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This Preliminary Agenda lays out the main items for discussion along with the relevant reference documents attached as **ANNEXES**.
A dialogue involving all participants and supported by a panel of GFDRR partners addresses challenges and opportunities for enhancing DRM mainstreaming engagements. The discussions reflects on lessons learned from the previous session and aims to provide recommendations along four key areas:

- Country ownership
- Donor Coordination
- Value added impact of GFDRR funded and GFDRR leveraged initiatives
- Importance of Access to Data, knowledge, capacity & resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12:30 – 14:00</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 16:00</td>
<td><strong>Water-Related Risks: a Complex Climate Adaptation and Development Agenda</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;- <strong>Introduction</strong> <em>(15 min, Netherlands’ representative)</em>&lt;br&gt;- <strong>Flood risk management at the Bank &amp; GFDRR</strong>: approaches and portfolio <em>(15 min, Zuzana Svetlosakova)</em>&lt;br&gt;- <strong>A comprehensive response to drought</strong>: the Horn of Africa experience <em>(10 min, Doekle Wielinga)</em>&lt;br&gt;- <strong>Risk financing instruments for water-related hazards</strong> <em>(15 min, Lijia Vado and Eugene Gurenko)</em>&lt;br&gt;- <strong>From recovery towards prevention: role of Post-Disaster Need Assessment (PDNA)</strong> <em>(10 min, Raja Arshad)</em>&lt;br&gt;- <strong>Early Warning</strong> <em>(10 min, Xiaolan Wang)</em>&lt;br&gt;- Questions &amp; answers; Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 17:30</td>
<td><strong>What Countries Need from GFDRR and Partners</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<em>Building on the discussions of the day and, the successes and challenges brought forward during the different sessions, the main action points identified will be presented. The participants will be invited to vote on 2 short term, 2 medium term and 2 longer term actionable items that can be taken forward as coordinated efforts to enhance DRM mainstreaming at the country, regional and sector level.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 – 19:00</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Agenda for April 17th on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30</td>
<td>Coffee &amp; Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Members Only *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>GFDRR Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As requested at the 11th CG, the co-chair will report on its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preliminary consultations on GFDRR Governance and hold discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with CG members on the issues and options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG members will be invited to discuss and agree on the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roadmap for the next Partnership Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session moderated by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms. Hannah Tijmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Members and Observers *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks and Introduction of new GFDRR Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms. Zoubida Allaoua (Acting CG Chair), Director, Finance Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Urban Department, Sustainable Development Network, the World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms. Hannah Tijmes (CG Co-Chair), Head of Humanitarian Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mr. Tom Hockley, Head, Regional Office Support &amp; Inter-Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination Unit, UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(UNISDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Introduction and Statements by New Partners and Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New CG members and partners will have the opportunity to introduce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>themselves and their interest in the GFDRR partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session moderated by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms. Hannah Tijmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:00</td>
<td>Adoption of Agenda &amp; Minutes of the 11th CG Meeting [ANNEX A, C &amp; D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of the agenda of the meeting, confirmation of the minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the 11th CG meeting and update to CG members on follow up items,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including the DRM Advocacy Paper, Track III Impact Note and Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases, and the updated Annual Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session moderated by:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|           | • Ms. Zoubida Allaoua
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 13:00</td>
<td><strong>Update on the Partnership with UNISDR [ANNEX E]</strong>&lt;br&gt;<code>Discussion the ongoing and future cooperation between GFDRR and UNISDR.</code>**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Session moderated by:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Ms. Hannah Tijmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:30</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 – 16:00</td>
<td><strong>GFDRR’s Partnership with Civil Society [ANNEX F]</strong>&lt;br&gt;<code>Discussion of the proposed Civil Society Partnership Strategy.</code>**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Session moderated by:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Ms. Hannah Tijmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:20</td>
<td><strong>Coffee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20 – 17:20</td>
<td><strong>Working together on Aid tracking [ANNEX G]</strong>&lt;br&gt;<code>Global Aid tracking is a critical element to guide future investments in disaster risk management. This session will present a new proposal, followed by a discussion, for advancing the global aid tracking system of disaster related funding sources in collaboration with UNISDR.</code>**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Session moderated by:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Ms. Zoubida Allaoua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20 – 18:00</td>
<td><strong>Closing Remarks and approval of the 2013 Co-Chair</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Session moderated by:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Ms. Zoubida Allaoua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Events Contact**

Catherine Burtonboy, GFDRR  
Phone: +1 (202) 473-9816  
Email: cburtonboy@worldbank.org

* For a list of Members and Observers, please see the next page.
List of GFDRR Consultative Group Members and Observers

As stated in the Partnership Charter members of the GFDRR Consultative Group include:

1. World Bank
2. Donors contributing at least $3,000,000 cumulatively over three years
3. Chair of the ISDR system
4. Chair of GFDRR Results Management Council
5. Developing country governments contributing at least $500,000 cumulatively over three years.
6. Developing country governments invited by the CG (on a 2-year staggered rotational basis)

Beyond formal CG membership (as defined above) GFDRR has engaged a broader partnership-base by welcoming other stakeholders to attend the Consultative Group meetings as Observers. In addition, 2 key international organisations are regularly invited to attend the Consultative Group as Observers. The below list lays out GFDRR members and observers, based on contributions and pledges, as of March 2012.

**Formal CG Members:**

*Donors:*
ACP Secretariat
Australia
Brazil
Denmark
European Union
Germany
Italy
Japan
Korea, Republic of
Luxembourg
Nigeria
Norway
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
The Netherlands
United Kingdom
United States
World Bank

**Other members:**
UNISDR

*6 invited Developing country Members:*
Yemen (2011-12)
Malawi (2011-12)
Bangladesh (2011-12)
Togo (2012-13)
Solomon Islands (2012-13)
Haiti (2012-13)

**CG Observers:**

Arab Academy
Austria
Belgium
Canada (donor but 3-year contribution expired)
China
Colombia
Egypt
Finland
France (donor contribution under 3 million)
India
Indonesia
Ireland (donor contribution under 3 million)
Islamic Development Bank (pledge pending)
Malaysia
Mexico
New Zealand
Portugal
Saudi Arabia (pledge pending)
Senegal
South Africa
Vietnam

**Invited Observers:**
UNDP
IFRC
Thursday, 17th November, 2011

Welcoming Remarks:

World Bank Chair, Ms. Zoubida Allaoua, and Co-Chair, Mr. Alan March opened the meeting highlighting key issues in the agenda for the CG to take decision and welcomed all delegates, the new donors and members Nigeria and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; the Islamic Development Bank’s and Indonesia’s commitment to formalize membership; and Malaysia as a new observer attending the CG meetings for the first time.

Mr. Alan March also underscored Australia’s deep commitment to the DRR agenda.

The host, Mr. Sugeng Triutomo, Deputy Chief for Prevention and Preparedness, National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB), Indonesia, welcomed everyone and explained Indonesia’s keen interest in contributing and benefiting from sharing views and best practice on DRR. BNPB is awaiting response from Indonesia’s Ministry of Finance for formal membership in GFDRR. Mr Triutomo also thanked GFDRR for continued cooperation in implementing DRR in Indonesia.

Mr. Tom Hockley, Chief, Regional Support Office, UNISDR Secretariat, read out a message from Ms. Margareta Wahlstrom, Special Representative of the UN Secretary General for Disaster Risk Reduction, UN ISDR, who apologized for not being able to attend in person.

The statement highlighted how GFDRR has been instrumental in assisting the work of UNISDR. Around 20% of UNISDR’s work takes place through GFDRR Track I and is financed by the World Bank Development Grant Facility.
Key Outcomes:

GFDRR Today (Draft 2011 Annual Report)

Results are fundamental and partnership is critically important. Capturing and communicating results is evolving and it is important to acknowledge this. The Consultative Group:

- Welcomed the GFDRR draft 2011 annual report on work undertaken and achievements;
- Sought the inclusion of discussion of challenges for progress;
- Requested the inclusion of an overview of GFDRR progress be provided against Tracks I, II, and III;
- Requested that financial reporting differentiates between single- and multi-donor trust funds.
- Recognised that the impact of GFDRR work is indirect, through GFDRR’s capacity building and mainstreaming work, and requested GFDRR to record the leveraging impact of GFDRR’s work on the ground;
- Expressed strong interest in reporting on impact in countries and communities and on GFDRR work with others in the disaster risk reduction sector;
- Requested more clarity in communicating results and to reflect more on the parameters of the proposed results framework and continuing dialogue on these important issues; and
- Requested a 2 page advocacy document on disaster risk reduction results to support resource mobilization.

The Consultative Group requested inputs to the revised GFDRR 2011 annual report to be provided to the Secretariat by December 9, 2011.

The Consultative Group welcomed the Secretariat commitment to provide CG papers 15 days prior to the CG.

UNISDR Biennial Work Plan and Track I Work Plan

The Consultative Group:

- Appreciated the UNISDR 2025 Strategic vision;
- Requested further advice on Track I achievements and cooperation between UNISDR and GFDRR and to have this reflected in a revised GFDRR 2011 annual report;
- Encouraged further cooperation between UNISDR and GFDRR and requested a joint paper on possible future cooperation for consideration at the 12th Consultative Group;
- Acknowledged that World Bank’s last year of funding for Track I is fiscal year 2013, and noted at the same time that this budget is approved on an a year-by-year basis. The CG asked the World Bank to positively consider financial year 2013 Track I funding (from WB’s Development Grant Facility) for UNISDR, guided by the revised GFDRR 2011 annual report and the presentation of Track I results at the 12th Consultative Group meeting.
Strategic Direction for GFDRR’s Engagement for Enhanced Local and Community Action

Outcomes of the consultations to date, presented by Marcus Oxley, Chair of the Global Network

Partnership with CSOs is critical for building resilient communities. The Consultative Group:
- Agreed the importance of GFDRR partnering with civil society
- Appreciated the update on the consultations with civil society organizations presented by the chair of the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations in Disaster Reduction, Marcus Oxley.
- Noted the role GFDRR can play in helping to close the gap between national policy and local action.
- Endorsed continued consultation with civil society in priority countries.
- Agreed to the proposal to form a working group to support GFDRR with the strategy development and financial and organizational modalities for its implementation, to be presented at the 12th CG meeting.

Consultative Group Membership of Developing Countries

GFDRR’s inclusive governance model encourages greater participation of developing countries in the CG. The CG:
- Thanked outgoing members, Senegal and Vietnam.
- Nominated and agreed to invite Haiti, Togo and Solomon Islands for the next two year term.

Consultative Group Co-Chair

- CG thanked the outgoing Australian Co-chair for Australia's outstanding contribution to the growth and development of GFDRR partnership.
- CG welcomed the proposal and accepted the Netherlands Government to Co-chair the CG during 2011-12.

Friday, 18th November, 2011

Looking Forward: Strategic Directions for GFDRR 2012-2015

Resource Mobilization

The Consultative Group:
- Acknowledged that country programs and current resource commitments leave significant gaps.
- Emphasized that filling the gap in resources is crucial for effectiveness of the programmes and request GFDRR to articulate a resource mobilization strategy to implement its work plan for 2012-2015
- Noted that programs and allocated resources have to take into account principles of vulnerability, exposure, and need, not only 'program implementation capacity'.
Standby Recovery Financing Facility

The Consultative Group:
- Welcomed the overview provided by the Secretariat on Post-Disaster Needs Assessments and recognized the value of Track III.
- Acknowledged the relevance of close coordination between the UN, WB and EU, under the 2008 Joint Declaration on Post-Crisis Assessments and Recovery Planning.
- Welcomed the advice that an evaluation will be undertaken and a business case will be brought forward, including the performance of Track III to date and relevant facts and the rationale to upscale funding.
- Acknowledged that SRFF assistance to affected countries has grown disproportionately vis-à-vis donor commitments, thereby constraining its ability to provide adequate post-disaster response and emphasized the importance that this constraint has to be addressed.

Governance

The Consultative Group:
- Welcomed the discussion on governance in light of the growth of GFDRR’s work, growing CG membership and the end of the current term of the Results Management Council.
- Agreed this important and sensitive issue would benefit from further discussion, both bilaterally and in the Consultative Group.
- Agreed that the outgoing and current Co-chair consult further on this issue with a view to present a proposal for discussion to the next CG meeting.
- Asked the outgoing and current Co-chair to seek nominations for the 2013 Co-chair.
- The World Bank requested the CG to recognize it as a GFDRR donor in addition to its role as CG chair.

GFDRR Management

- The Consultative Group received an update from the World Bank on GFDRR staffing matters.

Next Meeting

- The Consultative group agreed in principle to hold the 12th CG in Washington on April 17-19, 2012, in the margins of the World Bank annual meetings and to hold the 13th CG in late November 2012 in a venue and on a date to be decided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participant name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>Mr. Alan March</td>
<td>Assistant Director-General</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Grant Morrison</td>
<td>Manager, Disaster Risk Reduction, Humanitarian Policy Section</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGLADESH</td>
<td>Dr. Muhammad Abdur Razzaque</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Food and Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Md. Masumur Rahman</td>
<td>Assistant Private Secretary to the Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Food and Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>Ms. Carol Mundle</td>
<td>First Secretary</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada, Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Rashmi Sharma</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Embassy of Canada, Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Andersen</td>
<td>Head of Section</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Jozias Blok</td>
<td>Policy Officer, Desertification &amp; Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>European Commission. EuropeAid – Development and Co-operation Directorate General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>Ms. Päivi Alatalo</td>
<td>Counselor/ Deputy Head of Mission</td>
<td>Embassy of Finland, Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>Mr. Romain Tosello</td>
<td>Cooperation, Governance, and Human Rights</td>
<td>Embassy of France, Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Piesch</td>
<td>Head of Division, Emergency and transitional aid, WFP, crisis unit</td>
<td>German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
<td>Organization/Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>Mr. A. E. Ahmad</td>
<td>Secretary (Border Management)</td>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Sanjay Agarwal</td>
<td>Director (Disaster Management-III)</td>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>Mr. Sugeng Triutomo</td>
<td>Deputy for Prevention and Preparedness</td>
<td>National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Max Pohan</td>
<td>Deputy Minister</td>
<td>National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>Mr. Mohammed Mukhier</td>
<td>Head, Community Preparedness and Risk Reduction Department</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAMIC</td>
<td>Mr. Ismail A. Daod</td>
<td>Lead Trust Funds</td>
<td>Trust Funds Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Mr. Ammar A Elsharif</td>
<td>Officer Trust Funds</td>
<td>Trust Funds Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Mr. Rocco Mandolla</td>
<td>Bilateral Emergency Activities - Desk Coordinator</td>
<td>Italian Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>Dr. Hitoshi Baba</td>
<td>Senior Advisor</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Yuji Yamamoto</td>
<td>Senior Coordinator, Global Issues Cooperation Division</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLIC OF</td>
<td>Dr. Sangman Jeong</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>National Disaster Management Institute, Ministry of Public Administration and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA</td>
<td>Dr. Dugkeun Park</td>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>National Disaster Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAWI</td>
<td>Mr. Jeffrey Kanyinji</td>
<td>Principal Secretary and</td>
<td>Department of Disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>Ms. Nurwaheeda Omar</td>
<td>Principal Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, International And Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Munirah Zulkaple</td>
<td>Principal Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>National Security Council / Disaster Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>Ms. Hannah Tijmes</td>
<td>Head of Humanitarian Aid Division</td>
<td>The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Winnie Teunissen</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor</td>
<td>The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Adakole Agbo</td>
<td>Director, Planning, Research and Forecasting</td>
<td>National Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Kayode Fagbemi</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>National Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>Mr. Oddvar Kjekstadt</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Humanitarian Section, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUDI ARABIA</td>
<td>Mr. Tariq Ashmawy</td>
<td>Director General of Emergencies</td>
<td>Presidency of Meteorology and Environment Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Abdulkareem Abdulwasea</td>
<td>Director of Coastal Areas Department</td>
<td>Presidency of Meteorology and Environment Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td>Mr. Mare Lo</td>
<td>Director, Direction of Civil Protection</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>Mr. Moses Phahlane</td>
<td>First Secretary</td>
<td>Embassy of the Republic of South Africa, Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Mr. Mario Gonzalez-Pliego</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Embassy of Spain, Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>Mr. Per Byman</td>
<td>Head, Humanitarian Unit</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWITZERLAND</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Jakob Hallgren</td>
<td>Head of Section for Humanitarian Policy, Department for Multilateral Development Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Magdalena Lesjak</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Multilateral Aid Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED KINGDOM</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Nick Harvey</td>
<td>Resilience Adviser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNISDR</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Tom Hockley</td>
<td>Chief, Regional Support Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Neil Mcfarlane</td>
<td>Coordinator, Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Madhavi Ariyabandu</td>
<td>Regional Programme Officer, Bangkok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED STATES</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Ayse Sezin Tokar</td>
<td>Senior Hydrometeorological Hazard Advisor, Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIETNAM</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Dang Quang Minh</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Disaster Management Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEMEN</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Omar Abdullah Al-Kurshomi</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Abdulmalek Hazzaa Al-Jolahy</td>
<td>First Deputy Minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Public Works and Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B
Country Program Updates

The following documents summarize the progress made in three of the priority countries. These documents were prepared with the GFDRR country focal points in each of the countries. They provide background information for CG members to prepare for CG Day 1 discussion.

The Secretariat is requesting feedback from the CG as to whether this format and level of information is useful and relevant for CG members.
GFDRR ENGAGEMENT

A | Projects 2007-2009 | US$ 953,000
B | Country Prog. Budget 2010-2012 | US$ 4,984,000
C | Total | US$ 5,937,000
D | Sources of funding | SDTF

WORLD DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

- DRR index\(^1\) 4.75/5 (DRI = 5/7)
- Income group: Upper-middle
- Population: 14,464,739
- GDP: 4,008 US$/capita
- Poverty: 32.8%
- Urban population: 67%

KEY PARTNERS

- NATIONAL: agriculture, urban and land-use planning, education
- INTERNATL: UNISDR, EC, UNDP, WFP
- REGIONAL: AC, IADB
- DONORS: Spain

DRM SPECIALIST

Ms. Jeannette Fernández
jfernandezc@worldbank.org
+507-6217-7747 / 5732-2000

GFDRR-FUNDED PROJECTS’ OUTCOMES

Disaster Risk Reduction Program for Quito Municipality
GFDRR USD 953,000
others USD 200,000
2008 – 2012

- The objective is to support mainstreaming of risk reduction in development processes at the country and local levels. Quito is used as a pilot for testing a holistic approach to risk reduction and is part of a South-South collaboration network with Kathmandu (Nepal) & Makati (Philippines).
- Outcomes up-to-date include:
  - Increased funding made available and enhanced institutional arrangements for DRM at the municipal level, showing understanding and ownership of prevention and mitigation in addition to emergency management.
  - Municipality’s DRM capabilities enhanced through direct engagement of the project coordinator and administrator in daily operations. This GFDRR support is perceived by the government as a good practice worth replication in future projects.
  - Seismic risk knowledge is available under a unified risk information system, utilized in particular within the water, sanitation, health, education, housing and transportation sectors. It will form the basis for the development of a comprehensive culture of safety.
  - Contingency plans are available for flood and landslides in eight administrative zones. Exposed population has benefited from awareness campaigns.

---

1 The WDI Disaster Risk Reduction progress score is an average of self-assessment scores, ranging from 1 to 5, submitted by countries under Priority 1 of the Hyogo Framework National Progress Reports (1-5 scale; 5=best); The Disaster Risk Index is a mortality-based index developed in order to enable comparisons of countries hit by different hazards types (7 classes; 7=high mortality).
The Bank participates in regular informal coordination meetings with national, international and regional organizations as well as civil society organizations. Program and project updates are shared to promote coordination and leveraging for DRM interventions. Examples are the joint efforts and funding channeled through WB/GDFRR, UNDP and EC/DIPECHO to support the implementation of comprehensive risk reduction programs in two of the poorest neighborhoods in Quito.

The “Disaster Risk Reduction Program for Quito Municipality” promotes collaboration among municipal administrations across sectors.

At the regional level, a project is in the pipeline to support the DRM dialogue within the Andean Region, with a particular emphasis on Ecuador and Bolivia. GFDRR will hire a DRM specialist in Bolivia.

**CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISK PROFILE**

Ecuador shares with other Andean countries an acute vulnerability and high exposure to several natural hazards. 66% of the population lives in urban areas and 96% in the coastal and mountainous regions, exposed to seismic, volcanic, flood, landslide, and El Nino hazards.

The country has experienced different economic stresses as a consequence of natural hazards. Flooding mainly affects the coastal zone and Amazon region and volcanic eruptions the central zone. In addition drought has been recorded in some provinces in the northern coastal and central regions.

The most affected sectors in the central and eastern regions of the country are health, education, agriculture, and road infrastructure. Concentration of development in the mountains also leads to frequent landslides affecting urban areas and infrastructure. Insufficient land use planning instruments in urban areas leading to inadequate location of settlements, environmental degradation of river basins, expansion of farmland and inferior building standards all contribute to the high levels of vulnerability.

Different climate change scenarios have been analyzed for Ecuador. As examples, (i) a temperature increase of 2°C and precipitation decrease of 15% would lead to agricultural shortages, (ii) temperature increase of 1°C and precipitation increase of 20% would also severely affect fisheries and agriculture production as a result of increased flooding risk.

**PRIORITIES FOR GFDRR ENGAGEMENT**

GFDRR engagements to date support five out of six priorities identified by the DRM specialist, namely (i) understanding risks, (ii) DRM/CCA policies, building codes, land-use & urban planning, (iii) resource mobilization (seed funds to start engaging local authorities), (iv) cost benefit analysis of investments in disaster risk management, and (v) enhancing the resilience of cities, communities and critical infrastructure. Support for risk financing mechanisms is recommended to be addressed in future GFDRR engagement.

On the technical side, the Municipality of Quito strongly appreciated the cost-benefit assessment of investments in DRM. The local authority has signaled an interest in up-scaling the project by addressing cost-benefit analysis of vulnerability reduction initiatives in schools.

One priority for more efficient future GFDRR engagement is to develop project management capacities within recipient and partner organizations with a tendency towards decentralized and crosscutting approach to DRM.
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**GFDRR ENGAGEMENT**

A. Projects 2007-2009
   - US$ 0

B. CP Budget 2010-2012
   - US$ 8,100,000

C. Total
   - US$ 8,100,000

D. Sources of funding
   - MDTF

E. Resources Approved
   - US$ 1,750,000

F. Resources Transferred
   - US$ 270,767

G. Resources Disbursed
   - US$ 155,767

H. Bank Executed
   - 10 %
   - Main Government Counterpart
   - N/A

I. Recipient Executed
   - 90 %
   - Implement. Agency
   - Technical Secretariat of the National DRR Platform, Ministry of Environment

**WORLD DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS**

- DRR index¹: *no data* (DRI class 3/7)
- Income group: Low income country
- Population: 6,027,798
- GDP: 523 US$/capita
- Poverty: 61.7%
- Urban population: 43%

**KEY PARTNERS**

(as identified by the DRM specialist)

NATIONAL: meteorological, hydrological, civil protection
INTERNATIONAL: UNISDR, IFRC, UNDP
REGIONAL: Africa Union, ECOWAS
CSO: Croix-Rouge, Amis de la terre

**DRM SPECIALIST**

Koffi Hounpke
khounkpe@worldbank.org
+228 2223 3300 / 5336 3330

**NATIONAL PLATFORM**

Formally declared to UNISDR; WB is observer; Focus: DRM only.

**NATIONAL LEGISLATION**

Environmental framework law (May 2008)

**GFDRR-FUNDED PROJECTS’ OUTCOMES**

**Project**

Integrated Disaster and Land Management

**DRM and CCA-related outcomes**

- The project uses GFDRR funds to leverage GEF resources; it pulls together resources required for both short- and long-term disaster risk management activities. The development objective is to strengthen institutional capacities to manage risk of flooding and land degradation in rural and urban areas. Expected outcomes include:
  - Enhanced knowledge of flooding risk in Greater Lomé and area of Baguida is being developed with the view to mainstreaming DRM into development plans and identifying priority disaster risk management and development interventions;
  - Strengthened capacities of communities and institutions for early warning, emergency preparedness, land-use planning, natural resources management in targeted rural and urban areas – thus reducing losses of lives and property.
  - Enhanced farming and forestry practices to combat desertification and land degradation, resulting in reduced flooding risk and strengthened resilience.

¹ The WDI Disaster Risk Reduction progress score is an average of self-assessment scores, ranging from 1 to 5, submitted by countries under Priority 1 of the Hyogo Framework National Progress Reports (1-5 scale; 5=best); The Disaster Risk Index is a mortality-based index developed in order to enable comparisons of countries hit by different hazards types (7 classes; 7=high mortality).
The Post Disaster Need Assessment conducted in the aftermath of the October 2010 flooding event was instrumental. The flooding had impacted urban, semi urban and rural areas, in 5 regions in the country, and led to US$ 43 million in terms of recovery needs. The assessment was led by Government officials and brought together experts from national and local government agencies, academia, civil society organizations and the UN. It provided a clear action plan for reducing flooding risks in the country by building upon expertise, capacities and resources from all key stakeholders. The Government’s immediate reaction was to provide US$ 1.2 million for flood prevention and preparedness. The Government supported inclusion of disaster risk reduction activities in the national Integrated Disaster and Land Management Project.

The PDNA training, conducted prior to the 2010 flooding event, developed capacities across disciplines within a national team that was able to promptly conduct the PDNA with minor support from international stakeholders. This resulted in reduced cost and enhanced ownership of the PDNA in the country (see above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>DRM and CCA-related outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 PDNA</td>
<td>The Post Disaster Need Assessment conducted in the aftermath of the October 2010 flooding event was instrumental. The flooding had impacted urban, semi urban and rural areas, in 5 regions in the country, and led to US$ 43 million in terms of recovery needs. The assessment was led by Government officials and brought together experts from national and local government agencies, academia, civil society organizations and the UN. It provided a clear action plan for reducing flooding risks in the country by building upon expertise, capacities and resources from all key stakeholders. The Government's immediate reaction was to provide US$ 1.2 million for flood prevention and preparedness. The Government supported inclusion of disaster risk reduction activities in the national Integrated Disaster and Land Management Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 PDNA Training</td>
<td>The PDNA training, conducted prior to the 2010 flooding event, developed capacities across disciplines within a national team that was able to promptly conduct the PDNA with minor support from international stakeholders. This resulted in reduced cost and enhanced ownership of the PDNA in the country (see above).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYNERGIES AND COMPLEMENTARITIES WITH OTHER PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB Projects</th>
<th>DRM- and CCA-related outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Energy Project (EIREP)</td>
<td>Contributes to flooding risk management through enhanced and more resilient drainage, water supply, energy generation equipment and transportation as well as institutional strengthening – thus supporting Government efforts to reduce periodic flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Project (CDP)</td>
<td>Contributes to the establishment and strengthening of basic socioeconomic infrastructure geared towards poor communities, for health, education, water and sanitation, as well as revenue-generating activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Partners’ Projects**

| UNDP | Assists the Government in the development of a national strategy for disaster risk management, a national risk/hazard map, a contingency plan and an early warning system. |
| EU, BOAD | Implemented by AfD, development of drainage project in the lagoon of Lomé, which reduce flooding risks in the lagoon. The project is funded by the EU (€5 million) and BOAD (€3 million). |
| UNISDR | Supports the National Platform in the preparation of the national DRR strategy. |
| UN OCHA | Strengthen preparedness and response mechanisms in case of emergency, with the Ministries of Environment and Civil Protection. |
| UN -SPIDER | Recommendations on the use of geospatial data for DRR. |

**PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION**

| Key national services | meteorological, hydrological, civil protection |
| International organizations | UNISDR, IFRC, UNDP |
| Regional organizations | African Union, ECOWAS |
| NGOs/CSOs | Croix-Rouge, Amis de la terre |

Partnership and coordination among stakeholders is identified as the main priority by the HFA focal point in Togo. The Integrated Disaster and Land Management project itself is funded through a partnership of donor agencies, implemented through a network of national entities. The national platform for disaster risk reduction is the core mechanism for coordination and bringing together national and international agencies.

The DRM specialist will soon complete, in collaboration with the Technical Secretary for the National Platform for DRR, an updated inventory of projects and activities contributing to DRR and CCA, with the objective of leveraging funds from partners, enhancing synergies among actions and facilitating government reporting on HFA implementation.
CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISK PROFILE

Togo is vulnerable to floods that have enormous destructive potential to population, society, environment and the economy. Soil/coastal erosion as well as deforestation are also of major concern, exacerbating the effects of flooding.

Although the country experiences flooding almost every year, the last few years have witnessed particularly widespread and devastating floods. In 2007, Togo was one of the hardest hit among West-African countries, with 127,880 people affected and 23 casualties. The 2010 flooding affected 83,000 people and resulted in over $US 38 million in damages and losses.

According to the Togo second national communication on climate change, the country’s vulnerability may increase as a result of climate change and the five following sectors are particularly vulnerable: agriculture, energy, health, housing, water resource and coastal erosion.

PRIORITIES FOR GFDRR ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(as expressed by the DRM specialist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cooperation with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outreach and capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provision of analytical tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resource mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Risk financing mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhancing the resilience of cities, communities and critical infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participation of Togo during the upcoming GFDRR Consultative Group on 16-17 April 2012 will provide an opportunity for CG members to interact with Government official and get more specific feedback on GFDRR engagement.

Implementation of the Integrated Disaster and Land Management Project, a key engagement for the country, is about to start. It will address most of country priorities as identified in the table beside, except risk financing mechanisms.

PRSP-II is under preparation and could benefit from early engagement from GFDRR to support DRM mainstreaming. In this context, an environmental study will provide due consideration to DRR and climate change as part of poverty reduction.
Vietnam Country Program Update
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GFDRR ENGAGEMENT

| A | Projects 2007-2009 | US$ 914,000 |
| B | CP Budget 2010-2012 | US$ 15,000,000 |
| C | Total | US$ 15,914,000 |
| D | Source of Funding | MDTF |
| E | Resources Approved | US$ 3,364,000 |
| F | Resources Transferred | US$ 3,364,000 |
| G | Resources Disbursed | US$ 1,113,686 |

| H | Bank Executed | 51% | Main Gov. Counterpart |
| I | Recipient Executed | 49% | Implement. Agency |

WORLD DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

| DRR index | WDI: No data |
| DRI: class 6/7 |

Income group | Upper-middle |
Population | 86,967,000 |
GDP | 1,224 US$/capita |
Poverty | 21.5% of population |
Urban population | 28.8% of total |

KEY PARTNERS

NATIONAL: Meteorological, hydrological, civil protection
INTERNATIONAL: UNDP, IFRC
REGIONAL: ADB, ADPC
DONORS: Australia, EC, Japan

DRM SPECIALIST

Mr. Dzung Huy Nguyen
dnguyen4@worldbank.org
+84-4-3934-6600 Ext. 306

NATIONAL PLATFORM
The World Bank, with IDA resources, will provide support to implement a National Platform on DRM and CCA to facilitate inter-ministerial policy dialogue and knowledge-sharing mechanisms.

NATIONAL STRATEGY
National Strategy for Natural Disaster Prevention, Response and Mitigation to 2020

GFDRR-FUNDED PROJECTS’ OUTCOMES

Vietnam Disaster Risk Management Capacity Building Program – Phase II (Bank Executed Component)
US$ 2.45 million
(US$ 0.95 million Bank-executed and US$ 1.5 million recipient-executed)
2010-2012
Active

The objective of this program is to strengthen the capacity of the government of Vietnam to implement its national strategy for natural disaster prevention, response and mitigation towards 2020. The focus of the project is on (i) DRR mainstreaming in the WB portfolio, (ii) risk financing, and (iii) climate-proofing infrastructure. To date, the project has mobilized international expertise in support of the Government’s long-term DRM strategy.

Outcomes include:
− Mainstreaming DRM into ongoing World Bank projects in the transport, urban and rural sectors, following program guidelines and methodologies;
− Supporting the hydro-met sector in the shift towards service-oriented operations with the development of new client business plan;
− Enhancing the resilience of infrastructure in the irrigation and road sectors;
− Providing emergency preparedness plans to 14 provinces in the central region;
− Supporting the Government in implementing its national program on CBDRM;
− Enhancing the flood management of Ho Chi Minh City through a scenario-based approach;
− Supporting the government’s implementation of a long-term disaster management strategy by enhancing monitoring and evaluation.

1 The WDI Disaster Risk Reduction progress score is an average of self-assessment scores, ranging from 1 to 5, submitted by countries under Priority 1 of the Hyogo Framework National Progress Reports (1-5 scale; 5=best); The Disaster Risk Index is a mortality-based index developed in order to enable a comparison of countries hit by different hazards types (7 classes; 7=high mortality).
Project | DRM- and CCA-related objectives and outcomes
---|---
**Hazard Risk Management Institutional Development. Advocacy and Capacity Building Program**<br>US$ 914,000<br>2006–2010 Completed | The objective of this program was to strengthen the coordination and mainstreaming of hazard risk management in Vietnam’s socio-economic development planning process across various sectors. The project provided a good foundation for further work in DRM by national counterparts and development partners. Outcomes included:<br>- DRM mainstreamed into poverty reduction initiatives in the rural northern mountain provinces;<br>- Climate change impacts on drainage systems in low-lying coastal cities were assessed and recommendations were developed;<br>- Prevention and preparedness capacity was increased in the cities of Hanoi, Dong Hoi and Can Tho, supported by a Local Resilience Action Plan (LRAP);<br>- Information about disaster risks and mitigation options was provided to the most vulnerable communities;<br>- The national government received guidance on affordable and effective options for disaster risk financing.

**SYNERGIES AND COMPLEMENTARITIES WITH OTHER PROJECTS**

**WB Projects** | **DRM- and CCA-related objectives and outcomes**
---|---
Natural Disaster Risk Management Project – (NDRMP) | This project seeks to reduce human, economic and financial losses from natural hazards, while ensuring rapid post-disaster recovery of poor communities living in hazard-prone areas.
Post –Disaster Reconstruction - Additional financing – (NDRMP) | This project reduces the government’s financing gap for post-disaster reconstruction, strengthens its speed and efficiency in allocating and disbursing post-disaster resources and enhances the effectiveness of public resource utilization.
Vietnam – Managing Natural Hazards Project (Vn – Haz) | This project strengthens the resilience of people and assets to natural hazards in selected river basins in the central region of Vietnam.
Rural Transport III | This project provides evidence-based tools for enhanced climate resilience in rural roads.
Road Asset Management Project | This project aims to increase the resilience of roads to future floods by providing a methodology and a menu of options for climate proofing investments in the transport sector.
Coastal Cities Environmental Sanitation Project | This project enhances environmental sanitation in low-lying coastal cities in a sustainable manner through integrating climate change impacts on drainage systems.
Second Northern Mountains Poverty Reduction Project | This project improves the capacity, living standards and disaster resilience of poor communities.

**PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION**

| Key national services | Meteorological, hydrological, civil protection |
| International organizations | United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC) |
| Regional organizations | Asian Development Bank (ADB), Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) |
| NGOs/CSOs | Action Aid, CARE international, CECI, Christian Aid, Plan International, Oxfam, Save the Children, Vietnam Women Union, World Vision |
| GFDRR donors | Australia, European Commission (EC), Japan, Luxemburg, United Kingdom, South Korea, Sweden |

The World Bank works closely with governmental agencies, as well as a wide range of NGOs and CSOs. Lending and grant programs have helped leverage support from many government agencies, localities, donors, international and local organizations and civil society, among other institutions, to strengthen capacity on DRM/CCA in Vietnam. GFDRR activities have helped improve coordination and information sharing between the Government and donors in the area of disaster risk management in Vietnam.
Vietnam Country Program Update – March 2012

CLIMATE CHANGE & DISASTER RISK PROFILE

Located in an area characterized by tropical monsoons, Vietnam is one of the most hazard-prone countries in the Asia-Pacific region. With a coastline of 3,200 km, an estimated 70 percent of the population exposed to flooding risks (living in coastal areas and the low lying deltas), and a location on the Pacific Ring of Fire, this rapidly developing country of 87 million people is highly exposed to natural hazards (typhoons, floods, droughts, sea water intrusion, landslides, forest fires and occasional earthquakes). Typhoons and flooding are the most frequent and devastating of these, resulting in numerous casualties and damaged livelihoods. The encroachment of agricultural and economic activity and the development of floodplains, coastal swamps, drainage channels or other natural buffers, only add to the vulnerability of the country.

A 2007 assessment report of the World Bank lists Vietnam as one of the five countries in the world most affected by climate change. A one-meter rise in the sea level would partially inundate one commune out of five (5% of the national land area, 11% of the population and 7% of the agricultural land), leaving the Mekong River Delta most seriously affected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITIES FOR GFDRR ENGAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(as expressed by the DRM specialist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DRM/CCA policies, building codes, land-use &amp; urban plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Risk financing mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhancing the resilience of cities, communities and critical infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hydrological and meteorological systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Vietnam, GFDRR has until now been engaged in support of flood and water resource management, climate resilience investments in transport and infrastructure, early warning systems, modernization of hydro-met services, and disaster risk financing. Another top priority for GFDRR investment is mainstreaming DRR in development planning at the government, national and local level.

In addition, GFDRR works to strengthen established government support for a “build-back-better” approach at both policy and field levels. GFDRR works to strengthen government capacity for project management, which will accelerate the implementation of other activities.
ANNEX C

GFDRR Advocacy Note

The following document has been developed to promote the importance of disaster risk reduction and to present some key results of GFDRR's work. This was drafted following requests from CG members for a short and easily digestible two-pager to use for the purposes of internal and external advocacy.
Managing Disaster Risk, Helping Communities Recover
An Effective Response of the International Community

WHO: A partnership of 41 countries and eight international organizations.

WHAT: The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) – a multi-stakeholder partnership and financing mechanism with the greatest impact in helping developing countries build resilience to natural hazards and climate change.

WHERE: GFDRR primarily focuses its engagements on 31 of the world’s most vulnerable and in-need developing countries in the world.

WHEN: GFDRR was established in 2006, responding to growing international concern about the rising impact (lives lost + financial costs) of natural disasters on developing countries.

WHY: This partnership is driven by four key facts:

- **Disasters impede economic growth for years.** For example, a drought of typical intensity can reduce overall growth of output by 0.6%, and a typical storm reduces agricultural growth by another 0.6%.

- **Growing cities and a changing climate will intensify the risks of disasters.** The number of people exposed to storms and earthquakes in large cities could double by 2050. By 2100, the expected annual damages from tropical cyclones alone can be as much as $68 billion.

- **Investment in disaster risk management pays off.** In the US, from 1985 - 2004, a study shows that $1 spent on risk management averted $15 of recovery costs. In China, $3.15 billion invested in flood control measures over 40 years has offset potential losses of $12 billion. In Vietnam, $1.1 million invested in mangrove plantation on 110 km of sea-dykes has protected 7,750 families and cut maintenance costs by $7.3 million per annum.

- **Disaster risk management saves lives, while ignoring risk kills.** The impact of disasters is not just a function of nature, but of human preparedness and preventative action too. An understanding of risks saved the lives of 500 tsunami-aware school children in a school during the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011. All the children were evacuated to higher ground without delay. In the 2005 Kashmir Earthquake in Pakistan, however, nearly 20,000 children died in poorly constructed school buildings.

HOW: GFDRR works with national governments and the World Bank to mainstream disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into national development strategies. The partnership supports country-led and managed implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action by providing technical and knowledge assistance in risk management and recovery.

The unique position of GFDRR and its relationship to the World Bank means that it is able to leverage the major investment potential and policy influence of the institution. Since the establishment of GFDRR, the World Bank has invested $6 billion in disaster risk reduction, and $10.8 billion in total disaster-related assistance. On the policy side, seven out of every ten World Bank Country Assistance Strategies (CASs) now recognize natural disasters as a challenge or a risk to sustainable development, compared with four out of every ten prior to the creation of the GFDRR.

GFDRR Partners

* Currencies in US dollars.

Headquarters: The World Bank 1818 H Street, NW Washington, DC 20433 USA tel: (202) 473-1000 fax: (202) 477-6391 [WWW.GFDRR.ORG]
GFDRR has approved a total number of 339 projects totaling $150 million, which has leveraged significant additional resources and impact on the ground. Below are six examples from around the world:

1. GRENADA & ST VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES
   **Issue:** Caribbean countries, such as Grenada and St Vincent and the Grenadines, are exposed to extreme weather events (hurricanes) that cripple infrastructure.
   **Solution:** Build and repair storm-resistant schools and other public buildings and water supply systems.
   **Impact:** 200,000 islanders benefit from security of water supply in case of disruption and safe schools.

2. TOGO
   **Issue:** In Togo, unsustainable land and forest management in exacerbate erosion and intensify the negative results of climate change, especially flooding.
   **Solution:** Reform land and natural resource management, helping to protect livelihoods and reduce the impact of floods in all five regions of Togo.
   **Impact:** 3 million Togolese are better protected from recurrent floods and land degradation.

3. DJIBOUTI
   **Issue:** In Djibouti, drought and flash flooding threatens precarious livelihoods and water resources.
   **Solution:** Help national authorities assess their own disaster risks, plan their own investment in mitigation and develop critical functions like weather forecasting.
   **Impact:** 750,000 inhabitants of the country are better protected by national preparedness systems.

4. KYRGYZ REPUBLIC & TAJIKISTAN
   **Issue:** In Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan, inadequate weather forecasting and hydro-meteorological services.
   **Solution:** Improve the efficiency of weather forecasting and other hydro-met services to forecast and plan for extreme weather events.
   **Impact:** Increased protection for the lives and assets of more than 12.5 million people.

5. BANGLADESH
   **Issue:** Bangladesh’s Cyclone Sidr in 2007 wiped out disaster risk infrastructure across the country.
   **Solution:** Construct 50 new shelters, repair another 250, and rehabilitate over 100 kilometers of embankments.
   **Impact:** 1.7 million households are now better protected against severe storms and cyclones.

6. VIETNAM
   **Issue:** Rural villages in Vietnam suffered repeatedly from flooding and extreme weather.
   **Solution:** Provide local early warning systems, 12 new or upgraded storm shelters, and 165 safe schools and health care facilities damaged by recent storms.
   **Impact:** Over 210,000 people living in 30 villages are now better prepared with their own disaster action plans and evacuation systems.
GFDRR established the SRFF (Track III) in 2007 to facilitate sustainable recovery in high risk, low capacity countries. It assists governments conduct reliable Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) to assess disaster impact and identify needs with the help of UN, EU, the World Bank and other development partners; provides technical assistance for post-disaster recovery planning and financing; and, in-country capacity development to enhance resilience and preparedness. This note is based on an internal evaluation of 19 PDNAs and gives a summary account of its impact on affected governments and communities. It reveals that PDNAs have helped foster donor coordination, assist mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in development strategies and leveraging recovery investments, accelerate recovery and build capacities for response preparedness. There are some areas of improvement to make PDNAs more inclusive, holistic and effective in informing development and resilience strategies of governments. GFDRR is continually working on these areas and will benefit from the continued programmatic support of its partners to further refine the PDNA as an instrument of coordination, mainstreaming and recovery.

Impact Note: 2007-2011

PDNAs are platforms of UN, EU and bilateral cooperation with country governments.

1. Since 2007, SRFF has assisted 45 disaster-affected countries including 33 with PDNAs. 70% of these are low-income countries. There has been a three-fold increase in demand over 4 years. This shows that the PDNA is now established as the internationally accepted standard post-disaster assessment methodology for determining disaster impact and needs and are useful planning and financing platforms for multi-sector accelerated recovery. This has in turn improved country ownership and strengthened country systems.

2. PDNAs foster an inclusive partnership to bring together country governments and all major stakeholders – UN, EU, bilateral partners, INGOs, IFIs, civil society, private sector etc. This facilitates aid harmonization, donor coordination and mutual accountability of governments to their peoples and partners in the recovery processes, resulting in better development effectiveness of recovery processes and longer-term risk reduction initiatives. For example, experts from UN, EU, IaDB, ADB and bilateral partners like Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Japan, Australia and Germany participated in PDNAs in Haiti (2010), Pakistan (2010), Kenya (2011).

---

1 Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Haiti (2008 and 2010), India, Indonesia, Lao PDR (2009 and 2011), Madagascar, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, Togo and Yemen.
3. SRFF has a compact with UN and EU for cooperating on PDNAs formalized in the Joint Declaration of 2008. Building on this, it has also entered into formal partnerships with the Italian Civil Protection, Swedish Civil Protection, Australian Civilian Corps, Norwegian Geotechnical Institute and is engaged in initial consultations with GIZ (Germany) and SDC (Switzerland).

4. The internal review has shown that findings and recommendations of PDNAs supported by SRFF have been substantively taken into account in designing, planning and financing post-disaster recovery. The graphic shows that, by and large, PDNAs have satisfactorily served as a strategic mechanism for multi-sectoral recovery and contributed to the development of multi-partner recovery programs. They have also served as critical entry points for subsequent initiatives aimed at strengthening policy and institutional frameworks for disaster preparedness and resilience in recipient governments.

5. The 2009 Philippines PDNA is a good example of how the full spectrum of recovery and resilience assistance is triggered by a PDNA: the PDNA assessed damage and loss caused by Typhoon Pepeng and identified needs. It led to a (i) knowledge support to study risks of urban flooding in Metro Manila; (ii) leveraged support for development of a Metro Manila Flood Management Master Plan; (iii) analytical support by the Bank for a risk financing strategy, leading to a $500 million Catastrophe Deferred Drawdown Option (CAT-DDO) in September 2011; and, (iv) a SRFF support for monitoring of disaster-related expenditures in government to improve accountability and transparency.

SRFF engagements support mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Management (DRM).

1. PDNAs also assess the policy and institutional frameworks and identify interventions for DRM that are later leveraged by Track II, generating a synergy among GFDRR Tracks. They create an enabling environment between the international community and government that gives a head start to subsequent Track II mainstreaming of DRM in country strategies as in Bolivia, Haiti, Lao PDR, Yemen etc. Track II invested over $9 million on mainstreaming activities in five priority countries to follow up on PDNA outcomes. For example, the Yemen PDNA (2008) made recommendations for capacity and institutional strengthening. These were followed up by Track II to establish a national program for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR). SRFF’s post-disaster support also harmonizes DRM activities of the World Bank and other donors as recently exemplified in the Horn of Africa. SRFF engagements have produced concrete results such as Sri Lanka’s adoption of PDNA as the standard methodology to assess damages, losses and needs for disasters affecting populations over 50,000 and customization of the PDNA methodology in Bangladesh (2009), Lao PDR (2011) etc. SRFF is also supporting development of regional standards for PDNA for South Asian countries.

2. Since 2007, the number of World Bank-funded DRM projects in response to disasters has increased from 10 to 40 for the 17 countries under review. Follow-up activities by the World Bank/GFDRR help projectize PDNA

2 A contingent loan that can be triggered by government in the event of a disaster. The government has triggered the CAT-DDO to cope with the exigencies of the devastation caused by Typhoon Washi (2011).
recommendations into investments to promote risk reduction through improving infrastructure for disaster resilience, access to basic infrastructure, action plans for safe schools, augmenting institutional capacity for disaster management etc. In 16 out of the 17 countries under review, PDNAs led to Government-World bank investments in mainstreaming DRM or in the national developmental plans of these countries. Some examples of this follow up include Haiti, Philippines, Benin, and Samoa.

3. At least 2/3rds of these recovery projects included strong DRM components. In six of the countries, Country Assistance Strategies (CASs) were updated after PDNAs to include risk reduction as a critical pillar of engagement. For instance, after the Haiti (2008) PDNA, the CAS was updated to incorporate the PDNA recommendation by including vulnerability reduction to natural disasters as one of the CAS’ three main pillars. After the Yemen (2008) PDNA, the CAS was updated to make DRM one of the four strategic priorities and call for a national early warning system and strengthened support for disaster recovery.

4. Increasing mainstreaming of DRM in sustainable development and poverty reduction strategies is evident as increasing number of countries are getting sensitized with the long-term developmental and economic impacts of disasters. PDNAs utilize the political momentum after a disaster and serve as an instrument for promoting mainstreaming. PDNAs and post-PDNA sustained engagement create a conducive environment for medium to long-term DRM mainstreaming in the planning and development strategies of these countries. To demonstrate this, a review of seven post-disaster countries and their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and national development agendas provides strong evidence of DRR becoming a priority for national governments, catalyzed by the DRR-led recovery agenda promoted by PDNAs, particularly when the high costs of inaction become evident to decision-makers. For instance, after Cyclone Sidr in Bangladesh (2008), the PDNA recommended strengthening of disaster forecasting and warning systems, of local communication systems, and public awareness to enhance emergency preparedness. This was internalized by the Government of Bangladesh in its National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction (2009), which identifies improved forecasting and signaling systems and strengthened coordination and management at local levels as two of its seven goals for enhanced DRM. In the Philippines Development Plan (2011), DRM is a cross-cutting theme. The Plan recognizes the importance of DRM, and incorporates actionable strategies for its mainstreaming in nearly all sectors. The country released a national risk reduction framework and plan that specifically cites the findings of the 2009 PDNA, and enacted the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act in 2010.

SRFF engagements strengthen the development agenda by leveraging recovery investments.

1. PDNAs inform and strengthen national development plans and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) that guide development priorities. SRFF investments of $4 million in 25 affected countries have leveraged $4.9 billion from the World Bank in 40 recovery investments in 2007-11. Over $1 billion of these investments are directly based on PDNA findings.

2. An analysis of 22 of these projects reveals that nearly 70 million people are to benefit from these in sectors such as housing, water and sanitation, physical and social infrastructure, agricultural productivity, education, and livelihood support through disaster-resilient reconstruction of 3600km of roads, 685 safe shelters and 1400 wells with hand pumps, 1.7 million homes, over 600 health facilities and 2,300 schools. PDNAs also leverage additional IDA resources from the World Bank, as in Bhutan, Samoa, Central African Republic etc. Some examples include cash-for-work programs in Madagascar after 2008 cyclone and Haiti after 2010 earthquake which doubled up as instruments of building community resilience.

3 Benin, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Philippines, and Yemen.
3. In many countries of engagement, PDNAs have also catalyzed financial planning of recovery processes for ex ante preparedness such as national disaster funds in Yemen, Madagascar, and Indonesia.

**SRFF helps countries transition after disasters with early recovery assistance.**

1. SRFF support for disaster recovery goes beyond assessments. In many countries, GFDRR and the World Bank have supported government requests for developing recovery programs and leveraging DRM in existing development plans and projects. This desk review has found that (i) dissemination of PDNA findings with full country ownership forms the bases for full-fledged recovery frameworks in about 70% of the cases; (ii) leveraging World Bank, EU, UN, GFDRR and bilateral donors support for development of policy and institutional environment as well as recovery programs in two-thirds of the countries, and; (iii) pledging conferences or other leveraging of recovery financing in more than half of the countries where SRFF engaged in post disaster recovery.

**Building capacity for disaster recovery through training, knowledge products and methodology.**

1. SRFF, in collaboration with UN and EU, is the largest provider of capacity building for country governments, regional bodies and other development partners. In 2007-11, SRFF has trained 14,400 professionals through 169 training events and the training days increased six-fold 10700. It covered another 2,500 DRM practitioners through its online training module launched in 2010. SRFF has built capacity in 15 high risk countries covering 1200 country officials in countries such as Nigeria, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam and Yemen. It has also delivered capacity development programs for staff of donor organizations like Australian Civilian Corps, GIZ, SDC, EU and the World Bank.

2. SRFF supports capacity development in regional organizations for recovery planning and has undertaken capacity development initiatives with many regional bodies. Training offered to government officials raises awareness of the technical and operational aspects of DRM, enhance preparedness and promote self-sufficiency. In Togo, 150 officials were trained in the PDNA methodology in 2009. After the 2010 floods, the government carried out a PDNA on its own with minimal supervision from SRFF. In Lao PDR, a capacity building initiative by SRFF in 2009 enabled government in conducting the PDNA after Typhoon Haima in 2011.

---

4 UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Association of Southeast Asian Nations, International Recovery Platform, Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative, National Emergency Management Agency (Nigeria), Arab Academy, Asian Development Bank, South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, Australian Civilian Corps, Swedish Civil Protection, Italian Civil Protection, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, GIZ, Norwegian Geotechnical Institute, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Asian Disaster Reduction Center, Secretariat of the Pacific Community Applied Geo-science and Technology Division, Intergovernmental Authority on Development.
3. In partnership with UN and EU, SRFF is developing an omnibus PDNA Guide as a global compendium on PDNAs. In addition, it has delivered knowledge products such as the Damage and Loss Assessment (DaLA) Guidance Notes (available online and in Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish in addition to English). SRFF is continually refining the DaLA methodology with new inputs like social impact assessment and monitoring, and cultural heritage. It is currently working on developing guidance on ‘greening’ of PDNAs (integrating climate adaptation) and on the use of remote sensing and earth observation in assessments.

4. SRFF is building a network of partner institutions for delivery of capacity building in different regions of the world. It has engaged with regional organizations and technical/academic institutions in every region of the world for cost-efficient delivery of capacity development to at-risk and low capacity governments. This includes organizations like SOPAC, IGAD, Arab Academy, SAARC, ASEAN, Middle Eastern Technical University etc.

### Business Case: 2012-2015

1. There are many exogenous factors that affect the impact of SRFF’s post disaster engagements, ranging from the political context, international and intra-governmental coordination matrix, budgetary constraints, varying country and donor priorities etc. Going forward, there is room to improve the transition from assessment of damage, losses and needs to the development and implementation of disaster recovery frameworks. There is a compelling case for the post-disaster engagement to outlast the response and expand into disaster resilience building. The impact of SRFF engagements should focus on better institutional arrangements, preparedness and resilience through the stages of support to governments. This expansion of the mandate of SRFF to assist governments in closing the loop from assessment to recovery is predicated upon minimum resource adequacy and predictability.

2. In 2007-2011, SRFF has provided over 90 interventions to affected countries for PDNAs (33) and other technical assistance for disaster recovery. This has been delivered at a net cost of $13 million. 72% of SRFF resources have been committed for PDNAs, 12% for capacity and remaining for knowledge and methodology development. This goes to show that SRFF engagements are low-cost, high impact interventions and help countries in accelerated recovery. In terms of value for money, SRFF engagements have a high value for nominal investments in terms of immediate recovery assistance and longer-term seeding of risk reduction engagements with governments and are quick disbursing.

3. As of March 2011, SRFF has a cumulative commitment of $25.4 million of which $21 million has been received. It has a narrow resource base and does not have the resource adequacy or predictability that is needed for planned delivery of post-disaster and response preparedness assistance to requesting governments. Currently, only EU, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden and Ireland provide programmatic support to SRFF and Denmark has announced a commitment to this effect. Support from Australia, Brazil, Italy and Switzerland has been occasional and disaster-specific. SRFF has very limited unprogrammed funds to be able to plan ex ante activities for enhancing preparedness and capacity building.

---

5 Recovery interventions funded through the Callable Fund, totaling $6 million, are not factored in this figure.
6 Including Callable and occasional disaster-specific contributions from some donors.
4. On an average, SRFF has annually responded to 15 requests for assistance in the aftermath of disasters in the last two years. The increase in frequency and severity of disasters coupled with global advocacy is generating higher demand from governments for recovery assistance, resilience, capacity building and preparedness: in Jul-Dec 2011, SRFF has already responded to 14 requests for assistance from affected governments. It is expected that SRFF will be called upon to respond to a growing number of requests from governments in the coming years.

5. This would require an annual predictable resource envelope of $6 million\(^7\) for 2012-2015 to maintain adequate response to requesting governments battling post-disaster challenges and to implement its demand-driven capacity development plan for enhanced disaster preparedness and resilience. 75% of this would be utilized for post-disaster technical assistance including PDNAs, 15% for capacity building, and 5% each for knowledge and methodological development and partnerships. This financing gap is over and above the funds made available from the EU-ACP end which are being utilized for capacity building in african, caribbean and pacific countries.

---

\(^7\) Not taking into account EU-ACP earmarked funds for ACP countries and exceptional disasters.
ANNEX E

UNISDR-GFDRR Working Paper on Future Areas of Cooperation 2012 – 2013 and post-2013*

Background

The 11th Consultative Group meeting (November 2011) requested a joint paper on the potential future cooperation between UNISDR and GFDRR. This paper takes stock of areas of engagement, and sets out areas for future cooperation both in 2012 and 2013, and beyond 2013 at which point the current World Bank DGF Funding to UNISDR through GFDRR’s Track 1 is expected to end.

The paper is guided by recognition of:

- The cooperation to date between UNISDR and GFDRR in pursuit of the objectives of the Hyogo Framework for Action.
- The opportunities for collaboration afforded by the respective roles as mandated focal points for UN and the World Bank on Disaster Risk Reduction.
- The role of the UN and World Bank in collaborating with a range of stakeholders who contribute to disaster risk reduction and are committed to the Hyogo Framework for Action.
- The need to review the working relationship and partnership in light of increasing size and scope of disaster risk reduction.
- The fact that both organizations have evolved in size and scope over recent years.

What do we do? And what guides our work?

UNISDR was established in 1999 to facilitate the implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR). UNISDR has a mandate “to serve as the focal point in the United Nations system for the coordination of disaster reduction and to ensure synergies among the disaster reduction activities of the United Nations system and regional organizations and activities in socio-economic and humanitarian fields” (UN General Assembly Resolution 56/195). With the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (HFA), the United Nations General Assembly tasked UNISDR with supporting its implementation. UNISDR also organizes the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (UN General Assembly Resolution 61/198).
The work of UNISDR is set out in the UNISDR Strategic Framework for 2012-2015. The UNISDR work plan has four objectives:

1. **Lead and Coordinate**: Strengthened support to the implementation and coordination of the ISDR and the HFA and improved coherence with climate change adaptation and the Millennium Development Goals.
2. **Credible Evidence**: Producing and disseminating credible evidence to strengthen decision making at local, national and regional levels in support of disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and achievement of the MDGs.
3. **Advocacy and Outreach**: Increased public and private sector investments in DRR and climate change adaptation through advocacy and outreach.
4. **Deliver and Communicate Results**: More effective, results-orientated UNISDR to carry out its mandate.

**GFDRR**, established in 2006, is a partnership of the ISDR system in support of the Hyogo Framework for Action. GFDRR’s mission is to mainstream DRR and climate change adaptation (CCA) in country development strategies to reduce vulnerabilities to natural hazards. GFDRR is housed in the World Bank, on behalf of its donors and partners, who are represented at the regular governance meetings - the Consultative Group - that guides GFDRR’s strategic direction in line with the Partnership Charter and Partnership Strategy. GFDRR is also mandated as the policy focal point, or ‘anchor’, for the World Bank Group on Disaster Risk Management, providing support to regional departments within the World Bank and policy guidance to World Bank clients and partners.

The work of GFDRR is organized through **three** business lines:
- **Track I**: Support to the ISDR system through the ISDR Secretariat
- **Track II**: Support to countries for mainstreaming disaster reduction in development
- **Track III**: Standby Recovery Financing Facility (SRFF)

In addition GFDRR runs a number of special initiatives including:
- Disaster Risk Financing and Insurance
- GFDRR Labs
- Strengthening Weather and Climate Information and Decision-Support Systems
- The Economics of Disaster Risk Reduction
- South-South Cooperation Program for Disaster Risk Reduction

**Supporting HFA Implementation**

Effective implementation and integration of DRR and CCA into development is a long-term process requiring focused action and advocacy across a range of actors. This was recognized in the Mid-Term Review of the HFA (2010-11), which recommended that national and international institutions must integrate disaster risk reduction in their development, climate change adaptation, environmental and humanitarian planning, and execution and accountability frameworks in order to safeguard development gains and investments.

Effective collaboration and making the most of the comparative advantages of UNISDR and GFDRR is essential if the objectives of the HFA are to be realized.
UNISDR is able and well-versed in engaging the full range of DRR actors into dialogue and discussion. This includes, but is not limited to central government, parliamentarians, local and city government, UN, civil society, private sector and academia. In coordinating the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, the UNISDR secretariat provides for innovation and flexibility in partnership and implementation, linking global agreements and frameworks to national action through a system of global, regional and national platforms.

GFDRR, as a multi-donor partnership and financing mechanism, serves to leverage donor coordination and aid effectiveness to support disaster resilience and the implementation of the HFA. GFDRR provides an entry point through World Bank headquarters and country offices for national government-led sustainable DRR and CCA development. By leveraging its position in the World Bank Group, GFDRR provides opportunities for national programmatic financing with accompanying multi-sectoral technical expertise, guidance and capacity building.

As the UNISDR leads DRR coordination, GFDRR, as the DRR focal point of the World Bank, supports UNISDR in HFA implementation by coordinating and driving World Bank DRR at the national, regional and global levels. GFDRR is a highly active member of the ISDR.

**National**

GFDRR's primary mission is the mainstreaming of DRR and CCA in development strategies and programs. In particular in the 31 focus countries of Track II, holistic multi-year country programs are supported for a more strategic engagement, also by linking and leveraging with World Bank sectoral investments. Specific activities and programs are pursued in institutional capacity and consensus building, risk assessment and monitoring, knowledge and capacity enhancement, disaster preparedness and sustainable recovery, risk financing and insurance, weather/climate information and decision support systems, and multi-sectoral mitigation, prevention and CCA. Through World Bank country offices GFDRR supports coordination with the government, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society and UN Country Teams, often through national platforms.

At the national level UNISDR facilitates national platforms and the HFA Monitor. In addition UNISDR works through the UN System at country level, supports the building of national disaster loss databases and supports in-country advocacy through for example parliamentarians and the Resilience Cities Campaign.

Specific GFDRR and UNISDR collaborations at the national level include safe schools and education (through the Thematic Platform on Knowledge and Education - TPKE) and urban risk reduction (through the Resilient Cities Campaign and development of related guidance material).

**Regional**

Regional organizations provide key linkages between global policy dialogue and agreements and national actions for implementation. The regional approach has already been shown to be a successful model to advance the DRR agenda, yielding results at regional and national levels in many disaster prone areas of the world.

UNISDR is present in all regions, providing capacity development and supporting policy dialogue through its regional offices. Regional technical and ministerial platforms strengthen implementation of the HFA, and often bring together countries with similar risk profiles. Countries in the same region
often share climatic conditions, sit on common seismological fault lines and / or are served and threatened by the same trans-boundary river systems. UNISDR has provided technical assistance to regional inter governmental organizations, with ministerially endorsed strategies in Africa (Africa Strategy and Plan of Action for DRR) Asia and the Pacific (Incheon Regional Road Map on DRR), and the Arab League (Arab Strategy for DRR).

Increased information and knowledge management on DRR issues have been another area of strong engagement, leading to knowledge networks such as the South Asia Disaster Knowledge Network (SADKN) and regional risk assessment of South East Europe.

GFDRR provides support to regional organizations both through UNISDR and its work in Track I, and through the World Bank regional teams. This facilitates technical assistance to regional centers of excellence such as SOPAC\(^1\), and trans-boundary risk programs such as regional risk financing and transfer facilities (e.g. CCRIF\(^2\)) and regional risk assessment initiatives (e.g. CAPRA\(^3\)). Other examples include cooperation with the IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Center in improving the ability to use regional modeling techniques to assist in the development of adaptation and climate risk management.

Track I activities at the regional level are coordinated through an annual planning process that brings together UNISDR, GFDRR and WB regional coordinators. The intention is to strengthen and make more systematic this annual planning process.

**Global**

With its unequivocal global mandate, UNISDR has sole responsibility for ISDR and HFA coordination, and leads on global DRR advocacy. Key areas of present work include preparations for regional platforms in 2012 in Africa, Americas (Argentina), Arab States, Asia (Indonesia), Europe (Croatia), and the Pacific (New Caledonia) and the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (May 2013). In addition UNISDR facilitates submissions to Rio + 20, and the processes of developing Sustainable Development Goals and a post 2015 framework for DRR. Other examples include the Resilient Cities campaign to which a thousand city leaders have committed, and the work with the Inter-Parliamentary Union which has engaged 130 parliamentarians from 62 countries, leading to powerful changes such as legislation on DRR and CCA passed in Argentina, Serbia and the Philippines. The next Global Assessment of Risk Report will also be published in 2013.

As DRR focal point of the World Bank, GFDRR is frequently requested both externally and internally for thought-leadership and convening power to support certain processes, events and publications. A good example is the current Mexican Presidency of the G20: the Government of Mexico has requested World Bank support for thematic development and GFDRR has therefore been internally tasked to lead on the DRR agenda. Other examples include the support to Japan to co-host the Sendai Dialogue in the margins of the WB-IMF Annual Meetings in October 2012, co-hosting The Resilience Dialogue with Japan and EU in the margins of the IMF-World Bank Spring and Annual Meetings.

---

1 Secretariat of the Pacific Community - Applied Geoscience and Technology Division
2 Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility.
3 Central American Probabilistic Risk Assessment.
GFDRR Track I

Track I consists of financial support to and is managed by the UNISDR. This track is designed to enhance global and regional advocacy, partnerships, and knowledge management for mainstreaming disaster reduction. To ensure complementarity between UNISDR, GFDRR and World Bank programming, activities under UNISDR’s Track I annual work plan were developed and agreed together by the UNISDR, World Bank Regional Coordinators and GFDRR. UNISDR’s Regional Office Support Unit is the main GFDRR focal point, responsible for managing the Track I work plan and coordinating with the UNISDR regional offices. GFDRR has placed in Geneva a full-time staff for liaison with UNISDR, as well as ISDR partners and missions.

To date, GFDRR Track I activities through UNISDR have been funded by the Development Grant Facility (DGF) of the World Bank. FY 2007 to FY 2012 DGF funding totals 28.5 million and currently represents approximately 17% of the UNISDR annual work program. These funds have been significant, particularly in assisting to develop the UNISDR regional programs, creating an enabling environment to facilitate country dialogue and support. Track I financing of UNISDR is scheduled to exit DGF in FY 2013.

The team in the GFDRR Secretariat that manages the partnership with UNISDR and other ISDR system partners is also named Track I. This team also deals with core Secretariat functions such as maintaining effective relationships with donor partners, country governments, IFIs, UN Agencies, research and academic institutions, CSOs, private sector, and other stakeholders; supporting resource mobilization; providing secretariat services to the Consultative Group and the Results Management Council (including organizing and following up on their meetings); DRR policy coordination in the World Bank and GFDRR outreach, communications, processes and events.

Priorities for Cooperation

Specific areas of collaboration suggested are,

1. UNISDR, GFDRR and World Bank Regional Coordinators will engage in a stronger annual planning process and strive to build strong regional organizations and networks that ensure national enabling environments for DRM mainstreaming in line with the comparative advantages and Track I objectives. Regular coordination meetings will be held to ensure effective regional policy dialogue and complementary capacity building activities.

2. GFDRR will contribute to ISDR global efforts led by UNISDR, including through engagement in the Global Platforms. As an ISDR member, GFDRR will represent the World Bank in post-HFA consultations and development.

3. The biennial Global Assessment Report (GAR), developed by UNISDR, is the authoritative publication on the global state of disaster risk and its management. GFDRR will contribute technical expertise and information in the areas of risk assessment (for example through experiences gained through the Central American Probabilistic Risk Assessment - CAPRA and the Global Earthquake Model - GEM, and work on resilience analysis), economic impacts of disasters and benefits of risk management (following on joint efforts resulting in the Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention report), and promoting access to and understanding of risk information to support resilient decision making by communities and governments (for example, the Open Data for Resilience Initiative or OpenDRI).
4. At the national level GFDRR and UNISDR will identify specific areas of collaboration in support of HFA, for example, mainstreaming DRR in PRSPs and UNDAFs.

5. Disaster Aid Tracking: In order to optimize resourcing of regional and national efforts in DRR and CCA, a better understanding and tracking of international financial commitments is needed. The Disaster Aid Tracking (DAT) initiative aims at collaborative development of a global system for tracking the investments in DRR, post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. Current systems, for example that of the OECD DAC, require refinement for enhanced and targeted investment tracking. UNISDR and GFDRR will continue to work together with donors and the OECD to improve reporting for current and future DRR and CCA financing, and to analyze trends to help target investments in-line with national priorities and international commitments.

6. Civil Society Engagement: The process of developing GFDRR’s civil society strategy has been supported by UNISDR. The two secretariats will continue to cooperate to strengthen civil society engagement.

**Partnership Strategy and Charter**

The GFDRR Partnership Strategy (2009-12), which builds upon the financial and governance framework set out in the Charter, outlines the approach of the GFDRR partnership and the actions to be undertaken. With the update of the GFDRR Partnership Strategy planned for the second half of 2012 and the end of the present commitment of DGF funds to UNISDR in Track I, the CG may like to consider if there is a need to review the Charter.

*Please note this document has not been cleared by World Bank or UNISDR senior management.*
INTRODUCTION

1. This document presents the proposed civil society partnership strategy to be discussed at the 12th meeting of the GFDRR Consultative Group (CG). It was drafted in response to the request from the GFDRR partners to consider the option to systematically scale up the engagement with civil society organizations (CSOs). In August 2011, the Secretariat began an in depth consultation process with civil society to inform its development. The key findings and recommendations of the consultations and the GFDRR Policy Forum – Community Action for Resilience outcomes (See BACKGROUND 3 and 5 respectively) were presented to the Consultative Group at the 11th CG meeting in Jakarta, November 2011. As a follow-up, the Secretariat formed a joint working group to support the development of the strategy. The working group consisting of representatives from civil society, UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and government representatives met with the Secretariat in Washington D.C for a 3 day meeting to discuss the possible options for the proposed strategy (See BACKGROUND 4 for meeting outcomes).

CONTEXT

2. Lower income countries account for more than 70 percent of the world’s disaster ‘hotspots’, and a third of the world’s poor live in multi-hazard zones. The need to support vulnerable countries to build capacity and strengthen resilience to natural hazards is greater than ever. Storms, floods, earthquakes, and droughts caused more than 3.3 million deaths and $2.3 trillion in damages (in 2008 US dollars) between 1970 and 2010.1

3. Disaster risk management (DRM) was universally endorsed as a development priority through the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in 2005. The HFA has three strategic goals: to integrate DRM in development policies, strategies and planning; to strengthen institutions responsible for DRM at all levels and, to build a culture of disaster resilience in response and recovery operations.

4. The joint World Bank—United Nations Report Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention2 argues that fulfilling the prevention agenda requires actions from institutions at all levels: from the local - with citizens, communities, civil society working together - to the global, where the largest global risks require a global response. Prevention need not be only through governments, alternatives abound, especially in cohesive communities. Public involvement and oversight can also encourage communities to experiment with, and to devise, their own sustainable prevention measures.

---

2 Available online at www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa
3 Available online at www.worldbank.org/preventingdisasters.
5. The UK’s independent Humanitarian Emergency Response Review 2011\textsuperscript{4} maintains that at risk governments and civil society must be given the means to act in order to build greater resilience to disasters. It asserts that although many challenges exist, the increased capacity, especially that of national and local NGOs provides untapped potential.

6. The Views from the Frontline (VFL) 2009 report\textsuperscript{5} showed that progress in establishing national policies and legislation had not generated widespread changes in local practices. Furthermore, the VFL 2011 with a focus on ‘local risk governance’ concludes that national progress is not reaching the frontline. A comparison of national and local level monitoring results shows a persistent gap between national policy and local action.

7. The United Nations 2009 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction\textsuperscript{6} (GAR09) in its ‘20-point plan to reduce risk’ identifies the need to adopt an approach supportive of local initiatives. The report argues that the promotion of a culture of planning and implementation of disaster risk reduction (DRR) that builds on government-civil society partnerships and cooperation can dramatically reduce the costs of risk reduction, ensure local acceptance, and build social capital. Similarly, the GAR11 maintains that where communities, civil society organizations and governments enter into partnership, the scale of disaster risk management efforts can be increased considerably.

\textsuperscript{4} Lord Ashdown (Chair), 2011 Humanitarian Response Review; available online at www.dfid.gov.uk/emergency-response-review.

\textsuperscript{5} Views from the Frontline reports compiled by the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. Available online at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/views-from-the-frontline.html

\textsuperscript{6} Available online at www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2011/en/home/index.html
Box 1. Added Value of the Partnership

**Value of Partnership**

- A partnership creates good will and trust and provides a medium to long term framework for joint DRM initiatives.
- The efficiency of the DRM work of both GFDRR and civil society would be enhanced, through mutual accountability and consultation.
- DRR programs and policy would gain in sustainability through public consensus and local ownership.
- The voice of the most at risk poor and marginalized populations would be better heard at all levels.
- The development of innovative DRR approaches would be better supported with a participatory approach.
- Knowledge exchange would contribute to create and strengthen local DRM capacity for disaster resilience.

**Civil Society Organizations**

- The work of CSOs could complement government DRR actions and programs by bridging the gap between the policies put in place and their implementation at the community level.
- The CSOs can bring an in-depth knowledge of the situation on the ground at the local level.
- The CSOs bring with them the trust already established with the communities, particularly at the grass root level.
- The CSOs bring the experience of initiatives that work and transfer he knowledge.
- Utilizing the capacity and expertise of CSOs allows for a more effective use of government funds and resources to implement policy.
- CSOs can contribute local knowledge and technical expertise to policy design and DRR planning.

**GFDRR**

- GFDRR has the ability to use its convening power, leveraging its traditional engagement with governments to create space for constructive cooperation between CSOs and government.
- Being housed in the World Bank, GFDRR can leverage this interlocutor role with World Bank regions and country offices to open up DRR and CCA dialogue with CSOs.
- Through its analytic, knowledge, and advisory activities, GFDRR is well equipped to promote the value of civil society in DRM and to encourage ways to reinforce their role as vital partners in planning and implementing DRR and CCA policy at all levels.
- GFDRR's links to the World Bank's fiduciary and implementation mechanisms help to ensure a common platform and reporting requirements that satisfy a range of potential donors in providing financial support to civil society.
PROPOSED CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY

8. The World Bank has adopted a definition of civil society7 developed by a number of leading research centers: “the term civil society to refer to the wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) therefore refer to wide array of organizations: community groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), labor unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, and foundations”. This definition has been used for the consultation process and is adopted for the proposed GFDRR strategy.

9. It is evident that there are different levels of civil society who perform different roles in DRR and CCA initiatives. Recognizing this, the GFDRR partnership will engage the different types of civil society organizations/groups, depending on the objective and targeted level of engagement. For example at the global and regional level large civil society networks and international NGOs, while at the national and local level smaller CSOs, community groups, and grassroots organizations would be the focus of engagement.

10. Considering the substantial feedback received from the online consultation, face-to-face focus group meetings held in 11 countries and the unanimous recommendation of the joint working group, GFDRR is proposing a phased approach to further the development of this partnership. Should there be an agreement and endorsement by the Consultative Group to develop this partnership, GFDRR will proceed with this approach.

11. Through the proposed strategy GFDRR will continue to coordinate with our partners, donor agencies and other key organizations who are engaged with CSOs in DRR, to ensure coordination with existing activities by other stakeholders, to avoid possible overlap and focus on where GFDRR has an added value.

12. PHASE I aims to achieve tangible progress in terms of immediately accessible entry points for engagement in a 2 year activity period and underscores the importance of engaging with civil society throughout the GFDRR business lines: through global dialogue and advocacy (Track I), in the implementation of DRR Country Programs (Track II) and in carrying out Post Disaster Needs Assessments (Track III) and is therefore structured around these 3 pillars of engagement. In parallel to the proposed PHASE I activities, and depending on the guidance from the CG on the feasibility of financing a possible dedicated stand alone trust fund, GFDRR would continue the process (PHASE II) of exploring/developing a suitable financing mechanism for specific civil society engagement.

---

7 More information available online http://go.worldbank.org/4CE7W046K0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>PILLAR 1. Global Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Developing CSO representation as part of the Consultative Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Facilitating DRM civil society in preparation of WB policy documents (e.g. knowledge notes, CAS, PRSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Collaborating with CSO networks to extend GFDRR outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>PILLAR 2. Mainstreaming DRM at the national level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Engaging CSO in design and implementation of DRM country programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Convening national &quot;civil society policy forum&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Mapping civil society engagement with WB country teams on DRR and CCA and CSOs activities in-country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Identifying pilot countries based upon clear criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Supporting capacity development and knowledge exchange of good practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Mainstreaming DRM into World Bank civil society initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>PILLAR 3. Sustainable recovery after disasters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Integrating Local-Level Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA) into Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Including civil society expertise and resources as part of the proposed regional hubs of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Training and engaging CSOs in PDNA exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROSSCUTTING: Results Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Inclusion of CSOs inputs and data in the GFDRR Results Model towards enhancing its '360 view' on results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Partnership with CSOs in pilot countries towards measuring results at the national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bilateral, technical knowledge sharing between results teams and possible use of CSOs' M&amp;E mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Phase 2 | Continuing to explore/develop a suitable financing mechanism for civil society engagement. It should be noted that this is a lengthy process (approx. 18-24 months) that would require meeting the World Bank legal, fiduciary, policy and procedural requirements in the design of the mechanism. |
Questions for Consultative Group Discussion

1. Does the Consultative Group agree with the 2-phased approach of the strategy?
2. Do the activities proposed under PHASE I cover a sufficiently broad array of potential cooperation?
3. If the Consultative Group agrees with the PHASE I approach and activities it entails, would the Consultative Group allow GFDRR to absorb the limited cost of these activities within the existing Multi-donor Trust Fund?
4. Does the Consultative Group support GFDRR exploring the options to set up a Multi-donor Trust Fund to finance specific civil society projects and activities, along with the modalities of such a fund?
BACKGROUND 1: The Strategy in Detail

PHASE I

13. PILLAR 1. GFDRR partnership to expand to civil society organizations for greater accountability and effectiveness of its mandate. The Facility will build upon its current engagement with civil society in the GFDRR partnership, through engaging key DRR and CCA actors at all levels that could bring local level insights and experiences up to the international policy- and strategy-making level. This will be achieved through:

A. Civil Society Representation in the Consultative Group

It is proposed to have civil society representative(s) to sit as observers in the CG (alongside the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the United Nations Development Program). The observer seats could be held on a two-year rotational basis. Once the strategy is adopted a criteria would be finalized and provided to large civil society networks engaged in DRR to disseminate amongst their member groups/organizations and agree to the possible civil society actors/organizations they would nominate to be the representative(s) on the CG.

B. World Bank Policy Documents

GFDRR through its cooperation with the World Bank Regions in the preparation of policy documents such as Country Assistance Strategies and the review of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers could facilitate the inclusion of DRM civil society in the participatory consultation process leading to the drafting of such documents, to the extent that this is feasible in the given specificities of a country context.

C. Partnerships and Outreach

Working with partners UNISDR, and collaborating with civil society DRR networks, GFDRR through its analytic, knowledge, and advisory activities will jointly promote the business case for mainstreaming DRR into policy and practice and for greater engagement with civil society organizations on DRR at the global, regional, and national level.

14. PILLAR 2. Leveraging the power and reach of civil society organizations in GFDRR’s national policy dialogue and delivery of DRR and adaptation agenda. GFDRR’s programmatic approach provides a unique opportunity to develop a comprehensive capacity development action plan with the government and other relevant in-country stakeholders. In this context GFDRR will support stronger civil society engagement in a number of ways:

A. GFDRR Country Programs

GFDRR will support and facilitate a stronger role for civil society during the design and implementation of its country programs. This will be done by GFDRR in-country local staff, as part of their regular stakeholder dialogue. Since GFDRR country programs are government led, the involvement of civil society in the implementation of the country program, can only be done where government counterparts are receptive.
B. Forum

GFDRR will hold regular civil society policy forum. The forum will take place at the national level in countries and bring together government representatives and civil society engaged in DRR and CCA activities to discuss common issues and showcase these positive experiences. This would link to and build upon existing national multi-stakeholder platforms for DRM dialogue, where they exist. In addition, this forum could be used as a mechanism to review the progress of the civil society partnership in the GFDRR priority countries.

C. Mapping

Building upon existing data available, GFDRR will perform an internal mapping exercise with the World Bank country offices in the priority countries. The aim of this exercise will be to examine engagement in-country of the DRM focal points and country teams with civil society on DRR and CCA activities and initiatives. This will give the Secretariat an overview of the World Bank engagement on DRM with civil society in focus countries and enable GFDRR to identify champions to implement the strategy at country level. A second external exercise will be performed to map CSOs engaged in DRR and CCA activities in-country. This will be performed in collaboration with civil society partner organizations and should provide a comprehensive overview of civil society engagement on DRM in the focus countries.

D. Identification of Pilot Countries

Through performing an internal and external stock-taking it is proposed that GFDRR will identify focus countries where civil society engagement will be feasible. This will be based on a number of factors, including:

- World Bank/ GFDRR country office and focal point resources and receptivity.
- DRM policy /strategy/action plans in place.
- Government – Civil Society relationship.
- World Bank – Civil Society relationship.

The outcome of the exercise and identification of pilot countries will allow GFDRR to categorize the 31 f countries in terms of civil society and government engagement on DRR and CCA policy and implementation, enabling the Facility to identify which countries would be most receptive and at which level or scale of engagement would be required for each of the priority countries.

E. Capacity Development and Knowledge Exchange

Through facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogue and peer learning at regional, national and local level, GFDRR will support good practice and knowledge sharing of successful government and civil society engagement. In addition, training and capacity building for collaboration will be supported. Awareness raising and the development of innovative tools and evidence-based approaches for effective DRR at all levels will also be facilitated. By partnering with key DRR

---

knowledge centers, including research institutions and universities, GFDRR will provide and support training activities in DRR practices throughout developing countries, to facilitate the training and development needs of local communities. GFDRR will continue to promote greater South-South knowledge exchange, with strong CSO engagement wherever possible.

**F. Integration of DRR into World Bank Civil Society Initiatives**

GFDRR will promote the integration of DRR into World Bank civil society activities. The World Bank has a number of programs already established that support civil society and community based organizations, GFDRR will provide targeted timely support to the Community Driven Development program and other World Bank investments, to enhance the extent to which DRR is addressed during project design and implementation.

15. **PILLAR 3. Civil society participation in sustainable recovery after disasters**: As part of the government-led Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) and recovery process GFDRR will promote civil society participation along the following lines:

**A. Identify the Advantages of Integrating Local-Level Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA) into Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA)**

The value-added of the VCA would come in informing the Recovery Needs identified by the PDNA, making them and the overall Recovery Framework more relevant for community-level disaster risk reduction. While neither the VCA nor PDNA are comprehensive assessments, the extrapolation of existing VCAs in a post-disaster country to the national level can (i) increase national Government and donor awareness of the financial and technical resources required for community-based recovery and DRR measures; and (ii) triangulate and validate the findings of the PDNA, especially in regards to the local level impacts and needs. To further strengthen the utility of the PDNA tool, CSO involvement in the review of the preliminary findings of the PDNA would allow for a stronger prioritization of needs and recovery framework, due to the comparative advantage of CSOs' work in communities.

**B. Provide Expertise and Resources to Regional Hubs of Excellence**

One of GFDRR's Sustainable Recovery team's priorities is to build regional hubs of excellence around the world that would be able to quickly mobilize technical expertise for a PDNA in the aftermath of a disaster. A potential area for CSO collaboration would be to have those CSOs with a regional footprint lend their expertise to the regional hub. Through the involvement in the regional hubs, CSOs could use their position to link the affected country's diaspora to the disaster, as the diaspora is a very important shareholder in recovery and reconstruction, especially for fragile or conflict-affected states.

**C. Ensuring Resilience in Assessment and Recovery**

Prior to a disaster, the primary focus of GFDRR's training programs is on building capacity of governments and their development partners to prepare for and respond to disasters. These trainings can be tailored to country-specific contexts that would then allow these parties to provide trainings to communities and community leaders. During the assessment phase, as the Government provides PDNA teams secondary data for the assessment, CSOs that have an established presence in the country prior to the disaster and during relief can help validate...
damage and loss data. Combined with the ability of community leaders to validate data, this would provide greater accuracy in assessments and therefore a more well-informed recovery process. Having the input of communities and CSOs on disaster impacts would (i) help the local and national governments better understand the extent of a disaster’s impact at the community level; and (ii) create a more accurate assessment of overall damages, losses, and needs for recovery by validating data provided by government. During the recovery phase, CSOs can help ensure resilience in recovery by providing local workers/artisans with trainings on risk reduction measures for reconstruction. For instance, by educating workers on resilient reconstruction measures, CSOs can help ensure a country’s build-back-safer agenda.

Results Monitoring and Evaluation

16. Results monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is an area where there are significant synergies that could be achieved by working closer with civil society. GFDRR’s Results Team will collaborate with civil society towards the following:

- **Civil Society Partnership in GFDRR’s M&E Agenda**
  - Inclusion of CSOs inputs and data in the GFDRR Results Model towards enhancing its ‘360 view’ on results.
  - Partnership with CSOs in select pilot countries towards developing and measuring Country DRM institutional and ‘on-the-ground’ results.
  - Bilateral, technical knowledge sharing between results teams and possible use of partner CSOs M&E mechanisms.

17. Should there be an agreement and endorsement by the Consultative Group to develop this partnership, GFDRR will continue the consultation with civil society in the priority countries to inform a longer term partnership work plan. The Secretariat believes it is important to ensure that input from the in-country civil society and their country specific challenges and opportunities on how to develop this partnership. GFDRR would use the feedback gathered during these consultations to develop a more operational and implementation strategy based on identified country specific initiatives in addition to those identified in other PHASE I activities, that could be implemented jointly through World Bank country offices or through other DRM stakeholders on the ground.

**PHASE II**

18. In parallel to the proposed PHASE I activities and depending on the guidance from the CG on the feasibility of financing a possible dedicated stand alone trust fund, GFDRR would continue the process of exploring/developing a suitable financing mechanism for specific civil society engagement. It should be noted that this is a lengthy process (approx. 18-24 months) that would require meeting the World Bank legal, fiduciary, policy and procedural requirements in the design of the mechanism.
BACKGROUND 2: Ongoing Activities

1. **Participation and Accountability:** The GFDRR Results Management Council has civil society representation, thus allowing for transparency and accountability to its members and stakeholders. GFDRR has also supported UNISDR to engage civil society organizations in policy dialogue through national multi-stakeholder platforms and at a global level, through the Community Practitioners Platform. The International Federation for Red Cross/Red Crescent, who acts as an auxiliary to government, is invited to participate as regular observers in CG meetings.

2. **South-South Knowledge Exchange:** GFDRR’s South-South Cooperation Program fosters knowledge exchange amongst developing country governments, research institutions, regional organizations and civil society to facilitate the implementation of effective DRR and CCA solutions to vulnerable developing countries. The program recognizes CSO’s as a valuable resource and utilizes their expertise ensuring vital local and community level engagement. Recent grants included an award to a network of grassroots CSOs in India, Guatemala and Honduras, facilitating the role of women’s leadership in community based DRR planning and local level resilience work.

3. **Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction:** GFDRR has contributed funding to support ‘The Views from the Frontline Report 2011’, which is leading a participatory monitoring process to independently assess progress on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action at the community level, coordinated by the Global Network. The results of the report were presented in Geneva at the third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Reduction in May 2011.

4. **Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) and Sustainable Recovery:** During the government-led process of the PDNA and recovery planning, CSO participation in many cases has enhanced policy dialogue and ownership of build back better agenda at the local level. Civil society engagement has also enabled far greater community participation in post-disaster assessment, through crowd-sourcing techniques, such as in the case in the immediate after-math of the earthquake in Haiti of January 2010.

5. **Volunteer Technology Communities:** GFDRR Labs partners with civil society to bridge the gap between DRR practitioners and technology experts to create Public-Private-People-Partnerships and deploy new innovative tools in both ex-ante and ex-post DRR. It supports Volunteer Technology Communities such as: the Random Hacks of Kindness initiative\(^9\), the Crisis Commons and Civil Society 2.0.\(^10\)

---

\(^9\) For more information on RHOK go to: [www.rhok.org](http://www.rhok.org)
\(^10\) For more information on Volunteer Technology Communities go to: [www.gfdrr.org/gfdrr/volunteer-technology-communities-open-development](http://www.gfdrr.org/gfdrr/volunteer-technology-communities-open-development)
BACKGROUND 3: Summary of Consultations and Feedback

As suggested at the 10th meeting of Consultative Group in Geneva, May 2011, GFDRR embarked on a consultative process, reaching out to civil society organizations throughout the world, both large international networks, as well as small local and community-based organizations in priority countries to inform the development of the proposed strategy.

Beginning in August 2011 with the launch of the open online consultation and questionnaire posted in English, French, Spanish and Arabic, GFDRR provided civil society around the world the opportunity to supply feedback on the consultation paper. In addition, face-to-face focus group discussions were held in London, Brussels, Paris, Washington D.C, Rome, the Hague, Geneva with civil society. Following these meetings further regional consultations were held in the Philippines and Kenya, and priority country meetings in Ethiopia and Indonesia. To date the consultation process has provided feedback from over 300 civil society organizations/groups. The following is a summary list of the feedback received:

Desired Outcomes of GFDRR – Civil Society Partnership:

- Enabling environment / opening of political space for increased civil society and community voice within government policy formulation and implementation.
- Genuine multi-stakeholder planning and decision-making processes.
- Ability to influence development of policies and plans relevant to local context, needs and priorities of vulnerable people.
- Better understanding of the role and benefits of civil society engagement amongst broader set of government and development actors (i.e. beyond DRR actors).
- Better understanding and mainstreaming of DRR within development policies and planning.
- More effective coordination of efforts.
- Increased harmonization between different sectors and policy frameworks.
- Better integration of DRR across disaster cycle i.e. continuity and connectively between response, recovery, and longer term development programmes.
- Greater accountability of GFDRR business lines and associated World Bank activities.
- Increased access to resources and capacity building support to civil society organizations to achieve desired outcomes.
- Scaling up from local to national in support of widespread replication and impact.

Constraints and Challenges to Civil Society Engagement:

- Lack of cooperation, trust and confidence between governments and civil society.
- Limited understanding of potential roles and responsibilities of civil society and at-risk communities to improve development outcomes.
- Lack of user-friendly procedures to facilitate inputs from local civil society actors and most vulnerable communities.
- Lack of capacity and resources for local civil society actors and local authorities to input at national level.
- Multiple small scale civil society actors with limited connectivity to other actors, limited shared vision and collective intent.
- Dependence on short-term “project-based” donor funding.
Different operating cultures/ways of working between governments and civil society (e.g. command-control, top-down, supply-side vs bottom up demand-side).

Issues of corruption, transparency, social accountability which impact on political-economy.

How will GFDRR engage with other development actors (inc. Humanitarian agencies) in the process of strengthening GFDRR collaborative efforts with civil society?

What is the relationship with the private sector - current emphasis is on government – civil society engagement?

How will GFDRR ensure coherence with other World Bank investments, including World Bank programmes and staff that support civil society?

Is GFDRR's definition of civil society too broad? Will the consultation process engage the wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations?

What is the nature of the proposed partnership and who are the key partners in the process i.e. GFDRR; governments; civil society and/or affected populations?

How can GFDRR Strengthen Civil Society Engagement:

- Articulate and promote benefits of greater civil society engagement and partnership and need for supportive regulatory environment.
- Ensure co-development and co-ownership of GFDRR – Civil Society partnership strategy development.
- Undertake civil society stakeholder analysis / mapping to understand local context, local capacities, needs and priorities.
- Model multi-stakeholder partnerships, cooperative approaches and adopt transparent, participatory, inclusive methodologies.
- Comprehensive capacity building and training programme for civil society actors and local authorities.
- Advocate and support civil society inputs into National Multi-stakeholder Platforms and World Bank Country Assistance Strategies (CAS).
- Identify, work with local champions, government reformers and change agents (women, children), develop prototypes and innovative approaches.
- Build alliances and broad-based constituencies across boundaries and policy frameworks.

Broadening GFDRR Internal Governance:

- Develop appropriate indicators to measure required local-level outputs / outcomes within GFDRR Results Management Framework.
- Civil society inputs (including representation of vulnerable groups) within all elements of GFDRR governance processes (i.e. Consultative Group; Civil Society Forum; Results Management Council).
- Define rights of Consultative Group “Member” vis-a-vis “Observer” status.
- Establish Civil Society Working Group to advise and co-develop GFDRR – Civil Society Partnership Strategy.
- Ensure civil society inputs at national and local government levels (i.e. not just GFDRR international governance).
- Agreement on democratic process for selecting civil society representatives within GFDRR governance.
• Should representatives be from individual or coalitions / umbrella grouping; humanitarian or development actors; DRR or CCA; priority countries and/or donor countries; local / affected communities and/or national and/or global actors?
• Develop Terms of Reference, roles and responsibilities of Consultative Group representatives.
• Learn from experiences and good practices of other sectors and disciplines (e.g. Internet Governance Forum, Food Security, HIV, Climate Change).

Post Disasters Needs Assessment (PDNA):

• Explicit mandate of PNDAs to engage with civil society, local authorities and affected populations in post-disaster recovery.
• Current process is top-down, has limited local level inputs and is not user-friendly for civil society and affected populations.
• Support involvement of vulnerable people within prioritisation, decision-making and planning processes across disaster cycle i.e. not only damage assessment process.
• Develop and model more user-friendly assessment methodology to support greater engagement with local level state and non-state actors (including links with local Vulnerability / Capacity Assessments.
• Develop linkages with other assessments and action planning processes e.g. UNEP.
• Develop good practice guidelines for key actors for engaging civil society and focusing on most vulnerable groups.
• Provide civil society training on PDNAs.

Proposed Pilot Fund for Community Action:

• Define pilot fund purpose, objectives, governance arrangements, modus operandi
• What is the proposed pilot fund relationship with other existing World Bank community-driven development funding mechanisms?
• CSO funding should be incorporated within existing GFDRR business lines and accompanying budgets rather than through a multi-donor trust fund conditional on additional donor support. What is the “distinctiveness” of this fund? Only fund strategic initiatives possibly using a broader understanding of risk (i.e. not isolated stand-alone DRR projects). Possible uses for pilot funds:
  o Incentivize collaboration
  o Model multi-stakeholder partnerships
  o Inclusion of most vulnerable
  o Shared learning including library / knowledge base
  o Local capacity building
  o Scaling up local practices
  o Vertical cooperation/ collaboration across institutional scales
  o Harmonization across different policy frameworks
  o Mainstreaming DRR into development programs
• Fund to support independent monitoring of outworking of GFDRR – Civil Society Partnership strategy (Global Network?)
• Ensure fund disbursement, monitoring and evaluation procedures are user-friendly for local level actors
• Learn from experiences and good practices of other relevant funds (e.g. community resilience fund)
• Funding to be spread across 20 or 20+ countries?
• Need to ensure fund does not distract from “added value” of civil society outside of the proposed pilot fund activities.
• Challenge of funding DRR activities that are incorporated within development policies and planning
In response to the identified gap between national policy and local action, GFDRR maintains the need to support and facilitate policy dialogue between government and civil society. As part of GFDRR’s commitment to strengthen its partnership with civil society the Secretariat has been engaged in an ongoing consultation process to support the development of the GFDRR Civil Society Partnership Strategy. GFDRR presented the outcomes of the consultations to date to its Consultative Group (CG) at the 11th CG meeting held in Jakarta on November 15th, 2011. The CG agreed the importance of GFDRR partnering with civil society and noted the role the Facility can play in helping to close the gap between national policy and local action. In addition, the CG recommended that GFDRR form a joint working group to work with the Secretariat to inform the development of the strategy.

The joint working group met with the Secretariat at the World Bank in Washington D.C from February 14th – 16th, 2012. The group consisted of 6 civil society representatives in addition to 1 local government, 1 International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), 1 UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), and World Bank GFDRR representatives. It should be noted that the national government representative, Dr. Aslam Alam, Secretary, Disaster Management and Relief Division, Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh was unable to attend the meeting due to last minute difficulties with his visa. The following is the list of the working group participants:

- Ms. Natalia Kirpikova, World Bank External Relations.
- Mr. Marcus Oxley, Chair of Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction.
- Ms. Suranjana Gupta, Coordinator, Community Practitioners Platform for Resilience.
- Ms. Josephine Castillio, Community Organizer, DAMPA, Metro Manila, Philippines.
- Ms. Maite Rodriguez, Fundacion Guatemala, Guatemala.
- Ms. Sasja Kamil, Policy Advisor, Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Aid, Cordaid.
- Mr. Ibhram Ceesay, Executive Coordinator- African Youth Initiative on Climate Change (AYICC).
- Mr. Motuma Mekassa Zeru, Head, Mayors Office & Cabinet Affairs, Addis Ababa.
- Ms. Aurelia Blin, Partnerships and Networks Officer, UNISDR, Geneva.
- Mr. Rod Snider, Sr. Advisor Disaster Preparedness, American Red Cross.
- Ms. Catherine Burtonboy, DRM Operations Officer, GFDRR.
- Mr. Ralph Connery, Global and Regional Partnerships, GFDRR.
- Mr. Robert Reid, Global and Regional Partnerships, GFDRR.

The group agreed to use the GFDRR Civil Society Partnership Consultation Paper and its 3 proposed pillars to guide the discussion in addition to examining the objective of the proposed partnership, a proposed GFDRR civil society fund, and to explore possible indicators for measuring the success of the partnership. In addition, the working group agreed that the main focus of the 3 day meeting should be on Pillar 2 and that this should be reflected in the proposed strategy.
Objective of the Partnership

The working group put forward that in order to proceed with the proposed partnership between GFDRR and civil society the objective of the partnership needed to be defined. The following objective was agreed to by the group as a working objective that may be further refined as the strategy evolves:

- To build and strengthen cooperation between government and civil society to improve resilience in disaster-prone communities.

Value Added of the Partnership

It was highlighted that the strategy will need to make a strong ‘business case’ for government to engage with civil society on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation policy and implementation. For this the value added of this partnership needs to be strongly portrayed in the strategy paper. The group agreed on the following as the value added of civil society:

- Complement government action
- Effective use of funds and resources
- Strengthen credibility to DRM work of both government and civil society
- Increase sustainability to DRR projects and policy
- Give voice to poor and marginalized populations
- Promote public sector transparency and accountability
- Build public consensus and local ownership
- Bring innovative ideas and participatory approaches
- Contribute local knowledge and technical expertise
- Creating and strengthening local capacity
- Bridging the gap between national policy and effective local implementation

Overall Message of the Proposed Strategy

- Take a phased approach by starting with some pilots that can be up-scaled.
- Focus more on bringing civil society to the policy dialogue with government than on potential funding. This also emerged from the national consultations and reflects the added value of GFDRR from the civil society perspective.
- Facilitate joint learning of civil society and government.
- Communicating the added value and success stories of civil society partnership is key in order to incentivize donors, governments, implementing agencies, including the World Bank to engage.
- Importance of identifying key champions within different institutions and governments that are willing to drive this agenda forward.
- Identify opportunities for engagement in countries and be opportunistic.
- Structure the partnership based on the main business lines for GFDRR.
Pillar 1: **GFDRR partnership to include civil society organizations for greater accountability and effectiveness of its mandate.**

- **Advocacy**

  The working group agreed on the importance of jointly promoting the business case for government engagement with civil society organizations on DRR at the global, regional, and national level.

- **World Bank Policy Documents**

  GFDRR through its cooperation with the Region in preparation of policy documents such as Country Assistance Strategies (CAS) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) could facilitate the inclusion of DRM civil society in the participatory consultation process that takes place during the drafting of these documents.

- **Civil Society representation on Consultative Group**

  The working group welcomes the proposed possibility of having civil society representatives sitting on the CG as observers on a rotational basis. The group agreed it could support GFDRR in developing criteria for representative selection and following this civil society would agree amongst themselves who they believed should represent them on the CG. The group proposed that the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction and the Community Practitioners Platform for Resilience as the two main international networks focussing on DRM and due to their regional and national networks and their ability to reach the vulnerable communities at all levels could be the first civil society representatives on the CG. It was also suggested that following these that groups such as BOND, Partners for Resilience (Cordaid, CARE Netherlands) could be representative observers. It was also highlighted that form should follow function, stating that GFDRR should first get civil society operations in place on the ground and then decide on how to broaden its governance structure to include civil society. It was also indicated by the group that there shouldn't only be Northern NGO's but also Southern NGO's to ensure that CSO representative in the CG would have experience of DRR at the community level.

- **Forum**

  The group proposed that if GFDRR hold policy forum that they should not be held every year, should take place at national level, and mechanism should be developed to feed the outcomes into the GFDRR strategy and policy. It was put forward that the forum should take place in countries where civil society and government are working together and used to showcase these positive experiences. In addition, forum could be used as a mechanism to review the progress in the priority countries.
Pillar 2: Leveraging the power and reach of civil society organizations in GFDRR’s national policy dialogue and delivery of DRR and adaptation agenda.

- **Mapping**

  A mapping exercise of the World Bank country offices in the priority countries of the DRM focal points and country teams engagement with civil society on DRR and CCA initiatives. In addition, with the support of civil society networks a mapping of CSOs in-country engaged in DRR and CCA activities and the state of play of the platforms in the priority countries.

- **Identification of Pilot Countries for Focused Engagement**

  It was proposed GFDRR perform an internal and external stock-taking to identify focus countries where civil society engagement would be feasible and based on a number of factors, including:

  - World Bank/ GFDRR country office and focal point resources and receptivity
  - DRM policy /strategy/action plans in place
  - Vulnerability to disaster
  - Government – Civil Society relationship
  - World Bank – Civil Society relationship
  - World Bank – Government relationship

  The outcome of the mapping and identification of pilot countries would allow GFDRR to grade the 31 priority countries in terms of civil society and government engagement on DRR and CCA policy and implementation enabling the Facility to identify which countries are most receptive and at which level or scale of engagement is required for each of the priority countries.

- **Knowledge Management**

  The strategy should support good practice and knowledge sharing of successful government and civil society engagement, awareness raising, innovative tools and methodologies for effective DRR at all levels, training and capacity building for collaboration and civil society engagement.

- **Service Delivery/ Policy Implementing**

  Innovative approaches to downscaling and up-scaling policy implementation and DRR service delivery. For example support to downscale the data generate in country risk assessments to disseminate the information in a more practical and user friendly format for at risk vulnerable communities. Conversely, innovative ways to up-scale valuable risk data from communities to feed up to the national and policy level.
Pillar 3: Civil society participation in sustainable recovery after disasters.

- **Identify the unique advantages of integrating local-level Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (VCA) into Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA).**
  The value-added of the VCA would come in informing the Recovery Needs identified by the PDNA, making them and the overall Recovery Framework more relevant for community-level disaster risk reduction. While neither the VCA nor PDNA are comprehensive assessments, the extrapolation of existing VCAs in a post-disaster country to the national level can (i) increase national Government and donor awareness of the financial and technical resources required for community-based recovery and DRM measures; (ii) triangulate and validate the findings of the PDNA, especially in regards to the local level impacts and needs. To further strengthen the utility of the PDNA tool, CSOs involvement in the review of the preliminary findings of the PDNA would allow for a stronger prioritization of needs and recovery framework, due to the comparative advantage of CSOs’ work in communities.

- **Provide expertise and resources to regional hubs of excellence.**
  One of GFDRR’s Sustainable Recovery team’s priorities is to build regional hubs of excellence around the world that would be able to quickly mobilize technical expertise in the aftermath of a disaster for PDNAs. A potential area for CSO collaboration would be to have those CSOs with a regional footprint lend their expertise to the regional hub. Through the involvement in the regional hubs, CSOs could use their position to link the affected country’s diaspora to the disaster, as the diaspora is a very important shareholder in recovery and reconstruction, especially for fragile or conflict states.

- **Provide trainings to community leaders in disaster-prone countries to conduct local-level damage and loss assessments.**
  One of GFDRR’s priorities is to build governments’ capacities in preparing for and responding to disasters (including conducting PDNAs), often achieved through offering training programs. While the primary focus of GFDRR’s training programs is on building capacity of governments and their donor and development partners, these trainings can be tailored to country-specific contexts that would then allow trained government, donor, and CSO parties to provide trainings to communities and community leaders. Having a number of communities trained in determining their own damages and losses would (i) help the local and national governments better understand the extent of a disaster’s impact at the community level and what those impacts mean for national recovery; and (ii) create a more accurate assessment of overall damages, losses, and needs for recovery by validating data provided by government. CBDRM programs in post-conflict situation – using community leaders for validation of data provided by government. GFDRR can support to tailor the models.

**Results Monitoring and Evaluation**

Results monitoring and evaluation is an area where there are significant synergies to be achieved by working together. The meeting brainstormed ways in which CSOs and GFDRR’s results team could collaborate towards the following:
• **M&E of the Proposed Strategy and its Implementation**

  The following overarching principles could apply to this joint effort:

  o Different actors in the partnership may have different goals and measurement yardsticks; indicators must try to accommodate these while ensuring that all actors strive towards a common higher level outcome.

  o As in the formulation and implementation of the CSO strategy, the design and operationalization of its M&E framework would use a participatory and consultative approach, utilizing and optimizing resources (people, knowledge, networks etc) from all stakeholders and at all stages.

  o Indicators should be available at different levels e.g to reflect process, outputs, outcomes.

  o The framework should be tailored to the specific contexts and should contain both qualitative and quantitative information that can be aggregated.

• **Civil Society Partnership in GFDRR's M&E Agenda**

  The following are potential areas for collaboration:

  o Inclusion of CSO inputs and data in the GFDRR Results Model towards enhancing its '360 view' on results.
  o Partnership with CSO in select pilot countries towards developing and measuring Country DRM institutional and 'on-the-ground' results.
  o Bilateral, technical knowledge sharing between results teams and possible use of partner CSO M&E mechanisms.

**Civil Society Fund**

The Secretariat clarified to the working group that the proposed Fund in the GFDRR civil society partnership consultation paper was put forward to start the discussion and to explore the potential appetite for such a fund with both civil society organizations and donors alike. It was highlighted that to date there has been no commitment of funds by the donors and that the process of creating a fund dedicated solely to civil society engagement will be a lengthy process that must adhere to World Bank policy and procedures.

• GFDRR is proposing that should the partnership be endorsed by the Consultative Group in April 2012, the Facility would put forward the option of a phased approach. Phase 1. will aim to achieve tangible progress in terms of immediately accessible entry points provide by the partnership, funded from the existing MDTF after donors commit additional funding for this purpose.

• In parallel GFDRR would start the process of exploring/developing a possible stand alone trust fund dedicated for specific civil society engagement. The aim would be to have all the World Bank legal, fiduciary, policy and procedure requirements met during this period in the design of the possible fund allowing GFDRR to proceed depending on the success of the pilot activities and CG endorsement.
All present agreed that it would be premature to identify specific objectives and activities of a fund before an agreement by the CG to create and fund the partnership and stand alone fund.

**Format of Strategy Paper**

The group proposed that the strategy paper should be no more than 12-15 pages (excluding annex) in length and be structured in the following format:

- Background – GFDRR consultation
- Problem Statement / Context / Rationale
- Partners and Stakeholders of the Partnership
- Objectives/Goals – values of partnership
- Benefits of Collaboration / Business Case
- Priority Actions and Associated Impacts – phased approach (mapping, focus country prioritization and piloting, etc.) including recommended criteria for country selection
- Timeframe and Process
- Monitoring / Indicators - principles to guide the process
- Proposed next steps

**Consultations**

Having received a great deal of feedback from the online consultations and focus group meetings carried out to date, the joint working group recommended that the Secretariat should not continue additional priority country consultations until the partnership strategy is developed further and agreed to by the Consultative Group. Carrying out the priority country consultations following the adoption of the strategy would allow for a focussed discussion on the operationalization of the strategy in-country and avoid the unnecessary raising of expectations in these countries which has the potential to hinder the proposed partnership before the strategy is endorsed.

**Next Steps**

The Secretariat will prepare the Civil Society Strategy Paper drawing upon the recommendations from the online consultation, focus group meetings, and the joint working and present to the Consultative Group at the 12th CG meeting to be held in Washington D.C on April 17th, 2012. Depending on the outcome, the Secretariat will organize for the joint working group to meet to discuss the next steps.
BACKGROUND 5: GFDRR Policy Forum – Community Action for Resilience
Monday November 14th, 9:00-18:30 Jakarta Indonesia, The Sultan Hotel.

Report

In response to the identified gap between national policy and local action, GFDRR maintains the need to support and facilitate policy dialogue between government and civil society. As part of GFDRR’s commitment to strengthen its partnership with civil society and the ongoing consultation and development of the GFDRR Civil Society Partnership Strategy, the first GFDRR policy forum focusing on civil society and disaster risk reduction (DRR) was held in Jakarta on November 14th, 2011.

The Policy Forum – Community Action for Resilience organized in partnership with the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Secretariat (UNISDR) was attended by 120 people and brought together representatives of civil society, national and local government, and international organizations from over 20 countries around the world to showcase activities, encourage knowledge exchange and highlight current challenges in implementing effective DRR at the local level.

Opening Session

The policy forum was opened by Dr. Syamsul Maarif, Chief of National Agency for Disaster Management, Indonesia, who stated that disaster risk management is no longer the domain of the government and for effective DRR community action is required in partnership with civil society organizations. Furthermore, he highlighted that the Indonesian National Board for Disaster Management (BNPB) relies on the philosophy of building community capacity and resilience.

Mr. Baquer Namazi, independent Middle East civil society representative, followed by declaring that government, the World Bank and other major stakeholders must be able to make connections with community based organizations to increase resilience at the community level. Mr. Namazi put forward the ground rules for working with civil society: build trust and confidence; see advice translated into concrete action; gap between policy and practice bridged; civil society to be viewed as constructively critical friends; and both parties must accept criticism. In addition, he stated that although in relative terms the GFDRR is a small facility in the scale of the World Bank, the GFDRR Civil Society Partnerships Strategy has the opportunity to set the standards on how to engage with civil society on the DRR agenda and therefore strides must be taken to ensure quality from the outset of the partnership.

Mr. Neil McFarlane, Coordinator, UNISDR, stated DRR is a shared responsibility amongst government, civil society, private sector and international organizations. Mr. McFarlane maintained that working with civil society is more cost effective in promoting DRR but also more effective. He stated that government and international organizations will benefit from the knowledge of civil society on DRR moving forward to improve resilience.

Mr. Stefan G. Koeberle, World Bank Country Director, Indonesia, highlighted that Jakarta was the perfect place for the policy forum given Indonesia’s high exposure to natural hazards. Mr. Koeberle stated that Indonesia can be very proud of the work done by the National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM), which covers over 60,000 villages working to accelerate the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals and increasing resilience. In addition, Mr. Koeberle recognized the importance of a more effective interaction by GFDRR and the World Bank with civil society to move the DRR agenda forward.
**Session 1: Tackling the Gap between National Policy and Local Action**

**Moderated by:**
Mr. Marcus Oxley, Chairman, Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction

**Panelists:**
Mr. Bruno Haghebaert, DRR Advisor, Netherlands Red Cross/Partners for Resilience
Mr. Avianto Muhtadi, Chairman, Indonesian National Platform for DRR
Dr. Manu Gupta, Director, SEEDS India
Ms. Hepi Rahmawati, Yakkum Emergency Unit, Yogyakarta

This session explored the main findings of the *Views from the Front Line* report, highlighted the gap between national policy and local action and identified opportunities for future action. Mr. Oxley presented some of the key findings from the recent Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction 2011 report. Ms. Rahmawati presented on the progress of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) at the local level in Indonesia. The panel discussion followed with audience participation.

The following were the key messages and outcomes from the session:

- Community resilience is the foundation of resilient nations and the greatest progress is made in countries who adopt participatory and partnership approaches supported by coherent actions at provincial and national levels.

- Governments cannot deliver required changes without the support of an empowered citizenry and engaged civil society.

- At-risk populations are the primary stakeholders and need to be brought to the table. The most important factor in building local resilience is local governance. An enabling environment is needed to bring together all the stakeholders and local governance is a cross-cutting issue at the heart of a holistic approach to building resilience.

- Awareness must be raised and demand created, resources already in the system need to be used more wisely in addition to a break out of project thinking.

- There is limited evidence of local government increasing resilience to natural disasters. In order to bring civil society organizations into the policy dialogue there is a need to provide evidence of where local action has worked. These experiences need to be documented and shared.

- A study to better understand the enabling environment for local action needs to be carried out in addition to another round of the *Views from the Front Line* or another mechanism for M&E of progress made at the local level.

- Enhance inclusion and participation – decision making on DRR development plan priorities needs to accommodate inputs from broader community.

- Develop local capacities and capabilities – building of community based preparedness systems supported by sufficient infrastructures.

- Enable greater accountability and transparency – conduct participatory M&E and develop information management systems ensuring accessibility for at-risk communities.
• The idea of a global network of local, multi-stakeholder platforms for DRR was put forward. To enable this to progress there needs to be i) transparency, focus on most vulnerable; ii) ownership/strong leadership at local level; iii) alignment (mainstreaming, addresses domestic needs and priorities as well as national commitments); iv) harmonization, built on inputs from all contributors.

• Civil society organizations need greater and more consistent documentation of their work which creates greater credibility. National and local governments respond and engage when there is credibility.

Session 2: Community-Driven Demand for Pro-Poor Disaster Resilience Programs

Moderated by:
Ms. Suranjana Gupta, Coordinator, Community Practitioners Platform for Resilience

Panelists:
Mr. Ilham Arief Sirajuddin, Mayor of Makassar, Indonesia
Mr. Ismunander, Makassar Urban Poor Committee, Indonesia
Ms. Josephine Castillo, Community Organizer, DAMPA, Metro Manila, Philippines
Ms. Crisell B. Beltran, Barangay Captain, Bagong Silangan, Quezon City, Philippines
Mr. Sagar Misra, Section Officer, Disaster Management Section, Ministry of Home Affairs, Nepal
Ms. Prema Gopalan, Executive Director, Swayam Shikshan Prayog, India

Three teams representing collaborative initiatives from Indonesia, Philippines and Nepal showcased different types of innovative, community-driven partnerships with local and national government institutions to advance pro-poor resilience priorities of communities living with disaster risk. Key messages and outcomes:

• Community-based approaches enable more effective DRR programs and initiatives. When the results of risk mapping are analyzed collectively by communities, they not only take ownership, but come up with solutions to the issues. This is the best method to avoid the ‘layers of complexity’ in DRR.

• Need to bring women into the DRR discussion. Women should no longer be viewed as victims but as a vital resource and source of knowledge and expertise for effective DRR at all levels.

• There is a need for champions. There are numerous development and strategic plans created and put forward. However, there is a shortage of people who can motivate, inspire and collaborate across all sectors to implement these plans. There needs to be more efficient and stronger cooperation across existing institutions before we create new ones.

• Resources are required. Unless there are funds involved, DRR is just rhetoric. If communities are to engage, they need resources from national government, otherwise will not be able to execute.
• In DRR policy there should be a clause that requires a member of community groups/organizations to be involved in the implementation. This ensures that the at-risk communities are aware and understand the laws designed to benefit them.

• There is a need to ensure that development policy does not increase the vulnerability of low-income populations. World Bank should be part of creating new economic systems that will reduce the vulnerability of low-income populations through improved distribution of wealth.

• Need more focus on the protection and strengthening of assets at community level, not just emergency preparedness and response. Need to ensure that local poor people’s organizations stay engaged in DRR through enhancing, increasing, and building asset base to reduce long-term vulnerability.

• Community –managed institutions provide the greatest benefit to the local community and are in the best position to ‘push’ the message up from the local to the national level.

Session 3: Understanding Risks: Supporting Local Capacity, Inclusion and Participation

Moderated by:
Mr. Jan Weetjens, Lead Social Development Specialist, World Bank Indonesia

Panelists:
Dr. Trevor Dhu, Risk & Vulnerability Manager, Australia-Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction (AIFDR)
Mr. Peter Kern, Head of Office, International Organization for Migration, Garut, West Java
Ms. Abigail Baca, World Bank/Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

This session explored risk assessment techniques implemented in local vulnerable communities to collect, map and disseminate local risk information to inform resilient decision-making; make specialist information easily accessible to local communities; and provide local actors with the tools and necessary information to manage disaster risk in a changing climate. Key messages and outcomes:

• Data sharing is critical to making communities more resilient. It is vital that the creators of technical information not only generate the relevant data but also make it open, accessible and usable. The communities need to own the information created during the risk mapping process.

• Communities are the source of a wealth of detailed information. It must be ensured that this information is packaged and communicated in a way that can feed into local and national decision-making processes to be utilized for effective DRR.

• The challenge of retaining and maintaining the data once the ‘large organizations’ complete their assessments was identified. The need for support to enable communities to keep the data up to date and maintained correctly to ensure sustainability was highlighted.

• Regional universities were identified as possible partners to local communities to ensure the sustainability of data generated and a source of resources and expertise.
Communities need to engage and work with the private sector to identify mutually beneficial activities to be undertaken at the local level.

It was proposed that the GFDRR should include a window to fund pilot technological best practices, in addition to those already working on the ground.

**Session 4: Addressing Community Needs in Post-Disaster Resilient Recovery**

Moderated by:
Mr. Sanjaya Bhatia, Knowledge Management Officer, International Recovery Platform

Panelists:
Mr. Kristanto Sinandang, Head of CPRU UNDP Indonesia
Mr. Iwan Gunawan, Senior Disaster Risk Management Specialist, World Bank
Mr. Simon Matakupan, Mercy Corps and Micra, West Sumatra
Ms. Bevita Dwi Medityawati, Indonesian Red Cross (PMI)

Increasing the involvement of community level actors in post-disaster recovery and reconstruction is needed to enhance participation and inclusion, ensuring the needs of vulnerable populations are reflected. This session shared experiences in strengthening local capacity for post-disaster action. Key messages and outcomes:

- When the Government involves communities in post-disaster reconstruction, a much better outcome can be achieved for long-term recovery.

- It is important to give particular attention to the dedicated timeline for the implementation of recovery and reconstruction programs. Often the implementation is rushed resulting in the loss of quality and technical soundness.

- To facilitate a better understanding by the community and the government of their relative roles following a disaster, guidelines for participation in post-disaster reconstruction should be prepared prior as part of preparation planning.

- Local communities are particularly successful at targeting where assistance is most needed. Consequently, organized community groups have a strong role to play in recovery effort.

- In order to prevent homeowners and builders rebuilding houses to a low unsafe standard there is a need to provide the proper tools and knowledge to build safer more resilient homes.

- Need to provide the communities with incentives to build resilient homes, such as conditional grant mechanisms to ensure that the communities build back better.

- A methodology is needed for selecting civil society organizations to support and engage with the communities in best practice reconstruction for example mapping and rating the housing.

- The consistent challenge for the government to identify which civil society organizations to work with was highlighted. For example when the government works with the private sector
there is a competitive bidding process however, there is no complementary method to do so for engagement with civil society.

• Need for a framework for governments and international organizations to better understand how to work with civil society before and after a disaster.

Closing Session and Wrap-Up

Dr. Matt Hayne, Australian Co-Director, Australian-Indonesia for Disaster Reduction, highlighted that in the last 10 years there has been a focus in the development of national disaster risk management plans to make sure they can be translated into community actions. He noted that communities are at the forefront of saving lives but unfortunately, there are many examples of programs that do not properly engage with at-risk communities to reduce their vulnerability. Dr. Hayne maintained that this is a two-way street and information flows need to go up and down for effective DRR.

Ms. Zoubida Allaoua, Director of Finance, Economics & Urban Department, World Bank, recognized that in the last 10 years there has been a dramatic transformation in how the World Bank and civil society engage. Ms. Allaoua stated that the more the government and international organizations partner with civil society, the more that can be accomplished. However, Ms. Allaoua cautioned that there must be an understanding of the constraints of each partner in order to improve the end result. She highlighted that civil society have the convening power and ability to be candid where government and international organizations are constrained, enabling them to bring the voice of low-income communities to light. Ms. Allaoua stated that we have moved forward from just talking and now the partners discuss and act, and maintained that GFDRR has the structure and commitment to act and follow through on the outputs of the Policy Forum. Ms. Allaoua ended by stating that we have the tools, the information, and the structure, there is now a need to agree to the Framework.

Dr. Manu Gupta, Director, SEEDS India, commended GFDRR for taking the initiative and organizing a policy forum focusing on civil society and DRR and gave credit for bringing together such a dynamic group of attendees from around the world and across all sectors. Dr. Gupta stated it was refreshing for civil society to be engaged in the dialogue and questioned how can there be a structural change for an improved dialogue. He maintained that the issue is to formalize the process which will in turn bring about a long term change. Dr. Gupta presented a summary of issues taken from the Forum he believed should be highlighted:

- Need civil society to be constructively critical of governments and international organizations.
- Responsive local governments is key, need mutual accountability for local governments and communities.
- Data made available to empower communities to take ownership over their own risks and effectively manage them.
- Across sectors, increasing cooperation; believe in power of informed citizenry.
- To enable change, must strengthen local institutions, give them legitimacy, invest further in their capacity, to facilitate their feeding up in to higher processes.
- Good partnerships and platforms, how to share experiences from these outside their communities.
- Need for sound evidence to from data.
- Best practices at local level (latent energies here that can be tapped through working together).
In response to the identified disconnect between national policies and practices at the local level, civil society want the GFDRR to take agenda forward to engage with both sides to leverage capabilities and make connections.

**Next Steps**

- Outcomes of the GFDRR civil society consultations to date and the policy forum were presented to the GFDRR Consultative Group in Jakarta, by Marcus Oxley, Chair of the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction.
- The Consultative Group (CG) agreed the importance of GFDRR partnering with civil society and noted the role GFDRR can play in helping to close the gap between national policy and local action.
- GFDRR will continue consultations with civil society in the priority countries on the proposed Civil Society Partnership Strategy.
- GFDRR will form a joint working group with civil society to support GFDRR with the strategy development and financial and organizational modalities for its implementation, to be presented at the next CG meeting in Washington D.C., April 2012.
ANNEX G

Disaster Aid Tracking

Introduction:

The GFDRR’s Disaster Aid Tracking (DAT) initiative aims at collaborative development of a global system for tracking the investments in disaster risk reduction, post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. In addition to the traditional DAC donors, this system targets including ex-ante and ex-post disaster-related development and humanitarian aid by non-DAC donors, bilateral, and corporate/public/private sectors.

The DAT is set to allow donor organizations, citizens in donor countries, researchers, NGOs, recipient governments, and, ultimately, the beneficiaries on the ground in developing countries to gain a more detailed understanding of past and present trends in aid, and disaster-development nexus.

While the DAT is a global initiative, it has huge potential for integrating within the donor agencies’ development finance tracking systems as well recipient countries’ national accounting systems for better monitoring of disaster related financial flows. GFDRR can provide technical assistance in the initial phase of such integration until the participating donor or recipient country assumes full ownership and regular maintenance responsibilities of their customized DAT system.

The development of DAT has been carried out in collaboration with the Development Gateway Foundation (DGF), which is a not-for-profit organization and the principal developer of AidData (www.aiddata.org) initiative which captures the universe of development finance and foreign aid, increase the value of data by providing more descriptive information about development activities, provide data in an accessible format, and strengthen efforts to improve donor and recipient strategic planning and coordination. The DAT is based upon the AidData model as depicted in the graphic above.

The activities carried out under this endeavor entail:

- Developing exclusive classification structure for Disaster Risk Reduction, Recovery, and Reconstruction (DR4) projects in line with HFA priorities and a project classification methodology for improving the quality, precision and visibility of the related project coding and datasets in the existing AidData database and to modify and maintain a global master database accordingly.
- Exploring the possibility of involving other nontraditional development/DR4 donors (public/private sectors, philanthropies, civil society organizations etc.) to have their DR4 aid data captured in the AidData database.
Current Status:

- All projects related to DR4 in AidData have been reviewed and re-coded for DAT dashboard.
- The DAT Dashboard technology has matured to handle cross-browser support and optimum data traffic. The beta version of the dashboard is at gfdrr.aiddata.org
- The beta version is being extensively tested by DG team, GFDRR and academic partners such as College of William & Mary and Bringham Young University.

Next steps:

- Public launch of DAT beta portal for global review and feedback.
- Constitution of an Experts Group to review, augment and validate the DAT’s DR4 related activity classification codes and methodology of classifying a given project under one (or more) of the activity codes with financial resource desegregation. This Experts Group will include UNISDR, UN IASC’s working group on Preparedness Financing, OECD, DAC Donor representatives, IATI and prominent experts from Academia and Aid tracking think tanks.
- Close collaboration with OECD to mainstream the DAT classification codes within the Creditor Reporting System (CRS).
- Develop customized interface for interested donors as well as recipient Countries on need basis.
- Building new technical capabilities in this dashboard such as geo-coding all projects, allow crowd-sourcing for aid information management & reporting, Community based M & E, Mobile applications and APIs etc.
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