



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
18 September 2013

Original: English

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction

Third session

Bangkok, 27-29 November 2013

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

The development agenda beyond 2015 as it pertains to disaster risk reduction in Asia and the Pacific

Disaster risk reduction related to the development agenda beyond 2015, including issues pertinent to least developed countries and countries with special needs

Note by the secretariat

Summary

The dialogue on disaster risk reduction (DRR) relating to the development agenda beyond 2015 is taking place at global and regional levels and involves the key stakeholders, including ESCAP member States. The discussion so far indicates that DRR issues may be broadly reflected under the framework of resilience. It is notable that DRR issues are being discussed as an integral component of the development agenda beyond 2015. The United Nations regional commissions, including ESCAP, are providing the regional inputs into the ongoing global debate. In the specific context of the Asia-Pacific region — the world's most disaster-prone region with a complex landscape of hazards, vulnerability and exposure — dialogue is ongoing in several forums. The present document contains the key outcomes emerging from these consultations. It is also highlighted in the present document that DRR issues are likely to be factored into poverty eradication, and sustainable development goals and targets. While considering the region's specificities, the key issues and challenges in facilitating inclusive dialogue — and thus enabling the regional voice of member States to be heard while maintaining a focus on the regional dimensions of the development agenda beyond 2015 within the DRR framework — are highlighted in the present document. Of special note in this context are the region's least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States, which are all characterized by their acute vulnerability and their lack of resilience to disasters. In conclusion a number of outstanding issues related to integrating DRR into poverty eradication and sustainable development are highlighted for consideration by the Committee, including those in Commission resolution 69/12, which relates to enhancing regional cooperation in order to build resilience to disasters in Asia and the Pacific.

* E/ESCAP/CDR(3)/L.1/Rev.1.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	2
A. United Nations initiatives	3
B. Regional initiatives	3
II. The development agenda beyond 2015: DRR framework.....	6
A. Sustaining the momentum of the Hyogo Framework for Action.....	6
B. Asia-Pacific regional consultative processes	7
III. DRR: resilience framework.....	7
A. Resilience framework: political support	7
B. Resilience framework: broadening coverage to multiple shocks.....	8
C. Resilience framework: mainstreaming DRR in the development strategy	9
IV. Countries with special needs: Where do they stand in the DRR framework?	9
A. Critical vulnerability	9
B. Increasing climate risk	10
C. Persistent challenges of vulnerability	10
D. Taking the case to the global arena.....	11
V. Resilience framework for DRR: setting the goals and targets	11
A. Stand-alone DRR goal versus multisectoral goals	11
B. DRR goals and targets: emerging trends.....	12
VI. Issues for considerations by the Committee	12
 Table	
Asia-Pacific regional priorities and specific concerns as regards the development agenda beyond 2015	4

I. Introduction

1. As the deadline for implementing the Millennium Development Goals approaches, the shaping of the development agenda beyond 2015 is taking place at different levels. In September 2011, at the request of the Secretary-General, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) initiated system-wide preparations for the definition of the agenda. The United Nations System Task Team on the Post-2015 United Nations Development Agenda (UNTT), which comprises more than 60 entities of the UN system, including ESCAP, was launched in January 2012. In June 2012, UNTT published its first report,¹ identifying a future vision based on the core values of human rights,

¹ United Nations System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, *Realizing the Future We Want for All: Report to the Secretary-General* (New York, 2012). Available from www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/unttaskteam_undf/untt_report.pdf.

equality and sustainability. The report proposes to organize the framework beyond the Millennium Development Goals along four lines: (a) inclusive social development; (b) inclusive economic development; (c) environmental sustainability; and (d) peace and security.

A. United Nations initiatives

2. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development resulted in a focused political outcome document,² which contains clear and practical measures for implementing sustainable development, including a set of sustainable development goals that build upon the Millennium Development Goals and that converge with the development agenda beyond 2015. Simultaneously, the United Nations system — specialized agencies, programmes and funds — started several efforts to define a new set of initiatives, namely the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, the United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network, the Global Compact, and the United Nations Development Group. In a 2012 report,³ the Secretary-General outlined how to advance the development agenda beyond 2015, including by taking action to ensure coherence between it and follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

3. On 30 May 2013, the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda released their report.⁴ In the report, the Panel highlights five big, transformative shifts, namely: leave no one behind; put sustainable development at the core; transform economies for job and inclusive growth; build peace and effective, open and accountable institutions for all; and forge a new global partnership.

4. In all of these forums, DRR is typically listed as a priority area in the development agenda beyond 2015, being clustered with climate change and other environmental priorities and, increasingly, with socioeconomic development.

B. Regional initiatives

5. In June 2013, the regional commissions published *A Regional Perspective on the Post-2015 United Nations Development Agenda*,⁵ highlighting the regional contribution to the global policy debate, including the topic of policy coherence at different levels. In the report, the regional commissions outlined the regional perspective in formulating the development agenda beyond 2015 and identified priority areas and messages. In the specific context of Asia and the Pacific, building on the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, regional priorities have been clustered around four themes, namely economic sustainability, social sustainability, environmental sustainability, and governance and institutions. The regional priorities and areas of concerns that are specific to the Asia-Pacific region are shown in the table below.

² “The future we want”, General Assembly resolution 66/288, annex.

³ A/67/257.

⁴ High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development* (New York, 2013). Available from www.post2015hlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/UN-Report.pdf.

⁵ E/ESCWA/OES/2013/2.

Table
Asia-Pacific regional priorities and specific concerns as regards the development agenda beyond 2015

Economic sustainability	Social sustainability	Environmental sustainability	Governance and institutions
Regional priorities			
Economic growth; poverty reduction; employment; food security; trade, investment and technology; income inequality	Education; health; gender equality and women's empowerment; social protection	Climate change disaster risk reduction; biodiversity; urbanization	Democracy and the rule of law; effective institutions; citizen security; global governance
Specific concerns			
Absolute poverty levels; promotion of high-value manufacturing; building domestic demand	Strengthening and extension of social protection systems	Large internal displacement induced by floods and storms; small island inundation/seawater incursion; megacity challenges	Decentralization and devolution of governmental services

Source: United Nations, Economic Commission for Europe, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Economic Commission for Africa and Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, *A Regional Perspective on the Post-2015 United Nations Development Agenda* (E/ESCWA/OES/2013/2).

6. Between 26 and 28 August 2013, at the request of member States, ESCAP organized the Asia-Pacific Ministerial Dialogue: From the Millennium Development Goals to the United Nations Development Agenda Beyond 2015. The dialogue was aimed at reviewing progress made in achieving the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and the Millennium Development Goals, while shaping the agenda with a focus on the outstanding issues facing the Asia-Pacific region. The dialogue was the first regional ministerial-level event to discuss the development agenda beyond 2015, following the release of the high-level Panel's report.⁶ The dialogue helped in providing the region's input into the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly, which is important for finalizing the development agenda beyond 2015. Further, the regional implementation meeting for Asia and the Pacific on the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, which took place in Bangkok from 22 to 24 April 2013, discussed regional perspectives to the global processes that resulted from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, such as the establishment of a high-level political forum to replace the Commission on Sustainable Development, and the development of sustainable development goals.

⁶ United Nations, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, "Asia-Pacific Ministerial Dialogue: From the Millennium Development Goals to the United Nations Development Agenda beyond 2015", concept note (Bangkok, 2013). Available from http://apmd2013.unescap.org/documents/APMD2013_ConceptNote.pdf.

Bangkok Declaration of the Asia-Pacific region on the United Nations Development Agenda beyond 2015^a

Ministers and high-level representatives from Asia and the Pacific adopted the Bangkok Declaration as the key outcome document of the Asia-Pacific Ministerial Dialogue: From the Millennium Development Goals to the United Nations Development Agenda Beyond 2015. The Declaration emphasized that the development agenda beyond 2015 should be “holistic, inclusive, equitable, people-centred and universal”, and should aim to eradicate poverty and promote sustainable development. The Declaration recommended that the development agenda should “address all forms of inequalities and the factors underpinning them”. It proposed a strengthened global partnership and enhanced implementation of the agreed-upon development goals. It was recommended that the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015 should carry forward the spirit of the Millennium Declaration with:

(a) A determination to build upon and implement further measures to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, particularly with the aim of eradicating poverty;

(b) A balanced integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development;

(c) An emphasis on inclusive, equitable and sustainable development and economic growth that aims to effectively address all forms of inequalities and the factors underpinning them;

(d) A focus on the global, regional and national dimensions of sustainable development in addressing the special needs and particular challenges of the least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States, in the context of their respective plans and programmes of action;

(e) A strengthened global partnership for the enhanced implementation of internationally agreed development goals and objectives.

In the Declaration, ministers reiterated their commitment to address the remaining gaps in implementation of the outcomes of the major summits on sustainable development, to address new and emerging challenges and to seize new opportunities in the actions enumerated in the framework for action and follow-up to the “The future we want” document, supported as appropriate by the provision of the necessary means to implement such measures. Ministers also encouraged the United Nations system, including its regional commissions, and regional and subregional organizations, to continue promoting a balanced integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and in their respective capacities supporting the member States in implementing sustainable development.

^a http://apmd2013.unescap.org/documents/APMD2013_Declaration.pdf.

II. The development agenda beyond 2015: DRR framework

7. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, which was a major milestone in recognizing DRR to be amongst the issues influencing sustainable development, called for greater political commitment to ensure that DRR and building resilience among communities and nations are addressed with a renewed sense of urgency in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. It provided the momentum for building up resilience to disasters in the framework of the green economy and sustainable development, through the employment of more integrated and coordinated approaches. It also introduced several innovative approaches to enable greater integration of DRR and climate change adaptation at all levels, including in national development strategies and investment, strengthening of local governance and stronger partnerships with civil society. There is now an opportunity to capitalize on green economy paradigms so as to provide political support, as well as additional resources, to strengthen risk management capacities, including those relating to disaster loss and risk assessment.

A. Sustaining the momentum of the Hyogo Framework for Action

8. The Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (HFA)⁷ will be reviewed and a framework for DRR (referred to as the Hyogo Framework for Action 2 or HFA2) will be developed at the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, which the General Assembly decided to convene in Japan in early 2015.⁸ The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) was identified as the secretariat that will facilitate development of HFA2 and coordinate preparatory activities in consultation with all relevant stakeholders.

9. In conjunction with the fourth session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which was held in May 2013, UNISDR published a synthesis report on consultations that had taken place on a framework beyond 2015 for DRR.⁹ Three common patterns that have captured the variety of themes and specific issues during the consultation process are reflected in the report. The first pattern is described as local action — which is characterized by the common aim of building leadership through community engagement and fully capacitated local government. The second pattern relates to integrated approaches, which reflect a range of issues related to breaking barriers, especially those concerning sectoral issues and institutional mechanisms. The third pattern relates to an enabling environment, which includes conditions and incentives for building resilience, for example, measures such as risk-informed decisions, risk assessment and analysis, public awareness, capacity development, governance and accountability, and monitoring and resources.

⁷ A/CONF.206/6 and Corr.1, chap. I, resolution 2.

⁸ General Assembly resolution 67/209, para. 10.

⁹ United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, *Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2)* (Geneva, 2013). Available from www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=32535.

B. Asia-Pacific regional consultative processes

10. Consultations in the Asia-Pacific region, which are being conducted at various levels and which include the integrated and multisectoral discussions related to the development agenda beyond 2015 and sustainable development goals, resulted in the following seven imperatives: (a) building on HFA in order to construct a new framework for DRR; (b) integrating DRR, climate change and sustainable development; (c) local-level action; (d) turning vulnerability into resilience; (e) multi-stakeholder engagement; (f) risk governance and accountability; and (g) knowledge-based decision-making.⁹ As a result of the consultations, it was strongly recommended that HFA2 should have well-defined targets, indicators, clearly defined responsibilities and monitoring mechanisms to increase accountability for its implementation and to measure not only the outputs, but also the cumulative impact of risk reduction interventions. There was also a call to consider making the new DRR framework a legally binding instrument, in the form of a United Nations convention. The need to develop regional and national frameworks to ensure HFA2 implementation was also highlighted.

11. The second phase of consultations on HFA2 are ongoing and are focused on identifying the main elements, principles, targets, indicators, and implementation and monitoring mechanisms needed in the new global framework for DRR. The consultation process also aims to strengthen the ownership and commitment of stakeholders, in particular national and local governments. Inputs from these consultations will then inform subsequent deliberations, primarily at the regional platforms on DRR that will take place in 2013 and 2014, including those during the third session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction, the General Assembly in September 2014 and at the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in March 2015, where countries will negotiate and adopt HFA2.

III. DRR: resilience framework

12. The concept of “resilience” emerges, through multi-stakeholder consultations, to be a broader concept, goal and development agenda, which considers both known and unknown possibilities and combinations of threats in the future.¹⁰ This includes, but is not limited to integrating DRR, climate change adaptation, conflict and fragility into sustainable development considerations. Building resilience is thus regarded as a transformative process that strengthens the capacity of people, communities, institutions and countries to anticipate, manage, transform and recover from shocks.¹¹

A. Resilience framework: political support

13. The recent Bangkok Declaration of the Asia-Pacific Region on the United Nations Development Agenda Beyond 2015 emphasized that the development agenda beyond 2015 should aim, amongst other things, at

¹⁰ United Nations, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, *Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crises* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.13.II.F.3).

¹¹ United Nations Development Programme, Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction and United Nations Children’s Fund, *Impact of Conflict, Violence and Disaster on Long-term Development. A Global Thematic Consultation: Building the Post-2015 Development Agenda* (2013). Available from www.worldwewant2015.org/file/285363/download/309358.

promotion of DRR and preparedness and that it should also be supportive of climate change adaptation and environmental sustainability.

14. The Global Thematic Consultation on Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2015 Development Agenda, which was held in Jakarta in February 2013, focused on integrating DRR and resilience into the development agenda beyond 2015 and highlighted the importance of DRR in achieving any future development goals.¹² The Consultation took forward as principal drivers the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and those of the High-level Panel on Global Sustainability. It advocated the integration of DRR into national policies, plans, programmes and budgets; and identified the need to pursue DRR as an integral element of sustainable development, and to demonstrate how its absence would compromise economic, social and environmental resilience in the development agenda beyond 2015. The Consultation suggested possible options for integrating DRR into the development agenda beyond 2015, including:

(a) Establishing a stand-alone goal on DRR using resilience as a framework. This would provide an opportunity to address the interface between global frameworks for sustainable development, DRR, climate change and conflict;

(b) Mainstreaming DRR into the goals of other sectors, particularly poverty reduction, health, environment, governance, food security, gender equality, education and water;

(c) Promoting a new development approach that integrates DRR considerations into all development interventions, for example, making disaster risk assessment mandatory at the outset of any development project, and using existing assessment tools, such as environmental impact assessments;

(d) Developing input, outcome and impact targets and indicators that capture reductions in direct losses, such as mortality and economic impact; as well as indirect losses, such as the loss of social capital and ecosystems. Targets and indicators should be applicable at regional, national and subnational levels.

B. Resilience framework: broadening coverage to multiple shocks

15. The sixty-ninth session of the Commission, which took place in May 2013, provided valuable insights into building resilience to natural disasters and major economic crises. ESCAP conducted a regional theme study¹⁰ that was published to coincide with the Commission session, during which a high-level policy dialogue was conducted with participation from ministers and top government officials. As a result of the study, it was found that multiple shocks, especially natural disasters and major economic crises, are occurring with increasing frequency and are converging in new ways, demanding more comprehensive and systemic approaches to building resilience. A single incident, which might once have been localized and managed in isolation, now has multiple and interrelated regional and global consequences that call for new macroeconomic frameworks, and a rebalancing between economic,

¹² United Nations Development Programme, Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction and United Nations Children's Fund, *Report: Global Thematic Consultation on Disaster Risk Reduction and the Post-2015 Development Agenda, 19-20 February 2013, Jakarta, Indonesia* (2013).

social and environmental systems. In the study, it is argued that a new paradigm in policymaking is needed, as Governments across the region struggle to cope with multiple and overlapping shocks. ESCAP has proposed a new regional framework for resilience-building, which rebalances economic, social and environmental systems. Central to the framework is the priority given to the role of Government as the chief planner of long-term socioeconomic development.¹⁰ Recognizing that many of today's shocks are transboundary in nature, transnational responses based on regional cooperation are proposed in the framework, which also emphasizes that by working together, Governments in the Asia-Pacific region can produce solutions that are greater than the sum of actions by individual countries. It is argued that, as shocks rarely, if ever, impact single countries, there are gains to be had from multi-country cooperative approaches.

C. Resilience framework: mainstreaming DRR in the development strategy

16. In the *Chair's Summary: Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva, 21-23 May 2013 — Resilient People, Resilient Planet*,¹³ it is argued that development and resilience are unlikely to be sustained unless disaster risk is explicitly addressed in all development initiatives. Both the accumulation and reduction of disaster risk are closely intertwined with development strategies, environmental protection and climate change, as well as human mobility. It is important that policies in these areas are designed to be mutually reinforcing — whether at the local, national or international levels — and are appropriately framed in development strategies. The emphasis was placed on integrated, multisectoral approaches to DRR, and to strengthening it in key sectors, such as education, agriculture and health. Development and financing of resilience plans in development strategies were identified as a means of promoting approaches that involved everyone in society. Policies for investment, improved tracking of financing for DRR across sectors and funding streams, and the introduction of special markers in global aid reporting were also recommended.

IV. Countries with special needs: Where do they stand in the DRR framework?

A. Critical vulnerability

17. It is highlighted in the ESCAP Theme Study that the most vulnerable to economic crises and natural disasters are the countries with special needs, namely least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States. For example, small island developing States, including Tonga, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu — which do not have very diverse economies and which have a large proportion of their populations concentrated in low-lying coastal areas — have been found to be extremely vulnerable to both disasters and major economic crises. As a proportion of GDP, the countries that lose most as a result of natural disasters are the developing countries, which globally lose between 2 and 15 per cent of GDP annually. Among these, the most vulnerable are the least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States. A similar trend emerges in the Asia-Pacific region where the most vulnerable are the least developed countries and small island developing

¹³ Available from www.preventionweb.net/files/33306_finalchairssummaryoffourthsessionof.pdf.

States. Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji and Papua New Guinea are the most at risk of natural disasters due to their increased exposure and susceptibility to damage. Landlocked developing countries, such as Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia and Tajikistan, are the most susceptible to economic shocks; these countries, being relatively more dependent on primary products, suffer most from commodity market volatility. The map of vulnerability in Asia-Pacific follows, to a great extent, the contours of the region's poverty map, which shows the most vulnerable people to be those living in the most populous least developed countries.¹⁰

B. Increasing climate risk

18. The Global Climate Risk Index 2013, which analyses to what extent countries have been affected by the impacts of weather-related loss events (such as storms, floods and heatwaves), establishes that least developed countries are generally more affected than industrialized countries.¹⁴ Particularly in relative terms, least developed countries and poorer developing countries are hit much harder. The results of the Global Climate Risk Index underscore the particular vulnerability of poor countries to climatic risks, despite the fact that absolute monetary damages are much higher in richer countries. For the period between 1992 and 2011, Bangladesh, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, Pakistan, Thailand and Viet Nam were among the top 10 countries at greatest risk from weather-related incidents. With regard to future climate change, the Global Climate Risk Index can serve as a warning signal, indicating past vulnerability, which may further increase in regions where extreme events are becoming more frequent or more severe as a result of climate change.

C. Persistent challenges of vulnerability

19. It is argued on page 33 of the report⁴ of the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda that: "no one is more vulnerable than people in poverty to desertification, deforestation and overfishing, or less able to cope with floods, storms, and droughts. Natural disasters can pull them into a cycle of debt and illness, to further degradation of the land, and a fall deeper into poverty." Similarly, the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development highlight that DRR and building resilience to disasters have to be addressed in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. The Asia-Pacific regional implementation meeting focused on addressing gender equality, conflict situations, natural disasters, and food insecurity related to the water-food-energy nexus in the specific context of the region's least developed countries and small island developing States. Furthermore, the regional advisory services of ESCAP in Afghanistan, Cambodia and Mongolia clearly indicate the complex risk environment created by the convergence of disasters, conflict and fragility. As a result, in Afghanistan, even disasters of limited magnitude have a severe impact due to depleted capacities at all levels. On the other hand, Cambodia and Mongolia are at great risk from weather-related events. Climate change adaptation and DRR are inseparable in such contexts. The emerging resilience framework, which encompasses poverty eradication, DRR and climate change adaptation, while meeting the requirements of the sustainable development agenda, encapsulates the challenges facing countries with special needs.

¹⁴ Sven Harmeling and David Eckstein, *Global Climate Risk Index 2013: Who Suffers Most from Extreme Weather Events? Weather-related Loss Events in 2011 and 1992 to 2011* (Bonn, Germany, Germanwatch, 2013).

D. Taking the case to the global arena

20. Confronted by the threats of climate change and the prospect of rising sea levels and more extreme weather events, the Alliance of Small Island States proposed, as early as 1991, an insurance mechanism against rises in sea level.¹⁵ Subsequently, it has championed the issue and fought for acknowledgement of loss and damage at the 13th Conference of the Parties (COP13) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Bali Action Plan),¹⁶ COP16 (Cancun Adaptation Framework)¹⁷ and COP17 (implementation of the work programme on loss and damage).¹⁸ Similarly, feeling the brunt of loss and damage in the context of climate change, the group of least developed countries has actively participated in the work programme of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In the submission of the group of least developed countries on loss and damage, the countries expressed their views on the role of the UNFCCC in loss and damage and on key concerns and needs related to loss and damage both now and in the future. The work on loss and damage has made a great deal of progress. At COP19, which is scheduled to be held in Warsaw, there will be deliberations on the international institutional arrangements needed to operate in this domain.

V. Resilience framework for DRR: setting the goals and targets

21. Setting the goals and targets for the resilience framework for DRR has been quite challenging.¹⁹ The dilemma lies in how to position DRR vis-à-vis other development goals, using relevant indicators and targets.¹² While raising the political profile of DRR, there is a risk of isolating it.

A. Stand-alone DRR goal versus multisectoral goals

22. A stand-alone goal on DRR — namely, framing the goal as “reducing disaster mortality” or “reducing economic losses and the impact on poverty levels due to disaster” — keeps the focus on vulnerability, rather than the resilience of communities. The alternative proposal, which is receiving greater currency, is “community resilience” or “strengthening global, national and local disaster resilience”, which captures the spirit of resilience but is considered quite challenging to communicate and measure.

23. With regard to mainstreaming DRR goals in development, there is already recognition of it in the interface between global frameworks for sustainable development (United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development), DRR (HFA2) and climate change. It is also considered specifically relevant given the emerging risks associated with climate change, major economic crises and urbanization. It is recognized that the resilience framework should involve developing a multidimensional risk index that reflects different themes; designing integrated risk assessment and impact monitoring and evaluation frameworks; and developing the capacities of local stakeholders to use the new framework. However, following up and

¹⁵ See A/AC.237/WG.II/CRP.8.

¹⁶ FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1, decision 1/CP.13.

¹⁷ FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1.

¹⁸ FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.2.

¹⁹ Tom Mitchell, *Options for Including Disaster Resilience in Post-2015 Development Goals* (London, Overseas Development Institute, 2012).

developing measurable targets and impact/outcome indicators, in this regard, is methodologically quite complex and challenging.

24. For mainstreaming DRR into the goals of other sectors, it is important to include disaster relevant targets and indicators in other goals like climate change, environment, education, health, water, gender and so on. In this regard, mainstreaming DRR is critical from both a strategic point of view, in the event that a standalone goal on DRR is not included, and as an operational imperative, since the success of DRR is highly dependent on its integration into the sectors traditionally targeted by development, which is a lesson learned from implementing the Millennium Development Goals.

B. DRR goals and targets: emerging trends

25. Assuming that the DRR resilience framework should be a cross-cutting theme in the development agenda beyond 2015, the next step is to appropriately conceptualize and develop input, outcome and impact targets and indicators. Given the need to align targets and indicators as regards the goal on DRR, together with the goals of other sectors, it is important to identify broad and flexible options that reflect DRR priority concerns. Some examples are listed below:¹²

(a) Reducing disaster mortality is considered valuable for its political appeal and the relative ease of quantifying it. It could also be mainstreamed under the goals of health, education and gender;

(b) Reducing direct and indirect economic impacts is considered useful given its appeal to development factors, especially in times of global economic crises. It is also important to expand the scope of economic indicators beyond gross domestic product (GDP) so as to capture losses related to social capital, ecosystems and the like;

(c) Capturing proactive and accountable disaster governance in relevant targets and indicators needs to be achieved. There have been suggestions that the targets and indicators should cover conscious integration of DRR in existing development planning processes, with specific budgetary allocations at the national, subnational and local levels. Other areas that have been suggested for coverage are investments in risk assessments; disaster prevention, preparedness and recovery planning and financing with a strong focus on DRR; and ensuring community participation and active engagement of the private sector in risk reduction;

(d) Integrating DRR in development plans may be achieved through the use of operational frameworks for disaster plans (for example, contingency and preparedness plans). It has been considered relevant to have targets and indicators on factoring DRR into development plans at national, subnational and local levels, with specific budget allocations.

VI. Issues for consideration by the Committee

26. Resolution 69/12 on enhancing regional cooperation for building resilience to disasters in Asia and the Pacific enables ESCAP to provide a platform for its members and associate members to articulate a strong regional voice in favour of giving due consideration to DRR in the development agenda beyond 2015, emphasizing the view that sustainable development cannot be achieved without consideration for and concrete measures on DRR, based on the experience of the region. The resolution also

requests the Executive Secretary to facilitate implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development as they pertain to DRR in the region, and to work with relevant United Nations entities to encourage appropriate consideration of DRR, including in discussions on the development agenda beyond 2015 in as much as they relate to climate change adaptation.

27. ESCAP organized the first regional ministerial-level event to discuss the development agenda beyond 2015.²⁰ ESCAP, as the key player in the regional implementation mechanism, has been party to the development of sustainable development goals. At the request of the member States, ESCAP has also been providing capacity-building and regional advisory services to shape their perspectives on the development agenda beyond 2015 and the DRR framework.

28. It is on this basis that the secretariat presents the following outstanding issues for consideration by the Committee in order to further refine the regional perspective on the development agenda beyond 2015 as it pertains to DRR in the Asia-Pacific region:

(a) *Resilience framework for DRR.* The Committee may wish to consider continuing to support development of the resilience framework in a manner that ensures its close alignment with DRR considerations as they occur in the development agenda beyond 2015, sustainable development goals, HFA2 and other frameworks. With this in mind, the Committee may wish to consider requesting the secretariat to formulate an action plan to advance the Asia-Pacific perspective on the strategic positioning of DRR in the development agenda beyond 2015 in the different regional and global meetings;

(b) *Recognizing regional approaches to the resilience framework.* The Committee may wish to request the secretariat to develop a resilience framework that takes on board the importance of Asia-Pacific regional approaches for building resilience with a strong emphasis on the importance of DRR and climate change adaptation in achieving any future development goals. This may entail both deliberation at policy level as well as at a technical level, through projects on, for example, strengthening the evidence for policymaking on resilience. In this regard, the Committee may also consider inviting a number of member States to advocate common Asia-Pacific positions in the crucial forthcoming regional and global negotiations;

(c) *Mainstreaming of DRR in development strategies.* The Committee may wish to reiterate the importance of member States' engaging in the process of shaping the development agenda beyond 2015 at national level. In this regard, the Committee may invite member States to consider developing national resilience frameworks that seek to rebalance economic, social and environmental systems in addressing the root causes of disaster risks, together with options on climate adaptation in a comprehensive and inclusive manner in the context of development strategies;

(d) *Resilience framework for least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States.* The Committee may wish to give guidance on the orientation of the resilience framework as it relates to poverty eradication, DRR and climate change, all within the contextual realities of the region's least developed countries,

²⁰ See para. 6 above.

landlocked developing countries and small island developing States. In this regard, in order to provide appropriate support to countries with special needs, the Committee might consider asking the secretariat to engage in the ongoing deliberations on loss and damage, including those due to take place at COP19, where institutional arrangements for that matter will be negotiated;

(e) *The “One UN” approach for developing targets and indicators.* The Committee may wish to provide direction on establishing input, outcome and impact targets and indicators for the DRR resilience framework. Such targets and indicators should incorporate reductions in direct losses, such as mortality and economic impacts, as well as indirect losses, like the loss of social capital and ecosystems at regional, national and subnational levels. In this regard, the Committee might use a “One UN” approach so as to ascertain the level of coherence across sectors, as well as between regional and national articulations.
