



Brussels, 16/09/2008

D(2008) 7392

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries**
(draft version of 11 August 2008)

Lead DG **DG DEV**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

The Commission announced its intention to propose a EU Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in developing countries in the Commission Green Paper on "Adapting to climate change in Europe - options for EU action" (COM (2007) 354) and in the Communication on "Reinforcing the Union's Disaster Response Capacity" (COM (2008) 130). The proposed strategy is part of a Commission package on disaster risk reduction, addressing both the internal and external dimensions of disaster risk reduction. The Commission is also preparing a communication concerning the internal dimension of the strategy: "Towards a comprehensive Community strategy for the prevention of natural and manmade disasters".

(B) Positive aspects

The report is written in an accessible manner. The challenge of disaster risk prevention and reduction is clearly outlined, while the analysis is kept short proportionately to the general nature of a proposal for a strategy.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance.

General recommendation: This proportionate draft IA requires some significant changes. Three aspects in particular should be developed and clarified. Firstly, the description of the strategy should be made more concrete and operational, including by outlining to what extent this initiative addresses current fragmentation of efforts and to what extent its focus is on anticipating possible fragmentation in the future. Secondly, the report should clarify what difference the strategy will make in terms

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 1111. Office: BERL 6/29. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 2981898. Fax: (32-2) 2965960.

of process and results in comparison to the current situation. Thirdly, the report should explain the links between the strategy and other EU or international initiatives with an impact on disaster risk reduction. Lastly, the sources of funding of the strategy, notably within the context of the ACP Convention, should be made more explicit. During its meeting with the Board, DG DEV agreed to revise this impact assessment on this basis.

(1) Clarify the specific content, approach and intended outcomes of the strategy.

The report should describe in more operational terms the functioning of the strategy, the budgetary aspects and the way in which the options for detailed design of the strategy will be presented. In particular, the opportunities for regional cooperation and synergies, for example on hurricane risk reduction and prevention in the Caribbean, should be highlighted. The report should be clear to what extent this initiative addresses current fragmentation of efforts and to what extent its focus is on anticipating possible fragmentation in the future.

(2) Clarify the added value of the strategy in relation to the current situation. The report should provide some concrete examples of disasters where the existence of an EU strategy would have made a significant difference in comparison to the current situation. The report should demonstrate the strategy's added value in relation to the Hyogo strategy and to the already ongoing coordination of EU development policy (e.g. in ensuring the coherence of Community policy and its complementarity with the Member States' national aid programmes aimed at disaster risk reduction). The report should also give examples of existing duplication of efforts which this initiative would remove.

(3) Clarify how the strategy will be linked to existing initiatives. The report should recognise and describe more precisely the links with other initiatives contributing to disaster risk reduction like GMES, and measures taken in the context of the Climate Change Adaptation strategy.

(D) Procedure and presentation

An executive summary should be added. Subsidiarity aspects should be discussed in a separate section.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2008/DEV+/004 (catalogue initiative)
Author DG	DGDEV
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	10 September 2008
Date of adoption of Opinion	18/09/2008