Monitoring progress in disaster risk reduction at local, national, regional and global level

Global analysis and synthesis process (GAR-HFA Mid-term review)

Sub/ regional HFA review process
Regional/ sub regional synthesis and review of trans-boundary issues

National HFA progress review process
Self- assessment of countries to review their own progress, gaps and challenges in Disaster Risk Reduction efforts

Local HFA Monitor

City HFA Monitor

Views From the Frontline

process
(Who, Why and What)

Who:

Governments at local and national level (self-assessment through multi stakeholder engagement)

Inter-governmental organizations at the regional level

Why:

To assess their own progress, gaps and challenges in DRR efforts

To establish a continuous feedback mechanism for development planning processes

What:

National HFA Monitoring and Review

Self- assessment

Assist countries in reviewing their own progress, gaps and challenges in Disaster Risk Reduction efforts

Serves as a continuous feedback mechanism for the countries

For the country and led by the country through multi-stakeholder engagement

Indicators for national HFA Monitor

- 3 strategic goals

- 22 core indicators in 5 priorities for action

- 5 drivers of progress

- 3 future outlook statements

- 5 levels of progress from minor progress to comprehensiv achievement

Disclaimer: The depiction and use of boundaries and geographic [...] this map are not warranted to be error free nor do they necessa[...] official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

Africa

12, 21%

21, 37%

24,

Americas

2, 4%

22, 42%

28, 54%

Asia

14, 29%

14, 28%

21, 43%

Europe

5, 10%

15, 31%

29, 59%

Oceania

2, 8%

3, 12%

20, 80%

Countries/OT	2009 HFA	2010 HFA
Anguilla	Yes	Yes
Antigua and Barbados	No	Yes
Aruba	No	No
Bahamas	No	No
Barbados	No	Yes
Bermuda	No	No
British Virgin Islands	Yes	Yes
Cayman Islands	Yes	Yes
Cuba	No	Yes
Dominica	No	No
Dominican republic	Yes	Yes
Grenada	No	No
Guadeloupe	No	No
Haiti	No	No
Jamaica	Yes	Yes
Martinique	No	No
Montserrat	No	No
Netherlands Antilles	No	No
Puerto Rico	No	No
Saint Barthelemy	No	No
Saint Lucia	Yes	Yes
Saint Pierre and Miquelon	No	No
Saint Vincent and Grenadines	No	No
Saint Kitts and Nevis	No	Yes
Trinidad and Tobago	No	No
Turks and Caicos	No	Yes

1 Make Disaster Risk Reduction a Priority

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation

2 Know the Risks and Take Action

Identify, assess, and monitor disaster risks - and enhance early warning

3 Build Understanding and Awareness

Use knowledge, innovation, and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

4 Reduce Risk

Reduce the underlying risk factors

5 Be Prepared and Ready to Act

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Level	Generic description of level of progress for overall ranking for each question (add narrative comments on context and challenges)
5	Comprehensive achievement has been attained, with the commitment and capacities to sustain efforts at all levels.
4	Substantial achievement has been attained, but with some recognised deficiencies in commitment, financial resources or operational capacities.
3	There is some institutional commitment and capacities to achieving DRR but progress is not comprehensive or substantial.

rity 1 Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for entation Core Indicators (CI) HFA Priority 1

National HFA monitoring results priority 1

Legend: P1.1, P1.2, P1.3, P1.4

Categories: nguila, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Dominican republic, Jamaica, Saint Kits and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Turks and Caicos Islands

Level	Generic description of level of p overall ranking for each question
5	Comprehensive achievement attained, with the commitment an to sustain efforts at all levels.
4	Substantial achievement has been with some recognised defic commitment, financial resources o capacities.
3	There is some institutional comm capacities to achieving DRR but pr comprehensive or substantial.
2	Achievements have been mad incomplete, and while improve planned, the commitment and ca limited.
1	Achievements are minor and th signs of planning or forward action the situation.

National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralized responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

Community Participation and decentralization is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning

A self assessment tool for city/ local governments and local civil society organizations

Aimed at providing a feedback mechanism for the local and city governments

Intend to support the national Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) review process

Objectives

- Complement the national HFA monitoring and multi-stakeholder engagement process by providing information and an assessment of the situation from the local level.

- Present a "baseline" and a status report for cities and municipalities that have committed to the *Making Cities Resilient Campaign.*

Local/city Indicators

Prepared in consultation with local government representatives, civil society network and partner

43 key questions aligned to

o 5 HFA priority of action

o 10 essentials – Making Cities Resilient Campaign

level of progress

Local stakeholders
Municipalities, City authorities, provincial governments, local civil society organisations, other relevant local government organisations and so on.

Local feedback loop

...rms back to the local ...ty authorities on trends, ...allenges and gaps in ...er risk reduction at the local level.

**Local multi stakeh...
engagement proc...**
Continuous review o...
reduction efforts at the l...
through city/ local indi...

Local/ city HFA Monitor and VFL

Pilot phase

- 5 countries: national multi – stakeholder workshops

  - Peru, Nepal, Mozambique, Indonesia, Armenia

- 25 cities: local multi-stakeholder process

  - Santa Tecla (El Salvador), Telica (Nicaragua), Florianopolis (Brasil), Lima (Peru), Quito (Ecuador)

- http://www.unisdr.org/applications/campaign/index.php

HYOGO FRAMEWORK ▾ | **COUNTRIES & REGIONS** ▾ | **THEMES & ISSUES** ▾ | **HAZARDS** ▾ | **PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES** ▾

Subscriptions: 🔊 RSS ✉ Email

- About the Hyogo Framework for Action
- HFA Progress Reports
- HFA Monitoring & Review
  - Regional HFA Monitor
  - National HFA Monitor
  - Local HFA Monitor
- HFA Mid-Term Review
- Global Assessment Report
- Millennium Development Goals
- ISDR System
- Global Platform
- National Platforms
- Key Documents

HFA Monitoring & Review

Regional HFA Monitor 2009-2011

Regional reporting for 2009-2011 began on 15 October 2010.

More »

National HFA Monitor 2009-2011

National reporting for 2009-2011 began on 22 March 2010.

More »

Local HFA Monitor 2009-2011

Local reporting will begin in January 2011.

More »

Description

The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) Monitoring and Progress Review process will facilitate monitoring, evaluating and reporting on the implementation of disaster risk reduction measures at the national, regional and global levels.

Objective

Login to HFA Monitor

Regional, National and Local

Login

Password

[LOGIN]

Making Cities Resilient

Cities getting ready

197

Sign up today to make your city resilient to disasters

World disaster reduction campaign 2010-2011

Get involved in the campaign »

HFA Progress Reports

National and regional reports on the progress of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

Making Cities Resilient My City is Getting Ready

HFA MONITOR LOCAL

Bienvenida(o) HFA Monitor Local - **Bonn (North Rhine-Westphalia)**

> Detalles del Punto Focal

Detalles del Punto Focal

Informe de Seguimiento al proceso de implementación	Perfil de la ciudad	**Detalles del Punto Focal**

Editar los detalles del Punto Focal - última actualización: 15 Sep 2011

Ciudad/Municipalidad que se inscribe

País * `Germany`

Ciudad/Municipalidad * `Bonn`

Estado/Provincia/País `_____`

Código postal * `1203`

CAL HFA MONITOR

A Monitor Home

| gress Monitor | **Focal Point Details** |

rent monitoring and review period (2009-2011)

> **You have marked "Priority for Action 1" as complete.** You can edit this section any time.

ction	Description	Status	Completion
rity for action 1	Making risk reduction a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation	●-●-●	CompleteOngoi
rity for action 2		●-●-●-○ ○-○-	ng
rity for action 3	Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks andenhance early warning	○-○ ○-○-○-○- ○ ○-●-●-●	Not started
rity for action 4	Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels		Not startedOngoing
rity for action 5	Reduce underlying risk factors across key sectors of development activity		
	Strengthening disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels		

You have completed 1 out of 10 sections

Essential 5 ②

Assess the **safety of all schools and health facilities** and upgrade these as necessary.

status: o-o-o [You can mark this section as complete]

★ Mandatory

ReferenceDocuments

>Ten Essentials (PDF, 89KB)

> Progress monitoring framework 2009-2011 (PDF, 539KB)

Key Questions ②

Previous report

Have local schools and hospitals received special attention for "all hazard" risk assessments in your local authority? ②

◯ Yes   ◯ No

Are all main hospitals safe from disasters and have the ability to remain operational during emergencies?

◯ Yes   ◯ No

Do the local government or other levels of government have special programs in place to regularly assess public infrastructure (especially schools & hospitals) for maintenance, seismic stability, general safety, weather related risks etc.?

◯ Yes   ◯ No

Are regular disaster preparedness drills undertaken in schools?

◯ Yes   ◯ No

Summary

Previous report

Level of Progress *

    ○ 1: Minor progress

    ○ 2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

    ○ 3: Commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

    ○ 4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects

    ○ 5: Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Progress & Achievements *

(**300** of 300 words)

Future Plans & Constraints *

(**300** of 300 words)

+ Additional related documents [attach]

+ Additional related links [attach]

status: o-o-o [You can mark this section as complete]

☒ Save   ☒ Preview   ☒ Print   ☒ Email