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In the context of the II Consultative Forum of the Central American Policy on Integral Disaster Management (PCGIR for its Spanish acronym) held 18-19 June in Costa Rica, UNISDR ROAM jointly with the Executive Secretariat of the Central American Coordination Centre for the Prevention of Natural Disasters (CEPREDENAC), organized an post HFA consultation with more than 120 representatives of national disaster risk management organizations, IGO’s, technical institutions, international organizations, donors and civil society of 6 countries of Central America.

The consultation was designed around the main elements identified in the synthesis report of the first phase of the HFA2 consultations, the Chair’s Summary of the GP13, and the main elements of the Central American Policy of Integral Risk Management (PCGIR). Participants organized the discussions around suggested indicators for a new HFA Framework, under the main thematic pillars of the PCGIR : investment and recovery; social compensation; environment and CC; land use planning and governance; disaster management as new priorities for consideration in the HFA2.

The results of the discussions and indicators for a new HFA framework are summarized in the following pages:

**Roundtable 1**

Suggested indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pillar I : Disaster Risk Reduction investment for sustainable economic development.** | Methodologies of risk analysis applied for regional, national, local and sectorial project investment planning.  |
| Percentage of the public investment oriented to disaster risk reduction. |
| Existence of mechanisms of participatory approach in the process of identification of public and private investment for DRR. |
| Mechanism of public investment tracking and investment evaluation for DRR established. |
| Existence of budgetary policies with specific guidelines to incorporate DRR in sectoral budgets. |
| Structure of disaster risk reduction budget classifiers established |
| Percentage of public investment applied to reduce vulnerability per sector. |
| Existence of disaster risk project assessment criteria established at the sectoral/ministerial levels  |

Comments :

* Participants highlighted the need to advance in application of risk analysis in order to be able to identify the advantages in economic terms of investing in disaster risk reduction.
* The participants pointed out the need of examples and regional knowledge exchanges of applied cost benefit analysis of DRR investment in the region as an important instrument of advocacy for DRR budget allocations in the Ministries of Planning/Finances.
* Participants mentioned that only few countries in the Central American region regularly update a database of national assets in key areas of water, energy, transport. Such inventory is necessary as part of the process of a cost benefit analysis and could be translated into a specific indicator.

**Roundtable 2**

Suggested indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pillar II : Development and social support to reduce vulnerability** .  | Number of sectoral development plans include disaster risk reduction goals. |
| The education (formal and non-formal) sector plans include disaster risk reduction considerations. |
| Land use planning and building regulations incorporate disaster risk reduction considerations.  |
| Disaster risk considerations integrated in the planning of water and basic social services |
| Existence of mechanisms to follow up disaster risk reduction goals at the national level. |

Comments :

* Participants highlighted the need of explicit sectoral indicators.
* The process of integrating DRR in sector planning requires further capacity development and experience exchanges with relevant partners.

**Roundtable 3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pillar III. Climate change and environment**  | Existence of participatory mechanisms in the formulation and management of DRR, Integral management of Hydric Resources and CC |
| Public and private investment (national and local) incorporate DRR, Integral Hydric Resource Management and Climate Change.  |
| Existence of a single policy framework that integrates National Adaptation Plans and Disaster Risk Reduction plans. |
| HFA2 follow up mechanisms report on climatic change adaptation and climatic risks.  |
| Existence of National communication plans of climatic change that incorporate reporting on disaster risk reduction.  |

Comments :

* Participants suggested that indicators in this pillar should measure country efforts for the integration of Global and regional initiatives of Climate Change and DRR into unified policies at the country level.
* Thus the indicators proposed are oriented to identify how governments integrate both concepts (DRR and CCA) in the policy instruments and develop relevant reporting mechanisms.

**Roundtable IV**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pillar IV : Land use planning and governance.** | Existence regulatory frameworks that integrate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in land use plans at the national and at the local level. |
| Extent to which municipal development plans include disaster risk reduction goals.  |
| Existence of tracking mechanisms to follow up investment on DRR at the local level .  |
| National DRR legal frameworks consider explicit responsibilities and budget allocation for disaster risk reduction at the municipal/local levels.  |

**Roundtable 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pillar V : Disaster response management and recovery**  | Existence of disaster management legal frameworks for response and recovery at the national and local levels.  |
| Existence of standard protocols for loss and damage evaluation at the national and subnational level.  |
| Existence of effective procedures for information exchange (among countries in a sub-region) and between national and local governments during situations of disasters. |
| Existence of trans-boundary information exchange and response cooperation agreements between countries in a sub-regional context. |
| Existence of preparedness and contingency plans integrated in the sector plans. |
| Existence of capacity building programmes for preparation and response at the national and regional levels. |
| Existence of national legal frameworks for the coordination and mobilization of international aid.  |
| Existence of national recovery plans or recovery strategies as part of the disaster risk reduction strategies.  |
| Existence of explicit allocations for disaster related contingencies, emergencies, and preparation in national budgets. |
| Existence of country financial management strategies for risk retention. |
| Existence of mechanisms of financial reserves that integrate response, mitigation and preparation. |

* Participants highlighted the advances that national governments have made in different aspects of response and preparation: EWS, response mechanisms, development of legal frameworks, loss and damage protocols. However, indicated the need to strengthen and furthering these mechanisms at the local level and make regular assessment of the timeliness of responses provided and capacities.
* The representatives recognized the value of the development of drills and simulations at national and local level, however there exist the need to establish standard procedures to measure impact of the drills in reducing disaster losses.
* Participants highlighted the need to reinforce the need of legal frameworks that make mandatory the establishment of contingency plans at the sector level (education, health, water and sanitation, power and electricity, agriculture).