

---

# Synthesis

**Lindsey Jones, Tom Mitchell, Emma Lovell  
and Eva Comba**

Overseas Development Institute

The preceding chapters highlight that there are many different options for including DRM in the post-2015 development framework, each with varying levels of ambition, feasibility and measurability. In choosing among them, the post-2015 consultation process will have to consider what types of action the framework should incentivise. It will also have to strike a delicate balance between setting aggressive targets (recognising the scale of technical and institutional change needed) and ensuring they remain attractive and communicable (recognising the inherently political nature of the post-2015 consultation process).

In addition, how DRM is included in the framework depends heavily on the overall structure and architecture of the post-2015 goals framework. Three potential formulations of the goals framework are as follows. First is a collection of many single issue-based objectives that happen to be politically acceptable at the time but without a strong story binding them together. Second is a jigsaw-based approach that tries to mesh poverty reduction objectives with sustainable development objectives. A third is a single, focused objective, such as ending absolute poverty, supported by goals that establish social and environmental minimums, around health, education and access to clean water, for example (Melamed, 2012).

While DRM could be a component of each of these approaches, the strategy for promoting its inclusion would need to be tailored accordingly. If the focus is on ending absolute poverty, then strong evidence would need to be presented that highlights how disasters are a significant barrier to poverty reduction and how DRM can solve this. If the focus is on environmental sustainability or inclusive and sustainable economic growth, the argument for including DRM would need to be oriented more towards avoiding economic losses or protecting environmental and economic assets from disasters.

The question of whether the goals should be universal or not remains: whether they should apply equally to all countries and be relevant at global, national and local levels, or whether different countries have different goals based on a principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Some have also suggested a 'one world' approach: a global agreement between North and South, with poverty targets for the South and sustainable consumption targets for the North (e.g. Scott and Shepherd, 2011). Such an approach faces political challenges, given the difficulty of securing any kind of commitment to constrain or reduce consumption in some rich countries (Melamed et al., 2012). In all scenarios described here, DRM has the benefit of being a concern for virtually every country and, compared with other issues, is reasonably apolitical. Whether it can attract enough passionate support from member states to make it an indispensable part of the framework is another matter.

Nonetheless, many other issues also require agreement. What is the baseline period for the post-2015 MDGs? What should the starting point be – especially given that data for 2015 will not be available in the same year? Will targets be calibrated on the basis of historical progress or on projections of future rates? With such uncertainty about the future form of the post-2015 agenda, it is important to retain a high degree of flexibility in considering options for DRM targets and indicators.

## Potential targets and indicators

Each of the targets and indicators presented here emerge from background studies that consider a broad set of options. Experts have used criteria to recommend their preferred choices. These include whether the target matters for poor people, whether it can be calibrated and is meaningful across scales, whether it reinforces human rights and whether it is simple to communicate. This analysis also benefits from previous consideration of DRM targets and indicators resulting from a technical workshop held in London in December 2012 and a study published by ODI in September 2012.

In order to guide the options presented in this report, we propose three possible scenarios for how DRM could be included in post-2015 goals:

Scenario 1: A standalone goal on disasters, supported by targets. The report assesses targets on reducing mortality, reducing economic losses, preventing impoverishment and protecting and improving health systems;

Scenario 2: A target on disasters within a goal on ‘resilience’, ‘security’ or ‘tackling obstacles to development’ for example; drawing on the detailed assessments of the targets mentioned above.

Scenario 3: Integration of DRM into other goals. The report particularly highlights how DRM could be included in poverty reduction and education goals.

These scenarios are not mutually exclusive, but are necessarily flexible in order to adapt to the different potential formulations of the overall post-2015 goals framework. The following formulations of targets and indicators under each scenario selectively draw on the content of each chapter to provide a single example. There are many other ways of locking together the different suggestions.

## Scenario 1: A standalone DRM goal

Drawing on material in the chapters, an example of a standalone goal, target and indicator set on DRM could be as follows:

Goal	Targets	Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Reduce the risk of disasters</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● By 2030, reduce by 20% the economic loss from disasters</li><li>● By 2030, halve the number of people killed by disasters</li><li>● By 2030, no additional people enter poverty</li><li>● By 2030, all new hospitals and health facilities are built to withstand local hazards</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Number of men, women, children killed by age, location, hazard type and socioeconomic group as proportion of population exposed (combining actual and modelled data)</li><li>● Direct economic losses as a % of gross domestic product (GDP) (combining actual and modelled data)</li><li>● % of budget allocated to disaster risk reduction (DRR)/preparedness</li><li>● Proportion of people living in poverty in areas exposed to natural hazards (combining actual and modelled data)</li><li>● Proportion of new health care facilities built in compliance with building codes and standards to withstand hazards</li></ul>

## Scenario 2: DRM within a ‘resilience’-type goal

Under scenario 2, there is insufficient space or lack of prioritisation of DRM for a standalone goal on disasters. Alternatively, consensus emerges that a disasters target could usefully sit alongside targets on violence, food security or environmental degradation for example, as a way of fostering better integration of risk management approaches to development shocks and stresses. One potential formulation is as follows:

Goals	Targets	Indicators
Enhance community resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● By 2030, halve the number of people killed by disasters</li><li>● Other resilience-related targets, for example:</li><li>● By 2030, halve violence against women and girls</li><li>● By 2030, achieve 100% access to adequate food all year round</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Number of men, women, children killed by age, location, hazard type and socioeconomic group as proportion of population exposed (combining actual and modelled data)</li><li>● % of budget allocated to DRR/preparedness</li><li>● Other indicators relating to non-disasters target</li></ul>

## Scenario 3: DRM mainstreamed in other goals

In combination with either of the first two scenarios, or if DRM is considered primarily as a cross-cutting concern in an effort to prevent DRM from being siloed, Scenario 3 involves the integration of DRM (or resilience-related) targets and indicators across other goal areas. Selected examples from poverty, education and health goals could be as follows:

Goals	Targets	Indicators
Goal on poverty reduction	Reduce by 1 billion the number of people 'at risk' (of falling into poverty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Proportion of the population above/below the 'security poverty line' of \$10 PPP per capita at which the risk of falling back into poverty falls drastically</li></ul>
Goal on education	By 2030, halve the number of children killed in schools by disasters, with no children killed by disasters in new schools built after 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● % of newly built early childhood development, primary and secondary educational facilities certified to be in conformity with locally appropriate hazard-resistant building standards, codes and norms</li><li>● # of children killed in schools by disasters, with no children killed by disaster in new schools built after 2015</li></ul>

## Weighing up the options

While the various targets and indicators included in this report highlight considerable diversity – from the technically ambitious to the politically sensitive – a number of commonalities can be drawn from among them. Choosing which to embed into a framework, and how, will inevitably require difficult decisions and trade-offs. Below, we discuss lessons drawn from each of the chapters and list key considerations that need to be taken into account in selecting between them.

**Satisfying the criteria:** The report set the ambitious task of proposing suitable DRM-related targets that adhere to criteria. What is quickly apparent is that few targets and indicators can satisfy all criteria. Ones that do stand up to at least some of the tests, often involve significant trade-offs – between incentivising the right kind of disaster-relevant activities, ensuring measurability and being attractive to policymakers. The implications of this are that selected targets will, in many cases, be sub-optimal in promoting effective DRM. If poorly selected or too heavily skewed towards one of criteria, some may even

serve to encourage weak practices or perverse incentives. Certainly making these kinds of choices requires delicate handling and analysis of available evidence.

Including disasters within the post-2015 framework will ultimately secure a considerable amount of political momentum and interest in the delivery of DRM. However, given the intense competition between different development priorities, disasters will almost certainly have a limited profile within the framework – whether as a standalone goal or mainstreamed within others. With this in mind, only a handful of targets (or possible even just one) can be selected for inclusion, and these will need to be considered carefully so they cover or at least encourage a wide spectrum of DRM-related activities.

If the DRM community is comfortable with these trade-offs, then being open and accommodating to the debates involved in engaging with the post-2015 process will be key. More importantly, a post-2015 framework must not be seen as the predominant vehicle for delivering the full range of DRM objectives. Rather, coordination and overlap between other disaster-relevant frameworks is important in filling this gap – like the post-2015 consultative process on a successor to the current HFA (2005-2015). This will help ensure the promotion of a holistic approach to addressing the many facets of DRM across all levels of governance: from the local and community levels through to the national, regional and international.

**Choosing the right kind of metrics:** The type of indicator used has a significant bearing on how data are collected, what can be inferred from them and the extent to which annual progress can be charted. Given the political momentum associated with the MDG and post-2015 frameworks, the choice of indicators will also heavily determine what types of DRM activities are incentivised. Four categories of indicators are worth considering within the context of this report: input, output, outcome and impact measures (for details and the pros and cons of each, see Chapter 2). Impact- and outcome-based categories have the advantage of being relatively simple to communicate and often generate strong political motivation. Input- and output-based categories are typically easier to measure and act as a useful guide on how DRM-related activities can be promoted. However, on their own, none can measure the spectrum of activities needed to deliver DRM in a holistic manner. What is clear from across the various chapters is that limiting DRM indicators to one or two categories of indicators will be detrimental. Where possible, a range of indicators from across the typology of indicator categories is therefore needed, ones that monitor and incentivise both *ex-ante* and *ex-post* actions and ones that are relevant for both extensive and intensive disaster risk profiles.

**Opportunities and limitations in using models:** A number of the report's proposed targets present the option of using probabilistic risk models in tracking and measuring progress. Such models simulate the losses from thousands of possible events, allowing for an assessment of the damages expected in a given year. These have many advantages, not least of which is the ability to project the impact (and therefore imply the effectiveness of DRM strategies) of disasters on a given population and over a specific time period. They also offer the opportunity of assessing preparedness for high-impact low-probability events, a factor that observational records may struggle to adequately account for given that the next set of goals are unlikely to span a period significantly beyond a 15-year time period.

However, models are not without their limitations. For one, they are heavily dependent on the quality of data inputs, which presents significant challenges for many developing countries. Models are also inevitably subjective; modellers make certain assumptions (and simplifications) across the interactions of various natural, social and economic variables - many of which will be difficult to test empirically over shorter-term time periods. This is particularly the case for flood and drought events, for which risk models are in their infancy. In addition, issues of trust, transparency and ownership present a number of challenges, especially in the contexts of low technical capacity within many developing country contexts. Nevertheless, models do add value in complementing other observational measures and targets, and their utility in a post-2015 framework should not be discounted. Rather, policymakers may well wish to take advantages of recent progress in the development and application of risk modelling where relevant, particularly with regard to their role in monitoring year-on-year progress and addressing the variable nature of disaster occurrence.

**Better Data:** Irrespective of which scenario plays out, the need to invest in technical capacity and data collection around disaster impacts and DRM is paramount. Challenges with regard to data availability and collection are common to all chapters. Some issues relate to the difficult nature of measuring key variables (like vulnerability or resilience); others relate to a lack of geographic coverage (as for economic losses in developing countries). However, if disaster-related targets are to be monitored successfully in the context of a post-2015 development framework, two things are necessary.

First is the prioritisation of systematic reporting and collection of disaster-related data. This is not to say that singular datasets for each measured variable are necessary; far from it: diversity in sources and analysis of data (such as economic losses) is important. Rather, standard and systematised procedures for data collection (similar to the systematic methods for reporting mortality) will help ensure that data can be used



reliably to chart and compare progress in achieving targets across both spatial and geographic scales.

Second is the need to support developing countries in enhancing their capacity for data collection and use. Not only are reliable disaster-relevant data lacking for many countries (particularly in a least development country context), but also a shortage of expertise and technical capacity to compile, validate and make use of such data is apparent. Thus, enhancing investment in research and technical capacity and promoting knowledge sharing and greater access to global datasets, as well as encouraging North–South and South–South collaboration, should go hand in hand with any targets and indicators set under a post-2015 framework.

## What next?

Securing a place for DRM within the post-2015 goals framework will take continued concerted action on a number of fronts:

**Testing which targets and indicators work in practice:** Our conclusion is that the target should be outcome-focused and will need to blend a mix of observations and modelling techniques in order to assess annual progress on DRM and to cover both extensive and intensive disaster risk. The target and indicator set should incentivise both ex-ante and ex-post action to reduce disaster risk and the indicators should guide activities by being focused more on inputs and outputs. However, selecting the most appropriate targets and indicators on DRM in the post-2015 framework requires striking a delicate balance between different factors. One of the most important aspects is whether or not they make sense when applied in practice at community and national level. Therefore the next step is to road test the suggestions made in this report, in an exercise that should engage local and national stakeholders in filtering some of the options.

**A clear narrative, supported by evidence:** We know that disasters can hamper economic growth, affect poverty levels and cause human suffering. In addition, disasters present ever-greater obstacles to development progress and can reverse development gains. Without significant action, the extent and impact of economic and social damage due to disasters is likely to get worse, largely as a result of growing exposure. Including measures to promote DRM in the post-2015 development goals is needed to incentivise investment in advance of shocks that will protect lives and livelihoods – but



also save money. This is a clear story line, but needs to be presented to key decision makers at opportune moments, backed by solid evidence. Given the Sustainable Development Goals Open Working Group has now begun meeting, it will also need to be supplemented with a focus on how DRM shapes sustainable development, including the interplay between environmental protection and disaster risk.

**Forging coherence in international policy:** With the MDGs, SDGs, HFA and climate change negotiations processes all seeking agreements in 2015, it is vital that DRM is included in each of them, but also when taken together, they provide a coherent message on how DRM should be prioritised and implemented. This will take co-ordinated work by key agencies acting in all these policy processes.

**Generating political momentum:** DRM will only be included in the post-2015 goals if there are enough member states willing to argue strongly for it being there. Currently this is unclear and more work is needed to secure this type of support.