

Report on Regional Consultation on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Americas

**During the Third Session of the Regional Platform on DRR in the Americas (RP12)
Santiago de Chile, 26-28 November 2012**

Consolidated by the UNISDR Regional Office for the Americas

1. Introduction
 2. Methodology
 3. Regional consultation
 - 3.1 Panel discussions
 - 3.2 Meeting with stakeholders
 - 3.2.1 Meeting with Intergovernmental Agencies, regional and UN organisations*
 - 3.2.2 Meeting with national governments*
 - 3.2.3 Meeting with local governments*
 - 3.2.4 Meeting with civil society*
 4. Conclusions and Recommendations
- Annex 1: Questions and online survey
- Annex 2: Agendas of the different sessions during the Regional Platform
- Annex 3: Powerpoint presentations stakeholder workshops / Results online questionnaire

1. Introduction

The UNISDR Regional Office for the Americas coordinated the regional consultations on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (the successor of the Hyogo Framework for Action or HFA2) during the 2012 Regional Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction for the Americas (RP12) which took place in Santiago de Chile from 26-28 November 2012. Nearly 100 participants participated in the discussions related to the HFA2 consultation. The results of the regional consultation will feed in to the on-going global consultation process to define a post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction.

On the first day of the Regional Platform, a Plenary Session on the post-HFA process introduced the concept and provided details to the participants how they can engage in the process during and beyond the RP12. Representatives from different stakeholder groups presented their perspective the HFA2 in this Plenary Session.

In total four working group sessions were organized with key disaster risk reduction (DRR) stakeholders to discuss specific questions related to the HFA2 process.

The objectives of the consultation were:

- Engage a wide range of stakeholders in the preparatory process in developing a Post-2015 Framework on DRR.
- Review success and lessons learnt, identify challenges and solutions to disaster risk reduction, especially at national and local levels.
- Deepen understanding and knowledge of issues imperative to making development resilient to the impact of natural hazards.

Based on the discussions held during the RP12 this report summarizes the main recommendations for the HFA2 as contribution from the Americas to the global consultation process. Results of this consultation were furthermore included in the RP12 declaration¹.

The detailed structure for each HFA2 consultation session can be found in Annex 2. Annex 1 provides the questions that were used for an online survey. Disaster risk reduction stakeholders in the Americas were requested to reply to these questions before the RP12. The results of the survey were analyzed and presented during the RP12 and further discussed during the stakeholder working group sessions on HFA2 during the RP12.

The UNISDR regional office for the Americas was also supporting the sub-regional consultation in the Caribbean which took place on 3 December 2012 during the 7th CDM conference. The consultation is aligned to the discussion on the CDM Strategy Beyond 2012. The summary report of this consultation is the input to the HFA2 consultation process for the CARICOM member states and the beyond CDM framework.

2. Methodology

To familiarize a wide range of DRR stakeholders with the HFA2 consultation process and the regional consultation that is planned during the RP12, an online survey was circulated to the regional DRR

¹ http://eird.org/pr12-eng/documents/RP12_Communique_Santiago_ENG_101212.pdf

partners. The purpose of the survey was to collect initial ideas for the consultations during the RP12 which were used as basis for the discussions in the stakeholder workshops.

The online survey was visited by over 100 DRR stakeholders (see table 1 below). 43 of these stakeholders completed the full questionnaire and thus contributed to the first phase of the consultation which supported the analysis of trends among each stakeholder group. Table one provides an overview of which stakeholders and how they responded to the survey.

Stakeholder Group	Visited the questionnaire			Response to all questions		
	<i>Spanish</i>	<i>English</i>	total	<i>Spanish</i>	<i>English</i>	total
Inter-governmental, UN and regional organizations	22	3	25	7	1	8
National governments	13	6	19	8	1	9
Local governments	11	0	11	6	0	6
Civil society	45	3	48	17	3	20
Communities/NGOs	31	1	32	13	1	13
Academic sector	10	1	11	5	1	6
Private sector	4	1	5	0	1	1
		Total	103	Total		43

The UNISDR Regional Office for the Americas analyzed the feedback received from the different stakeholder groups and identified initial trends which would be verified in the consultation process at the RP12. At the plenary session during the RP12, HFA2 process was introduced with the objective to call for reflections on HFA2 and to identify areas of agreement related to the trends, challenges and emerging solutions for DRR in connection with other important areas such as adaptation to climate change, sustainable development, poverty eradication and environment.

In this plenary session representatives from different stakeholder groups were requested to provide comments along predefined questions.

Following the plenary discussion, working sessions were organized with 4 different stakeholder groups to present the trends, analyzed from the online survey, to verify the analysis and provide recommendations from the group for the HFA2. Section 3 of this report provides a summary of each working session. The methodology has been modified for some sessions based on the feedback received through the online questionnaire. For session with modified methodology, it is indicated in the reports. The agendas, presentations and results of these four sessions can be found in Annex 2 and 3.

3. Regional consultation

3.1 Panel discussions during the thematic plenary session

The panel discussion began with a presentation by Ms. Margareta Wahlström, Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for DRR. Ms Wahlström provided an overview of the global consultation process including the scopes and the process envisaged for the development and adoption of a new DRR framework post 2015.

She also mentioned that one result of the consultation in other regions highlighted the need for the inclusion of and linkages to climate change related issues, in particular on how to address these with

actions and concrete results. In the same way, to reinforce information on loss and damage databases which help to assess future risk.

Other relevant aspects were:

- The need for having visions from the national to the local level both in the medium and long term, articulating social processes, with the development of science and assessing disaster impact on the population;
- Promote DRR in other sectors and forums.
- The consultation process contemplates the involvement of various actors at national, sub national, local level, public and private sector, as well as civil society.

Ricardo Mena, Head of the UNISDR Regional Office for the Americas, provided a summary of initial ideas for HFA as drawn from online survey, the planned consultation activities in the Americas during and beyond the RP12 such as the sub-regional consultation during the 7th CDM conference.

It was suggested to undertake at least 2 consultations at the national level and a consultation with financial and international technical cooperation agencies involved in the region.

Moderated by Mrs. Wahlström, panelists at regional, national and local level were invited to give their respective visions on the achievements and challenges in implementing the HFA and DRR in general and to provide suggestions for the new DRR framework.

Ms. María de el Pilar Cornejo, Ecuador Minister of the National Secretary of Risk Management noted the importance of building on the progress made, as well as to consider new hazard trends, primarily weather related, which affect policy and legal frameworks that are not contemplated in such situations and thus restricting public responsible bodies' actions. There is a need to change risk management towards a more inclusive vision oriented towards the development, sustainability and resilience.

Ivan Morales, Executive Secretary of CEPREDENAC, pointed out that one of the recognizable achievements is the importance of having a common framework guiding DRR action globally. This is not viable if there is no political or effective support. As it has been the case in Central America where common framework has allowed the consolidation of the Central American Integral Risk Management Policy, facilitating the paradigm shift of national DRR systems in the region towards a less emergency response and disaster-driven to a more development- and prevention-oriented one. This process is still ongoing.

Among the challenges faced for effective DRR, he mentioned the importance of joint efforts of countries and regions, but also the UN system itself and other international bodies, to effectively disperse efforts and resources.

The consultation process must be comprehensive, taking as a reference the prioritizing process carried out in the Americas:

- Public policies
- Funding both public and private and in conjunction
- Territorial approach and;
- Involvement of the private sector, not only in the emergency care but in business continuity and prevention support and risk reduction

Jeremy Collymore, Executive Director of CDEMA, acknowledged that a key element is to move to an effective transition to development processes, and have spaces for sharing with other actors, pointing out that national level and other organization mechanisms should be recognized as important for this purpose.

It was recognize that there is an implementation deficit in linking the social sciences with a management vision and decision-making policies for action from the national to local level. Mr Collymore suggested the establishment of common procedures for such articulation, as well as strengthening capacity building, involving different actors, protecting and developing the community's livelihood to create development and resiliency. He also highlighted the importance to consider the participation of the private sector, innovation, public education and strengthening the link to information centres and most importantly, press communications.

KEY ELEMENTS for HFA2

Panel 1

1. Focus on the population and reduce the impacts on people
2. Passing from a reactive attitude (apologizing to the constituents for the losses suffered) to a proactive and leading attitude for DRR through actions that are oriented to more sustainability and resilience.
3. Link different levels of international management to local,
4. Territorial approach and local level empowerment and strengthening of action
5. Private sector involvement
6. Consider the possibilities of a binding mechanism for resilience and reducing vulnerability as effective commitments with a reduction of DRR and adaptation to climate change with compliance indicators.

Panel 2

1. Academy, science and technology link to processes and social demands on sustainability and DRR.
2. Recognize women and children's role in resilience building, as well as in generating impact information enabling a gender-equality approach that allows concrete actions to reduce their vulnerability.

3.2 Meeting with stakeholders

3.2.1 Meeting with Intergovernmental Agencies, regional and UN organisations

Facilitation by Ms. María del Pilar Cornejo Grunauer, Ecuador Minister of National Secretary for Risk Management

Participants of the meeting agreed to validate the results of the survey carried out by UNISDR to determine the main trends related to the HFA2 consultation process. However, a particular discussion took place on the legal binding character of HFA2. In this regard the participants pointed out:

- a. It is a country decision to consider the relevance of having a binding agreement. It implies the identification of indicators or targets that should be subject to the agreement and commitments for compliance. The international community and the UN system can play a role in supporting and facilitating this process.

- b. A binding mechanism should identify concrete actions, commitments and results, with objectives and targets, monitoring and compliance mechanisms as well, and sanction in case of not fulfilling the mandates of such binding agreement.
- c. What aspects should be considered in such as a binding agreement? For example the development of EWS? DRR standards?
- d. There are experiences that binding agreements are not necessarily expressed textually but supported by moral imperatives and in some cases by specific sectoral compliance rules, or by mandatory bilateral or sub-regional rules (e.g. health related agreements as in the case of vector diseases and pest control, also the MDGs and HFA themselves, etc).
- e. It was also highlighted that the new agreement should aim to address DRR root problems, which, according to the participants of the meeting, are the consideration of DRR into the development process, shifting the focus from preparedness and emergency response with involvement of various actors at regional, national, sub-national and even local and community levels.
- f. The new agreement should focus primarily on the way forward and then identify the best manner to transit through that way.
- g. It was suggested by the facilitation of the meeting that a working/task team group is formed to guide the consultation process until March 2013 as contribution from the region for the Global Platform on DRR in 2013. This consultation should be of inter-sectoral nature, enabling the involvement of the various actors in the issue, encouraging the participation of those actors, who even though are still not part of the process but have an important role, such as youth and childhood, the private sector, etc.
- h. This process in turn should consider the progress already made and the many agreements at regional and sub-regional level for the enhancement of action on DRR.

The participants also addressed the importance of HFA2 to be aligned with the different global mechanisms for sustainable development, in particular:

- The MDGs and post-2015 Development Agenda
- UNFCCC and its main decision related to Adaptation to CC (E.g. Nairobi Work Program, Cancun Adaptation Framework, Adaptation Committee, Loss and Damage, etc.)
- Rio+20 Declarations (“The Future We Want”)

Participants: PAHO, UNDP, WFP, UNOPS, CEPREDENAC, CAPRADE, OAS

3.2.2 Meeting with national governments

Facilitation by Mr. Ronald Jackson, ODPEM Jamaica

The HFA2 consultation was undertaken in two stages. The first stage is the analysis of a survey sent to representatives of national governments that identified trends through responses to 10 questions. The second stage was to validate this analysis through face to face meeting of national governments during RP12. Responses to the survey questions and consultation highlighted the following aspects:

1. *What are the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?*
 - The meeting validated the survey finding pointing out to the lack of reliable/robust information as one of the main constraints in DRR. Furthermore, participants pointed the need of integrating the scientific community and knowledge to support DRR efforts.

- Another challenge, mentioned by participants, which is in line with the survey results, is the lack of specific budget (at national and local level) as one of the main constraints for advancing DRR agenda.
 - Participants also highlighted the impact of political cycles on DRR efforts. Political cycles affect the continuity of qualified trained specialists and technicians. An adequate legal framework that reduces the impact of changes in DRR institutions due to political cycles should be ensured.
2. *What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction?*
- Participants validated the survey finding that one of the elements that should be addressed is increasing risk knowledge both through greater efforts in the education sector by having DRR as a stand-alone subject rather than “mainstreamed”. It is also necessary to integrate DRR as part of the education programmes in the professional career training (at university level). The new DRR framework should ensure DRR knowledge permeates to the communities and local governments (DRR through a bottom up process).
 - Enhancing risk knowledge should also be a key element of an effort to better integrate the scientific community in HFA2, especially in advancing EWS, school safety assessments and school construction standards.
 - The third element highlighted by the participants is the integration of DRR in sectors with an emphasis on DRR in investment projects (finance) both by private and public sectors.
 - Participants also highlighted that the new DRR framework should address the need to continue the formulation of public policies, strategies and national plans.
 - Participants indicated the need for mandatory consideration of DRR in the local territorial planning and territorial planning.
3. *How would you incorporate more accountability in disaster risk reduction?*
- Participants indicated that instead of furthering DRR legal responsibilities to public or local officers, mechanisms should be developed for risk transfer and timely access to risk knowledge (with reliable data and scientific information) for better decision making. The group indicated the need to further the discussion around the responsibility /accountability among risk managers.
 - There was an interesting discussion on the role of scientific community and its accountability. Representatives from the scientific community indicated that they have responsibility to generate and analyze information and to provide this information in a timely manner (when existing) to the risk managers or decision makers. However, they are not accountable for the use or no use of this information. It is necessary to broaden the dialogue among risk managers, mayors and scientific community to support the process of evidence-based DRR decision making processes.
4. *Emphasis has been placed on the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors; has this been successful? Can you provide examples?*
- Participants validated the finding that DRR integration has been partially successful and further efforts are needed. Positive examples of progress are the achievements in the areas of developing legislative frameworks, dissemination of concepts and sensitization of communities as well as significant influence of municipal plans. Special progress in mainstreaming DRR has been identified in the environment and planning and finance sectors.

5. *What is the national governance structure of disaster risk reduction? What are the key elements of risk reduction governance? What elements are missing?*
 - An important achievement is the development of legislative frameworks of many countries in the region as well as the assignment of earmarked investments for DRR.
 - The concept of DRR is moving from response to risk reduction and prevention although is still necessary to further capacity building at the local level.
 - The national governments participating in the consultation indicated that one of the needed factors is the involvement of political parties in order to prioritize DRR in the political agenda and local plans.
 - Monitoring mechanism has been identified as a missing aspect to allow follow up of the investments for DRR at the national and local level.

6. *What progress has the government made in linking disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation?*
 - Participants described the creation of observatories of climatic change and participation of Ministries of Environment as part of the National Platforms as one of the main achievements.
 - They noted that many DRR and CCA processes, projects and interest are common but are managed in different public sectors.

7. *How much risk assessment is taken into account in urban planning in your country?*
 - Participants agreed with the trends identified through the survey.
 - The exposure of population to disasters is one of the main problems in urban areas. The topic of relocation policies and good practices has been identified as an important aspect to be prioritized.

8. *What has been done in making schools and hospitals resilient to disasters in your country? How were the actions carried out?*
 - The participants agreed with the trends indicated in the survey.

9. *In your opinion, does the post2015 framework need to be legally binding?*
 - Countries considered that this framework could be legally binding. However participating countries indicated that in order for it to be legally binding, not all parts of the post-HFA framework could be legally binding. Further examination and discussion should take place on this aspect.

10. *How does the post2015 development agenda (post MDGs) and proposed sustainable development goals relate to disaster risk reduction?*
 - Participants agreed with the trends indicated in the survey.

Participants: República Dominicana, Perú, Chile, Colombia, Canadá, Argentina, Ecuador
 CONYCET (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas)

3.2.3 Meeting with local governments

Facilitation by Mr. Luis Hernandez, Chief of staff of the Mayor of Santa Tecla, El Salvador

Objective of the meeting: review and validate answers provided by local government representatives to the on-line survey on the HFA2 consultation process.

Session methodology: participants in the panel were asked to review a set of questions in the HFA2 online survey results. The questions were selected from the online survey together with the session moderator.

The panel reviewed the answers provided for the following questions of the post 2015 online survey:

- What are the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction?
- What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction?
- In your opinion, should the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction be legally binding?
- How effectively have the national policies on disaster risk reduction been implemented at local levels?

The online survey results were reviewed by participants using the following questions as guidance:

- Are the issues compiled from the online survey in regard to the posted questions relevant and do they offer clear answers?
- Would it be necessary to add new topics/issues to complement the online survey results?
- Does the panel have additional comments?

Summary of panel conclusions:

Following are the main conclusions of the panel discussion.

1. With regard to the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction:

Participants emphasized the need for having communities properly informed and being self aware of the implications of proper risk management. In this regard the panel called for improvements in risk management communication strategies.

From the list of issues reported in the online survey, three main challenges for DRR are highlighted:

- Funding and implementation of mitigation measures: we know what needs to be done, problems have been identified; there is a need to move forward to find solutions and implement them
- Getting more effective community participation at the local level – throughout the decision making process
- Improving coordination between institutional and non-institutional DRR stakeholders

Participants suggested include in the list of challenges the integration of DRR into land use and territorial planning processes at national, sub-national and local level.

3. With regard to the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post-2015 Framework:

From the list of answers, the panel highlighted the following 3 issues as the most relevant:

- Strengthening local governments decentralization process (including through improvement of regulation, mechanism for resources use; monitoring and accountability instruments to guarantee law enforcement

- Fostering participatory risk management process (including throughout the decision making process)
- Mechanisms to guarantee availability of resources (both financial and technical) as well as the capacities for their sound management

With regard to resources (both financial and technical), participants indicated the need to analyze this matter, considering the issues such as availability and capacities for management and mobilization. Some participants drew the attention to the fact that in many occasions rather than the lack of resources, what hinder the progress are: the weak capacities to manage available resources (identification of donors/resources, sources, knowledge of available instruments at sub-national, national and international level and project formulation, etc.). This situation differs between small and big cities. Small cities more often face with the challenge of accessing resources and managing them while for big cities it is more about management problems.

3. With regard to a post 2015 legally binding instrument:

Participants noted that this question was formulated in a way that leads to induce a positive answer.

In general, participants agreed with the introduction of a legally binding mechanism for a post 2015 DRR framework. Nevertheless, they stated the need to specify in more detail how this “binding character” would work at different management and intervention levels (international, regional, sub-regional, national, sub-national and local). Additionally, they reiterated the emphasis on the importance of ensuring active participation of local levels in the process.

Moreover, the definition of a binding instrument should be accompanied by the instruments that enable monitoring and evaluation as well as accountability.

4. With regard to the question on how effectively the national policies on disaster risk reduction have been implemented at local levels

Participants noted that the question assumes the existence of specific policies on DRR in all countries, which is not true. In this regard, the situation in the Americas is very diverse. In some cases there are political elements in various laws that partially support local initiatives. In other cases, there are incipient processes (still under development) upon which no conclusions can be drawn yet.

Therefore, the panelists stressed the need to further analyze the question proposed and to collect more input that would allow for a more complete answer to reflect current different levels of progress.

Participants: 15-20 representatives from the local level

3.2.4 Meeting with civil society

Moderator: Sandy Schiller (GROOTS International)

Participants were divided into groups to look at the questions selected from the online survey. The survey results had not been presented to the participants to avoid predefinition of the responses.

In summary, the following points were identified as important:

- Have inclusive mechanisms in place that ensure participation of all relevant actors and particularly those that are not usually considered (local grassroots women organizations, people with disabilities, among others) and define measurable indicators and responsibilities to ensure accountability.
- Better coordination between the government and civil society (in both their rights and corresponding responsibilities) at all decision-making levels and implement public policies that guarantee reinforce decentralization of resources (budgets) to the local level
- Accountability instruments, tools and mechanisms: monitoring and indicators
- The importance of knowledge and awareness, communications as well as education and training, including access to adequate information and timely and good practices
- A binding mechanism to ensure compliance with local land use plans and local development plans

Group A summary:

- A good basis for communication and training is a must
- Public policies with budget allocation and prevention approach that includes high government levels
- Promoting civil society participation, prioritization and accountability processes
- Holistic approach to development
- Local communities acknowledgements to incorporate into local processes with integration and civil diversity

Group B (COOPI, GROOTS, Plan International, private sector, ACHNU):

- Clear and explicit mechanisms to ensure community participation and influence of commonly excluded communities in the decision making processes
- Creating binding commitments so that governments socialize their commitments at all levels
- All countries must have risk management legislation (not only for emergency) that promotes the commitments
- Technical-financial resources improved and/or strengthened
- Clear monitoring framework that includes civil society (not just the governments involved in the reports but should include explicit accountability mechanisms/clear indicators)

1. What are the three most significant elements for disaster risk reduction to be addressed within the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction?

Group A:

- Be binding, strengthening accountability mechanisms
- Ensure communities participation, women's organizations and indigenous people in the formulation of strategies under the social inclusion umbrella (view neglected populations and examples of good practice and women as multipliers)
- Decentralize local level resources
- Integration of development approaches and risk reduction (emphasis on the underlying causes)

Group B:

- Less theoretical and more operational community participation and training (inclusion of minorities, disabled persons, children, WOMEN)
- Community and the local authority awareness
- Local level state resources decentralization
- Establishment of a comprehensive platform (at all levels) to address the issue from prevention preparedness and response.

Online surveys responses:

- Civil society political influence in decision-making and greater articulation and public-private coordination (government-civil society) at all levels with participatory processes and particular local focus
- Capacities, education and public awareness towards a DRR culture
- Public policy and sustainable and applied processes with appropriate investment and coordination between levels
- Greater articulation of DRR and development (HFA/MDG)
- Comprehensive risk analysis - multiple threats, vulnerability and capacities
- Information - access and dissemination, exchange of experiences and good practices
- Local organization and participatory processes
- Land uses and management
- Monitoring, accountability and use of national and international instruments
- Delve into the 5 HFA priorities, specially at community level
- Citizen participation technologies
- Gender equity and women's role
- Sustainable local economic development
- Climate Change adaptation

2. In which way do you think that the development agenda post-2015 (Millennium Development Goals), the sustainable development goals and disaster risk reduction framework post 2015 are integrated, at the local level?

Group A:

- Sensitization and training at community and local government levels, using best practices and successful experiences such as joint communal action, resilience platforms, existing risk and sustainable alternative models. The training should be the basis to promote participation in the preparation of mandatory land use plans and citizen participation on monitoring of the application of land use plans.

Online surveys responses:

- Decision-making incidence, joint public-private policies, plans with civil society and private sector
- DRR and poverty reduction-HFA/ODM as a comprehensive vision and articulation between sectors and levels
- Education, training and skills
- It almost does not occur or is very slow
- Financing
- Health
- Access to basic services
- DRR / CCA
- Local focus
- Monitoring

3. In which way collaboration between civil society and local government for the implementation of actions aiming to disaster risk reduction can be strengthened?

Group A:

- Avoid/remove access barriers for women and other excluded groups in different participation levels.
- Promote the right approach
- Clear communication and coordination mechanisms between civil society and local governments, recognition of community organization forms
- Promote transparency in both directions to create confidence
- Knowledge dialogue (ancestral and academics)

Group B:

- Audit local expenditures so that spending would be done effectively and showing a good management of budget (increasing interest of local government to gain access to more funds)
- Civil society formal recognition in partnership with the government in processes and published policies implementation
- Monitoring developments in policy capacity and risk management to develop plans of action.
- Implementing local actions accompaniment; monitoring led by civil society.

Online surveys responses:

- Capacities, culture, education and information
- Articulation, communication, coordination, dialogue and public and private exchanges with civil society or private sector
- Legislation and controls, public policy
- Sustainability despite changes of government
- Media
- Designated resources
- Civil society monitoring in the decision-making process
- Global campaign and 10 Essentials
- Climate change
- Volunteering

Participants: Ana María de la Torre (ECHO), Eugenia Morales (WSPA), Katia Araujo (Comisión Huairou), Alberto Schiappapietra (GVC), Nikhil Da Victoria Lobo (Swiss RE), Claudia Melo (Swiss RE), Castorina Villegas (GROOTS Perú), Carmen Robles Arana (GROOTS Perú), Barbara Zamora (Oxfam), Antonio Hou (Oxfam), Relinda Sosa Pérez (GROOTS Internacional), Iné Avila (ASONOG), Isabelle Bremaud (Oxfam), Pedro Ferradas (Soluciones Prácticas / Red Global de Sociedad Civil), Jeannettr Vicencio P., Anamaría Fuentes Cáceres, María Verónica Bastias (ACHNU), Graciela Salaberrí (Amigos del Viento Uruguay), Ana Lucy Bengo Chea (Groots Honduras), Diana Aristizabal (Red Género y Desastres), Anne Hild (Oxfam), Jorge (Save the Children USA), Maite Rodríguez (Groots / Huairou / Fundación Guatemala), Mercedes García (Plan Internacional), Saskia Carosi (COOPI), Haydee Rodríguez (GROOTS Nicaragua / Cooperativa Las Brumas), Benedicta Saravena

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following points have been suggested in different HFA2 session during the RP12.

Thematic Session: Consultation Process: Toward a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

- Focus on the population and reduce the impacts on it
- Passing from a reactive attitude (apologizing to the constituents for the losses suffered) to a proactive and leading attitude for DRR through actions that are oriented to more sustainability and resilience
- Link different levels of international management to local
- Territorial approach and local level empowerment and strengthening of action
- Private sector involvement; academy, science and technology link to processes and social demands on sustainability and DRR; Recognize women and children's role in resilience building, as well as generate impact information whereas the gender approach that allows concrete actions to reduce their vulnerability

Intergovernmental, UN & regional organizations

- The new agreement should aim to address DRR's root problem, e.g. the consideration of DRR into the development process, changing from a preparedness and emergency response focus, with involvement of various actors at regional, national, sub-national and local and community level.
- This process in turn should consider the progress already made though many agreements at regional and sub-regional level for the enhancement of action on DRR.
- The importance of HFA2 should be aligned with different global mechanisms for sustainable development (MDGs and post-2015 development agenda, UNFCCC and its main decisions related to Adaptation to CC , Rio+20 Declarations)

National Level

- Risk knowledge integrated in education programmes
- Integration of DRR in sectors with an emphasis of DRR in investment projects (finance) both private and public.
- The need to consider mandatory DRR perspectives in the local territorial planning and territorial planning processes

Local Level

- Strengthening local government decentralization process (including through improvement of regulations, mechanism for resources use; monitoring and accountability instruments to guarantee law enforcement)
- Fostering participatory risk management process (including throughout the decision making process)
- Mechanisms to guarantee availability of resources (both financial and technical) and the capacities for their sound management

Civil society

- Better coordination between the government and civil society (in both their rights and corresponding responsibilities) at all decision-making levels and implement public policies that guarantee reinforce decentralization of resources (budgets) to the local level
- Accountability instruments, tools and mechanisms: monitoring and indicators

- The importance of knowledge and awareness, education and communications as well as of education and training, which includes access to adequate information and timely and good practices

A particular discussion point in all four stakeholder sessions was the legally binding character of the new DRR framework.

Comparing these contributions, the main recommendations from the regional consultation process can be summarised as follows:

- The importance of risk knowledge and awareness being integrated in education programmes and communications
- Strengthening local governments decentralization process
- DRR integration in relevant sectors, e.g. private, academic, finance, public, etc for effective DRR implementation
- Integration of development approaches

Annex 1: Questions of the online survey

Survey questions for Intergovernmental, regional and UN organizations

1. What are the three key successes (or achievements) in disaster risk reduction since the implementation of the HFA in 2005 and what contributed to the successes?
2. What are the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?
3. What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction?
4. Emphasis has been placed on the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors; has this been successful? Can you provide examples?
5. How would you incorporate more accountability in disaster risk reduction?
6. Can you give some examples of how disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation is integrated into regional development planning and programmes? What more can be done?
7. In your opinion, should the post2015 framework for disaster risk reduction be legally binding?
8. What has been done in making schools and hospitals resilient to disasters? How were the actions carried out?
9. How does the post2015 development agenda (post MDGs) and proposed sustainable development goals relate to disaster risk reduction?

Survey questions for national governments

1. What are the three key successes (or achievements) in disaster risk reduction since the implementation of the HFA in 2005 and what contributed to the successes?
2. What are the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?
3. What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction?
4. How would you incorporate more accountability in disaster risk reduction?
5. Emphasis has been placed on the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors; has this been successful? Can you provide examples?
6. What is the national governance structure of disaster risk reduction? What are the key elements of risk reduction governance? What elements are missing?
7. What progress has the government made in linking disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation?
8. Can you identify the good practices in your country land use planning? How much risk assessment is taken into account in urban planning in your country?
9. How much risk assessment is taken into account in urban planning in your country?
10. What has been done in making schools and hospitals resilient to disasters in your country? How were the actions carried out?
11. In your opinion, does the post2015 framework need to be legally binding?
12. How does the post2015 development agenda (post MDGs) and proposed sustainable development goals relate to disaster risk reduction?

Survey questions for local governments

1. Give examples of how local governments have implemented disaster risk reduction measures. What are the three key successes (or achievements)?
2. What are the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?
3. What are the top three issues, imperative to building local resilience to disasters that need to be further addressed in the post2015 framework for Disaster Risk Reduction?
4. Emphasis has been placed on the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors; has this been successful? Can you provide examples?
5. What progress has the local government made in linking disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation? How?
6. What has been done in making schools and hospitals resilient to disasters? How were the actions carried out?
7. In your opinion, should the post2015 framework for disaster risk reduction be legally binding?
8. How effectively have the national policies on disaster risk reduction been implemented at local levels?
9. What are major challenges in investing in disaster risk reduction at local level?
10. How does the post2015 development agenda (post MDGs) and proposed sustainable development goals relate to disaster risk reduction?

Survey questions for civil society (including the following stakeholders: private sector, communities and NGOs and academic sector)

Common questions for all three groups

1. What are the three key successes (or achievements) in disaster risk reduction since the implementation of the HFA in 2005 and what contributed to the successes?
2. What are the three major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?
3. What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction?

Survey questions private sector

1. How can we improve the understanding of the benefit of disaster risk management among the private sector?
2. How can we engage private sector in disaster risk management? What can we learn from small enterprises relating to DRR and business continuity planning?
3. How can we better understand the economics and investment consequences of disaster from a business perspective?
4. What are the top three issues, imperative to building resilience of the private sector to disasters that can be further addressed in a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction?

Survey questions communities and NGOs

1. What were the impacts and changes made in reducing risk and building resilience at community level, as result of the HFA implementation?
2. What are the major challenges in investing in disaster risk reduction at the community level?
3. What are the key factors that contributed to the successes or failures in reducing local risk of disasters?
4. How does the community impact on the decision making process in disaster risk reduction?
5. How do you see the post2015 development agenda (post MDGs), proposed sustainable development goals, and a post2015 framework for disaster risk reduction coming together at the community level?
6. How can the collaboration in implementing disaster risk reduction at the local level be strengthened between civil society and local government?

Survey questions academic sector

1. How do we improve the science and policy dialogue to ensure that decisions are informed by science? Example?
2. How can we better understand the cost and benefits of disaster risk reduction?
3. How can we better understand the linkages between conflict, disaster risk reduction and sustainable development?
4. What are the top three science related issues, important to building local resilience to disasters that need to be further addressed in a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction?
5. How can the academic sector incorporate disaster risk reduction aspects into curriculum of different disciplines and programmes?

Annex 2: Agendas of the HFA2 consultation sessions during the Regional Platform

Thematic Session: Consultation Process: Toward a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction,
10:00 – 12:30, Monday, 26 November 2012

10:00-10:20 Presentation on the Post-2015 framework for DRR consultation process
Margareta Wahlström, Special Representative for DRR of the Secretary-General

10:20-10:30 Overview presentation on post-2015 consultation process in the Americas.
Methodology for the post-2015 consultation during the Regional Platform
Ricardo Mena, Head of the UNISDR Regional Office for the Americas

10:30-11:10 PANEL 1: Regional, national and local reflections
Moderator: **Margareta Wahlström**, Special Representative for DRR of the Secretary-General

Representatives from Intergovernmental organizations, national and local level as well as from regional and UN organizations

- **Jeremy Collymore**, Executive Director, CDEMA
- **Iván Morales**, Secretario Ejecutivo, CEPREDENAC
- **Jean Luc Poncelet**, Area Manager, PAHO
- **María del Pilar Cornejo de Grunauer**, Ministra, Secretaría Nacional de Gestión de Riesgos, Ecuador
- **Emilio Graterón**, Mayor of Chacao, Venezuela

Questions PANEL 1:

- What are the key successes (or achievements) in disaster risk reduction since the implementation of the HFA in 2005 and what contributed to the successes?
- What are the major challenges (or obstacles) for disaster risk reduction? What are the underlying factors that contributed to the challenges identified?
- What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction? Why?
- Emphasis has been placed on the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning and sectors? Has this been successful? Can you provide examples?
- How does the post-2015 development agenda (post MDGs) and proposed sustainable development goals relate to disaster risk reduction?

11:10-11:30 *Questions and Answers*

11:30-12:10 PANEL 2: Reflections from the civil society
Moderator: **Joseluis Samaniego**, Chief of the Division of Sustainable Division and Human Settlements, UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, ECLAC

Representatives from civil society, NGOs, the scientific community, the private sector will be invited:

-
- **Xavier Castellanos**, Head of the Americas region, IFRC
 - **Participant from the private sector**
 - **Prof. Dr. Nelly Gray de Cerdán**, Researcher of CONICET, Argentina
 - **Diana L. Aristizabal**, Coordinator, Gender and Disaster Network for Latin America and the Caribbean

Questions PANEL 2:

- What has been done in integrating disaster risk assessment into your sector / group / organization planning? How? What are the good practices and what are the lessons learned?
- What are the top three significant elements for disaster risk reduction that should be addressed in the post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk reduction? Why?
- How can your sector / group / organization contribute to further strengthen disaster risk reduction implementation?
- What progress has been made in linking disaster risk reduction with climate change adaptation?

12:10-12:30 Questions and Answers

Meeting with Inter-governmental, UN and regional organizations on the post-2015 Consultation Process, 18:30 – 19:30, Monday, 26 November 2012, Salon Atacama

18:30-18:40 Presentation of online survey results.
Ricardo Mena, UNISDR

18:40-19:25 Identifying main recommendations towards the post-2015 framework
Chair: Maria Pilar, CAPRADE
Reporter: tbd

1) Validation of trends identified for each questions

Validation of presented tendencies for each question: group agrees with tendencies identified based on the online questionnaire or request revision
Time slot: 10 minutes.

Working Groups (depending on group size)

Review of identified tendencies: participants will be asked for their advice and recommendations on the relevance and prioritization of the findings

Presentation on group results

Groups will present the tendencies identified. In the plenary session. After the presentations, the group will reach a consensus regarding the tendencies for the issues discussed.

2) Identification of main recommendation as stakeholder group input to the post-2015 framework for DRR

Based on the tendencies identified, the group is requested to select the main three recommendations for the post-2015 DRR framework

19:25-19:30 Summary

Meeting with national governments on the post-2015 Consultation Process

17:30 – 19:30, Tuesday, 27 November 2012, Salon Patagonia

17:30-17:40 Presentation of online survey results.
Ricardo Mena, UNISDR,

17:40-19:20 Identifying main recommendations towards the post-2015 framework
Chair: Ronald Jackson, ODPEM
Reporter: tbc

3) Validation of trends identified for each questions

*Validation of presented tendencies for each question: group agrees with tendencies identified based on the online questionnaire or request revision
Time slot: 10 minutes.*

Working Groups (depending on group size)

Review of identified tendencies: participants will be asked for their advice and recommendations on the relevance and prioritization of the findings

Presentation on group results

Groups will present the tendencies identified. In the plenary session. After the presentations, the group will reach a consensus regarding the tendencies for the issues discussed.

4) Identification of main recommendation as stakeholder group input to the post-2015 framework for DRR

Based on the tendencies identified, the group is requested to select the main three recommendations for the post-2015 DRR framework

19:25-19:30 Summary

Meeting with local governments on the post-2015 Consultation Process

18:30 – 19:30, Monday, 26 November 2012, Salon Patagonia

18:30-18:40 Presentation of online survey results.
Raul Salazar, UNISDR

18:40-19:25 Identifying main recommendations towards the post-2015 framework
Facilitator: Luis Hernandez, Municipalidad de Santa Tecla
Relator: tbd

5) Validation of tendencies identified for each questions

*Validation of presented tendencies for each question: group agrees with tendencies identified based on the online questionnaire or request revision
Time slot: 10 minutes.*

Working Groups (depending on group size)

Review of identified tendencies: participants will be asked for their advice

19:20-19:25	<p><i>and recommendations on the relevance and prioritization of the findings</i></p> <p>Presentation on group results <i>Groups will present the tendencies identified. In the plenary session. After the presentations, the group will reach a consensus regarding the tendencies for the issues discussed.</i></p> <p>6) Identification of main recommendation as stakeholder group input to the post-2015 framework for DRR <i>Based on the tendencies identified, the group is requested to select the main three recommendations for the post-2015 DRR framework</i></p>
-------------	--

19:25-19:30 Summary

Meeting with representatives from civil society (NGOs, scientific community, the private sector, communities) on the post-2015 Consultation Process
 17:30 – 19:30, Tuesday, 27 November 2012, Salon Atacama

17:30-17:40 Presentation of online survey results.
Jennifer Guralnick, UNISDR

17:40-19:20 Identifying main recommendations towards the post-2015 framework
Chair: Sandra Schilen, Groots / Huairou Commission
Reporter: Claudia Melo, Swiss Re

7) Validation of trends identified for each questions
Validation of presented trends for each question: group agrees with tendencies identified based on the online questionnaire or request revision
Time slot: 10 minutes.

Working Groups (depending on group size)
Review of identified trends: participants will be asked for their advice and recommendations on the relevance and prioritization of the findings

Presentation on group results
Groups will present the trends identified. In the plenary session. After the presentations, the group will reach a consensus regarding the tendencies for the issues discussed.

8) Identification of main recommendation as stakeholder group input to the post-2015 framework for DRR
Based on the trends identified, the group is requested to select the main three recommendations for the post-2015 DRR framework

19:20-19:30 Summary
