



MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN
AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

REPORT

GLOBAL THEMATIC CONSULTATION ON DISASTER RISK REDUCTION AND THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

19-20 February, 2013

Jakarta, Indonesia



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.



UNISDR



United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

1. The Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Imperative:

Participants stressed that the following be **acknowledged** and duly considered in the design of the post-2015 development agenda:

- The frequency and severity of disasters are increasing globally. Moreover, exposure to natural hazards is projected to increase even further in light of urbanization, climate change, ecosystem degradation, migration, food insecurity, conflict and fragility, and other unexpected shocks;
- Development is never disaster neutral, it either creates and exacerbates risks and vulnerabilities, or reduces them;
- Disasters destroy lives and livelihoods, negatively impacting poverty reduction and human development, both in fragile countries and in countries having made progress on MDGs;
- Sustainable development is not achievable without investment in disaster risk reduction;
- Past development frameworks did not specifically include or adequately address the causal aspects of disaster risk, which undermined the achievement of development goals;
- There is an urgent need to rethink development, to address the underlying causes of disaster risk from the very outset;
- Disaster risk reduction must be seen as an investment in sustainable development and not as an additional expenditure;
- There is evidence to show that investments in disaster risk reduction leads to the achievement of development goals, including a reduction in mortality and the continued provision of education and health services; and
- Good governance, social equity and accountability are preconditions for achieving both sustainable development and disaster risk reduction goals.

In light of the above, participants urged that the following be **addressed** in the post-2015 development agenda:

- Disaster risk reduction is specifically referenced, to ensure its prominence in future development approaches and investments;
- The entire 'risk basket', particularly at the community level, which includes the everyday risks associated with meeting basic human needs and those related to disasters caused by natural hazards, conflict and violence;
- Options for mainstreaming DRR in development planning, for example in fiscal budgets, long-term public investment plans, decentralization programmes in urban and rural areas, feasibility studies for development interventions etc.;
- Capacities, resources and organizational mechanisms for disaster risk reduction, particularly at the community level, with a particular emphasis on *at risk* groups; and

- Coherence between regional, national, sub-national and community level mechanisms for disaster risk reduction.

2. Recommended options for the integration of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda

Participants identified a menu of possible options for integrating DRR into the post-2015 development agenda. They called for generating a strong narrative on the importance of DRR for achieving any future development goals. Participants also recognised that the post-2015 development agenda on its own cannot achieve all the intended objectives of DRR, thus there should be strong coordination with disaster-specific frameworks, such as the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2).

Participants recommended the combination of a stand-alone goal on DRR, and mainstreaming DRR into other development goals.

- a. Establish a standalone goal on DRR, using resilience as a framework. This would provide an opportunity to address the interface between global frameworks for sustainable development, disaster risk reduction, climate change and conflict.
- b. Mainstreaming DRR into other sector goals, particularly in poverty reduction, health, environment, governance, food security, gender equality, education and water.
- c. Promote a new development approach that integrates DRR consideration into all development interventions, for example, making disaster risk assessment mandatory at the outset of any development project; and using existing assessment tools, like the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
- d. Develop input, outcome and impact targets and indicators that capture reductions in direct losses, such as mortality and economic impact; as well as indirect losses, like the loss of social capital and ecosystems. Targets and indicators should be applicable at regional, national and sub-national levels.

3. Next steps for strategic actions

- a. Continue to develop a proactive and compelling narrative, backed by evidence based research and human interest stories, that demonstrates the contribution of disaster risk reduction investments to sustainable development;
- b. Ensure close alignment between disaster risk reduction considerations in the post-2015 development agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2), and other frameworks. This is in acknowledgement of the limitations of a single framework in meeting all the goals of DRR, and the anticipated benefits of reinforcing guidance for disaster sensitive development;
- c. Support the imperative to reflect disaster risk reduction in relevant national and regional post-2015 development agenda consultation processes;
- d. Summarize key messages emerging from consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2), to inform the development of the post-2015 development agenda; and

Continue efforts to design targets and indicators for disaster risk reduction that are adaptable to the emerging post-2015 development agenda.

I. BACKGROUND

The Global Consultation on Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2015 Development Agenda took place in Jakarta, Indonesia on 19-20 February 2013. It was a part of a series of global thematic consultations on Conflict, Violence and Disaster and the Post-2015 Development Agenda, coordinated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) and the UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), with support from the Government of Finland.

The Jakarta consultation was organized in partnership with the Government of Indonesia and built on the previous discussions on DRR and the post-2015 development agenda, most notably the Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Yogyakarta (October 2012), the global e-discussions (August-December 2012) and other consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2).

The aim of the Jakarta consultation was to:

- a. build on the conclusions of the Yogyakarta consultation and identify specific ways by which disaster risk reduction, as well as the interface between conflict and disaster in fragile contexts, can be effectively addressed in the post-2015 development agenda;
- b. generate concrete recommendations for the most essential aspects of disaster risk reduction and resilience building, that should be integrated into priority goals, targets, and indicators; and
- c. identify strategic opportunities and next steps for influencing the integration of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda.

The consultation was inaugurated by the President of Indonesia, His Excellency Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and the Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Director of UNDP’s Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, Mr. Jordan Ryan, at the Presidential Palace during a formal opening. It was attended by 150 participants, including ministers, ambassadors, and representatives of NGOs, private sector, academia, media and the UN system.

The substantive discussions following the opening ceremony took place at the Four Seasons Hotel in Jakarta. It brought together 50 participants representing governments, civil society, academia, the private sector and the UN system. Refer to Annex 1 for the list of participants. It included a combination of tools to share and discuss options related to the latest thinking and multiple perspectives on the integration of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda. This included presentations, panel discussions, facilitated participant reflections and a summary group exercise. The sessions were facilitated by different stakeholder representatives to encourage shared ownership and reflection of varied perspectives. The consultation observed the Chatham House Rule and the principles of dialogue and mutual respect—treating all participants on an equal footing— to encourage constructive, free, and honest dialogue among stakeholders. In keeping with those principles this report does not attribute discussions to individuals or organizations.

The consultation was supported by a background paper, which captured the emerging thinking, challenges and opportunities in the integration of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda. The background note was complemented by several research papers and experiential documentation contributed by different stakeholders during the two-day event. For a detailed list of documents refer to Annex 2. The event was extensively covered by media in Indonesian and the region (refer to Annex 3 for details).

II. KEY MESSAGES DURING THE CONSULTATION PROCEEDINGS

1. Introduction

The President of Indonesia, His Excellency Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, who is also the United Nations' first-ever Global Champion for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), and the co-chair of the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel (HLP) of Eminent Persons, urged for disaster risk reduction (DRR) to be reflected in the global development agenda, in order to safeguard development gains from setbacks caused by disasters. In this regard he noted that disaster resilience must be seen as one of the building blocks for sustained prosperity. He stressed the need to integrate a DRR strategy into the future national plan of action for implementation of the new development agenda, and to develop DRR institutional capacity as part of these national development plans. Indonesia's National Agency for Disaster Management and the Indonesian Disaster Risk Index were identified as positive examples of organisational capacity to support the DRR strategy. He further called for the DRR strategy to be supported by a sound legal foundation. On the interface between conflict and disasters, the President was of the view that the post-2015 development agenda should also consider the importance of DRR in light of human-made disasters, including violent conflicts, which worsen poverty and underdevelopment. In this regard, he expressed full support for incorporating peace and security into the agenda.

The Chair of the Indonesia National Committee for the Post-2015 Development Agenda and Head of the President's Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight, Dr. Kuntoro Mangkusubroto, reiterated that Indonesia will continue to share its experiences in DRR and play a leadership role in making the case for its integration into the post-2015 development agenda. He shared his experience after the tsunami in Aceh in December 2004 and the earthquake in Nias in March 2005, as the head of the Aceh-Nias Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency. He noted that the current recovery and development in the area was the result of the commitment of the local, national and international communities, combined with the resilience of the people. He identified the consultation as a suitable forum for Indonesia to share its experience and lessons learned with global actors and to inform risk reduction efforts at the national and international levels.



The President of Indonesia, His Excellency Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono



Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Director of UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery

Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Director of UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, noted that disaster risk reduction is vital to poverty reduction and sustainable development. He stressed the close linkages between disasters and development, and noted that a common result of disasters, from low to high income countries, is the compounding of existing poverty and inequality. He noted that the continuance of inequality not only puts progress at risk but can also erode hard-won development gains. Mr. Ryan praised Indonesia's efforts to systematically address disaster risks, including by instituting early warning systems for local communities, establishing the necessary national and sub-national institutions, changing national policies and prioritizing DRR in national and local budgets – efforts which are all saving lives. He noted that Indonesia's and other countries' experiences should be put front and center during the consultation discussions. He further noted that systematic application of cutting-edge technologies and science is a critical factor in DRR and to enable this, the post-2015 agenda should incorporate sufficient space for innovation, capacity development, and the sharing of knowledge across borders. He further stressed that in an increasingly interconnected world, with rising risk levels, rising inequities and rising uncertainties, it is imperative that building resilience of people is at the heart of our development work.

The second day of the workshop benefitted from the thoughts of Dr. Syamsul Maarif, the Chief of Indonesia's National Agency for Disaster Management in Indonesia. Dr. Maarif drew attention to the experience of the Asia-Pacific region, and noted that while development contributes to reducing vulnerability, the development patterns we choose can contribute to increasing disaster risk by expanding exposure of people and assets to hazards. He stressed the need for strengthening DRR efforts at the local level, considering that the local authorities and communities are the ones most at risk when disaster strikes, and recognising them as the front-liners for implementing DRR. With regard to

Indonesia's experience and lessons, he noted that some measures, such as early recovery, undertaken in the early phase of emergency response, can in fact reduce further risks. He also highlighted the role of DRR in significantly increasing the economic growth of the area affected by a disaster, thus promoting the cause and commitment to 'building back better.'

2. Overview and Lessons from the previous Consultation and Implementation experience

This session provided an overview of the post-2015 development agenda process, covering a range of planned and delivered consultations at the global, regional and national level. It highlighted the concern of low prominence of 'disasters caused due to natural hazards' in national consultations, even in high disaster prone countries like Indonesia. The need to identify the cause of this trend and ways to address it in upcoming consultations was identified.

Participants shared experiences and lessons related to DRR in development practice in general, and in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA¹) in particular were shared. Experiences were shared from Asia, Africa and the Latin America and the Caribbean region. Participants identified both good practices and gaps that the post-2015 development agenda, particularly its DRR component should address. MDG related challenges included, inadequate acknowledgement of the causal aspects of vulnerability to disasters and focus on only quantitative and not qualitative indicators of development progress. HFA related challenges included inadequate support for local initiatives and processes related to DRR; insufficient focus on community resilience; lopsided focus on input rather than outcome and impact indicators and; reporting overload associated with the mapping progress.

The findings of the Yogyakarta Consultation (October 2012) and other DRR consultations related to the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2) process were summarised to include:

1. Integrated planning and action for disaster reduction, climate change adaptation (CCA) and sustainable development.
2. Expand focus from reducing vulnerability to building resilience.
3. Broaden scope of risk and resilience with a focus on issues, such as socio-economic vulnerability and exposure, gender, disability, age, capacities and cultural diversity.
4. Enhance risk governance and accountability with political commitment to deliver at all levels, and to generate awareness, education and public access to information on DRR;
5. Develop a community -centered approach, with strengthened bottom-up, multi-sector and multi-stakeholder engagement and partnerships;

¹ Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA): Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (2005-2015) is the global agreement and plan to make the world safer from natural hazards. For more information refer to <http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa>. Its post-2015 iteration is being collectively developed through several multi-stakeholder consultations and exchanges.

6. Focus on implementation through mechanism such as local risk assessment and financing, land use planning and building disaster-resistant infrastructure.



Based on the discussions during preceding presentations and drawing on their own experience, participants proposed the following **considerations that should inform the integration of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda:**

1. Consider all risks identified by stakeholders particularly at the household and community level, and not just risk related to natural hazards;
2. Facilitate processes that go beyond 'protecting' what people have to building an asset base that can enhance resilience;
3. Address concerns related to not only large scale mega-disasters, but local shocks and stresses and small and medium scale disasters, which have drastic and long term impacts on setting back local development;
4. Acknowledge that national development decisions have serious implications on building and addressing local risks and ensure development decisions at all levels take DRR into account;
5. Simultaneously focus on developing national and local capacity for DRR, including allocating financial resources, developing organizational/ institutional capacities and empowering decision makers at the national level to integrate DRR in the national budgeting process and those at the local level for implementing DRR in practice;
6. Treat DRR as an investment in achieving sustainable development and not as an expenditure. Consider risk assessment and risk financing interventions to identify and address risk timely;
7. Inform social protection measures that can build disaster resilience;
8. Encourage regional cooperation and partnerships in areas like early warning systems, which have had evident and significant gains in DRR. Use its potential for cost effective sharing of

sophisticated and sometimes costly Information Communication Technologies (ICT) like Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and space technologies. Also invest in building resilience of regional and global supply chains;

9. Consider ecosystem perspective to building disaster resilience;
10. Acknowledge good governance and equity as a precondition to achieving both development and DRR goals. Ensure that governments are accountable to increasing vulnerability and exposure to disaster risks and enhance citizen-centricity of government responses;
11. Consciously develop partnerships between communities and other stakeholders in disaster and development. Clarify the ultimate goal of DRR as community resilience; and
12. Anticipate and address emerging risks posed by urbanization, climate change and economic uncertainty.

3. Interface between Disaster, Conflict and Fragility: Experiences and Reflections

The interface between the agendas for disasters, conflict and fragility was discussed several times during the consultation. Particular references were made to the lessons learnt following the 2004 tsunami in Aceh, 2008 Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, 2010 earthquake in Haiti, 2010-2011 flooding across Pakistan and the 2011 drought and food insecurity across East Africa

It was agreed that recent high profile disasters in fragile and conflict-affected states have increased attention on the interface between disasters and conflict. It was however acknowledged that there was limited analysis on the subject. There was broad agreement that disasters and conflict/fragility can each exacerbate the impacts on affected communities. For example, conflict and fragility can decrease the ability of communities to respond to disasters and reduce the capacity of government and non-government actors to provide adequate protection from natural hazards. Disasters were also seen to be fuelling conflicts by creating resource scarcities and distribution challenges.



On the other hand it was expressed that post disaster recovery and reconstruction has provided opportunities for disaster diplomacy and related reconciliation and peacebuilding, as evidenced by the post 2004 tsunami recovery and reconstruction operations in Aceh. However, it was agreed that the spectrum of conflict (social or political, local, national or regional) would influence any integrated risk reduction approach. It was also considered important to distinguish between fragile and conflict-affected states that are willing but unable, and those that are unwilling and unable to reduce the vulnerability of people to disasters. Some also cautioned against bringing together the highly political agenda of conflict and fragility with the relatively non-controversial agenda of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda.

The practical implementation of such integration approach was identified to require much work by UN agencies and donors who traditionally work in silos as exclusive teams with segregated resources in disaster, conflict and fragile contexts. It was proposed that partnership between stakeholders working in the three areas should be consciously built and supported by compiling good practice evidence on DRR interventions in conflict and fragile contexts; developing multidimensional risk index which integrates existing data on conflict, fragility, natural hazards, vulnerability, poverty and climate change; designing integrated risk assessment and impact monitoring and evaluation frameworks; and developing capacities of local stakeholders.

4. Exploring Options for Integrating DRR and Resilience

An overview of the emerging dialogue on the concept and practice of resilience, with particular reference to DRR informed the discussions during this session. Perspectives of IFRC on building safer and resilient communities identified the commonality of approaches between resilience and DRR. These included people and community centered approach; local ownership; a comprehensive approach to identifying and addressing multiple shocks and underlying causes of vulnerability across time; a long term approach to engagement and investment; focus on partnership with a range of stakeholders; and acknowledgement of the contextual nature of interventions their relative achievements. The evolving perspectives of DFID, UNISDR, UNDP and the World Bank were also briefly shared.

Overall there was an agreement that the framework for resilience can be helpful in countering the challenge of compartmentalised, sectoral interventions in development, while addressing the existing and emerging risks related to disasters, conflict and fragility. There was however an expressed need for the DRR community to agree on a broad concept and identify practices and related targets of resilience, before using it as a connecting framework in the post-2015 development agenda.

The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) shared their recent work on options for goals, targets and indicators on disaster resilience. They recommended a mixed approach on pitching for both vertical integration of DRR, by way of a standalone goal on DRR and horizontal integration by including DRR relevant targets and indicators in goals of other sectors. While the vertical integration was seen as a better political strategy, the horizontal integration was seen as the technically more appropriate one.

Some specific examples and their pros and cons were shared. They also discussed the dynamics of decision making in the post-2015 development agenda process, which could impact if and how DRR is integrated.

This discussion set the tone for the group exercise on exploring options for the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of integrating DRR in the post-2015 development agenda, while reviewing recommendations through the lens of political acceptance, local relevance and achievability. Refer to Annex 4 for guidance on the exercise. Participants shared their findings in plenary proposing and discussing the following aspects.



a. What aspects of DRR should be reflected in the post- 2015 development agenda?

Participants identified the following priority areas in DRR to be considered and addressed in the design of the post-2015 development agenda:

- The entire ‘risk basket’², particularly at the community level, which includes the everyday risks associated with meeting basic human needs and those caused by natural hazards, conflict and violence, where relevant. This was considered particularly relevant in light of the emerging risks posed by urbanization, climate change, ecosystem challenges, economic recession etc. The aim of DRR in that light was identified to include risk management, vulnerability reduction and reduction in sensitivity to emerging shocks ;
- Clarify the approach of working towards DRR, specifically community participation, local relevance, appropriate and integrated assessments of risks and needs, multi-hazard analysis, good governance and accountability. Acknowledgement of the drastic and long term impacts of local shocks and stresses, and small and medium scale disasters on setting back local development ;

² Participants proposed this term risk basket to include a variety of risks that communities experience on a day to day basis. This may not only include the risk of a natural hazard, but also the risk of being evicted from an unregulated housing, of unsafe drinking water, of unemployment, of food insecurity, etc. They expressed that the highly localised nature of risk and risk perception demands that it is prioritised and addressed locally. This they identified would require access to resources, capacities and decision making power for risk reduction at the local level.

- Options for mainstreaming DRR in development planning, for example in fiscal budgets, long-term public investment plans, decentralization programmes in urban and rural areas, feasibility studies for development interventions etc.;
- Capacities, resources and organizational mechanisms for DRR, particularly at the community level and with a particular emphasis on *at risk* groups. Ensure resource allocation for DRR covering both pre-disaster preparedness and post-disaster response and recovery operations that helps build back better; and
- Coherence between regional, national, sub-national and community level mechanisms for DRR, given the spilling on effects of disasters and the cumulative benefits of DRR beyond borders.

Participants concluded that the current development paradigm does not acknowledge the multi-dimensional and complex risk environment built by the overlap of disasters (small, medium and large scale), conflict (active and latent) and fragility. It was agreed that the three share many root causes, most notably poverty, poor governance, economic shocks, climate change, natural resource management and access related impacts on livelihoods. They proposed for the development community to design a ‘new development model’ which aims at a net reduction in all forms of risk and includes disaster risk assessment as a standard practice. They called for the model to be flexible and forward looking, so that it can address both projected and emerging risks of the future.

b. How can and should DRR be reflected in the post- 2015 development agenda?

Participants made a clear recommendation for a combination of a stand-alone goal on DRR using resilience as a potential framework, and mainstreaming DRR into other development goals using relevant indicators and targets. They acknowledged that their suggestions during this consultation are only preliminary and must be followed up with detailed exercises in reviewing the proposed and generating additional recommendations on suitably reflecting DRR in the post-2015 development agenda.

Standalone goal on disaster risk reduction: Participants attempted to frame language for a DRR goal and identified the pros and cons of the proposals they extended.

- Initial proposals were for framing the goal as, ‘**reducing disaster mortality**’, or ‘**reducing economic losses and impact on poverty levels due to disaster**’. It was agreed that while this type of goal framing lends itself to current measuring frameworks, it keeps the focus on vulnerability, rather than the resilience of communities.
- The alternative proposal that received greater currency was ‘**community resilience**’, or ‘**strengthening global, national, and local disaster resilience**’. This framing was seen to support adaptability and application of development goals to different levels of development decision making, however was considered challenging to communicate and measure.
- Another proposed option was, ‘**mainstream DRR in development.**’ It was acknowledged to help with building an integrated approach to DRR, however was seen challenging in providing appropriate impact and outcome indicators.

Participants noted that a standalone DRR goal is the most desirable option in raising the political profile of DRR. They however warned against the pitfall of having a standalone goal, which may potentially lead to 'isolation of DRR,' and thus proposed for strongly mainstreaming DRR in other development goals.

They proposed that although the aspiration from the DRR community should be for a goal, they should recognising that it may not materialise given the completion with other development priorities like climate change, environment, water etc. . If that were to happen they would advocate for clustering conflict, fragility and disaster under one goal on resilience. Concerns about combining the politically charged subject of conflict with the relatively non- controversial subject of DRR were expressed. It was elaborated that while disaster diplomacy worked in the 2004 Aceh tsunami response and recovery, it did not take deliver during the 2004 tsunami response and recovery in Sri Lanka. Thus they called for a cautious approach to such integration in pitching for a DRR goal and only use it as a mechanism of last resort.

Overall they expressed that the **resilience framework** would help address the interface between global frameworks for sustainable development (Rio 20+), disaster risk reduction (HFA2), climate change and conflict (new deal). It was also considered specifically relevant given the emerging risks associated with climate change, economic stresses and urbanization that may further aggravate disaster, conflict and fragility concerns.

Participants strongly called for continued discussions to design a resilience framework. They recommended that the implementation of such a framework will involve developing a multidimensional risk index that reflects different themes; designing integrated risk assessment and impact monitoring and evaluation frameworks; and developing capacities of local stakeholders to use the new framework. They acknowledged the limits of the development agenda in covering all concerns related to DRR. They thus advised on the need for the DRR community to strengthen the narrative, prioritize the proposed DRR areas for inclusion in the post- 2015 development agenda and include details in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2).

Mainstreaming DRR into other sector goals: Participants called for including disaster relevant targets and indicators in other candidate goals like climate change, environment, education, health, water, gender, etc. They regarded mainstreaming critical from both, the strategic angle, in the event that a standalone goal on DRR is not included and from as operational imperative, since the success of DRR is highly dependent on its integration in traditional sectors of development practice, a lesson from the implementation of MDGs. Examining the sectors covered in MDGs and HFA for gaps relevant to DRR was identified as a useful strategy to identify specific mainstreaming needs and opportunities. Some also proposed that DRR and building resilience should be a cross-cutting goal for all development goals if such an option emerges in the post-2015 development agenda.

Develop input, outcome and impact targets and indicators: Given the need to align the targets and indicators to the goal on DRR and other sector goals (which were not yet developed), participants identified broad and flexible options for targets and indicators that reflect DRR priority concerns. These included

- **‘reducing disaster mortality,’** which was not a front runner given its counterfactual nature, however it was considered valuable for its political appeal and measurement opportunity. It was proposed to be mainstreamed under the goals of health, education and gender.
- **‘reducing direct and indirect economic impact,’** although it too was considered counterfactual; however it was identified to be useful given its appeal to development actors, especially in times of global economic recession. Participants’ urged to expand the scope of economic impact indicators beyond Gross Domestic Product (GDP), so as to cover both direct and indirect losses, in the formal and informal sector, especially losses related to social capital, ecosystems, etc.
- **‘proactive and accountable disaster governance,’** relevant target and indicator was considered important given the reliance on government and non-government actors as both a source of disaster risk and resource for DRR. Although no clear indicator was identified, it was proposed that targets and indicators in this area should cover conscious integration of DRR in existing development planning processes, with specific budgetary allocations at the national, sub-national and local levels. Other areas that were recommended for coverage under this target was investment in risk assessments; disaster prevention, preparedness and recovery planning and financing with a strong focus on DRR; ensuring community participation and active engagement of the private sector in risk reduction.
- **‘integrate DRR in development plans’.** was proposed on the acknowledgement that although the DRR community has several frameworks for disaster plans (like contingency plans, preparedness plans etc.) their titles are often confusing and alienating. Therefore as a starting point it was considered relevant to have targets and indicators on factoring DRR in development plans at national, sub-national and local levels, with specific budget allocations.

Participants called for reviewing the appropriateness of the above and other emerging options of targets and indicators from the angle of incremental benefit, political acceptance, measurability, local relevance in light of the availability of development baselines and existing or potential disaster information management systems and appropriate to needs of DRR.

It was suggested that while input indicators still remain relevant, however they are not sufficient. Thus the need for a combination of input, output, outcome and impact indicators was proposed. They also urged for indicators that would be applicable at the sub-national level, where disaster impacts can be significant and often missed when cumulated at the national level. The need for collecting and reporting sex and age disaggregated data as a part of the framework for targets and indicators was also emphasised.

In addition to the specific options and guidance for goals, targets and indicators proposed above, there was a strong recommendation for developing a **proactive and compelling narrative on DRR** that could be moulded to the emerging post-2015 development framework. It was suggested that this narrative should include both rigorous research based evidence and anecdotal evidence in the form human interest stories that appeals to the development conscience. It was proposed that instead of use the tone of ‘appeal,’ the narrative should use a tone of ‘demand and urgency’ in recommending the inclusion of DRR in the post-2015 development agenda. Participants stressed that an attractive and

incentivized advocacy of DRR should not only focus on the development benefit of investing in DRR, but also the dire development consequences of not investing in it.



5. Bringing it all together: Strategic Opportunities and Next Steps

The panel discussion, followed by participant reflections on the subject of emerging strategic opportunities for reflecting DRR in the post-2015 development agenda, brought together perspectives of the government, civil society, UN system, donors and academics. It was urged that the opportunity presented by the time overlap with other global frameworks like those for post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2), climate change framework and conflict framework should be consciously used to build linkages and strengthen advocacy efforts for DRR. Some specific recommendations and opportunities identified by the panel and participants included the following. See Annex 5 for details on upcoming advocacy opportunities.

1. Connect and coordinate with the national and regional consultations on the post 2015 development framework and the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2).
2. Pitch for DRR in upcoming forums on environment, both within and beyond activities planned for influencing the post-2015 development agenda.
3. Gain from discussions and experience sharing in forums on DRR, to inform the narrative on DRR in the post-2015 development agenda.
4. Capitalise on the attention received by disasters in the *Future We Want* document produced after the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), by informing and influencing development forums.

In order to avail of the above strategic opportunities and beyond the following **next steps** were identified:

1. Continue to develop a proactive and compelling narrative, backed by evidence based research and human interest stories, that demonstrates the contribution of disaster risk reduction investments to sustainable development. Package the DRR message in a fashion that appeals to the understanding and framework of development partners. For example, use terms like disasters interrupt development; identify existing development mechanisms that can integrate disaster feasibility studies for development projects that could include elements of risk assessment etc.;
2. Ensure close alignment between disaster risk reduction considerations in the post-2015 development agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2), and other frameworks. This is in acknowledgement of the limitations of a single framework in meeting all the goals of DRR, and the anticipated benefits of reinforcing guidance for disaster sensitive development;
3. Support the imperative to reflect disaster risk reduction in relevant national and regional post-2015 development agenda consultation processes. This was in acknowledgement of the concern of inadequate prominence to disasters in previous national consultations;
4. Summarize key messages emerging from consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA2), to inform the development of the post-2015 development agenda; and
5. Continue efforts to design targets and indicators for disaster risk reduction that are adaptable to the emerging post-2015 development agenda.



III. CONCLUSION

The consultation was wrapped up with the joint development of the ‘summary of key conclusions’ document, which captured key messages and recommendations from the consultation. Facilitators generated an initial draft that was commented on and refined by participants during and shortly after the consultation and made available for wider circulation (refer to Summary of Key Conclusions). The summary document, along with this detailed consultation report will inform the Synthesis Report to be shared during the High Level Consultation in Helsinki in March 2013 and other consultations and processes that may inform and guide the development of the post-2015 development agenda.

All documentation collected and generated during this consultation are available on the World We Want 2015 website <http://www.worldwewant2015.org/conflict>



Annex 1: List of Participants

	NAME	TITLE/INSTITUTION	EMAIL
1.	Anggit Arifiyanto	AusAid, Australia	anggit.arifiyanto@ausaid.gov.au
2.	Ardito Kodijat	Head of DRR Unit, UNESCO	a.kodijat@unesco.org
3.	Ari Huhtala	Senior Research Fellow, ODI	a.huhtala@odi.org.uk
4.	Aslam Perwariz	ADPC	aslam@adpc.net
5.	Budi Adiputro	Sekjen, PMI	
6.	Danang Parikesit	UGM	dan-dan@indo.net.id
7.	Diah Saminarsih	Office of President Special Envoy for MDGs	diah@mdgsindonesia.org
8.	Dian Lestari	Board PLANAS Indonesia National Platform	dianlestariningsih@gmail.com
9.	Dinh Viet Tu	Reporter, Vietnam News	majak@indosat.net.id
10.	Dominic Morice	Partnerships manager, AusAid	dominic.morice@ausaid.gov.au
11.	Eddy Purwanto	The Office of Vice President of Indonesia	epoe95@yahoo.com

12.	Faisal Djalal	Planas Indonesia Nat. Platform for DRR	faisal.djalal@gmail.com
13.	Hang Thi Thanh Pham	UN ISDR	phamh@un.org
14.	Hening Purwati	Executive Director Humanitarian Forum Indonesia and MPBI	hening.parlan@yahoo.com
15.	Hepi Rahmawati	Program Manager, YAKKUM, Indonesia	hepi.rahmawati@gmail.com
16.	Heru Prasetyo	Secretary of the Indonesia National Committee on the post-2015 development agenda , Government of Indonesia	heru.prasetyo@ukp.go.id
17.	Hideki Katayama	Disaster Management Advisor, JICA Indonesia	katayama.hideki@jica.go.jp
18.	Idwan Suhardi	Deputy Minister of Research and Technology, Indonesia	idwan@ristek.go.id
19.	Indu Weerasoori	Project Manager UN Habitat, Colombo, Sri Lanka	induw_nana@yahoo.com

20.	Jan Sopahelawakan	Chairman, LIPI	jan.sopahelawakan@gmail.com
21.	Jennifer Schlecht	Senior Program Officer, Sexual and Reproductive Health Women's Refugee Commission	JennS@wrcommission.org
22.	Julia Hoeffmann	Research & Advocacy UNORCID	julia.hoeffmann@unorcid.org
23.	Kamal Kishore	Programme Adviser, UNDP	kamal.kishore@undp.org
24.	Kishan Sugathapal	Head of Human Settlement Planning & Training Division National Building Research Organization	kishan1962@hotmail.com
25.	Leena Viljanen	Deputy Head of Mission Embassy of Finland	Leena.Viljanen@formin.fi
26.	Lindsey Jones	Senior Research Officer, ODI	l.jones@odi.org.uk
27.	Made Dwi Rani	DRR Unit, UNESCO	m.dwi-rani@unesco.org
28.	Madhavi Ariyabandu	Regional Programme Officer ISDR	ariyabandu@un.org
29.	Maggy Horhoruw	International Reform Advisor UKP4	maggy@max-excel.com
30.	Malikah Amri	Project Manager for DRR UNDP Indonesia	malikah.amril@undip.org

31.	Maureen Fordham	Gender & Disaster Network, Univ. of North Umbria	maureen.fordham@northumbria.ac.uk
32.	Michel Le Pechoux	Chief of the Preparedness and DRR Section, UNICEF	mlepechoux@unicef.org
33.	Muralee Thummarukudy	Chief, Disaster Risk Reduction Post Conflict and Disaster Management Branch, Geneva	muralee.THUMMARUKUDY@undp.org
34.	Naoya Furuta	IUCN	naoya.furuta@iucn.org
35.	Nila F. Moeloek	Office of President Special Envoy for MDGs	nilamoeloek@mdgsindonesia.org
36.	Nozomu Yamashita	Deputy Director of Disaster Management Division, JICA, Japan	yamashita.nozomu@jica.go.jp
37.	Pirjo Soumela Chowdury	Director of Unit for UN Dev. Affairs of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Finland	Pirjo.Suomela-Chowdhury@formin.fi
38.	Rajan Gengaje	Head, UNOCHA Indonesia	gengaje@un.org
39.	Ruby Mangunsong	World Bank	rmangunsong@worldbank.org
40.	Sanjay Srivasta	Regional Advisor DRR UN-ESCAP	srivastavas@un.org
41.	Sanny Ramos Jegillos	UNDP	sanny.jegillos@undp.org
42.	Samuel Doe	Policy Adviser, UNDP	samuel.doe@undp.org

43.	Shadia Yousif Bakhail	Representative, UNIDO	s.hakhail@unido.org
44.	Shamsul Alam	Member of Planning Commission , Ministry of Planning, Bangladesh	sabau4@yahoo.com
45.	Syamsul Maarif	Chief of the National Agency for Disaster Management BNPB, Indonesia	
46.	Sugeng Triutom	Deputy Chief BNPB, Indonesia	striutomo@bnpb.go.id
47.	Suprayoga Hadi	Deputy Minister for Special Regions, Ministry of Disadvantage Regions, Indonesia	yogahadi@gmail.com
48.	Suranjana Gupta	Huairou Commission, Community Practitioner Platform for Resilience	suranjana.gupta@huairou.org
49.	Syamsul Ardiansyah	National Platform of DRR / Advocacy	syamsulardianc@gmail.com
50.	Victoria Presland	DFID, UK	v-presland@dfid.gov.uk
51.	Vishaka Hidellage	Coordinator South Asia Network for Disaster Mitigation	vishaka.hidellage@gmail.com
52.	Wayne Ulrich	Community Safety and Resilience Delegation, IFRC, South East Asia	wayne.ulrich@ifrc.org

53.	William Sabandar	Former ASEAN SG's Envoy for Nargis Recovery in Myanmar	
54.	Hanna Grahn	UNDP	hanna.grahn@undp.org
55.	Shivani Khanna	Overall Consultation Facilitator	shivanik10@hotmail.com

Annex 2: Documents Circulated during the Consultation

Papers:

- Concept Note for the Global Consultation on DRR and the Post-2015 Development Agenda (December 2012)
- Background paper for the Global Consultation on Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2015 Development Agenda (February 2013)
- Summary Report from the consultations for Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and Development Agenda at the Fifth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction Yogyakarta, Indonesia, (October 2012)
- Yogyakarta Declaration Annex: Statement of individuals and organizations concerned with Gender Issues (October 2012)
- Outcome of Experts meeting in London on 'Integrating disaster resilience into a Post MDG framework': Summary Notes and table on disaster risk targets, indicators and how to measure them (December 2012)
- ODI paper on Options for including disaster resilience in post-2015 development goals (2012)
- ODI Paper on When disasters and conflicts collide: Improving links between disaster resilience and conflict prevention (January 2013)
- UNISDR Paper on Building Resilience to Disasters through Partnerships: Lessons from the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013)
- UNISDR Paper on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience: Contribution to the Global Thematic Consultation on DRR and the post-2015 Development Agenda, February 2013.
- UN ISDR Policy Recommendations for Post-2015: Strengthening Governance for Disaster Risk Reduction
- UN ISDR (gender)
- UNDP/BCPR Report on Disaster-Conflict interface: Comparative experience s (2011)
- Philippine Institute for Development Studies' Discussion Paper on Impacts of Natural Disasters on Agriculture, Food Security, and Natural Resources and Environment in the Philippines (October 2012)
- Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre's Study on Impact of Disasters on the Education Sector in Cambodia (March 2008)
- UN Millennium Campaign's Brochure on Disaster Proofing the Millennium Development Goals: enhancing Resilience and Accelerating Achievement of MDGs and HFA Implementation in Asia and the Pacific Region by 2015 (2012)

- UN's Analysis on Flood Impact on Millennium Development Goals Analysis (FIMA) in Pakistan (2011)
- CIGI and KDI Report on Post-2015 Development Agenda: Goals, Targets and Indicators (2012)
- ESCAP Inputs to the recommendations of the Global Consultation on DRR and the Post-2-15 Development Agenda (2013)
- AIDMI's Discussion Note for the Global Thematic Consultation on Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2015 Development Agenda (February 2013)
- IFRC's Framework for DRR in South-East Asia (2012)
- IFRC's Key determinants of a successful Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Programme (September 2011)
- IFRC's Road to Resilience: Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future (June 2012)

Speeches and Presentations:

- Speech by the President of Indonesia, His Excellency Dr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.
- Speech by the Chair of the Indonesia National Committee for the Post-2015 Development Agenda and Head of the President's Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight, Dr. Kuntoro Mangkusubroto.
- Speech by Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Director of UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery.
- Speech by Dr. Syamsul Maarif, the Chief of Indonesia's National Agency for Disaster Management
- MDGs in Disaster and Conflict Contexts: Regional Lessons by Dr. Shamika Sirimanne.
- Update on HLPEP preparation by Dr. Heru Prasetyo.
- Lessons learned Bangladesh, by Professor Dr. Shamsul Alam.
- Lessons learned on mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and conflict management into development policy and planning, by Dr. Suprayoga Hadi.
- Risk Governance and Resilience Building: Local Perspective by Ms. Vishaka Hidellage. Overview- Consultation Process towards the Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction by Ms. Madhavi Ariyabandu.
- Outcomes of the 5th Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction by Dr. Sugeng Triutomo.

- Post-HFA Consultations: Reiterating Yogyakarta messages: Adding new elements by Ms. Hang Thi Thanh Pham.
- Post-MDGs in Disaster and Conflict Contexts: Regional perspective by Dr. William Sabandar.
- Interface between Disaster, Conflict and Fragility: Positive experiences from Aceh by Dr. Eddy Purwanto.
- When disasters and conflicts collide: improving links between disaster resilience and conflict prevention by Mr. Ari Huhtala.
- Building Safer and more Resilient Communities by Mr. Wayne Ulrich.
- Disaster Resilience in the Post-2-15 Development Goals: Challenges and Options for Targets by Mr. Lindsey Jones.

Annex 3: Press Releases and Media Coverage

In English language media:

- <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/02/21/mainstreaming-disaster-risk-reduction-and-resilience-post-2015-agenda.html>
- <http://setkab.go.id/international-7502-.html>
- <http://www.tempointeractive.com/hg/ekbis/2013/02/19/brk,20130219-462391,uk.html>
- <http://www.antaraneews.com/en/news/87413/president-yudhoyono-kicks-off-consultation-on-disaster-risk-reduction>
- <http://wp.me/p2kitP-Bs>

In Indonesian language media:

- <http://www.presidenri.go.id/index.php/fokus/2013/02/19/8756.html>
- <http://www.tribunnews.com/2013/02/19/sby-buka-forum-konsultasi-penanganan-bencana-global>
- <http://www.beritasatu.com/nusantara/97738-soal-penanggulangan-bencana-undp-siap-bekerja-sama-dengan-indonesia.html>
- <http://jaringnews.com/politik-peristiwa/kabar-istana/34750/sby-bencana-dorong-jutaan-orang-masuk-ke-lubang-kemiskinan>
- <http://nasional.sindonews.com/read/2013/02/19/15/719245/sby-pengurangan-risiko-bencana-sudah-menjadi-program-nasional>
- <http://m.tribunnews.com/2013/02/19/sby-buka-forum-konsultasi-penanganan-bencana-global>
- <http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2013/02/19/078462336/SBY-Bencana-Hancurkan-Pembangunan>
- <http://www.beritasatu.com/nasional/97652-buka-forum-konsultasi-penanganan-bencana-sby-paparkan-progres.html>
- <http://www.bisnis.com/articles/risiko-bencana-sby-buka-forum-diskusi-global>

Annex 4: Guidance for Group Exercise on Exploring Options for Integrating DRR (WHAT and HOW) in the Post- 2015 Development Agenda

Based on key issues raised during this consultation, discuss the following questions.

Refer to the list of priority issues identified during this consultation and the list from previous consultations and discussions (provided as a hand-out).

Record your findings in a presentation.

1. Identify the **five key** priority areas for DRR which must be reflected in the post-2015 development agenda. Consider the list of priority areas in DRR identified during Day 1 of this consultation (attached).
2. Explore different options on how these priority areas can be reflected in the post-2015 development agenda.
3. Propose **specific options** (from the above), which are likely to get political acceptance, are locally relevant and achievable.
4. Which aspects of DRR can and should be aligned in the parallel processes (including post-MDGs, post- HFA, SDGs, climate change framework etc.)?

Annex 5: Upcoming opportunities for advocacy related to integrating DRR in the post-2015 development agenda

Forums on environment:

- The Energy Efficiency Global Forums, Washington DC in May 2013. The forum is hosted by Alliance to Save Energy, a non-profit coalition of business, government, environmental, and consumer leaders that promotes energy efficiency worldwide to achieve a healthier economy, a cleaner environment, and energy security. For more information.
- Sustainable Development Forum organised by the World Economic Forum (WEF), World Energy Council (WEC) - private sector.

Forums on DRR:

- Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva, May 2013. Make use of the evolving WGs during the platform.
- Community Practitioners Academy event on Demystifying Grassroots partnerships: Partnering Towards Community Resilience, in Geneva, May 2013.
- Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)'s Consultative Group (CG) Meeting in London.
- 6th Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Thailand in 2013.
- 2nd Asia-Pacific Water Summit on Water Security and Water-related Disaster Challenges: Leadership and Commitment, 14th– 20th May 2013, Chiang Mai, Thailand.
- Align and partner with agencies involved in the Sendai Dialogue (Oct 2012) on Mainstreaming DRM for Sustainable Development.
- Partner with networks like Community Disaster Response Network (CDRN), Duryog Nivaran (South Asia) and Gender and Disaster Network (GDN) could also be used for advocacy and information sharing and dissemination purposes.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR)'s conference in The Hague, March 2013.

Forums on development:

- MDG side event at the UN General Assembly (Sept, 2013)
- Commission on Sustainable Development's session in May 2013, USA.
- Governing Council Session of UN-HABITAT, April 15-19, 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Resilient Cities Congress organized by the ICLEI, the Global cities network for sustainable development, 31 May - 2 June 2013, Bonn Germany.
- Financing for development: Small Island Development States Meeting in 2014.