



United Nations
International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
Secretariat, Geneva

Monitoring Progress on implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA): HFA Monitor Template

Note to Users

The 'HFA Monitor' is the ISDR system's online tool to monitor, review and report on progress and challenges in the implementation of disaster risk reduction and recovery actions undertaken at the national level, in accordance with the Hyogo Framework's priorities.

The HFA Monitor tool has been designed and coordinated by the UN/ ISDR secretariat and is hosted online through [PreventionWeb](#). Inputs to the online tool will lead to the generation of comprehensive National Progress Reviews for the period 2007-09, and will enable the country with easy future access to its disaster risk information and monitoring trends in progress across the years.

The online HFA Monitor tool is accessible by designated national authority/ HFA focal points as of May 2008 onwards. An email notification to the designated national focal point with user id and password from the UN/ISDR secretariat enables access to the online tool. If this information was not received, please contact the UN/ISDR focal point in your region.

The present document is a sample template proposed as a working format that national focal points may use to undertake national consultation processes to review progress and challenges in implementation of risk reduction and recovery actions. This template will help you to discuss and record inputs from various partner consultations in a systematic manner.

To the extent possible, this template replicates the online HFA Monitor tool, and will give you an opportunity to familiarize yourself with the requirements of the online tool. As such, we invite you to use this template in your national consultation processes, the results of which can then be inserted online, within the HFA Monitor tool.

HFA Monitor templates are also available in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Russian. Please contact your ISDR regional office focal point for a copy, as relevant.

We hope the HFA Monitor tool will be of assistance to your mission of reducing disaster risk at all levels!

How to use it!

The online HFA Monitor tool has 8 sections to be filled in – all of which are replicated in this sample template. Each section consists of several subsections, as listed below.

All sections have an introduction that defines the scope of the section, highlight its significance, and guides you with instructions on how to fill in the subsections.

When you access the online HFA Monitor tool, detailed user guidance notes are also available to facilitate your use of the online tool.

1. Please familiarize yourself with the overview of sections and subsections listed below, all of which we encourage you to complete in the online HFA Monitor tool.
2. You can complete the sections and subsections in any order that facilitates information collection, partner consultations, and analysis.
3. In section 1, you will be requested to provide a statement on the current national focus with regard to each of the three strategic goals adopted under the HFA.
4. Sections 2 – 6 will help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA's five Priorities for Action. These sections will also help you to provide a succinct assessment of the country's contributions to disaster risk reduction efforts in other countries or at the regional and international levels, under each Priority for Action, as relevant.
5. Section 7 will help you assess areas or specific issues which act as 'drivers' or catalysts for achieving substantial progress in disaster risk reduction and recovery at the national and local level.
6. Section 8 will assist you with outlining overall challenges encountered in the implementation of national and local disaster risk reduction actions; and re-assess current priorities to provide a statement on the country's future outlook with regard to national disaster risk reduction goals.

For your quick reference: Overview of sections and subsections

Section 1: Strategic Goals	3 subsections	Pgs 3-4
Section 2: Priority for Action 1	4 subsections	Pgs 5-9
Section 3: Priority for Action 2	4 subsections	Pgs 10-13
Section 4: Priority for Action 3	4 subsections	Pgs 14-17
Section 5: Priority for Action 4	6 subsections	Pgs 18-23
Section 6: Priority for Action 5	4 subsections	Pgs 24-27
Section 7: Drivers of Progress	6 subsections	Pgs 28-33
Section 8: Future Outlook	3 subsections	Pgs 34-35

SECTION I: STRATEGIC GOALS

Strategic Goals: Definition and significance

With the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action in 2005 by 168 States, the following three strategic goals were outlined to guide activities on disaster risk reduction and recovery across all levels:

- a. The more effective *integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels*, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction;
- b. The *development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels*, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards;
- c. The *systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes* in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to provide a statement on the current national focus with regard to each of the three strategic goals adopted under the HFA.
- B. Express each statement as a 'goal' reflecting national level efforts and commitments, towards achieving each of the three HFA strategic goals.
- C. The statements should emphasize the key focus areas adopted, for reducing disaster and environmental risks at the national and local levels.
- D. The strategic goals statement should reflect the actions undertaken for each of the five HFA priorities for action.
- E. This section has three subsections to be filled in, corresponding to each of the three strategic goals.

Subsections

Strategic Goal Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Please specify how disaster risk reduction considerations are being integrated into sustainable development policies, planning and programming.

Example 1: Disaster and environmental risk management policies are being integrated into development plans at the national, sub national and local levels (through existing public policies, mechanisms for coordinating DRR actions at various levels, budgetary assignments or others)..

Example 2: Innovative mechanisms to reduce underlying risk are being institutionalized, including risk transfer schemes (including microfinance) and adoption of environmentally safe technologies.

Strategic Goal Statement (300 words max.)

Strategic Goal Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Please explain how institutions, mechanisms and capacities are being developed and strengthened to build resilience to hazards at the national and subnational levels.

Example 1: Strengthened capacities at community level for participatory, inclusive and integrated planning for post-disaster recovery and environment risk management.

Example 2: Enhanced capacities at all levels to monitor and respond to potential disaster and environmental risks of national, regional and international concern.

Strategic Goal Statement (300 words max.)

Strategic Goal Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Please explain what is currently being done to develop and strengthen institutions, mechanisms and capacities to build resilience to hazards at the national and sub national levels.

Example 1: Strengthened policy framework and implementation capacity of large-scale State and national programmes to reduce physical and socioeconomic vulnerabilities, for the achievement of strategic plan goals.

Example 2: Mechanisms and tools are being adopted for the implementation of environmental management and post-disaster recovery programmes and institutionalized at the various levels.

Strategic Goal Statement (300 words max.)

SECTION II: PRIORITY for ACTION 1

Priority for action 1: Definition and significance

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

Countries that develop policy, legislative and institutional frameworks for disaster risk reduction and that are able to develop and track progress through specific and measurable indicators have greater capacity to manage risks and to achieve widespread consensus for, engagement in and compliance with disaster risk reduction measures across all sectors of society.

In view of the areas outlined in the HFA, Priority for Action 1 has four 'core indicators' on which progress and challenges on implementation can be monitored and reviewed:

1. National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels
2. Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction activities at all administrative levels
3. Community participation and decentralization are ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels
4. A national multisectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA's Priority for Action 1.
- B. Mark a suitable level of progress, which realistically reflects the extent and nature of progress made with regard to implementing the 'core indicators' listed for this priority for action.
- C. Each subsection will give you space to describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level.
- D. *Highlight key challenges* encountered by the national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can or will be overcome in the future.
- E. This section has four subsections to be filled in, corresponding to the four core indicators for priority for action 1.

Subsections

a. Core Indicator 1: National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels

A country's constitution, laws and governmental system provide the basis to develop plans and institutional arrangements for all areas of disaster risk reduction. Assessing such elements can reveal gaps in resources and capacities that were previously underutilised or untapped. A comprehensive disaster risk reduction policy framework can also guide a government in its disaster risk reduction policies and strategies.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

The level of progress for core indicator 1, under Priority for Action 1, may be determined by assessing, for example, if a national policy for disaster risk reduction / management is in place, is being appropriately implemented and is sufficiently integrated into sectoral policies and national development plans.

Below is an indication of the state of achievements which help define the level of progress achieved for each priority for action.

Example to help determine the Level of Progress in implementation of HFA Priorities for Action:

Level	Generic description of level of progress	Examples of an assessment of the indicator <i>“A strategy for data provision for disaster risk reduction is in place”</i>
5	Comprehensive achievement has been attained, with the commitment and capacities to sustain efforts at all levels.	<i>“Systematic, properly resourced processes for data collection and dissemination are in place, with evaluation, analysis and improvements being routinely undertaken. Plans and commitments are publicised and the work is well integrated into other programmes.”</i>
4	Substantial achievement has been attained, but with some recognised deficiencies in commitment, financial resources or operational capacities.	<i>“Processes for data collection and dissemination are in place for all hazards and most vulnerability factors, but there are shortcomings in dissemination and analysis that are being addressed.”</i>
3	There is some institutional commitment and capacities to achieving DRR but progress is not comprehensive or substantial.	<i>“There is a systematic commitment to collecting and archiving hazard data, but little awareness of data needs for determining vulnerability factors, and a lack of systematic planning and operational skills”.</i>
2	Achievements have been made but are incomplete, and while improvements are planned, the commitment and capacities are limited.	<i>“Some data collection and analysis has been done in the past, but in an ad hoc way. There are plans to improve data activities, but resources and capacities are very limited.”</i>
1	Achievements are minor and there are few signs of planning or forward action to improve the situation.	<i>“There is little awareness of the need to systematically collect and analyse data related to disaster events and climatic risks.”</i>

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country’s ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

b. Core Indicator 2: Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

Dedicated resources refer to funds that are allocated specifically for disaster risk reduction actions. Resource allocation that embeds disaster risk reduction into an institution's day-to-day business is necessary. When risk is considered in development investment decisions and in the design of projects, the cost of disaster risk reduction is lower.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

c. Core Indicator 3: Community participation and decentralization are ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Such action calls for the promotion of community participation in disaster risk reduction through the adoption of policies relevant to the local level, promotion of knowledge networks, strategic management of volunteer resources, attribution of roles and responsibilities, and the delegation and provision of the authority and resources at local levels.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

d. Core Indicator 4: A national multisectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

A multisectoral platform for disaster risk reduction can be defined as a nationally owned and led mechanism – adopting the structure of a forum or committee that facilitates the interaction of key development players around the national disaster risk reduction agenda and serves as an advocate for adopting disaster risk reduction measures at all levels.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

SECTION 3: PRIORITY for ACTION 2

Priority for action 2: Definition and significance

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

The starting point for reducing disaster risk and for promoting a culture of disaster resilience lies in the knowledge of the hazards and the physical, social, economic and environmental vulnerabilities to disasters that most societies face, and of the ways in which hazards and vulnerabilities are changing in the short and long term, followed by action taken on the basis of that knowledge.

In view of the areas outlined in the HFA, Priority for Action 2 has four 'core indicators' on which progress and challenges on implementation are to be monitored and reviewed:

1. National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors
2. Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities
3. Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities
4. National and local risk assessments take account of regional / transboundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA's Priority for Action 2.
- B. Mark a suitable level of progress, which realistically reflects the extent and nature of progress made with regard to implementing the 'core indicators' listed for this priority for action.
- C. Each subsection will give you space to describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level.
- D. *Highlight key challenges* encountered by the national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.
- E. This section has four subsections to be filled in, corresponding to the four core indicators for priority for action 2.

Subsections

a. Core Indicator 1: National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors

National risk assessments allow decision-makers and communities to understand the country's exposure to various hazards and its social, economic, environmental and physical vulnerabilities. National risk assessments allow communities to take effective action to reduce disaster and environmental risks.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

The level of progress for core indicator 1, under priority for action 2, may be determined by assessing, for example, the extent to which standardized risk assessment methodology is being adapted and endorsed by national government and applied by local government as an integral part of the development planning process. Are disaster risk databases developed and updated regularly by national and local authorities? There may be other factors to consider across national and subnational contexts when making such an assessment.

United Nations
International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
Secretariat, Geneva

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

b. Core Indicator 2: Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities.

Data collection and dissemination processes allow decision-makers and the public to understand the country's exposure to various hazards and its social, economic, environmental and physical vulnerabilities. Such information, disseminated in an appropriate and timely manner, allows communities to take effective action to reduce risk.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

c. Core Indicator 3: Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities

Assessing capacity of the four elements of early warning (risk knowledge, monitoring and warning services, dissemination and communication, and response capabilities) is essential to empowering individuals and communities threatened by hazards to act in sufficient time and in an appropriate manner so as to reduce the possibility of personal injury, loss of life, damage to property and the environment, and loss of livelihoods.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

d. Core Indicator 4: National and local risk assessments take account of regional/transboundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

This action refers to the need to cooperate regionally and internationally to assess and monitor regional and transboundary risks, exchange information and provide early warnings through appropriate arrangements. This would imply having standardised and accessible information and data on regional disaster risks, impacts and losses.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

SECTION 4: PRIORITY for ACTION 3

Priority for action 3: Definition and significance

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

Disasters can be substantially reduced if people are well informed and motivated towards a culture of disaster prevention and resilience, which in turn requires the collection, compilation and dissemination of relevant knowledge and information on hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities.

In view of the areas outlined in the HFA, Priority for Action 3 has four 'core indicators' on which progress and challenges on implementation are to be monitored and reviewed:

1. Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)
2. School curricula, education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices
3. Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened
4. Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA's Priority for Action 3.
- B. Mark a suitable level of progress, which realistically reflects the extent and nature of progress made with regard to implementing the 'core indicators' listed for this priority for action.
- C. Each subsection will give you space to describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level.
- D. *Highlight key challenges* encountered by the national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.
- E. This section has four subsections to be filled in, corresponding to the four core indicators for priority for action 3.

Subsections

a. Core Indicator 1: Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems, etc)

Information on disaster risks and protection options, especially to citizens and local authorities in high risk areas, should be easily available and understandable to enable for them to take actions to reduce risk, and build resilience.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

The level of progress for core indicator 1, under priority for action 3, may be determined by assessing, for example, the extent to which national information management systems for disaster risk reduction are in place and accessible along with adequate data on disaster loss, impacts and events available to relevant stakeholders.

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

b. Core Indicator 2: School curricula, education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices

Incorporating disaster risk-related issues into existing education curricula contributes to continuous learning and reinforces knowledge for disaster risk reduction. Training activities also provide the opportunity to consider indigenous knowledge and traditional practices for risk reduction and mitigation.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

c. Core Indicator 3: Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened

Authorities at national and regional level have a key role to play in strengthening the technical and scientific capacities to develop and apply methodologies, studies and models to assess vulnerabilities and impacts of hazards, including the improvement of regional monitoring capacities and assessments.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

d. Core Indicator 4: Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities

A countrywide public awareness strategy is a national, long-term plan of action with specific goals that organizes how the general population is informed about disaster risk and the ways they can act to reduce their exposure to hazards. Public awareness actions are important tools to help integrate disaster risk reduction into every-day life.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

SECTION 5: PRIORITY for ACTION 4

Priority for action 4: Definition and significance

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Disaster risks related to changing social, economic, environmental conditions and land use, and the impact of hazards associated with geological events, weather, water, climate variability and climate change, are addressed in sector development planning and programmes as well as in post-disaster situations.

In view of the areas outlined in the HFA, Priority for Action 4 has six 'core indicators' on which progress and challenges on implementation are to be monitored and reviewed:

1. Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.
2. Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk
3. Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities
4. Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes
5. Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes
6. Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA's Priority for Action 4.
- B. Mark a suitable level of progress, which realistically reflects the extent and nature of progress made with regard to implementing the 'core indicators' listed for this priority for action.
- C. Each subsection will give you space to describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level.
- D. *Highlight key challenges* encountered by the national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.
- E. This section has six subsections to be filled in, corresponding to the six core indicators for priority for action 4.

Subsections

a. Core Indicator 1: Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use, natural resource management and adaptation to climate change

Scope of environment risk management policies can have major impacts on disaster risk reduction, and should explicitly incorporate risk reduction goals and strategies. When environmental and natural resource policies specifically incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, they can help reduce underlying risk factors.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

The level of progress for core indicator 1, under priority for action 4, may be determined by assessing, for example, the extent to which disaster risk reduction is an integral component of environmental protection and natural resource management policies, plans and programmes; as well as within existing mechanisms such as environmental impact assessments.

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

b. Core Indicator 2: Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk

This action can be achieved by addressing issues of food security, public health, risk sharing mechanisms, protection of critical public infrastructure etc. When public awareness, education, early warning and environmental policies specifically incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, they can help reduce underlying risk factors and reduce the vulnerability of impoverished groups.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking/assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

c. Core Indicator 3: Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

Focusing on the protection of a state's most vulnerable economic activities and productive sectors is an efficient strategy to help reduce the overall impacts of disasters.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

d. Core Indicator 4: Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes

Including disaster risk reduction elements in land-use plans is an important strategy for reducing the vulnerability of communities to hazards. Land use planning that is carefully designed and rigorously implemented is a useful approach to managing expanding human settlements and minimizing associated risks.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

e. Core Indicator 5: Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

It is essential to consider disaster risk reduction principles when designing post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes in order to 'build back better' and not recreate risk. There is an identified need for the national and local implementation of international post disaster recovery and reconstruction norms and standards.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking/assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

f. Core Indicator 6: Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure

It is crucial to institutionalise procedures to integrate disaster risk reduction measures into national sustainable development strategies, plans and programmes in key areas such as poverty reduction, housing, water, sanitation, energy, health, agriculture, infrastructure and environment to ensure that development does not create further disasters.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

SECTION 6: PRIORITY for ACTION 5

Priority for action 5: Definition and significance

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

At times of disaster, impacts and losses can be substantially reduced if authorities, individuals and communities in hazard-prone areas are well prepared and ready to act and are equipped with the knowledge and capacities for effective disaster management.

In view of the areas outlined in the HFA, Priority for Action 5 has four 'core indicators' on which progress and challenges on implementation are to be monitored and reviewed:

1. Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place
2. Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes
3. Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required
4. Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA's Priority for Action 5.
- B. Mark a suitable level of progress, which realistically reflects the extent and nature of progress made with regard to implementing the 'core indicators' listed for this priority for action.
- C. Each subsection will give you space to describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level.
- D. *Highlight key challenges* encountered by the national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.
- E. This section has four subsections to be filled in, corresponding to the four core indicators for priority for action 5.

Subsections

a. Core Indicator 1: Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place

An investment of time and resources in systematically evaluating and subsequently improving disaster preparedness capacities and mechanisms provides states with a substantial increase in readiness for managing disaster impacts, and improves response measures.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

The level of progress for core indicator 1, under priority for action 5, may be determined by assessing, for example, the extent to which existing preparedness mechanisms have or are being reviewed, gaps analysed and capacity development measures have or are being identified and implemented.

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

b. Core Indicator 2: Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes

Disaster preparedness and response planning for recovery and rehabilitation efforts should be informed by the lessons learned from previous disasters as well as knowledge of risk reduction measures in order to avoid missing the underlying causes of risk. Disaster risk reduction actions should be required in the design and implementation of both types of planning.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

c. Core Indicator 3: Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required

It is important for governments to commit resources for early recovery programmes, including quick assessment of damage, needs and capacities, restoration of critical infrastructure and livelihood, following major disaster events to support the resilience of affected communities, until long term reconstruction of assets takes place

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

d. Core Indicator 4: Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews

Emergency preparedness and response as well as planning for recovery and rehabilitation efforts should be informed by the lessons learned from previous disasters. Disaster risk reduction actions should be included in the design and implementation of all types of planning.

Level of Progress

The levels of progress will enable a self-assessment of the extent to which the policies, programmes and initiatives are sustainable in achieving the indicated risk reduction objectives.

- 1 – Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy
- 2 – Some progress, but without systematic policy and/or institutional commitment
- 3 – Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial
- 4 – Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 – Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

Description (300 words max.)

Describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for the country's ranking / assessment at the indicated level

Please use additional space if required.

Context and Constraints (300 words max.)

Highlight key contextual challenges encountered by the country / national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can / will be overcome in the future.

Please use additional space if required.

SECTION 7: DRIVERS of PROGRESS

Drivers of Progress – Definition and significance

'Drivers of progress' refer to factors which act as drivers or catalysts for achieving substantial progress in disaster risk reduction and sustainable recovery from disasters.

These factors will vary across national and local contexts, but typically emphasize the factors / issues which a country considers important for integration into plans, policies and programmes as a means to achieve disaster risk reduction goals.

The following issues are considered important drivers or catalysts at the national and local level for this assessment:

1. Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development
2. Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized
3. Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened
4. Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities
5. Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels
6. Other contextual drivers of progress as per national and local contexts / requirements.

Your assessment will consider how much emphasis was placed on each of these factors in achieving the intended outcome of reduced disaster risk.

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to help you assess areas or specific issues which act as 'drivers' or catalysts for achieving substantial progress in disaster risk reduction and recovery at the national and local level.
- B. Mark a suitable 'level of reliance' which will realistically reflect the extent to which each driver / factor has acted as a catalyst in achieving progress at the national and local level.
- C. Each subsection will give you space to describe some of the *key contextual reasons* for ranking the level of reliance on the identified factors, at the indicated level. You may also outline areas where more emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years, and provide overall challenges and recommendations for future action.
- D. This section has six subsections, five of which consist of identified drivers while the sixth subsection gives you space to provide up to 2 other or additional 'contextual' drivers of progress as per national and local contexts / requirements which may be relevant to the country's context and are important to mention.

Subsections

a. Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development

A multi-hazard approach can improve effectiveness. A community is usually exposed to risks from a variety of hazards, which can be either natural or human induced in origin, and can stem from hydrometeorological, geological, technological or environmental forces. The resulting cumulative risk cannot be tackled effectively if actors plan merely for selective hazardous events. A multi-hazard approach involves translating and linking knowledge of the full range of hazards into risk management approaches, strategies, assessments and analysis, leading to greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

Level of Reliance

The levels of reliance take into account the rate of progress a country is making towards the implementation of the HFA, while relying on the particular drivers outlined in the section.

1 – No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

United Nations
International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
Secretariat, Geneva

2 – Partial/ some reliance: full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

3 – Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders

Guiding questions:

Do studies/reports/atlasses on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country for the subregion?

If yes, are these being applied to development planning / informing policy?

Description (300 words max.)

Please identify where more efforts or emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years, and anticipate the types of investment / strategy required so that each disaster risk reduction and recovery effort places the optimal emphasis on relevant 'drivers'. This is also an opportunity to explain why a particular intended outcome did—or did not—lay emphasis on a driver.

b. Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized

Gender is a core factor to be considered in the implementation of disaster risk reduction measures. Gender is a central organizing principle in all societies, and therefore women and men are differently at risk from disasters. Gender shapes the capacities and resources of individuals to build resilience, adapt to hazards and to respond to disasters. It is thus necessary to identify and use gender differentiated information, to ensure that risk reduction strategies are correctly targeted at the most vulnerable groups and are effectively implemented through the roles of both women and men.

Level of Reliance

The levels of reliance take into account the rate of progress a country is making towards the implementation of the HFA, while relying on the particular drivers outlined in the section.

1 – No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

2 – Partial/ some reliance: full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

3 – Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders

Guiding questions:

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities? Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?

Description (300 words max.)

Please identify where more efforts or emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years and anticipate the types of investment and/or strategy required so that each disaster risk reduction and recovery effort places the optimal emphasis on relevant 'drivers'. This is also an opportunity to explain why a particular intended outcome did—or did not—lay emphasis on a driver.

c. Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Capacity development is a central strategy for reducing disaster risk. Capacity development is needed to build and maintain the ability of people, organizations and societies to manage their risks successfully. This requires not only training and specialized technical assistance, but also the strengthening of the capacities of communities and individuals to recognize and reduce risks in their localities. It includes sustainable technology transfer, information exchange, network development, management skills, professional linkages and other resources. Capacity development needs to be sustained through institutions that support capacity development and capacity maintenance as dedicated, ongoing objectives.

Level of Reliance

The levels of reliance take into account the rate of progress a country is making towards the implementation of the HFA, while relying on the particular drivers outlined in the section.

1 – No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

2 – Partial/ some reliance: full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

3 – Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders

Guiding questions:

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?

Description (300 words max.)

Please identify where more efforts or emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years, and anticipate the types of investment/ strategy required so that each disaster risk reduction and recovery effort places the optimal emphasis on relevant 'drivers'. This is also an opportunity to explain why a particular intended outcome did—or did not—lay emphasis on a driver.

d. Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities

One of the key challenges in disaster risk management is to ensure that the most vulnerable are protected from existing and emerging environmental risks, and that those most affected are reached through disaster response and recovery programmes. Often, the most vulnerable belong to socioeconomic and geographic 'minority' groups. Focused attention to meeting the special needs of the socio-economically vulnerable and/ or geographically secluded groups needs to be ensured through risk reduction and recovery plans and programmes.

Level of Reliance

The levels of reliance take into account the rate of progress a country is making towards the implementation of the HFA, while relying on the particular drivers outlined in the section.

1 – No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

2 – Partial/ some reliance: full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

3 – Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders

Guiding questions:

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?
Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?

Description (300 words max.)

Please identify where more efforts or emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years, and anticipate the types of investment/ strategy required so that each disaster risk reduction and recovery effort places the optimal emphasis on relevant 'drivers'. This is also an opportunity to explain why a particular intended outcome did—or did not—lay emphasis on a driver.

e. Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Effective disaster risk reduction requires effective community participation. Participatory approaches can more effectively capitalize on existing coping mechanisms and are effective at strengthening community knowledge and capacities. Equally, public-private partnerships are an important tool for disaster risk reduction. Such voluntary associations may involve public organizations such as government agencies, professional and/or academic institutions and NGOs, together with business organizations such as companies, industry associations and private foundations. Public-private partnerships can offer opportunities to combine resources and expertise to act jointly to reduce risks and potential losses. They can in turn improve the resilience of communities.

Level of Reliance

The levels of reliance take into account the rate of progress a country is making towards the implementation of the HFA, while relying on the particular drivers outlined in the section.

1 – No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

2 – Partial/ some reliance: full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders

3 – Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders

Guiding question:

Are there identified means and sources to convey local relevance, community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction? If so, are they being integrated within local, subnational and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?

Description (300 words max.)

Please identify where more efforts or emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years, and anticipate the types of investment/ strategy required so that each disaster risk reduction and recovery effort places the optimal emphasis on relevant 'drivers'. This is also an opportunity to explain why a particular intended outcome did—or did not—lay emphasis on a driver.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Possible instances of contextual drivers could include: resources and institutional capacities, political champions for disaster risk reduction, structural safety of schools, hospitals and critical public infrastructure, sound recovery strategies, institutionalization of mechanisms to mainstream disaster risk reduction in national development policy and programmes, etc.

Please specify, if there are other or more context-specific drivers that you have relied on to achieve the targets at national or subregional levels.

Level of Reliance

The levels of reliance take into account the rate of progress a country is making towards the implementation of the HFA, while relying on the particular drivers outlined in the section.

1 – No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

2 – Partial/ some reliance: full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

3 – Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders

Description (300 words max.)

Please identify where more efforts or emphasis might be required in the forthcoming years, and anticipate the types of investment/ strategy required so that each disaster risk reduction and recovery effort places the optimal emphasis on relevant 'drivers'. This is also an opportunity to explain why a particular intended outcome did—or did not—lay emphasis on a driver.

SECTION 8: FUTURE OUTLOOK

Future Outlook: Definition and Significance

It is important to reiterate the importance of implementing disaster risk reduction actions for achieving sustainable human development goals. The objective of this section is two fold. One, to outline overall challenges encountered in the implementation of national and local disaster risk reduction actions. Two, re-assess current priorities to provide a statement on the country's future outlook with regard to national disaster risk reduction goals.

'Overall Challenges' section: Express overall challenges in achieving the current priorities listed against each of the strategic goals, in the first section.

These can be summed up from the challenges encountered in implementing the specific HFA priorities for action. The challenges will typically refer to overarching systemic needs and gaps such as capacities, institutional structures and priorities, and political will.

'Future Outlook' Statements: While the strategic goal statement emphasizes the 'current priorities' of a country, the future outlook statement should reflect a *re-assessment of the current priorities in the context of the challenges outlined* throughout the previous sections.

This re-assessment is intended to encourage thinking on the future positioning and direction of the national strategy on disaster risk reduction. Focus on the criticality of disaster risk management programmes to emerging local, national and regional development priorities. This section may also contain recommendations for follow-up actions to be discussed among partners at the national, regional and international level.

Guidance for this section

- A. The objective of this section is to outline overall challenges encountered in the implementation of national and local disaster risk reduction actions; and re-assess current priorities to provide a statement on the country's future outlook with regard to national disaster risk reduction goals.
- B. Express overall challenges in achieving the current priorities listed against each of the three strategic goals as reflected in the first section.
- C. Focus on the criticality of disaster risk reduction to emerging local, national and regional development priorities and provide a 'future outlook' statement that summarizes the future orientation to be adopted by national disaster reduction goals.
- D. This section has three subsections to be filled in, corresponding to each of the HFA's 3 strategic goals.

Subsections

Future Outlook Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Overall Challenges (300 words max.)

Future Outlook Statement (300 words max.)

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges (300 words max.)

Future Outlook Statement (300 words max.)

Future Outlook Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges (300 words max.)

Future Outlook Statement (300 words max.)