

Workshop Report

Disaster risk management in the post-2015 international policy landscape

3rd July, Wellcome Trust

Contact: Dr. Tom Mitchell (t.mitchell@odi.org.uk)

Context:

Disaster losses are rising and are projected to get worse. Investment to reduce risk accounts for less than 5% of the money spent on post-disaster relief, yet disaster risk management (DRM), as a policy issue, has never had a higher profile. It was on the agenda at Rio+20, at the G-20, was discussed at the Summit of the Americas, and has just been the subject of an IPCC Special Report. The UN Secretary General has requested UNISDR to lead the process to agree a successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), timetabled for Japan in 2015. However, the post-Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) framework and climate change deal are also due in 2015, and present opportunities for improving the position of DRM in international policy agreements. The outcomes will be shaped by governments, private sector, civil society and academia and there is considerable value in forming alliances across these stakeholders to ensure that exposed and vulnerable people are more resilient to disasters in the future.

This workshop provided an early opportunity for stakeholders to come together to debate the key features of disaster risk management in an international policy landscape beyond 2015. The workshop had two objectives:

- To identify the best opportunities, strategies and structures to effectively manage disaster risk within the post-2015 international policy landscape
- To explore ways to work together to create a post-2015 policy environment that minimises disaster losses

A set of papers were made available to participants at the workshop to aid with discussions:

- Mitchell, T. and Wilkinson, E. (2012) 'Disaster Risk Management in Post-2015 Policy Frameworks: Forging a More Resilient Future'. ODI Briefing Papers 75, June 2012, available online:
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/details.asp?id=6663&title=disaster-risk-management-sustainable-development-policy-post2015>
- UN System Task Team on Post-2015 UN Development Agenda (2012) 'Thematic Paper on Disaster Risk and Resilience'. UNISDR, WMO:
<http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/27462>
- UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (2012) 'Towards a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction': <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/25129>

- Kapila, M. (2012) 'Development beyond 2015: new One-World goals for critical global challenges': <http://www.unicef-irc.org/research-watch/Post-2015--What-Next-/898/>

The workshop was attended by 55 participants from academia, government, civil society and the private sector (see Annex 1). The agenda involved a set of opening presentations by UNISDR, DFID and ODI on different aspects of the post-2015 policy agenda, including the HFA, the post- MDGs and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (see Annex 2).

Neil McFarlane (UNISDR) talked about the consultation process towards the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction and highlighted some initial findings. **Paul Wafer** (DFID) reflected on what we do, and do not know about the process to agree post-2015 MDGs, how the world has changed in the last 15 years and the set of dilemmas we face in developing the format of the new goals. **Claire Melamed** (ODI) talked about the relationship between MDGs and the SDGs, presenting 6 possible scenarios for how the relationship might emerge depending on the levels of political commitment to the different goal frameworks.

The presentations are available on the workshop's website: <http://www.odi.org.uk/events/details.asp?id=2994&title=disaster-risk-management-post-2015-international-policy-landscape#report>

The second session was in a panel format and focused particularly on the opportunities for enhancing disaster risk management through the post-2015 policy framework. There were short opening remarks from the panel members: **Prof. Mukesh Kapila** (University of Manchester), **Marcus Oxley** (Global Network for Disaster Reduction), **Dr. Emily Wilkinson** (ODI), **Katherine Nightingale** (Christian Aid) and **Robert Muir-Wood** (Risk Management Solutions). A range of issues were discussed including: the need to be ambitious and offer bold ideas on disaster risk management in the MDG process, the importance of participation at the local level to ensure developing countries set the agenda, the need to build local response capacity, the challenge of addressing politics and power in advancing disaster risk management, and the potential offered by risk modelling and improved risk assessment for shaping policies and response measures.

The afternoon sessions involved a carousel, where the participants were split into three groups and circulated through three different working groups anchored by a chair and a rapporteur. Working Group 1 looked at what instrument should follow the HFA when it expires in 2015. The group was chaired by **Marcus Oxley**, with **Kelly Hawrylyshan** (Plan UK) recording the conversation. Working Group 2 examined what a post-MDG framework would look like if disaster resilience was included. It was chaired by **Dr. Tom Mitchell** (ODI), with **Charlie McClaren** (UKCDS) taking notes. Working Group 3 discussed the priorities for improving disaster risk management and was chaired by **Dr. Nick Hall** (Save the Children), with **Katie Harris** (ODI) as rapporteur. The full notes of the rich discussions from each of the working groups form the bulk of this report and are included in Annex 3.

Annex 1: Participants List

Rob Bailey	Chatham House
Jenni Barclay	UEA
Steve Barnes	CCS
Professor Russell Blong	UCL
Rebecca Brookes	Vitol Foundation
Jazmin Burgess	UNICEF
Terry Cannon	IDS
Andree Carter	UKCDS
Ed Clay	ODI
Kate Crowley	CAFOD
Karl Deering	CARE international
Annie Devonport	DEC
Steve Edwards	UCL
Tracy Elliot	Royal Society
Richard Ewbank	Christian Aid
Rachel Fox	ActionAid
Jason Garrett	World Vision
Nick Hall	Save the Children UK
Clare Harris	Help the Aged
Katie Harris	ODI
Lizz Harrison	Y Care International
Nick Harvey	DFID
Joel Havenstein	Tearfund
Kelly Hawrylyshan	Plan
Merylyn Hedger	ODI
Frances Hill	Save/ELHRA
Debbie Hillier	Oxfam
Maggie Ibrahim	World Vision
Emma James	DFID
Lindsey Jones	ODI
Mukesh Kapila	University of Manchester
Randolph Kent	HFP
Maria Luz Larosa	International Medical Corps
Daniel Leary	GO-Science
Emma Lovell	ODI
Joanna Macrae	DFID
Ajay Madiwale	British Red Cross
Shirley Mathesen	ODI
Neil McFarlane	UNISDR

Charlie McLaren	UKCDS
Tom Mitchell	ODI
Sarah Moss	Christian Aid
Robert Muir Wood	RMS
Kate Munro	Bond Development and Environment Group
Katherine Nightingale	Christian Aid
Marcus Oxley	GNDR
Kath Pasteur	Practical Action
John Rees	NERC
Ros Rouse	ESRC
Jasdeep Sandhu	DFID
Hazel Taylor	Vitol Foundation
Tim Waites	DFID
Emily Wilkinson	ODI
Daniel Yeo	WaterAid

Annex 2: Agenda

9.30 Registration and coffee

9.45 Welcome

- **Dr. Tom Mitchell**, Head of Climate Change, ODI
- **Dr. Andrée Carter**, Director, UK Collaborative on Development Sciences

10.00 Key international policy processes: 2015 and beyond

Chair: Dr. Andrée Carter, UKCDS

- **Neil McFarlane**, United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
- **Paul Wafer**, Department for International Development
- **Dr. Clare Melamed**, ODI

Questions – Discussion

11.00 Coffee break

11.30 Panel: Opportunities for enhancing disaster risk management through 2015 policy processes

Chair: Dr. Tom Mitchell, ODI

- **Prof. Mukesh Kapila**, University of Manchester
- **Katherine Nightingale**, Christian Aid
- **Robert Muir Wood**, Risk Management Solutions
- **Dr. Emily Wilkinson**, Overseas Development Institute
- **Marcus Oxley**, Global Network of CSOs for DRR

Discussion

12.45 Lunch

13.30 Introduction to break out groups

Split into 3 groups (30 minute carousel)

<p>1. What instrument should follow the HFA in 2015?</p> <p>Chair: Marcus Oxley, GNDR Rapporteur: Kelly Hawrylyshyn, Plan UK</p>	<p>2. What would a post MDG framework look like if disaster resilience was included?</p> <p>Chair: Tom Mitchell, ODI Rapporteur: Charlie Maclaren, UKCDS</p>	<p>3. What are the priorities for improving disaster risk management in the next decade?</p> <p>Chair: Dr. Nick Hall, Save the Children Rapporteur: Katie Harris, ODI</p>
---	---	--

- 15.00** **Coffee**
- 15.30** **Report back from break out group and open discussion**
- 16.30** **Thanks and close**

Annex 3: Notes of Working Group Discussions

Working group 1: What instrument should follow the HFA in 2015?

The groups recommended that any planning for HFA2 needs to review what worked well in HFA and what were the gaps / failures to inform future programming:

Positives	Negatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Raised DRM agenda -Raised DRR and CCA integration -Advocacy function: guided policy (but this needs to be better documented) -National progress seen in HFA monitor reports -It was a simple framework (everyone can “get it” – 5 focused priority objectives) -Motivated better practice/programming -motivated (some) funding – but still not enough DRR funding... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HFA1’s goal = to reduce losses, how do we know we achieve this if we did not have a baseline in 2005? -M&E and targets are not really measuring progress (national progress report – self assessment, subjective and biased) -HFA 4 least progress: due to being “stuck” in the humanitarian debate and also the most “political objective” -Overall progress at national level only.... limited/no progress at local level -Ownership of HFA still with “ Aid Agencies” eg: DFID -Too much focus on the WHAT not on the HOW
	<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In UK not working jointly: UK HFA Platform & International platform (eg: BOND DRR WG, INGOs’ work on HFA in developing countries) -DFID withdrawal of funding to UNISDR (gone from a 10yr commitment to HFA to a 5yr commitment)...¹

What we want in HFA2

- Agreement that we need DRR/resilience within the post MDG framework, in order to be owned by broader community and be a part of the development discourse
- But also want a HFA2 looking at gaps and lessons learnt from HFA1
- Why HFA2? Goals and targets are not enough, need to describe the HOW and set up mechanisms for accountability (need practical mechanisms to train and explain what is resilience / how to do risk management)
- Need to ensure we don’t forget about the “software” and how knowledge, education, awareness raising as these are all key drivers for risk management
- Discussion on the need to focus on resilience and vulnerability to overcome sectoralization (humanitarian vs. development issue)
- Need to break out of the “aid” discourse

¹ In response to the comment on DFID’s funding withdrawal to ISDR, DFID is still supporting the realisation of the HFA through other political processes and funding mechanisms

-M&E needs:

- Stronger relationship between assessments and science – suggestion for the development of a scientific metrics
- Independent Monitoring, 2015 baseline
- Scientific metrics covering livelihoods, bio-ecosystems, equity / inclusion
- Measurable indicators at local level
- Disaggregated indicators (sex, age, disability, ethnicity etc.)
- Capture small scale losses
- Captures social benefit analysis

-Holistic approach addressing fragility/conflict vs. natural hazards. Redefining hazards within fragile states/fragile environments

-Break out HFA 4

-Focus on the HFA1s that have not progressed only

-Captures urban vs. rural risks and slow and rapid onset challenges (intensive vs. extensive risks)

-Understand the “tipping points” → divers of change (eg: large scale disasters)

-Promote incentives: social, environmental, legal (RBA): enshrine the principle of “the right be safe” vs. promote how risks are a barrier to the realisation of existing agreed rights frameworks (CEDAW, Convention on the Rights of the Child, Human Rights etc)

How to implement a post-2015 HFA

Need an HFA strategy to turn the vision into reality (ACTION and PROCESS oriented)

Need to start by analysing what prevented the achievement of HFA1. Lack of:

- M&E
- Funding
- Local level action
- Break away from the humanitarian silo

How to tackle M&E challenges:

- Ensure regional organisations play a bigger role in supporting accountability of countries signatory to HFA2 and role in contextualizing indicators relevant to the regional risk scenario (eg: ASEAN & ADMEER)
- Improve system mechanisms for measuring the impact of disasters - need a better metrics system to capture: impact on livelihoods vs. saving lives; sex, age, disability, ethnicity disaggregated data; urban vs. rural context; everyday risks / small scale losses
- Improve work on systemic learning and anticipation: eg: “Forensic Disaster Investigation”; post-disaster audits made “mandatory” granted funding to document and learn what caused the disaster / vulnerability and capacity interplay; make use of the technology and science available for M&E

How to tackle power relations barrier to resilience:

- Capitalise on opportunities disasters present to bring about social change and address systemic failure, to drive political change; focus on disaster risk *enhancement* vs. DRR
- Promote “how tos” for incentives/drives of change, eg: “public humiliation”/naming and shaming; independent watchdogs/CSOs pressure; role of social media; economic incentives; donor pressure; private sector incentives (eg.insurance risk sharing and tax breaks); documenting evidence to influence policy; investing in educating population to demand change; gender transformative/child centred approaches; enabling women and children as agents of change; rights agenda

Working Group 2: What would a post MDG framework look like if disaster resilience was included?

The Process of Developing the post-MDG Framework

- To help understand how to incorporate disaster resilience into a post-MDG framework we need to bring new actors to the table, e.g. the private, academia and the military etc.
- To define what the goals should be we need to clarify the end-points we are seeking and then the incremental targets can be set accordingly
- A thorough analysis of what the key barriers have been to achieving the MDGs and reducing inequality (e.g. politics and power) is needed and for those barriers to be explicitly addressed through the goals (at best) or simply that they are recognised by governments and non-governmental actors (at worst)
- Development of the goals/targets must be inclusive and participatory. One approach would be to have regional organisations, together with their member states, put together what they think the development priorities and targets should be (it was suggested that regional agreements do exist and are generally stronger than global agreements). In this scenario the role for the global forum would be to put together a set of principles on which to ground a regional framework. However, it was noted that regional bodies differ in their effectiveness – if this is the case, perhaps the global goal should be to make regional bodies stronger so they have the capacity to develop and oversee implementation of the priorities and targets of their member states
- We should question what kind of measures will actually be useful – we need to facilitate debate in-country which can inform the focus of the goals (i.e. the process should be more bottom-up)

Approaches, Opportunities and Issues associated with engaging decision makers

- Strip back the rhetoric and discourse to something that is simple but engaging
- Policy makers are looking for ideas which will enhance the resilience and sustainability of policy decisions; however, this requires clear definitions and examples of what is meant by concepts such as resilience, sustainability and risk. This will require applying theoretical thinking to practical problems and talking with substance (what changes are needed, why are they needed and how those changes can happen)
- An agreement on the SDG framework will be extremely politically sensitive and contested, whereas there is existing political unity around the goals of poverty reduction – consequentially the traction costs associated with integrating and reaching an agreement on both frameworks suggest it would be beneficial to address them separately
- It was suggested that greater political traction may be gained by tapping into popular political rhetoric, e.g. re-naming the goals the ‘Millennium Goals for Growth’ – ‘growth’ would not refer to economic growth per se but growth in security, education, health, equality, etc.
- Engaging and integrating concepts into mainstream political discourse can be highly advantageous as it provides profile and access to resources – this has been seen through challenges such as disaster risk reduction and global food security
- Visionary thinking (e.g. radically shifting the development and economic paradigm) is useful but needs to be balanced by a discourse that considers the state of the world now (though some would argue this is precisely why we need visionary thinking) – changing geopolitical dynamics, economic insecurity, African and MICs growth and growing inequality, greater

societal and political awareness of climate change, etc. Also, we should consider the difference between the global political economy now vis-à-vis what it was like when the MDGs were initially developed (and how this could influence the debate)

- We shouldn't solely focus our efforts (in terms of embedding DRM) in trying to integrate resilience in the post-MDG Framework – it should feature across a range of measures, e.g. global targets, targets for national governments and specific sectors, the HFA, etc., this is the approach that the UNISDR has adopted
- There is inherent political weakness in trying to achieve something without a goal / target and a means by which to measure it; the advantage of goals is that they have put development on the global political agenda. Goals have also allowed comparison between countries offering case studies of success and failure, and providing political leverage around key challenges / crisis states
- Having a high level goal focusing on DRM means that it has to be taken seriously (vertical integration) but it should also feature in the measuring process, through an assessment of resilience, of the other goals (horizontal integration) – vertical and horizontal integration is crucial. Could HFA2 be seen as vertical integration if a stand-alone goal isn't achieved?
- In communicating what we mean by resilience we need to move on from DRR

Key features of the Framework

- The Goals themselves have to be sustainable – therefore achieving the goals must increase the resilience of communities (i.e. building resilience into the goals)
- The MDG and SDG frameworks must be integrated – ecosystem services support development, without them the post-MDG framework will be unattainable and/or unsustainable
- The SDGs need to focus on sustainable resource use, irrespective of whether people are rich or poor; this contrasts with the current MDG framework that focuses exclusively on poverty reduction, which could pose challenges to integrating the two frameworks. Framing the post-MDG framework in terms of reducing inequality could provide a means for integration
- The post-MDG framework must cover multiple objectives within each Goal – e.g. minimising water insecurity would include measures of accessibility, affordability, choice, human dignity and respect, health, support of livelihoods, ecosystem conservation, inequality and power relations, etc. This will require a theoretical framework that draws all these factors together and metrics that are simple but sophisticated enough to reflect the interconnections
- The real issues associated with poverty reduction and reducing inequality are the softer issues which will be challenging to capture quantitatively; therefore the post-MDG framework must leave space for qualitative measurement techniques and/or the softer issues (such as well-being, social inclusion) must feature in the goals themselves
- The post-MDG framework has to be sensitive to natural resource limits – environmental sustainability and reducing inequality must be the core of new goals and targets
- The approach of developing and achieving goals suggest striving for constant progress; however, this must not be traded-off against heightened risk to communities. Goals and/or their interpretation / implementation must be sensitive to risk
- The MDGs encourage putting things in boxes and enforces the fragmentation of connected issues; instead, environmental sustainability and reducing inequality must be at the heart of all the goals (and could therefore act as glue between the goals)
- In striving to achieve the goals, we need to make sure we are not elevating risk – by prioritising measures of resilience and risk into progress monitoring, and making resilience a key determinant of progress, elevated levels of risk (from achieving goals) might be avoided

- Moreover, if these metrics are in place, the achievement of goals should be all or nothing. Should the post-MDGs therefore be Global Resilience Goals or Risk Reduction Goals?
- To understand the progress toward goals we need to measure and model over specific time frames
- We need to define resilience of whom / what, to what? Resilience must be thought of in the broadest sense covering a range of potential man-made and natural disasters, e.g. earthquakes, volcanoes, drought, conflict, financial shocks, etc. – it must encompass a series of generic factors and have the potential to be applied to different sectors and communities
- Goals must be seen as connected entities that could positively and negatively impact on one another (both in terms of risk and potential achievement). Intelligent targets and monitoring are needed to ensure that these relationships are recognised
- Resilience is an issue that should be integrated across the goals – having a separate goal on resilience could promote fragmentation. Another view was that there could be a specific goal on resilience and DRM could be buried within the targets

Suggestions on a risk reduction / resilience goal

- Every country should have a national risk register (mentioned that many countries already have these but they are rarely used) and/or every individual should have access to a national risk register
- All building stock has a reduced risk to hazards by a determined factor (e.g. 50%)
- In a year of a disaster you do not see a depression in absolute poverty levels
- Increasing the number of communities that can effectively cope with small and medium shocks
- More resilient communities to natural and man-made stresses

Suggested resilience and DRM metrics within the post-MDG Framework

- Protection of livelihoods / limiting livelihoods lost
- Mortality rate (not a popular choice) – Chinese started work on this in 2010 but data in general is very poor
- Levels of migration
- Measuring the response to the shock
- Number of measures introduced at the community level to increase resilience
- Gini co-efficient should be considered as part of the target – i.e. there should be no increase in inequality for goals to be attained. Targets should involve derivatives not values
- Measures of happiness and wellbeing should also be included as indicators (though challenging to measure with any rigour)
- Also, it was mentioned that you are reliant on consistent stocks to generate the data for meaningful analysis

Other comments

- At what level should the goals be focused – individual, community, sub-national, national?
- Can ‘resilience’ be mainstreamed across all the goals and is it integral to all goals? Are there goals where resilience can’t be integrated? Are there elements of resilience that can’t be mainstreamed?
- Why goals – are we setting ourselves up to fail and what is the measure of failure (how many need to be missed to count as failure)? Instead, prioritisation could be far more impactful (bulls-eye approach), focusing on one or a few high-level goals. Also,

it was noted that the MDG's have helped mainstream the issue of poverty reduction and that on balance they had been positive, though the counterfactual is difficult to measure

- One of the downsides of global goals is that they are immensely challenging to measure with any accuracy
- Rationalisation in terms of what can be achieved over a specified time frame (e.g. 2030) should be looked at
- Are we trying to understand how to incorporate DRM in the MDG or are we looking at the broader MDG framework – both, language needs to change to consider resilience and risk
- Should we focus efforts on targets or bigger picture goals – noted that NHS has had many targets but they haven't improved national health

Working Group 3: What are the priorities for improving disaster risk management in the next decade?

Group 1

- Aligning DRM with development priorities
- Ways to measure how we can evaluate achievements towards DRM against other goals – to enable an integrated resilience approach
- We need to engage with gaps – economics of DRR, and risk assessments, engage private sector, conflict – we need to do what we know better and more comprehensively: how to amalgamate different agendas?
- We need the evidence base for the economics and VFM for DRR, this is still lacking (Recognise that VFM can be used for different outcomes – perhaps not always as intended)
- Do we need to be more critical of our own work, to recognise the strengths and weaknesses
- Do we need better tools to understand what to invest in for better impacts over the longer term – this would require stronger evidence base and understanding of priorities of investment
- Could we learn from ecosystems analysis – to recognise the value of things that are not economically valued?
- We need to think more about the dynamic nature of risk, rather than viewing risk as a static time/space
- *'Anticipation is not just probabilistic, but is deterministic in nature'*
- Can we be better at defining what the problem of disaster risk is, to then be combined with social science inputs that provide insight into the decision making processes around risk
- Involve local communities in deciding the values of things – in the processes of risk modelling and decision making associated with DRR – to enable vulnerable communities to be involved in the accountability of risk reduction
- Can we take advantage of the technological advances to bridge the risk modelling with participation/recipients of DRR information i.e. community mobilisation around risk modelling
- How can we actually incentivise decision makers in programming and policy to take the right decisions based on that information – to avoid focusing on risk models etc. which become a process in themselves but can often fail to make any changes in the processes of decision making based on the findings
- Build into any/all design processes (from policy to programme) a risk management process which uses tools to include risk as an inherent part of the decision making process

- Should we have risk auditing mechanisms to ensure risks are taken into account (e.g. by the UN or government) – but how do you get the government to care?!
- We need to be more critical of the notion of economic losses as there is a tendency to focus only on insurable losses
- **Mainstreaming science in DRR through community engagement**
- **Aligning DRM with development priorities and making sure there are measures to assess this**
- **Aligning different sources of knowledge and decision making processes, providing a more holistic view of risk that draws on economic and social understandings**
- **Doing what we already do better**

Group 2

- Do we need to shift our discourse away from the word ‘disaster’ and towards ‘risk’ - with disaster you narrow towards preparedness and response? If we think about managing risk (so situations don’t result in a disaster) this would help this subtle shift. And would help to capture small, short and underlying/on-going daily risks (helping challenge the notion that people ‘don’t work on disasters’)
- Do we need to mainstream risk, thus requiring a change in the institutional structures for disasters (UNISDR)?
- To increase the number of people and communities who can predict, repair and recover from disaster events. Recognising that the impact is personal and individual
- The focus has been on response – thus we need to marry preparedness and response/recovery to help reduce risks holistically
- DRR needs to find its place alongside CCA. People are being asked to mainstream DRR and CCA into their programmes yet this can be confusing at the ground level. DRR needs to consider how it positions itself. What does DRR do in the face of mounting levels of CCA funding?
- What are the barriers for achieving existing DRR aims? Without knowing this we will only fail for any new goals. This is a political issue. We need to look more concretely at the political barriers to achieving what we know we need to do
- DRR managers assume all rationality – they think people behave in rational ways. But people live in dangerous places because they get a livelihood from that place. People trade off risks because of their own decision making processes and priorities. Need to align the mismatch between what DRR is trying to achieve and the priorities of the local communities we’re seeking to help
- Will attempts to mainstream or combine efforts risk dilution of efforts e.g. DRR, CCA and development.
- Will ‘mainstreaming’ actually produce the desired outcome? Understanding the incentives – individual, community, government department – at the political, social levels that confront decision makers
- How do the policies in place filter down to practical implementation – including at sector specific levels. We need to tailor DRR recommendations to sector specific implications
- Do we need to be more focused on cost-benefit within DRR, to help support arguments about local level DRR (rather than compromising it)?
- Take as a starting point an understanding of the strategies that communities adopt to be resilient – communities should be our starting point for understanding resilience. Yet this is

challenged – is it too romanticised to be thinking about ‘communities as resilience’ just because communities are surviving

- *We need ‘objective’ participatory dynamic risk indices upon which to base management decisions, across scales*
- **Do we need to shift our discourse away from the word ‘disaster’ and towards ‘risk’ – to take a more holistic perspective of risk, that captures the everyday risks coupled with the high impact shocks, and to challenge the notion that people ‘don’t work on disasters’)**
- **What are the barriers for achieving existing DRR aims? Without knowing this we will only fail for any new goals. We need to look more concretely at the political barriers to achieving what we know we need to do.**
- **Will ‘mainstreaming’ actually produce the desired outcome? Understanding the incentives at the political, social levels that confront decision makers**

Group 3

- **Better risk management systems, better risk assessments and better support to decision makers to make the right decisions**
- **We need to give far more consistent attention to the ‘what might be’ – issues that will have wide ranging impacts that we don’t consider at present.** This could include scenario planning, foresight planning etc. To ‘think the unthinkable’. Recognising that there are different risk management cycles for risks you can qualify and those you can’t
- **You have to look at a whole system of risk, and the whole system of funding – to work out what sound be spent on what, rather than in a piecemeal fashion. This requires an integrated risks management cycle**
- Are there some areas where there is more scope than others – to take action?
- ‘Practical is bad, speculative is important, we need to change the whole role of the UN with regards to the humanitarian system...’ who is going to bring the scientific communities together – the UN should be with the convening power rather than the delivery of assistance
- We need to recognise that we have a development failure rather than a focus on the humanitarian focus, with regards to promoting DRR
- We need to recognise that development is decentralised – by multiple agencies – is it even the function of governments? We’re talking as though there is a singular agency for ‘development’. Proportionately the funding for development public vs. private is increasingly within the private sector
- We need to think more holistically at risks, which includes disasters, conflict and financial risks
- Do we need to think more about committing and upholding corporate risk commitments and corporate social responsibility?
- Reports; incentivising corporates to take action towards sustainability by showing its direct link to market functionality and shareholder benefits. To value all positive activity and have liability for not incorporating sustainable activities within your core business
- Communities should be enabled to get access to their vulnerabilities, to do more thinking assessments and vulnerability analysis
- Having a DRR system that helps leaders to make good decisions
- Disaster risk fails to be part and parcel of the design of major investments, and major funders need to be part and parcel of this
- Does DRR cost a lot of money, or is it an approach that informs a different process?

- Most of our planning tools are useful for conditions of certainty, but don't work well in conditions of increasing uncertainty. We 'assume risks away' this is our get out clause. How do you plan for uncertainty?
- Is this actually a human resource issue – we don't have the capacity within agencies to plan for and anticipate uncertainty
- **Certification of risk analysis**
- Scale up community based DRR
- How do you reconcile the redundancy within any system with the economics of results?

Summary

We need 'objective' participatory dynamic risk indices upon which to base management decisions, across scales.

Challenging questions for the DRR community...

- Do we need to shift our discourse away from the word 'disaster' and towards 'risk' – to take a more holistic perspective of risk, that captures the everyday risks coupled with the high impact shocks and stresses, and to challenge those who say '*we don't work on disasters*'.
- Will 'mainstreaming' actually produce the desired outcome? Or do we actually need to better understand the political, social and economic incentives (and disincentives) that confront decision makers that can act as incentives for pursuing DRR?
- Disasters as an opportunity for change (this is quite controversial particularly given the differences in perspectives across the humanitarian and development communities).

3 specific ideas:

- Certification of risk analysis (e.g. having a standard that ensures that risk analyses are full and thorough across all sectors and scales – a cascade of risk information)
 - Better risk management systems, better risk assessments and better support to decision makers to make the right decisions
 - Aligning different sources of knowledge into decision making processes (this may entail mainstreaming science in DRR through community engagement) and adopting a more holistic view of risk
 - More attention is required on 'thinking the unthinkable', the 'what might be' – this could include scenario planning, foresight planning etc.
- Aligning DRM with development priorities and making sure there are measures to assess this.
- Doing what we already do better.
 - You can only do this by understanding - what the barriers are for achieving existing DRR aims. Without knowing this we will only fail for any new goals.
 - We need to look more concretely at the political barriers to achieving what we know we need to do
 - We need to view both risk, and funding for hum/dev holistically – and seek to marry these – to work out where money should be spent and on what, rather than in a piecemeal fashion. This requires an integrated risks management cycle