

HFA MONITOR: USER GUIDANCE

Overview of HFA Monitor

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 [Prevention Web](#). Inputs to the online tool will lead to the generation of comprehensive National Progress Reviews for the period 2007-09, and will enable each country with easy access to its disaster risk information and analysis on progress in the future.

The online HFA Monitor tool is accessible by designated national authority/ HFA focal points May 2008 onwards. The designated focal points are assigned a user id and password from the UN/ISDR secretariat (May 2008) which enables access to the online tool.

The online HFA Monitor tool has 8 sections to fill in. Each section consists of several subsections, as listed below.

All sections will have an introductory page which will define the scope of the section, highlight its significance, and guide you with instructions on how to fill in the subsections.

1. Please familiarize yourself with the overview of sections, and subsections.
2. Each subsection has mandatory fields. I.e. you will be required to complete a minimum amount of information in each subsection for the report to be completed online.
3. You can complete the sections and subsections in any order that facilitates information collection, partner consultations, and analysis.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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 explained in this document

Section 1: Strategic Goals	3 subsections
Section 2: Priority for Action 1	4 subsections
Section 3: Priority for Action 2	4 subsections
Section 4: Priority for Action 3	4 subsections
Section 5: Priority for Action 4	6 subsections
Section 6: Priority for Action 5	4 subsections
Section 7: Drivers of Progress	6 subsections
Section 8: Future Outlook	3 subsections

SECTION 1: 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.

Examples

Some hypothetical examples of areas that could be reflected by strategic goal statements are provided below. No doubt, country-specific strategic goal statements will in reality be more contextual and detailed with a precise indication of the national level goal relevant to each strategic goal area.

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.

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.

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.

SECTIONS 2 - 6

HFA five PRIORITIES for ACTION

Drawing on the conclusions of the review of the Yokohama strategy, on the basis of the deliberations at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction, and especially the agreed expected outcome and strategic goals, the Conference adopted the following five priorities for action in 2005:

1. Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.
2. Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.
3. Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.
4. Reduce the underlying risk factors.
5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

The HFA outlines that, in their approach to disaster risk reduction, States, regional and international organizations and other actors concerned should take into consideration the key activities listed under each of these five priorities and should implement them, as appropriate, to their own circumstances and capacities.

Guidance for sections 2-6: HFA five Priorities for Action

- A. The objective of these five sections is to help you assess the extent of progress made with regard to implementation of key activities as outlined in the HFA Priorities for Action.
- 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 under each 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.

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

Explanation of scope of each Indicator under Priority for Action 1

HFA Priority for Action 1

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

1(i) National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

A framework for a national policy on disaster risk reduction should provide a well designed and mutually reinforcing set of plans and positions by the national government to reduce the risk of disasters, including legislation, planing and resource allocation. Frameworks should be constructed through a systematic and consultative process that includes opportunity for input from a diverse range of sources.

A disaster risk reduction legal framework should provide a well designed and mutually reinforcing set of laws and regulations defining acceptable risk and assigning responsibility for risk reduction by government and the private sector, and as well as developing the capacity to carry out policies, plans and programmes.

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

1(ii) 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, and only for, disaster risk reduction. 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 desgin of projects, the cost of disasater risk reduction is lower. Institutionalising disaster risk reduction depends on building the capability of organisations to plan and implement the disaste risk reduction activities that are the most applicable in the sector.

1(iii) Community Participation and decentralisation is 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 specific policies, promotion of networking, strategic management of volunteer resources, attribution of roles and responsibilities, and the delegation and provision of the necessary authority and resources.

1. (iv) A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

A multisectoral platform for disaster risk reduciton can be defined as a nationally owned and led mechanism – adopting the form of a forum or committee that faciitates the interaction of key development players arounf the disaster risk reduction agenda and serves as advocate for adopting disaster risk reduciton measures.

Engaging the relevant stekaholders in a dialogue about disaster risk reduction will help build a national consensus on the need and priorities for disaster reduction. Such dialogue enhances awareness of hazards, risk and risk reduction. It promotes risk reduction actions by vulnerable stakeholders, including women and the socially and economically disadvantaged, and by local govenrmnets, private entities, community groups and NGOs through information sharing and coalition building. Dialogue can also lead to collaboration on risk reduction at the regional level.

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.

Explanation of scope of each Indicator under Priority for Action 2

2. Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning.
2(i) 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 risk.
2(ii) 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.
2(iii) 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 service, dissemination and communication, and response capabilities) is the first step to identify areas of weakness and set measures to fill gaps. Early warning systems empower 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.
2(iv) National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary 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 trans boundary risks, exchange information and provide early warnings through appropriate arrangements. This would imply, having standard and accessible information and data on regional disaster risks, impacts and losses.

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

Explanation of scope of each Indicator under Priority for Action 3

3. Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels
3(i) 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 them to take actions to reduce risk, and build resilience.
3(ii) 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 disaster risk reduction knowledge. Educating younger generations instills disaster risk reduction as a value in society. Children are thus effective agents for building a culture of resilience to disasters. Moreover, higher education and applied research are sources of practical endeavours in building disaster reduction capacities and therefore merit special attention. Training activities also provide the opportunity to consider indigenous knowledge and traditional practices.
3 (iii) Research methods and tools for multi risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened Authorities at national and regional level have a 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.
3 (iv) 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. Making stakeholders aware of the hazards they are likely to face also helps ensure political commitment to risk reduction measures.

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

Explanation of scope of each Indicator under Priority for Action 4

4. Reduce the underlying risk factors
<p>4(i) 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.</p> <p>Management policies can have beneficial impact on disaster risk reduction, and should explicitly incorporate risk reduction goals and strategies. Many disaster risk reduction actions have environmental benefits, and many environmental practices can provide solutions to reduce vulnerability. When environmental and natural resource policies specifically incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, they can help reduce underlying risk factors</p>
<p>4(ii) Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk – through addressing issues of food security, public health, risk sharing mechanisms, protection of critical public infrastructure etc.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>4 (iii) Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>4(iv) Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes</p> <p>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 the most useful approach to managing urban growth and minimizing associated risks.</p>

4 (v) Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

There is an identified need for the national and local implementation of international post disaster recovery and reconstruction norms and standards.

4(vi) Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure

The social impact of a disaster can be reduced by ensuring prompt resumption of these essential facilities. Direct community involvement is essential in all aspects of school and health facility disaster risk reduction. If procedures are in place, it greatly reduces the risks of communities.

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

Explanation of scope of each Indicator under Priority for Action 5

5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels
5(i) 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 and improves disaster preparedness.
5(ii) 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.
5(iii) Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required 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 and improve disaster preparedness.
5(iv) 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 both types of planning

LEVELS of PROGRESS for five PRIORITIES for ACTION

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

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>

SECTION 7: DRIVERS of PROGRESS

In determining appropriate actions to achieve the HFA's expected outcome and strategic goals, the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005 reaffirmed that the following general considerations will be taken into account by institutions implementing the HFA's key priorities:

- a. an integrated, multi hazard approach to disaster risk reduction should be factored into policies, planning and programming related to sustainable development, relief, rehabilitation, and recovery activities in post disaster and post-conflict situations in disaster prone countries
- b. a gender perspective should be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision making processes, including those related to risk assessment, early warning, information management, and education and training.
- c. cultural diversity, age, and vulnerable groups should be taken into account when planning for disaster risk reduction, with particular attention to livelihood approaches, as appropriate.
- d. both communities and local authorities should be empowered to manage and reduce disaster risk by having access to the necessary information, resources and authority to implement actions for disaster risk reduction
- e. there is a need to enhance cooperation and assistance at all levels, especially through sharing knowledge, technology and expertise to enhance capacity building for disaster risk reduction
- f. all actors are encouraged to build multi-stakeholder partnerships, at all levels, as appropriate, and on a voluntary basis, to contribute to the implementation of this Framework for Action.

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 will be 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 this 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 hydro-meteorological, 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.

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?

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.

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.

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 socio-economic 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.

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.

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

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

Example: Gender has evidently become an important concern for risk reduction and recovery approaches alike; however, there is little acknowledgement of the need to integrate gender concerns and perspectives at the local or national level policy and programmes.

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.

Example 1: While there is no systematic mechanism for such integration in place, gender perspectives are certainly recognized where considered relevant, in policies, plans and activities of the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA). The NDMA also held a 'gender and social equity' workshop recently with region wide participation.

Example 2: The NDMA has not institutionalized any partnerships with civil society actors at this stage. However, holds regular consultations with key representatives from these sectors, and is seeking to formalize partnerships with some key national and local NGO networks to take work on human security, social equity and gender forward. The NDMA has explored, and institutionalized partnerships with the private sector, especially regarding the role of micro-finance and risk transfer mechanisms. Details of the project have been provided in table 2.

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

Example 1: The National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) supports capacity development at the local level explicitly – through its programme goals, resource allocations and activities.

Example 2: The NDMA has dedicated sufficient resources from its 'core budget' to make trained personnel available for managing risk reduction and recovery activities, as per the mandate of the institution.

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 twofold. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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 which 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 3 strategic 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.