need to advance our understanding of the compounding nature of different types of risk. Specifically, the relationship between disaster risk, conflict and fragility, in risk and vulnerability assessments:
 - ‘Enhance the scientific and technical work on disaster risk reduction through the mobilization of existing networks of scientific and research institutions at national, regional and international levels in order to strengthen the evidence base in support of the implementation and monitoring of this framework, promote scientific research into risk patterns and trends and the causes and effects of short and long-term disaster risk in society, {insert} *specifically, on the compounding nature of different types of risk including the relationship between disaster risk and conflict and fragility in risk and vulnerability assessments*, utilize available good practices and lessons learned, provide guidance on methodologies and standards for risk assessments, risk modelling and the use of data, identify research and technology gaps and set recommendations for research priority areas in disaster risk management, promote and support the availability and application of science to decision making, contribute and cooperate on the update of the 2009 Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction, and use post-disaster reviews as opportunities to learn and enhance public policy’.
- Insert in point 27. In support of resilience building, DRR efforts should seek – where appropriate - opportunities for co-benefits in peacebuilding and statebuilding, in order to support of a broader ambition to achieve resilience through risk-informed development progress:
 - ‘Investing in risk prevention and reduction through structural and non-structural measures is essential to enhance the economic, social, cultural resilience of persons, communities, countries and their assets as well as the environment. Such measures are cost-effective and instrumental to save lives and prevent and reduce losses. A continued integrated focus on key development areas, such as health, education, agriculture, water, ecosystem management, housing, cultural heritage, public awareness, financial and risk transfer mechanisms, is required. {Insert} *Opportunities for achieving co-benefits in disaster risk reduction as well as peacebuilding and statebuilding should be harnessed – where appropriate’.*
- Insert in point 31A. To the extent possible, pre-prepared plans need to be cognisant of the content they are being developed for, and where relevant, this includes integrating nuanced contextual analysis – including conflict analysis:
 - ‘Prepare or review and periodically update disaster preparedness and contingency plans and policies at all levels, with a particular focus on {insert} *integrating conflict analysis*, preventing and responding to possible displacement, and ensuring the participation of all sectors and stakeholder groups, including the most vulnerable, in the design and planning;’
- Insert in point 32B. More effort is required to understand how to best implement DRR in fragile and conflict affected contexts to ensure there are no inadvertent unintended (negative) consequences:
 - ‘Promote the further development of standards, codes and other guidance instruments to support preparedness and response {insert} *in ways which respond to context specificity - with emphasis on best practice for contexts affected by conflict and fragility -* and contribute to the lessons learned for policy practice and reconstruction programmes’.

- Insert in point 34C. Actively encourage civil society to support DRR measures to be implemented by vulnerable groups where state structures are not sufficient:
 - ‘Social groups, volunteers, civil society and faith-based organizations to engage with public institutions and business to, inter alia, provide specific knowledge and pragmatic guidance in the context of the development and implementation of normative frameworks, standards and plans for disaster risk reduction; engage in the implementation of local, national, regional and global plans and strategies, and their monitoring; contribute to and support public awareness and education on disaster risk; advocate for an inclusive and all-of-society disaster risk management which strengthen the synergies across groups {insert} *and, where state structures are not fully functioning or developed, the role of civil society to support vulnerable groups to implement disaster risk reduction – including in fragile and conflict affected contexts – will be required.*’
- Insert in point 34C. An additional sentence is needed to fully accommodate for the tailored support required for persons affected by the compounding impact of conflict and natural hazard related disasters:
 - {insert} *vi) persons living in contexts where disaster risk and vulnerability are compounded by conflict, fragility and insecurity, should receive tailored support and modalities to enact disaster risk reduction in ways appropriate to their context*’
- Insert in point 37. Equal attention should be given to fragile and conflict affected contexts as ‘special’ cases:
 - ‘Disaster-prone developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States, and landlocked developing countries, {insert} *fragile and conflict affected contexts* and Africa, warrant particular attention in the view of their higher vulnerability and risk levels, which often greatly exceed their capacity to respond to and recover from disasters. Such vulnerability urgently requires the strengthening of international cooperation and ensuring genuine and durable partnerships at the regional and international levels in order to support developing countries to implement this framework in accordance with their national priorities and needs’.
- Insert in point 40A. Cases requiring ‘special attention’ should include fragile and conflict affected contexts:
 - ‘Developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, {insert} *fragile and conflict affected contexts* and Africa require predictable, adequate, sustainable and coordinated international assistance, through bilateral and multilateral channels, for the development and strengthening of their capacities, including through financial and technical assistance, and technology transfer on mutually agreed terms’.

The interface with the environment

There have been significant improvements in the consideration of environment in the Zero Draft. The pre-Zero Draft had omitted reference to economic, social and environmental impact assessments in planning and implementation of projects, which is included in HFA. The Zero Draft has re-included consideration of economic, social and environmental impact assessments for strengthening public investments in critical facilities and infrastructures (Point 28.b). It would be a useful next step to recognise that disaster risk assessments and environmental impact assessments should be integrated processes. Strategic environmental assessment at the land-use policy development stage would also significantly improve identification and mitigation of environmental hazards. Suggested amendment to Point 28D:

- Give land-use policy development and implementation, including urban planning, informal and non-permanent housing, special attention due to their

direct impact on risk exposure, {insert} *promoting and taking into account strategic environmental assessments.*

Inclusion of environment as a consideration across three of the four priorities for action is a step towards recognising the cross-cutting nature of environment for disaster risk reduction. Inclusion of cultural resilience in priority for action 3 is also welcome, particularly as cultural and ecological systems are often closely interlinked. However, the priority for action 3 (point 27) 'Investing in economic, social, cultural, and environmental resilience' still could be expanded to include more detailed measures.

Emphasis on sustainable development (considering social, economic and environmental concerns simultaneously) and coherence across global institutions and national policy and legal frameworks with respect to DRR is welcome from an environmental management perspective, suggesting that the co-benefits of sustainable development should be realised. Similarly the recognition of the role of environmental sciences, alongside the range of other science and technology disciplines and traditional and local knowledge, is welcome.

Taking into account ecosystem functions and services to reduce disaster risk in risk assessment protocols is a step forward in recognising that sustainable environmental management can reduce disaster risk. A next step would be to recognise the important role of ecosystem-based approaches at the community level, which should be supported by national governments. Suggested amendment to Point 28K):

- Strengthen the sustainable use and management of ecosystems and implement integrated environmental and natural resource management approaches that incorporate disaster risk reduction, {insert} *particularly those that are community-based or community-led.*

Vulnerability and inclusion

The Zero Draft has improved in many respects from the pre-Zero Draft. In terms of the Guiding Principles, Point 15.e. successfully links the inclusion of all member of society, and the principles of equality and non-discrimination in accordance with international human right agreements. The Zero Draft explicitly promotes the integration of a gender, age, disability and cultural perspective into disaster risk reduction (which was one of the key recommendations of the ODI/CDKN^x responses to the pre-Zero Draft), and culture is now included within the 'investing in economic, social, cultural and environmental resilience' priority for action. Within the Guiding Principles, Point 15H has added the disaggregation of data according to sex, age and disability variables and included in the same principle the inclusion of traditional and indigenous knowledge. The Role of stakeholders (Section E) now explicitly recognises the contribution of the elderly as well as indigenous people, in addition to children and youth, women and people living with disabilities (as per the pre-Zero Draft). Within the 'Understanding disaster risk' priority for action, capacity is now recognised, as well as the need for traditional and local knowledge, and throughout there is greater recognition of the need to tailor activities to the 'needs of users, including social and cultural requirements' (Priority 4, 15B) (also a CDKN/ODI recommendation^{xi}), however the draft does not detail how this will be accounted for, and by whom.

In the Zero Draft, requirements to support the understanding of disaster risk (Section D, Priority 1, 22) does not mention the disaggregation of data according to sex/age/disability although this was the first point mentioned in the pre-Zero Draft under this section. Perhaps this is due to the mention of the need for gender-specific/sex/age/disability-disaggregated data for 'transparent risk-informed

decision-making' under the Guiding Principles, but it is worth reemphasising this requirement under the first Priority of action to ensure its uptake.

The Zero Draft still misses language and requirements that would help create/enforce stronger accountability for action on social inclusion and adequate attention to social vulnerability. It acknowledges the necessary contribution of different social groups but it is still not clear what and who will ensure that States allow, promote and build upon the participation of these groups in policy-making processes pertaining to disaster risk reduction. Section f of Priority 2 for instance, calls for the strengthening of 'cooperation and the contribution to the development of international monitoring mechanisms, such as the HFA Monitor' but this does not explain who is responsible for developing monitoring mechanisms, for undertaking the review and who will be accountable for achieving progress against targets. The monitoring process must also, 'incorporate a social vulnerability dimension in the design of the new set of indicators' (CDKN/ODI).^{xii}

We propose the following changes to the current text, shown below:

- Guiding principles, section E): 'A gender, age, disability, and cultural perspective {insert} *must be {insert} systematically integrated into disaster risk management*'.
- Section D., Priority 1, 22B): 'Systematically survey, record and publicly account for all disaster losses and the economic, social and health impacts {insert} *using gender/age/disability and cultural sensitive disaggregated data and perspectives*'.
- Section D. Priority 2, 25B): 'Adopt and implement national and local plans, across different timescales aimed at addressing short, medium and long term disaster risk, with targets, indicators and timeframes {insert} *that are attentive to social, economic, cultural and political vulnerability*'.
- Section D. Priority 2, 25: {Insert} *Governments must acknowledge the differential needs, vulnerabilities, expectations and existing capacities of all groups, and create an enabling environment for socially margined people and grassroots organisations to engage in and/or lead decision-making processes, disaster risk reduction programme design and implementation*'.

The interface with Resilience

The Zero Draft contains ample mention of 'resilience'. While, the difference between disaster risk reduction and resilience is still the matter of much conceptual debate, broadly there is agreement on the fact that resilience implies an engagement with a dynamic environment, a wider range of shocks and stresses and longer time horizons than DRR has historically embraced. Building resilience requires a range of actions such as learning, working across scales and employing approaches that break out of tight sectoral silos. The Zero Draft shows some signs of a more robust engagement with the concept of resilience.

First, the Zero Draft clearly acknowledges the myriad issues that combine in complex ways to enhance vulnerability and undermine resilience. These include factors such as demographic change, poverty and inequality, weak governance, poorly managed urban and rural development, environmental degradation, climate change and conflict. As such, it bodes well that this early draft the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction demonstrates an understanding of the manner in which the underlying causes of risk and consequently, the pathways of building resilience are non-linear, multi-dimensional and mutually reinforcing. Second, to be truly resilient, a community needs to be prepared for a variety of shocks and stresses from multiple and diverse sources that requires a range of strategies that cut across disciplinary boundaries. The Zero Draft recognises this by

highlighting the need for deploying ‘structural and non-structural’ measures that focus on economic, social and cultural aspects of building resilience by strengthening diverse sectors such as health, education, agriculture, water, ecosystem management, housing and cultural heritage. Third, learning is key to resilience as it allows systems to recover from a shock in a way that it is not vulnerable to the same disturbance in the same way again. The Zero Draft acknowledges the importance of learning in a number of different places including in Priority 1 (Understanding Disaster Risk), Priority 2 (Strengthening governance and institutions to manage disaster risk) and in the section on Implementation and Follow-up.

This said, there is scope for subsequent drafts of the framework to engage more thoroughly with resilience. For instance, stressing to a greater degree the importance of approaches to building DRR that are nested across scales of governance where local institutions for DRR are supported by subnational institutions which in turn are supported by a DRR architecture at the national level. This principle needs to be firmly enshrined as part of priority 2. Subsequent drafts could imbibe the principles of systems thinking more clearly by, for instance, mandating holistic risk assessments. In this way, while the current draft merely acknowledges the complex and interrelated underlying risk factors, subsequent drafts can start to present tangible ideas on how this can be addressed. Point 22 D would need only minor amendments to include this idea.

Science and technology

Overall, science and technology has been well represented in the Zero Draft but there is a lack of detail on how an enhanced approach for evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience can be implemented.

The emphasis on strengthening technical and scientific capacity (Point 22G) and investing in solutions-driven research (Point 22H) at national level to better understand disaster risk is welcome as these are areas that have been lacking in HFA and must be improved. Promoting dialogue and cooperation within countries’ science communities and between scientists, policymakers and business (Point 22E) is also a vital step forward and it is encouraging to see the range of scientific disciplines mentioned, as well as traditional and local knowledge (Point 22F). Now, there is an urgent need to describe how these aims can be achieved. We recommend endorsement of Science and Technology Engagement Partnership for Disaster Risk Reduction (referred to henceforth as STEP-4-DRR and discussed by the Science and Technology Major Group) for an enhanced approach for evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience.

Similarly, the strengthened consideration of science and technology in the priority for action 2 to strengthen governance and institutions to manage disaster risk is a significant improvement in the Zero Draft. We support the principles of sharing and cooperating on the development of science-based and common methodologies and standards (Point 23.a.) and mobilisation of existing networks of scientific and research institutions at all levels (Point 23.f.). Again, detail on how these important aims can be achieved is lacking. In line with the STEP-4-DRR approach, the following amendments to Point 40.b. are recommended:

- {insert} *Strengthen international partnership for enhanced* access to, and transfer of, environmentally sound technology, science and innovation as well as knowledge and information sharing through {insert} *revitalised* existing mechanisms, namely bilateral, regional and multilateral collaborative arrangements, including the United Nations and other relevant bodies.

There is increased emphasis on the important role of both private and public stakeholders, including the academia and research entities (Point 34B). Recognition of the full range of stakeholders, along with improved communication of disaster risk reduction (34B), is likely to strengthen the policy-science interface within countries and globally. However, concerted efforts will need to be made to mobilise stakeholder networks and engagement around science and technology. This is where STEP-4-DRR can fill a gap in the existing framework. We recommend amendment of Point 34B as follows:

- Academia and research entities to focus on the evolving nature of risk and scenarios in the medium and long terms, increase research for local application and support action by local communities and authorities, and {insert} *under the Science and Technology Engagement Partnerships for Disaster Risk Reduction (STEP-4-DRR) enhanced approach for evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience*, support the interface between policy and science for effective decision-making;

Given the lack of clarity on implementation of science and technology actions, a serious concern is omission of Point 18D of the pre-Zero Draft, which recommended specific measures for revitalising existing mechanisms for the generation of evidence and consideration of that evidence in policymaking around disaster risk reduction. While the support for approaches to achieve this is implicit in parts of the Zero Draft, as highlighted in the preceding paragraphs, it is strongly suggested that the text of Point 23F of the Zero Draft be amended to explicitly recognise the need for an enhanced approach for evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience:

- {insert} *Engage with international partnerships for evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience (STEP-4-DRR)*, to enhance the scientific and technical work on disaster risk reduction through the mobilization {insert} *and revitalisation* of existing networks of scientific and research institutions at national, regional and international levels in order to strengthen the evidence base in support of the implementation and monitoring of this framework ...

It is our view that explicit focus on the role of UNISDR Science and Technology Advisory Group (Point 40G) is a regressive step. By its own estimation, the STAG has neither the resources nor the track record. It is also an inappropriate body to advance partnership or engagement with national governments for evidence-based DRR or support independent progress monitoring of the post-2015 agreement on DRR given its association with UNISDR. Emphasis on specific activities e.g. updating the Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction, only serves to further highlight the omission of detail on how to strengthen the engagement and partnerships that are required for evidence-based DRR. The following amendment to Point 40G is recommended to reflect the demand from national governments and Science and Technology Major Groups for a new approach to evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience:

- The UNISDR, in particular, is requested to support the implementation, monitoring and review of this framework including through: ... facilitating the enhancement of {insert} *international partnerships for mobilizing science and technology work on disaster risk reduction and strengthening existing science mechanisms within the DRR framework, including a revised and transformed ISDR Scientific and Technology Advisory Group and the Institute for Risk and Disaster Reduction, under a new approach for evidence-based progress towards DRR and resilience through the Science and Technology Engagement Partnership for Disaster Risk Reduction (STEP-4-DRR); ...*

Stakeholders and leadership

The Zero Draft contains some improved language around stakeholders and leadership on disaster risk management, which is encouraging. Non-government stakeholders are given higher priority overall and identified as key actors in reducing risk. A role for MSMEs is highlighted, which is important, given that formal MSMSEs alone employ more than one-third of the population.^{xiii} However, the role identified for MSMEs is limited to integrating DRM into their business models and practices (point 34) and there is no suggestion of how small or large businesses could contribute to collective action that prevents risk creation. In fact there is less detail on role of private sector companies than in the pre-Zero Draft, which specified basing investment decisions on risk considerations, developing quality standards for DRM and advocating for DRM with customers.

The structure of each priority area has also been improved to include national and local, global and regional dimensions; instead of these being presented as separate spheres of action, as they were in the pre-zero draft. This allows for a more detailed consideration of relevant activities at each scale. However, the roles of different stakeholders vis-à-vis actions envisaged under each priority area are still vague. These roles should be embedded in the priority areas and not be outlined in a separate section. This would help to envisage relationships between stakeholders, as opposed to just presenting a list of stakeholder types and a few actions each might take.

The primary responsibility of the state is brought out more strongly in the Zero Draft (points 15 and 16) as well as the notion that reducing disaster risk must be consistent with respect for human rights. There is a tacit recognition that the state is not monolithic, and the need for leadership and empowerment of local authorities and communities is mentioned in the guiding principles and under *Priority 2: Strengthening governance and institutions to manage disaster risk*. However, the language of responsibility and accountability is not used for actors other than national government and clear roles for other state actors – like legislators - are not identified. This needs to be articulated more clearly if implementation is to be taken seriously. National systems *may* draw on support from regional and international scales (to varying degrees) but *necessarily* involve horizontal and vertical interaction across institutions within a country. At the moment, the balance of roles is skewed too much towards external actors.

A recognition that incentives for reducing risk -and avoiding risk creation- vary across stakeholder groups, could be brought out more clearly. There are clear reasons for public and private actors engaging in activities that create disaster risk and these ‘development trade-offs should be articulated as well as the need for more participatory processes through which levels of risk tolerance amongst different stakeholders can be established.

Specific language to be included in the next draft of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction includes:

- The ‘development of principles or minimum standards for action to reduce disaster risk for different stakeholder groups’ and even some language around encouraging transparency: ‘developing risk registers and encouraging local authorities and businesses to declare the exposure of their assets to hazards’.
- A ‘recognition of the responsibility that many local governments hold for protecting their citizens and for decisions regarding the location of infrastructure within their jurisdictions’ in the guiding principles.
- States should be encouraged to ‘development an enabling environment for businesses to act to reduce disaster risk’, including through the provision of incentives for resilience markets to develop.

Finance

Financing remains poorly articulated in the Zero Draft. The document lacks a strong financial orientation, mainly due to the absence of financial commitments and specific references to the financial tools that should be used within each of the priority areas for action. Although in some cases finance is more prominent, for example in Priority 3, the Zero Draft is vague in terms of financial resourcing, commitments and tools.

In some respects the Zero Draft has taken a step backwards in terms of the inclusion of finance. The pre-Zero Draft successfully highlights the need for ‘international cooperation, through predictable, sustainable and adequate means of implementation in finance...’ (Point 5 of the Preamble), however, the Zero-Draft has removed all mention within the Guiding Principles of the need for international cooperation on finance, or the means of implementation for doing so. In the same way, the pre-Zero Draft starts with a strong enough mention of the need for ‘Risk-informed investments and strengthened financial instruments are required at national and international levels’ (Point 5 of the Preamble), whereas within the Zero dDaft this has been revised: the text no longer includes the word ‘required’ and the need for strengthening financial instruments has been removed. We therefore propose a new point within Section C, Point 15, in order to address these shortfalls:

- {insert} *‘Strengthened public and private financial instruments are needed at the national and international level in order to ensure predictable, sustainable and adequate means of financing disaster risk reduction’.*

Greater emphasis has been given to financial means and instruments at the national and international level within Priority 3, in which governments have been tasked with allocating ‘resources at all levels of the administration for the development and the implementation of disaster risk management policies, plans, laws and regulations in all relevant sectors’ (Point 28, a); this is now showing as the first point under the national and local level, thereby demonstrating its importance. Financial and fiscal instruments are highlighted at the national level, as is the use and: ‘integration of disaster risk reduction considerations and measures in economic valuations, investment tracking, cost-benefit analyses, competitiveness strategies, investment decisions, debt ratings, risk analysis and growth forecasts, budgeting and accounting, and the determination of incentives’ (Point 28J); these points are extremely important and are a welcome addition in the Zero Draft. The Zero Draft now also promotes the need for greater cooperation with businesses and international financial institutions in order to develop and strengthen ‘financial, risk transfer and risk sharing mechanisms’ (Point 29B); this point would be further improved by providing specific examples of what kind of mechanisms could be used, such as insurance.

Although in the ‘International cooperation and global partnership’ section (F) there is a request that ‘adequate voluntary financial contributions should be provided to the United Nations Trust- Fund for Disaster Risk Reduction (Point 40H), the terminology is too weak, and it is likely that ‘voluntary’ contributions will not adequately cover all the financial requirements that are needed; there consequently needs to be a stronger commitment. In addition, we would still suggest that the UN Trust Fund is hardly representative of all the financial requirements that should surely be placed on international finance.

The document is crucially missing commitments and details on the implementation of a proper financing system which should define financial tools and mechanisms at all scales and within each of the priority areas (as tentatively done in Priority 3). We would therefore suggest two modifications under Priority 1 which would help to financially support the understanding of disaster risk:

New point in Priority 1 for the National and local levels:

- *‘Ensure the inclusion of specific and dedicated financial commitments to support risk-informed decision-making by guaranteeing adequate resource allocation to finance national institutions responsible for research, data collection, analysis and dissemination’ {insert}.*

Modification of Point 23F, for the Global and regional levels:

‘Enhance the scientific and technical work on disaster risk reduction {insert} supported by the mobilisation of financial resources and {insert} through the existing networks of scientific and research institutions at national, regional and international levels in order to...’

International Cooperation and Global Partnership

The sub-section focused on *implementation and follow-up* usefully follows a clear statement about dedicated support to countries most in need. However, the details that follow about the role of the international community in supporting implementation are very general and surprisingly thin. This is one of the weakest sections of the zero draft and clearly needs much more work, including specifying the role of bilateral donors, multi-lateral development banks, UN agencies, regional bodies, the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery/World Bank, private sector bodies, city associations, parliaments and a new architecture for monitoring progress and guiding standards. More detail is also required on practical links with the SDGs, Climate Change and World Humanitarian Summit process and a full description of the reporting and review modality is necessary to replace the vague 40k).

In order to address this shortfall, we have offered the candidate text in Annex I to highlight the importance of having a means of implementation section that specifies the role of each key stakeholder in DRR working across all scales.

Additionally, while it is difficult to contest the centrality of UNISDR in facilitating co-ordination efforts for the post-2015 framework for DRR, the current focus on UNISDR to the exclusion of other key international actors is entirely out of balance. Its mandate appears to be expanding from the list included in 40 g) and it is unclear where member states have called for such an expansion. Furthermore, UNISDR is a secretariat within the UN system with a limited ability to contribute to the work of the key UN groups, such as IASC or the United Nations Development Group and to influence the priorities of the UN Resident Coordinators. We would encourage member states to call for a more thorough review of the way the UN system, including UNISDR, can maximise the implementation and co-ordination of the post-2015 Framework for DRR. This may require strengthening UNISDR, reviewing financial allocations to DRR across the UN system and gaining further clarity on the way the UN system can work to support DRR at a country level.

Annex I: Post-2015 Agreement for Disaster Risk Reduction
Section: Means of Implementation [Partnership and Cooperation]

Authored on 24th July 2014

A. General Considerations

1. The implementation of the strategic goals and priorities for action set out in this [Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction] should involve multiple stakeholders, working in partnership across all sectors and levels, to achieve disaster resilience in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication.
2. Communities, civil society organisations, sub-national governments, national governments, businesses, the science and technology community, and regional and international organisations, are all called upon to strengthen disaster resilience as part of sustainable development policy, planning and programming at all levels and in a way that recognises the unique functions of stakeholders in an effective system for managing disaster risk.
3. While each State has primary responsibility for its own sustainable development, an enabling international environment is vital to stimulate and contribute to developing the knowledge, capacities and resources needed to tackle the underlying drivers of disaster risk and to build disaster resilient communities and nations. Accordingly, the implementation of the [Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction] should guide priorities, set standards, outline targets and indicators, establish reporting and oversight frameworks, develop protocols for sharing knowledge, guide approaches to governing risk across borders and deliver capacities to support national and sub-national level actors where necessary. This requires an enhanced global partnership for disaster resilience, in the context of existing and future international development, climate change and humanitarian policy frameworks.
4. The [Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction] has an important role to play in promoting policy coherence with the Sustainable Development Goals/Post-2015 Development Agenda, the 2015 international agreement on tackling climate change and the outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit in 2015. Wherever possible the [Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction] and the wide community involved in its implementation, should seek alignment, coherence and mutual support with other policy frameworks, with the combined goal of strengthening disaster resilience for sustainable development and poverty eradication. Coherence with the SDGs should take the following form:
 - i. Mechanisms to monitor the two frameworks could be harmonised. This should be achieved by ensuring that the periods of reporting for the two frameworks are synchronised. Coherence in reporting can also be ensured by using the High Level Political Forum as a platform to ensure alignment in the two frameworks. Moreover, an expanded version of the HFA Monitor can be deployed to also track progress on targets/indicators on risk and resilience in the SDGs.
 - ii. The two frameworks should share targets and indicators on risk and resilience. This should be achieved by ensuring that targets on risk and resilience in the SDGs become stated outcomes of the [Post-2015 Framework for DRR]. Also, output level indicators on ‘underlying risk areas’ in the [Post-2015 Framework for DRR] should be aligned with targets and indicators on risk and resilience in SDGs. Finally, certain targets in the SDGs could overlap with input level indicators in the [Post-2015 Framework for DRR].
 - iii. Approaches to mobilise resources to support the SDGs and the [Post-2015 Framework for DRR] should be aligned.
5. There should be enhanced international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity building in developing countries to support national and sub-national plans to implement disaster risk reduction in the context of sustainable development, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation. Such support should also include assistance to developing countries, including for LDCs and SIDS, to increase significantly the availability of high quality, timely and reliable data on disaster risks and disaster losses, disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics. This should build on existing initiatives to develop measures of progress on disaster risk reduction in the context of measuring sustainable development progress, supporting statistical capacity building, particularly in developing countries.

B. Communities

Communities and individuals are called upon to undertake the following tasks:

- a) Hold local government functionaries/elected representatives accountable for implementing the [post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction] through the design and delivery of contextually appropriate, local disaster risk reduction plans and policies.
- b) Advocate for and participate in forums established by national and subnational governments for soliciting community inputs in the design and implementation of DRR policies.
- c) Contribute contextual information, local perceptions of risk and indigenous knowledge to the design and implementation of local DRR plans.
- d) Actively track and assess the implementation of the local disaster resilience plans; advocate for and contribute to inclusive platforms/forums for monitoring progress made on achieving outcomes.
- e) Use ecosystem services sustainably so as to not exacerbate risks and vulnerability.
- f) Advocate for the allocation/mobilization of adequate financial resources for the effective implementation of local DRR plans.
- g) Ensure that the voices of the disadvantaged/marginalised sections of the community are heard in communications to government institutions on the design and implementation of local DRR plans.
- h) To the extent feasible, volunteer time and resources to support community level actions, programs and plans for DRR.

C. Civil Society Organisations

Although civil society is often equated with non-governmental organisations it includes a broad spectrum of formal organisations through to less formal citizen associations and coalitions. In lower-income countries and particularly fragile states, the majority of civil society associations tend to be informal and less organised than in higher income countries requiring different strategies of engagement. The diversity of northern and southern-based civil society actors means it is well-placed to fulfil a range of roles and responsibilities towards strengthening the resilience of nations and communities including:

- a) To be active partners in the implementation of the HFA2 by mainstreaming its tenets into their organisational remits and programs of work.
- b) Ensure that national governments are accountable for enhancing the resilience of all vulnerable sections of society through adequate preparedness and planning for diverse hazards.
- c) Ensure that the views of the most vulnerable sections of society inform official DRR plans and policies as well as any other policies that have a bearing on their risk profile.
- d) Support national governments in undertaking granular and up to date vulnerability and capacity assessments to inform official DRR plans and policies.
- e) Interpret scientific evidence and technical information to build capacity of actors charged with DRR (especially at the local level) so as to improve actions for achieving the outcomes of the HFA2.
- f) Reach out to sub-national and national institutions leading the implementation of the HFA2 with tested, innovative models and methodologies of DRR to inform official plans and policies.
- g) Help tailor/adapt national guidelines on DRR to local contexts to facilitate improved implementation by local institutions and enhance their impact.
- h) Engage and organise vulnerable communities and link them to institutions charged with implementing DRR policies to help achieve the outcomes of the HFA2
- i) Advocate for the allocation/mobilization of adequate financial resources for the effective implementation of the HFA2.
- j) Actively track/assess the implementation of the HFA2; advocate for and contribute to inclusive platforms/forums for monitoring progress made on achieving outcomes.

D. Sub-national governments, including local and municipal bodies

Sub-national governments, including local and municipal bodies, are called upon to undertake the following tasks within their mandates, priorities and resources:

- a) Embed disaster risk reduction into sub-national development strategies and plans, and ensure that risk management is mainstreamed across all relevant sectors, as well as promote the integration of disaster resilience into long-term sub-national development goals and visions;
- b) Support close alignment of national risk reduction targets with sub-national development strategies and plans, and ensure that local drivers of risk and specific capacities of local stakeholders are effectively addressed. Where centrally allocated resources are limited, seek local sources of revenue and consider the promotion of low-regrets low-cost risk reduction measures;
- c) Improve the level of scientific understanding and technical capacity in promoting disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation within sub-national development strategies and plans. Where relevant, seek local solutions, local expertise and engage in the co-production of knowledge to ensure that community priorities are embedded into sub-national plans and reflected in risk reduction measures;
- d) Enhance awareness and dissemination of information on disasters and climate change to local communities and relevant stakeholders, with an emphasis on presenting contextualised information in a format that is accessible and easily understood to a wide range of local users. Promote meaningful partnerships with relevant scientific and technical bodies, particularly with regards to early warning systems, climate forecasting and longer-term projections, and implementation of disaster risk reduction measures;
- e) Develop, use and periodically revise monitoring and evaluation tools for the assessment of progress in implementing disaster risk and climate adaptation measures in the context of sub-national strategies and plans, using community-driven and locally relevant indicators;

E. National Governments

National governments should endeavour to undertake the following tasks within the bounds of their financial, human and material capacities, taking into account domestic legal requirements and existing international instruments:

- (a) Recognise that science-based risk information is critical to sound decision-making, institutionalise the preparation and publication of national sectoral baseline assessments of disaster risk at the sub-national and local level. National governments should also prioritise periodically preparing and updating summaries of national programmes for DRR related activities;
- (b) Develop procedures for reviewing national progress including systems for cost benefit analysis and ongoing monitoring and assessment of vulnerability and risk. In particular with regards to regions exposed to hydro-meteorological and seismic hazards. Consider zoning laws seriously for urban settlements to reduce losses;
- (c) Not only designate an appropriate national coordination mechanism for the implementation and communicating progress to the secretariat of ISDR, but also establish a bottom up process for identifying needs at the local level. It may be desirable to encourage parliamentary oversight to mainstream local needs through the best political support system;
- (d) To communicate commitment, mark a percentage of national budget to DRR activities, recognising that it is vital to ensure all elements of the national budget are sensitive to risk.
- (e) Consider approving or ratifying relevant international legal instruments and take effective measures for implementation.
- (f) Promote the integration of risk reduction associated with existing climate variability and future climate scenarios to inform investment decisions.
- (g) Strengthen and reinforce existing and future DRR science programmes and initiatives for integrated research and the scientific assessment of disaster risk.

(h) Systematically record and account for all disaster loss and impact, periodically estimate the probability of disaster risks to the population and to economic and fiscal assets over multiple timescales. This should be undertaken in the context of changing social, economic and environmental conditions, including a changing climate, and convene national multi-stakeholder risk platforms and outlook fora to this aim;

(i) Ensure that national and local plans minimise the creation of new risk, particularly increasing exposure, reduce existing risk and strengthen resilience with clear targets and timeframes, and that indicators and mechanisms to monitor, periodically assess and report on progress are put in place. The formulation and implementation of such plans require the full engagement of all legislative and executive institutions, private stakeholders and clear oversight authority;

(j) Ensure the coherence of, and further develop as appropriate, national frameworks of public policies that, through defining roles and responsibilities:

(1) Guide the public sector in addressing disaster risk in publically owned, managed or regulated services and infrastructure, and in the environment;

(2) Regulate and provide incentives for actions by households, communities, businesses and individuals, particularly at the local level.

(k) Specific public policies are needed to address post-disaster recovery, reconstruction and displacement, as well as disaster risk in informal urban development and in disaster prone rural areas, such as drylands and drought-prone regions;

(l) Review existing financial and fiscal instruments, including for development cooperation, in order to support risk-sensitive public and private investments;

(m) Stimulate the development, together with the private sector and professional associations, of disaster risk management quality standards and mechanisms for compliance, including certification, in specific sectors, and the use of existing relevant standards, such as International Health Regulations;

F. Private Sector Organisations

Private sector organisations are called upon to undertake the following tasks:

(a) Incorporate disaster risk and resilience into public, private and mutual accounts, financial regulation, investment processes and transactions.

(b) Support a transition from response-oriented actions to risk-informed investments as part of the business process.

(c) Increase dialogue among all stakeholders to identify barriers and opportunities to build an enable environment for public-private and other partners.

(d) Encourage the development of regulations, incentives and tools to motivate improvement in disaster risk reduction by the private sector with an emphasis on micro, small and medium enterprises.

(e) Strengthen private sector commitments to integrate risk assessment and use of risk information in decision-making and practices, contributing to their business sustainability and resilience as well as of the environment in which they operate.

G. Regional Organisations and Institutions

Regional organisations are called upon to undertake the following tasks within their mandates, priorities and resources:

(a) Promote regional programmes for technical cooperation, capacity development, the development of methodologies and standards for hazard and vulnerability monitoring and risk assessments.

- (b) Promote regional and sub-regional mechanisms and capacities for early warning systems (including tsunami); and assist in damage and needs assessments;
- (c) Assess, monitor and work on preventative measures for trans-boundary hazards. Strengthen and promote the coordination of trans-boundary risk management and 'cooperation in the management of shared watersheds, deltas and mountain systems';
- (d) Establish/strengthen existing specialized regional collaborative centers so as to undertake research, training, education, knowledge exchange, technical assistance, and capacity building in the field of disaster risk reduction; this should ideally be 'demand led' with clear need and buy-in from national governments;
- (e) Support the development of national policy and practice, and help define regional and sub-regional DRR strategies, agreements, approaches and plans. Encourage budget tagging of DRR activities at the national level for improved decision making;
- (f) Compile, standardize and publish, as appropriate, statistical information (baselines, metrics and targets) and data on regional and sub-regional disaster risks, impact and losses. Carry out periodic reviews on progress in the region and use this to identify impediments and support needs;
- (g) Research, analyse and report on changes and emerging issues that might increase vulnerabilities and risks or the capacity of authorities and communities to respond to disasters. Assist countries, as requested, in the preparation of periodic national summaries of their programmes and progress; and facilitate cross regional sharing to benefit from collective learning.
- (h) Assist in piloting and developing strategic partnerships, synergies and initiatives between technical, economic and political stakeholders; Attempts should also be made to include the private sector;

H. International Organisations

Intergovernmental organizations of global and regional nature, including international financial institutions and the United Nations system, through its United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience, and the Red Cross and the Red Crescent Movement are called upon to:

- (a) Support countries and other stakeholders in the implementation of this framework, including the development of relevant sector policies and standards, monitoring mechanisms and the strengthening of capacities, in particular in least developed countries, small-island developing States, fragile and conflict affected countries, and landlocked developing countries.
- (b) Strengthen co-ordination between United Nations organisations, funds and specialised agencies, including the World Bank, to effectively support national governments and other stakeholders to promote disaster risk reduction for sustainable development and poverty reduction. Enhance support to the UN Resident Co-ordinator in their efforts to promote co-ordination and coherence on disaster risk reduction at national level in developing countries, including helping strengthen the capacities of national governments to implement disaster risk reduction with other stakeholders.
- (c) Establish clear strategies to maximise the synergies and minimise duplication and incoherence with major international policy frameworks, including the Sustainable Development Goals, the World Humanitarian Summit and the climate change agreement.
- (d) Strengthen the overall capacity of the United Nations system to assist developing countries in disaster risk reduction through appropriate means, including by fully implementing the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience. Such implementation should involve periodic, transparent reporting of progress by all engaged UN organisations, funds and specialised agencies, with annual progress meetings held with states.

- (e) Enhance the United Nations Office of Disaster Reduction in its role as facilitator of this framework, including through its inclusion in the UN Development Group. Such a move would further support the recognition of disaster risk reduction as a development priority and strengthen the coherence of the UN system on disaster risk reduction. The United Nations Office of Disaster Reduction will facilitate this framework through:
- a. Co-ordinating the preparation of periodic reports on progress in its implementation, including by drawing on multiple sources of information, such as reports of states and reports of other stakeholders and independent bodies.
 - b. Acting as a co-ordination hub for a group of organisations at international, regional and national levels to collect data and track progress against the DRR goals, targets and indicators established by this framework, in close alignment or complete integration with the process to track progress on targets in the sustainable development goals.
 - c. Further strengthening and convening the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and supporting the organisation of regional platforms and fora, with the goal of closer integration of all such meetings with relevant platforms and fora for sustainable development and action climate change.
 - d. Advocating for action on disaster risk reduction for sustainable development and poverty eradication, including through annual campaigns and through the United Nations International Day for Natural Disaster Reduction.
 - e. Co-ordinating and leading the revision of the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience and acting as a facilitating body for UN system co-ordination on disaster risk reduction at international level.
 - f. Strengthening its regional offices to better provide training, knowledge sharing, learning processes and advisory support to regional organisations, states and other stakeholders.
- (f) Integrate disaster risk reduction into all investments, programmes and initiatives and provide transparent, periodic access to such information in a way that allows progress to be tracked.
- (g) Support states with the provision of appropriate, timely and well-coordinated help, at the request of countries, to assist with promoting disaster resilience in sustainable recovery.
- (h) Working in close collaboration with existing networks, platforms and organisations, cooperate to support the collection of consistent, sharing and presentation of data on disaster risks, vulnerabilities and disaster impacts at all scales, including those relating to extensive risks/small scale disasters.
- (i) Strengthen international and regional support mechanisms to assist fragile and conflict affected states and other stakeholders to implement conflict-sensitive disaster risk reduction. Such support should include help for disaster risk reduction activities in peacebuilding and conflict prevention and post-conflict processes.

I. Science and Technology Organisations

Science and technology organisations are called upon to undertake the following tasks:

- (a) Strengthen and reinforce existing and future DRR science programmes and initiatives for integrated research and the scientific assessment of disaster risk.
- (b) Drawing on and incorporating existing programmes and initiatives, establish and promote an international science mechanism for disaster risk reduction to enhance resilience. Working to support DRR in all international and regional agreements, such a mechanism will:

- (i) Strengthen the capacity of regional, national and sub-national scientific organisations in developing countries, including promoting and creating the regional DRR scientific research hubs.
 - (ii) Promote scientific research into risk patterns and trends and the causes and effects of disaster risk in society. Produce periodic reports on current and future disaster risks and on the status of efforts to manage such risks at global, regional, national and local scales.
 - (iii) Promote and support the availability and application of understandable and usable science and evidence for decision-making.
 - (iv) Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation, including convening stakeholders to identify and address demands for scientific research, information and evidence on disaster risk and resilience.
 - (v) Offer an independent source of evidence and information on monitoring progress towards the targets established by the [post-2015 agreement on disaster risk reduction].
 - (vi) Provide guidance on terminology, methodologies and standards for risk assessments, risk modelling, taxonomies and the use of data.
- (c) Make innovation and DRR technologies accessible, available and affordable to national governments and local communities through development and transfer of technology. Share best practices and data through, inter-alia, open sources and networking.
 - (d) Promote hazard and risk assessments, scenario building, and other research and studies on disaster risk reduction. Empowering national efforts to improve collection and sharing of comparable data on disaster losses, hazards, and vulnerabilities and sharing for best practices.
 - (e) Enhance the integration of disaster risk management into education at all levels.

J. Resource Mobilisation and Tracking

- (a) Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection to be used to finance DRR as an integral part of sustainable development.
- (b) Encourage risk-sensitive investments with accountability measures in development plans across sectors; strengthen the capacity of institutions to develop, analyse and use risk information in development planning and implementation; and consider the benefits of financial protection strategies in order to promote resilient public investments, especially in high risk areas.
- (c) Enhance financial tracking and transparency mechanisms to ensure that funds and resources (domestic and international) provided for DRR reach intended beneficiaries particularly at the local level in a timely, predictable, and accountable manner. Improved targeting of international finance based on a global assessment of needs, current and future disaster risk, particularly to support those most vulnerable and exposed.
- (d) Developed countries to implement fully their ODA commitments, including providing 0.7% of GNI in ODA to developing countries of which 0.15-0.20% to least-developed countries.
- (e) Enact an integrated international financing system for risk-aware development and economic growth that does not duplicate or undermine national systems, but rather provides catalytic, gap filling and backstopping support to national systems for risk management. International donors to lead by example by integrating risk management into all investment and funding provision, including through multi-lateral architecture: commitment to the provision of flexible, multi-year financing of disaster

risk management across all phases; resources allocated specifically from development budgets for the realization of risk reduction objectives; innovative financing instruments to support DRR at the local level when effective national fiscal planning and management is absent.

- (f) Strengthen policies for investment, improved tracking of financing for DRR across sectors and funding streams, and the introduction of special markers in global aid reporting and the role of supreme audit institutions in providing impartial information on the legality, efficiency and effectiveness of public spending.

ⁱ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

ⁱⁱ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

^{iv} Mitchell et. al. 2014

^v <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

^{vi} <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8228.pdf>

^{vii} <http://cdkn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/ODI-CDKN-response-to-HFA2-pre-zero-draft-4th-September-2014.pdf>

^{viii} UN High Level Programmes Committee Senior Managers Group on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience

^{ix} <http://www.wcdrr.org/preparatory/viewsandcomments>

^x <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

^{xi} <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

^{xii} <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>

^{xiii} <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8996.pdf>