Disasters and conflict

Many disasters occur in fragile states and conflict affected, accounting for a high proportion of disaster-affected populations each year.

50%

From 2005–2009, more than 50% of people impacted by natural hazard related disasters lived in fragile and conflict affected states.

80%

In some years the figure is more than 80%.

Disasters in challenging contexts account for some of the largest on record

Location of people affected by natural disasters

KEY MESSAGE

Fragile and conflict affected states experience shocks and stresses related to natural hazards simultaneously to the challenges of conflict and fragility. Much can be done to reduce, manage and prepare for natural disasters in more appropriate – or in some cases more interconnected – ways. The successor to the HFA must do more to support effective disaster risk reduction in these complex contexts by being explicit about the need to support governance strengthening as a starting point to building disaster resilience.

140

disasters associated with natural hazards were in contexts affected by complex political emergencies. But the gaps in evidence are immense - true numbers are likely to be much higher.

Recorded data shows that between 1999 and 2004

Future projections show that climate related disaster vulnerability will be felt most in fragile and conflict affected states

The latest IPCC report tells us that:

Our future will almost certainly feature an increase in climate-related disasters.

Countries experiencing violent conflict or difficulties in governance are least likely to be able to support communities to deal with vulnerability to climate impacts, or be able to adapt to climate change.

Poorly designed risk reduction, adaptation and mitigation strategies can increase the risk of conflict.

The necessary elements of disaster risk management are development levels, political conditions and risk governance

The top twenty ranked countries most at risk of combined high levels of fragility, disaster, poverty and climate change vulnerability, combined

RECOMMENDATIONS

The successor to the HFA should explicitly recognise the need and value of building disaster risk management institutions as a means to support governance strengthening.

- For contexts where formal Government structures are in place, disaster management should be seen as a means through which to strengthen policy formulation processes, national fiscal and budgetary arrangements, and institution building.

- For vulnerable populations living in areas where the state and/or governance structure are lacking, or where those in power are party to a conflict, international support should be provided to enhance disaster management through local action, governance arrangements at the sub-national level and through informal institutions.

The successor should include action and indicators on:

- Complexity of risk
  - To include the relationship between natural hazards, climate change, conflict and fragility in risk and vulnerability assessments.

- Dual benefits
  - Seek opportunities for co-benefits for peacebuilding and state building as well as development progress. And as a bare minimum, adopt climate and conflict-sensitive approaches to disaster risk management.

- Inclusive governance
  - Adopt inclusive decision making processes, with appropriate mechanisms in participation, accountability and transparency.

The successor to the HFA should explicitly recognise

- A third of countries are Latin American/Caribbean (20.9%), including Argentina, Mexico, Colombia, Panama, Cuba, Peru, Brazil and China.

- A third of countries are Latin American/Caribbean (30.7%), including Argentina, Mexico, Colombia, Panama, Cuba, Peru, Brazil and China.

- Africa, including Sudan, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Central African Republic, Afghanistan, Myanmar, Chad, Zimbabwe and Guinea-Bissau.

Contact Kate Peters at ODI for further information, including the background evidence for this set of graphics k.peters@odi.org