



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific States

Development policy : Thematic issues

Sustainable management of natural resources

EU Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries

(working title)

ISSUES PAPER

15/4/2008

This document does not represent an official position of the European Commission. It is a tool to explore the views of interested parties. The suggestions contained in this document do not prejudge the form and content of the Communication or of any future proposal by the European Commission.

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER	2
2. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION	2
2.1. Why an EU Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction in developing countries	2
2.2. Definitions, scope and objectives of the strategy	5
2.3. Approach and principles.....	7
2.4. Strategic areas for intervention.....	9
2.5. Implementation, complementarity and coordination.....	11
3. CONSULTATION PROCESS AND NEXT STEPS	13

1. PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER

The European Commission is in the process of developing a proposal for an EU Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in developing countries¹. The Strategy will build on existing preliminary strategic work on DRR done by the Commission², and propose a new comprehensive approach encompassing both development cooperation and humanitarian aid and all developing country regions.

The purpose of this paper is to provide elements for consultation with stakeholders on the rationale, scope, objectives, approach, principles, intervention areas and implementation issues for such a Strategy. The paper will be the basis for the public Internet consultation that will be open for individuals and organisations interested in contributing to this process, during the months of April-June 2008, as well as complementary face-to-face consultation meetings with key stakeholder, including EU partner countries, civil society and international actors.

The strategy will take the form of a Commission Communication to the Council and the European Parliament. The Communication is expected to be adopted by the Commission in October 2008 as part of a coherent EU package, comprising of both an internal and external dimension of DRR³. It will be a concise strategic document with some operational pointers. Contributors should note that input received will not only inform the development of the Strategy but rather inform the whole process ranging from policy formulation to concrete implementation.

2. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

2.1. Why an EU Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction in developing countries

The rationale for developing an EU Strategy for DRR in developing countries is based on the following considerations:

- Disasters undermine the results of development investments in a short time and therefore remain a major impediment to developing countries' efforts for sustainable development, poverty eradication and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Moreover, disasters divert important national resources from development activities to relief, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, depriving poor countries and poor people the resources needed to escape poverty. Disasters hit developing countries and the poorest people within

¹ As announced in the Commission Communications on Reinforcing the Union's Disaster Response Capacity: COM(2008) 130 of 5 March 2008; and the Green Paper on Adapting to Climate Change in Europe: COM(2007) 354 of 29.6.2007.

² Including in the Commission Communication on Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response in third countries (COM(2005)153) and the Commission Staff Working Paper on Disaster Preparedness and Prevention (DPP): State of play and strategic orientations for EC policy (2003).

³ The internal dimension will be developed in the Commission Communication on a proposal for a European integrated approach to the prevention of natural disasters.

these countries hardest as they are the most exposed and vulnerable and have the least capacities to cope.

- Disasters are currently increasing both in frequency and magnitude. Since 1975, the number of natural disasters has increased from around 75 to more than 400 a year. The rise in disasters is caused almost entirely by an increase in weather-related disasters: over the last three years hydro-meteorological disasters increased by more than 100% from about 100 in 2004 to more than 200 in 2006⁴, coupled with increased vulnerability of poor people.⁵ Natural disasters also increase in variability, with a sharp increase in small and medium scale disasters, which may require a more differentiated overall approach, hitherto mainly focussed on large scale disasters.
- Climate change is most likely to blame for this new sharp up-ward trend in small and medium scale disasters, which according to recent research⁶ is expected to continue and subsequently increase risk⁷, making the need for effective DRR even greater and more immediate. Linking DRR and climate change adaptation could have many benefits, including those related to policy coherence, non-duplication of efforts, cost-effectiveness, better inter-ministerial coordination, exchange of best practices, streamlining of integration efforts, and building on existing institutions instead of creating new ones. Moreover, climate change projections can inform existing DRR strategies that most likely will need to be modified due to changing weather patterns. This strategy will be in line with existing or draft EU policies on climate change and could possibly also contribute to the development of climate change adaptation policies and measures to be defined in the context of the UNFCCC post 2012 arrangements.
- A natural hazard⁸ does not necessarily need to translate into a disaster. The potential for a hazard to become a disaster depends on the degree of exposure of people, infrastructures and economic activities to a physical event or hazard; and the vulnerability of those exposed to the hazard or shock. Thus, the more exposed and vulnerable a community/society is, the more likely it is that a hazard turns into a disaster. It is increasingly difficult to distinguish natural from man-made disasters

⁴ CRED (Collaborating Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters) database: <http://www.emdat.be/Database/Trends/trends.html>

⁵ For example, increase in numbers of people living in vulnerable conditions due to factors such as population growth, rapid urbanisation, growing division between rich and poor, etc.

⁶ Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC.

⁷ In particular extensive risk, which is characterized by large numbers of frequently occurring but highly localized events, such as landslides, flash floods, fires and storms, mainly associated with climatic hazard, affecting specific groups of people and economic assets spread over extensive areas. DRR is crucial for quick- and slow-onset disasters but they may require different approaches. There is a need to reduce extensive risk as well as intensive risk.

⁸ Hazards can be of either slow (drought) or rapid (earthquake) onset and can have effects which can be felt across a range of scales and can have transboundary impacts (flooding). Furthermore different hazards can interact giving a domino effect. The consideration of a multi-hazard dimension is important seen from a management perspective.

as risks are determined just as much by human activity and lack of planning as by natural hazards.

- There are ways to reduce risks so that a hazard does not become a disaster, or that impacts are limited, for example by addressing the root causes of people's vulnerability to hazards, and strengthening their capacities to cope with them. Evidence shows that investments in DRR pay off; for example it is estimated that for every dollar invested in DRR between two and four dollars are returned in terms of avoided or reduced disaster impacts.⁹
- In recent years, the focus has indeed moved from only responding to disaster to also preventing them through more comprehensive DRR approaches. In 2005, 168 Governments adopted a 10-year plan to make the world safer from natural hazards: the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disaster.¹⁰ The vast majority of EU Member States' and developing countries' governments have adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Commission¹¹ is fully supportive of its implementation.
- The EU, meaning the EU Members States and the European Community, is the world's largest donor both with regard to Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Humanitarian Aid. Given the risk disasters pose to development efforts/investments, the integration of DRR into development simply means good development policies and practice¹².
- The EU has a global presence and wide experience with individual DRR projects/programmes but is lacking a comprehensive strategic framework to steer DRR action in its external aid and actions and exploit synergies in a more efficient and coordinated manner. An EU-wide strategy would frame and prioritise the EU's support to DRR in all developing countries as a contribution to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. The Commission will propose such a Strategy following the provisions of the Treaty of the European Community¹³ and the EU Code of Conduct and Division of Labour.

⁹ Reducing the Risk of Disasters – Helping to Achieve Sustainable Poverty Reduction in a Vulnerable World: A DFID policy paper (2006).

¹⁰ The Hyogo Framework for Action was adopted in 2005 at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction. Five priorities for action are outlined in the Framework to guide states, organizations, and other actors at all levels in designing their approach to disaster risk reduction: (1) Ensure that DRR is a national and local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation; (2) Identify, assess, and monitor disaster risks – and enhance early warning; (3) Use knowledge, innovation, and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels; (4) Reduce the underlying risk factors; (5) Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

¹¹ At the time, only Governments could adopt the Hyogo Framework for Action, this is why the EC has not formally adopted it.

¹² That is, policies and practices which not only improve the socio-economic situation of the targeted countries and people, but which equally result in tangible benefits in terms of less vulnerability to hazards.

¹³ *Article 180: §1.* The Community and the Member States shall coordinate their policies on development cooperation and shall consult each other on their aid programmes, including in

- Such a Strategy would also respond to the European Consensus on Development which commits the EU to support disaster prevention and preparedness in disaster prone countries and regions with the view to increasing their resilience to these challenges, as well as the recently adopted European consensus on Humanitarian Aid which commits the EU to develop an overall policy approach to DRR with special focus on disaster prone countries and regions and the most vulnerable groups.

Questions

- Do you agree with the above considerations? Are there other considerations that you think should be highlighted that would influence the rationale for action?
- Do you think this is a timely and appropriate initiative? Do you think it is important to have a common EU Strategy on DRR and developing countries?
- What do you think is the comparative advantage of the EU in addressing DRR?

2.2. Definitions, scope and objectives of the strategy

According to the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR)¹⁴, which is the key coordinator for the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, disaster risk reduction is "the conceptual framework of elements considered with the possibilities to minimize vulnerabilities and disaster risks throughout a society, to avoid (prevention) or to limit (mitigation and preparedness) the adverse impacts of hazards, within the broad context of sustainable development".

There exist other definitions of DRR, but there seems to be increasing convergence towards the ISDR definition. Likewise, there are different views on how to break down this somewhat abstract definition into more operational concepts, it is here proposed, as a basis for discussion, that DRR could be said to comprise of preparedness, mitigation and prevention¹⁵, keeping in mind that in reality many actions include a mix of both mitigation and prevention.

international organisations and during international conferences. They may undertake joint action. Member States shall contribute if necessary to the implementation of Community aid programmes. §2. The Commission may take any useful initiative to promote the coordination referred to in paragraph 1.

¹⁴ The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), launched in 2000, is a global strategy to engage a wide range of actors to join forces to reduce risk to disasters and to build "a culture of prevention" in society as part of sustainable development. As agreed in the Hyogo Framework for Action, the ISDR system will work with national, regional and international partners in carrying out support functions to provide coordination and assistance in the promotion of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

¹⁵ The below working definitions, slightly revised through footnotes, are taken from the Commission Staff Working Paper on Disaster Preparedness and Prevention (DPP): State of play and strategic orientations for EC policy (2003). Underpinning all three concepts are the acquisition and development of knowledge into the constitutive elements of risk and capacity building.

*Preparedness*¹⁶: Organisational activities which ensure that the systems, procedures and resources required to confront a natural disaster are available in order to provide timely assistance to those affected, using existing mechanisms wherever possible. (e.g. training, awareness raising, establishment of disaster plans, evacuation plans, pre-positioning of stocks, early warning mechanisms, strengthening indigenous knowledge).

*Mitigation*¹⁷: Measures taken before disasters which intend to reduce or eliminate their impact on society and environment. These measures reduce the physical vulnerability of existing infrastructures or of vulnerable sites which endanger directly the populations (e.g. retrofitting of buildings, reinforce "lifeline" infrastructure).

Prevention: Activities conceived to ensure a permanent protection against a disaster. These include engineering, physical protection measures, legislative measures for the control of land use and codes of construction. These activities reduce the physical vulnerability and/or exposure to risks through infrastructures (e.g. dams, flood barriers, building of refuges) and sustainable development practices (e.g. no deforestation in upstream areas).

Another concept that is central to DRR, is the concept of resilience. DRR is about enhancing the levels of resilience of disaster prone countries and societies with a focus on a long-term vision of building capacity and strengthening people and societies rather than crisis management. The ISDR defines *resilience* as

The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure. This is determined by the degree to which the social system is capable of organizing itself to increase its capacity for learning from past disasters for better future protection and to improve risk reduction measures.

With regard to scope, all EU partner countries would be eligible, but particular attention would be given to disaster-prone regions, countries and localities and the most vulnerable groups. These regions, countries and localities will need to be identified through risk analysis, which should be matched with vulnerability and needs assessments at the relevant levels. Such an exercise would also need to take into account the changing patterns of hazards due to increasing climate change, sometimes projected outside traditionally disaster-prone areas, and resulting vulnerabilities and specific needs.

The disasters targeted would primarily be natural disasters of geophysical or climatic nature; however, a multi-hazard approach should be adopted which leads to strengthened

¹⁶ The concept includes in particular preparedness focused on enabling communities to help themselves in the event of a disaster and financial preparedness in order to be able to absorb the effects of a disaster without creating undue macro-economic or budgetary problems (e.g. budgetary provisions, contingency financing, stand-by agreements, risk insurance).

¹⁷ Mitigation measures can also be taken after a disaster has struck. There is a window of opportunity that emerges for strengthened DRR in the recovery and transition process, for example through 'Building Back Better'. Mitigation in the context of DRR should not be confused with mitigation in the context of climate change which refers to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere.

resilience also vis-à-vis other types of disasters, included related environmental and technological disasters. While acknowledging that disasters can exacerbate existing trends, tensions and instability and overburden states and regions which are already fragile and conflict prone, the Strategy will not address man-made disasters such as conflict and war. In such complex situations, linking DRR to efforts for crisis response to conflicts and LRRD (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development) will be important.

In line with the above, it is suggested that the Strategy would put forward an overall objective of **contributing to sustainable development and poverty eradication through reducing the burden of disasters on the poor and most vulnerable countries and groups by means of improved disaster risk reduction.**

The EU would support partner countries achieving the following strategic objectives:

- Strategic Objective (1) Prevent, where possible, natural hazards from turning into disasters
- Strategic Objective (2) Improve preparedness of developing countries and societies in the event of a disaster
- Strategic Objective (3) Mitigate the risks and limit the impact of disasters on developing countries and societies

Sub-section 2.4 below will propose five strategic intervention areas for how these objectives will be achieved.

Questions

- Do you agree with the definitions as proposed above?
- Do you agree with the proposed scope and the level of ambition?
- How can we best identify regions, countries and localities for intervention? The World Bank Global Hotspots Analysis, the CRED database for most vulnerable countries as well as UNDP's disaster risk index and the Global Risk Identification Programme (GRIP) are some risk assessment tool, do you know of others? For which countries do we have/need reliable vulnerability and needs assessments?
- Based on existing data or personal experience, which – in your view - should be the regions, countries and localities to be targeted first? In which places have your agency/organisation already been working?
- Do you agree with the proposed overall objective and the proposed strategic priorities?

2.3. Approach and principles

DRR is not a sector but rather an approach and a cross-cutting issue. In order to ensure the sustainability of investments, DRR needs to be integrated into development and humanitarian policies and planning as well as into crisis response when it concerns disaster response and recovery. This should be done through the integration of DRR into

development policies and strategies, in particular Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), as well as into humanitarian response and recovery efforts; and disaster-sensitive sectors and cross-cutting issues such as: infrastructures, health, urban issues, education, agriculture, food security, environment, good governance and gender. It should also be reflected in macro-economic policies and national and local budget processes.

Such an integration seems to be the most appropriate way to make investments in development disaster resilient as well as take advantage of possible synergies (e.g. with investments for adaptation to climate change) and ensure that development projects and programmes do not inadvertently enhance the risk of disasters. Another argument for mainstreaming is that budget support, both at general and sectoral level, is increasingly becoming the preferred aid modality and that DRR concerns risk not being addressed if they have not been sufficiently mainstreamed in the first place.¹⁸ The mainstreaming of DRR should concern both partner countries and the EU (European Commission and the EU Member States).

However, the vision of DRR fully integrated into partner countries' development policies, planning and budgets is far from reality. Mainstreaming may not necessarily cost a lot, but it takes time before result become evident and requires long-term commitment both on the part of donors and partner countries. Therefore, it seems more opportune to opt for a dual approach: that is, combining mainstreaming of DRR with targeted DRR action, given that they are both needed for the moment and are mutually supportive. Examples of such targeted action could include key risk reduction investments with great immediate impact and good potential for replication, for example regional early warning systems.

Moreover, it may be helpful to identify some general principles to guide the strategy and subsequent implementation. Some proposed principles are found below:

- Primacy of national ownership of development strategies and processes. Partner countries should be in the lead for integrating DRR into development.
- Respect the principle of subsidiarity (implementing responsibilities at local, national, regional and global levels, role of specialised agencies)
- Ensure linkage to relevant cross-cutting issues and themes, in particular climate change and gender
- One size does not fit all; specific measures may need to be designed for individual regions, countries and localities.
- Ensure focus on the most disaster-prone and poorest countries of the world and on high risk groups and communities within those countries.
- Ensure broad stakeholder participation, particularly at the community level, in policy formulation and implementation.

¹⁸ Where donors provide Direct Budget Support, it is important that they work with governments to encourage a greater focus on community-based DRR approaches. Donors should also continue to engage directly with civil society to ensure that community-based approaches are constantly refined.

Questions

- Do you agree with the proposed dual approach? If not, how do you look at integration/mainstreaming?
- How can we progress with mainstreaming within the EU and within partner countries? Where is the greatest need for progress (for example among sectors, departments and processes)?
- What lessons have your organisation learned in mainstreaming DRR which would be helpful to the EU and others going through a similar process?
- Are these the right principles for a meaningful contribution to DRR efforts?
- How can linkages be ensured with relevant cross-cutting issues? How can synergies be enhanced with wider policy processes and themes?

2.4. Strategic areas for intervention

Sub-section 2.2 above proposes an overall objective and three strategic objectives. In order to achieve these objectives, there is a need to identify strategic areas for intervention. The following areas, which are in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action and international efforts by ISDR and other organisations, are proposed for consideration:

- (1) **Integrate disaster risk reduction better into development and humanitarian policies and planning as well as into crisis response when it concerns disaster response and recovery** - this should include support for better integration of DRR into partner countries' policies and strategies as well as into EU donors' own programming to ensure the sustainability of investments and enhance resilience to disasters. The integration should aim at over-arching development policies and frameworks as well as sectoral policies and strategies, and inter-linkages with cross-cutting issues and themes. Resources should be made available to support this process of mainstreaming within the European Commission, EU Member States and partner countries.

Successful integration also presupposes political commitment both on the part of donors and partner countries and well rooted engagement of non-state actors and vulnerable groups. Indeed, the commitment of national leaders is key to achieving visibility for disaster risk reduction and creating a culture of disaster risk reduction at all levels. Developing countries should be empowered to take the lead on DRR, including by improving their governance structures and processes. The EU has also an advocacy role to play, both internally and externally, to increase the visibility of, and demonstrate the need and benefits of DRR action.

- (2) **Improve identification, and assessment and sharing of disaster risk, and support specific strategies and measures for DRR** - Hazards and vulnerability factors are dynamic and their potential impacts vary. Greater knowledge of hazards, particularly in the context of increasing climate change, and vulnerability

enables communities and countries to better understand and anticipate future hazards and can help them minimize the risk of disasters and protect life, livelihoods, infrastructure and ecosystems. Current analytical gaps¹⁹ make it necessary to strengthen risk analysis capacities, promote integrated vulnerability and capacity assessment, upgrade data monitoring stations and capacity for reliable early warning, and improve loss/damage assessment in order to develop specific mitigation and prevention measures and strengthen resilience to disasters. Capacity building and instruments to ensure that early warning will make ‘the last mile’ to benefit the communities and people most at risk will be vital in this process.

- (3) **Develop and strengthen DRR institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels** – the integration of DRR into development needs a strong institutional basis to be implemented. The development and strengthening of the institutional framework can be facilitated through several means, including through capacity-building for local, national, regional authorities; good governance, promotion of appropriate policies and legislation; facilitating information, including on best practices, and effective coordination mechanisms. All stakeholders need to be involved, including communities, civil society organisations and the private sector, especially through supporting community-based preparedness activities. In addition, governments could provide incentives/support for responsible corporate behaviour and Public-private partnerships, which are particularly important to developing (affordable) insurance mechanisms against disasters. With regard to bridging the humanitarian and development spheres, national capacities for undertaking post disaster damage and needs assessments and prepare plans for recovery and reconstruction through a DRR lens should be developed or strengthened.

Support should also be provided to strengthening the international system's capacity to reduce disaster risk and ensuring that international commitments are translated into action. Harmonisation of EU donor responses to maximise aid effectiveness is equally important.

- (4) **Enhance knowledge and public awareness of DRR** – disasters can be reduced substantially if people are well informed about the risk they may face and about possible options and measures they can take to reduce vulnerability and better prepare themselves; and if they are motivated to act. Support should be given for expanded research capacity and dissemination of results related to DRR, education, training, and generation and access to information (statistics and data) to enhance the knowledge base; as well as communication and dissemination of this information to relevant authorities and local populations in order to empower people to protect their livelihoods and make them more resilient against disasters.
- (5) **Address and reduce the underlying risk factors** – vulnerability to natural hazards is increased in many ways, for example through poverty, poor land-use planning and housing, poor governance, lack of social and financial safety-nets, environmental degradation, gender inequalities and climate change. When addressing these underlying risk factors, the EU will make use of the full range of

¹⁹ A key gap is that community assessments are not linked with national & regional assessments.

its instruments and will ensure that appropriate linkages are made with specific initiatives, for example the implementation of the Global Climate Change Alliance²⁰, the EU Action Plan on climate and development²¹, the FLEGT-partnerships, etc.

These proposed strategic priorities for intervention will be implemented through concrete actions which will be further identified during this consultation process.

Questions

- Do you agree that the strategic areas for intervention identified above are the most relevant to vulnerable developing countries and societies? Should the Strategy be even more focussed, or would you include other areas as well?
- What specific actions would you identify under the five intervention areas? How could progress in implementation of such actions be best monitored, through targets, benchmarks, indicators at local, national and international levels? What indicators of DRR mainstreaming should be used to measure progress?
- Are there certain actions that are best implemented at a certain level (e.g. global, regional, sub-regional, national, local)?
- Which entities or organisations would be the most suited, in terms of experience and comparative advantage, for implementing specific actions (e.g. international organisations, inter-governmental bodies, national governments, non-governmental organisations, community based organisations, private sector)?
- Which cases of best DRR practices do you know of? Examples?

2.5. Implementation, complementarity and coordination

The EU will implement the EU Strategy for DRR in developing countries in the spirit of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness building on active coordination mechanisms, promoting in-country coordination, increasing EU policy-dialogue on disaster risk reduction in developing countries, and harmonising methodologies. When DRR action will be addressed through bilateral means, complementary will be ensured with global initiatives such as the World Bank's Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) and the Global Risk Initiative Programme (GRIP). The EU will also work closely with other non-EU donors, the UN Agencies, and international and community NGOs, such as the Federation of the Red Cross.

As regards funding, the majority of the EU Member States (eighteen) and the Commission are funding DRR efforts in developing countries on a regular basis. Funding for DRR comes either from development or humanitarian aid budgets, or both.²² As to

²⁰ COM(2007) 540 final

²¹ Council document 15164/04

²² EU Member States' and the Commission's replies to the "Monterrey survey 2008" (section 7: exogenous shocks) monitoring Europe's delivery on ten commitments that were made to improve

the level of engagement, some ten Member States and the Commission are currently stepping up support for DRR in various ways, including through policy and institutional approaches as well as increased funding.²³ In view of limited ODA and in an aid effectiveness perspective, it makes sense that the EU Member States and the Commission work together rather than separately.

The EU Strategy for DRR in developing countries should take advantage of this momentum and make sure that the vast experience that exists within the EU as regards disaster risk management in developing countries is being used to best effect. This include for example DRR work done in EU Member States through bilateral cooperation and in the Commission under geographical and thematic programmes for all developing country regions and the DIPECHO and Drought Preparedness programmes, as well as EC research as it relates to developing countries. The EU should for example explore how to scale up from community level projects/programmes to working more systematically with governments and building on experiences of communities to do this. Building further on the DIPECHO's community based programmes could be one way of doing this.

In addition to EU Member States' funding instruments, the Commission's main funding instruments for DRR include geographic funding for Country and Regional Strategy Papers for all developing regions, Intra-ACP resources (European Development Fund-EDF) and Drought Preparedness and DIPECHO and programmes as well as the Instrument for Stability.²⁴ Other relevant/complementary instruments include the thematic programmes on Food Security and Environment and Natural Resources, Non State Actors/local governments thematic programme and Research²⁵ budget and Joint Research Centre (JRC) Instruments²⁶.

Financing for Development in the spirit of the 2002 Monterrey Consensus. The data provided does not provide the breakdown between DRR financed form development or humanitarian aid budgets respectively.

²³ Idem. Measures included policy and institutional approaches, including a distinct DRR and development policy (UK), inter-ministerial cooperation, working papers and guidelines (three MS + Cion). Four Member States and the Commission are stepping up bilateral support for DRR at the country and regional level, both by ways of projects/programmes and enhanced mainstreaming. On the multilateral level, four Member States indicated their support for the UN ISDR system in support of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action. Four Member States are also supporting the World Bank's Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction (GFDRR). Finally, two Member States (UK and LUX) have made a quantitative commitment to dedicate a certain percentage of their budgets for disaster response to DRR (10% and 5% respectively).

²⁴ For example, 9th EDF has funded the Global Index Insurance Facility (GIIF)²⁴ for an amount of € 25 million, as well as the first phase of the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility²⁴ for an amount of € 12 million. As regards, the 10th EDF (2008-2013), at least € 100 million has been proposed by the Commission for DRR, with a part of this going to the second phase of the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility. Furthermore, funding for the Drought Preparedness and Dipecho programmes have been increased and the recently launched Global Climate Change Alliance has identified DRR as one of its strategic priorities. Other DRR activities included the post-tsunami programme and country and regional DRR programmes in India, Bangladesh, the Caribbean and the Southern Mediterranean regions.

²⁵ The EC supports a lot of hazards and disaster-related research under the 7th Framework Programme for research in particular in the frame of the Environment programme which has a sub-activity devoted

Finally, DRR is an important part of adaptation to climate change. Thus, some consideration should be given to further explore how funding streams could be better aligned and how innovative non-ODA funding can be mobilised for the benefit of both DRR and adaptation; and for the front-loading of resources.

Questions

- How can the EU best coordinate its efforts in order to implement the EU Strategy on DRR in developing countries in the most efficient way?
- Taking into account other development priorities, do you think that funding for DRR needs to be scaled up? If yes, why?
- How can the necessary resources for DRR be generated?
- What existing initiatives on DRR do you think the EU should be supportive of?
- What lessons can you share from your work within the area of disaster risk reduction, including with mainstreaming, that would be useful for the implementation of the Strategy?

3. CONSULTATION PROCESS AND NEXT STEPS

The calendar for the process and adoption of the Communication/Strategy is the following:

April-June	Wide stakeholder consultation, including a web-based consultation and informal consultations with developing country partners, EU Member States, civil society and other key stakeholders, including International Financing Institutions, UN bodies, etc.
May-September	Development of the Strategy, including Commission-wide consultation and translation.
October	Adoption of the Strategy by the European Commission and transmission of the document to the EU and the Council.

to natural hazards. The core areas are related to hazard assessment, vulnerability, management of risks and multirisk and mitigation.

²⁶ For example: GMES (Global Monitoring for Environment and Security), European Drought Observatory and Global Early Warning System for Desertification, CriTech (Crisis Monitoring and Response Technologies).