



Transforming the commitment into action

EU progress with mainstreaming
disaster risk reduction



Transforming the commitment into action

EU progress with mainstreaming
disaster risk reduction

‘The challenge ahead is to transform this commitment [the Hyogo Framework] into action in developing countries where it is needed most. We must do more to reduce the burden of disasters on the poor and most vulnerable.’

EU statement at the 60th Session of the UN General Assembly
New York, November 2005

Contents

Terminology	4
Executive Summary	7
1 Introduction	11
2 European Commission public positions on Disaster Preparedness and Prevention	13
3 The positions of ECHO, DG DEV, DG RELEX and the European Parliament	15
3.1 ECHO	15
3.2 DG DEV	16
3.3 DG RELEX	18
3.4 European Parliament	19
4 Conclusions and recommendations	21
5 Appendix: Monitoring the EU	23

Terminology

Acronyms

ACP countries	A grouping of 77 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries, mostly former colonies, with which the EU has a special relationship defined by the Cotonou Agreement. This includes additional financing through the EDF.
CSP	Country Strategy Paper that sets out the EC's approach to development in a country for a six-year period
DIPECHO	Disaster Preparedness Programme of ECHO
DPP	Disaster Preparedness and Prevention – EU term for DRR
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction – the term used by Tearfund, DFID and the UN system (see page 5 for definition)
EC The 'Commission'	European Commission
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
EDF	European Development Fund: funding for ACP states made available by some member states on a voluntary basis. This is separate from European Commission budget lines for development. The 9th EDF runs until 2007.
GAERC 'Council'	The General Affairs and External Relations Council of the EU. It brings together the foreign ministers of member states in monthly meetings. Ministers responsible for European affairs, defence, development or trade also participate, depending on the items on the agenda. It holds separate meetings on general affairs and on external relations respectively.
JPA	Joint Parliamentary Assembly
NIP	National Indicative Programme – an action plan for half of the period of a CSP
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
RSP	Regional Strategy Paper that sets out the EC's approach to development in a region for a six-year period
UN-ISDR	The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) is a platform to enable societies to increase their resilience to disasters and to reduce associated losses. A range of United Nations organisations and international partners participate in cooperation with governments and civil society organisations.

‘Disaster risk reduction’

Disaster management terminology is notoriously confusing, and can be misleading. Therefore, it is important at the outset to establish what Tearfund defines as disaster risk reduction.

The expression ‘disaster risk reduction’ is now widely used as a term that encompasses the two aspects of a disaster reduction strategy: mitigation and preparedness. Tearfund defines mitigation as the measures that can be undertaken to minimise the impact of hazards and thus lessen the magnitude of a disaster. We define preparedness as all measures undertaken before a hazard to ensure that communities are aware of hazards and are able to take precautionary measures in advance, and respond to their impact. This may include an organisation’s delivery of timely and effective rescue, relief and other post-disaster assistance.

(The EU refers to DRR as disaster preparedness and prevention (DPP). It defines prevention as: *Activities conceived to ensure a permanent protection against a disaster ... These activities reduce the physical vulnerability and/or exposure to risks through infrastructures and through improving existing infrastructures and sustainable development practices.*)

It is important to note that disaster risk management focuses on **vulnerability reduction** and is therefore distinct from conventional crisis or disaster management. The UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN-ISDR) states:

The subject of disaster risk reduction in the modern era draws its relevance largely from earlier contributions and previous practices in the field of civil defence and later disaster management. In this respect, the traditional focus has been on the preparation and improved operational capacities for more timely and effective response to an impending event ... In many places political commitment and the allocation of resources to address hazardous conditions have been concentrated overwhelmingly on short-term emergency contingencies.

By contrast, in more recent years ... those people associated most closely with affected populations ... are progressively recognising the essential public value of sustained efforts to reduce the social, economic and environmental costs of natural hazards. This translates into the need for much greater attention of protective strategies which can contribute to saving lives and protecting property and resources before they are lost. It is for this reason that a more holistic approach that emphasises vulnerability and risk factors has coalesced around the concept of risk reduction, or disaster risk management.¹

Therefore the focus of this study was on measuring EU support for vulnerability reduction, including through community-based measures, rather than its operational capacity for effective response.

‘Mainstreaming’

Mainstreaming means expanding and enhancing disaster risk reduction so that it becomes normal practice, fully institutionalised within an agency’s relief and development agenda. It has three purposes:

¹ UN-ISDR (2004), *Living with Risk: a global review of disaster reduction initiatives*

- To make certain that the development programmes and projects that originate from or are funded by an agency are designed with evident consideration for potential disaster risks and to resist hazard impact.
- To make certain that all the development programmes and projects that originate from or are funded by an agency do not inadvertently increase vulnerability to disaster in all sectors: social, physical, economic and environmental.
- To make certain that all the disaster relief and rehabilitation programmes and projects that originate from or are funded by an agency are designed to contribute to developmental aims and reduce future disaster risk.

Executive summary

Disasters are becoming increasingly frequent, and threaten the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals. Disaster risk reduction (DRR) should be a key element of sustainable development, and in fact is a prerequisite of sustainable development in hazard-prone environments. The European Union is the world's largest donor of development aid and one of the main donors of humanitarian assistance. It is therefore crucial that it has a clear, comprehensive and time-bound strategy for integrating disaster risk reduction into its relief and development policy and practice. Tearfund commissioned this study in November 2005 to determine EU progress with mainstreaming DRR.

The study found that European Commission (EC) statements contain a commitment to support disaster preparedness and prevention (DPP),² and to develop a strategy to address the needs of vulnerable countries including some indication of what elements of that strategy might include. However, to date there has not been a comprehensive statement of what the strategy will involve, or an Action Plan to 'transform the commitment into action'. In July 2005, the Council of Ministers asked for more complete proposals as soon as possible (see page 13: The European Commission: public positions on DPP).

The EU needs to make significantly more progress with systematically integrating – or 'mainstreaming' – DPP into its development policy and programming. Barriers to mainstreaming being experienced by the Commission include a lack of understanding of the concept and practice of DPP; lack of staff ownership of the issue within development divisions; and ultimately lack of institutional capacity to support the mainstreaming process in the form of dedicated, well-informed staff, technical support and strong leadership.³

The study focused on three services within the European Commission: the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), DG Development (DG DEV) and DG External Relations (DG RELEX). It also looked at the European Parliament.

European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO)

ECHO is widely acknowledged to have led the process of bringing DPP into the activities of the Commission. It now has 'four pillars' for its work on DPP:

- The Disaster Preparedness Programme of ECHO (DIPECHO)
- Integration of DPP into ECHO humanitarian operations
- Advocacy for the integration of DPP across the Commission and by other development funders
- Strengthening the preparedness of mandated international agencies

ECHO, particularly DIPECHO, is a key player in promoting DPP 'mainstreaming' across the Commission. However, ECHO needs to free up staff time for leadership on this (see page 15: ECHO).

² The Commission's term for disaster risk reduction

³ These 'barriers' are common to many donor organisations: see Appendix

DG Development (DG DEV)

Two themes have run through DG DEV's approach to DPP since early 2005:

The adoption of the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility

The Joint ACP-EU Council of Ministers agreed to the Facility in June 2005. In the first phase, €12 million will be spent on capacity building. The ACP Secretariat has requested a further €50 million for the second phase of the Facility. Indications from DG DEV are that it is reluctant to agree to the continuation of the Facility, as it does not want to establish a new instrument with associated staffing implications. Instead, DG DEV hopes to integrate DPP into Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and Regional Strategy Papers (RSPs).

The integration of DPP into Country and Regional Strategy Papers, 2007–2012

The Commission made public statements in late 2005 that DG DEV will integrate DPP into the next round of CSPs for ACP countries, due to take effect in January 2007. Whilst this commitment is welcome, it appears that the Commission has not correctly anticipated what support should be in place to ensure a successful process, or taken adequate steps to provide this. If the process is not properly supported, then this could mean that competition and lack of information and confidence result in DPP appearing in very few CSPs (see page 16: DG Development).

DG External Relations (DG RELEX)

There is no clear coordination of DPP within DG RELEX. Whilst RELEX is involved in DPP-related activities, DPP is not systematically integrated in its development cooperation. However, the Latin America Directorate has already integrated DPP into strategy papers. There is a need to ensure that the Asia Directorate also acts to integrate DPP into forthcoming strategy papers (see page 18: DG RELEX).

The European Parliament

The European Parliament has played a key role in promoting DPP – through the Carlotti report of December 2002 and subsequent resolution, and through the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly Social Affairs and Environment Standing Committee in 2005. A resolution of the ACP-EU JPA of November 2005 calls on the EU to allocate additional financial resources to the Natural Disaster Facility, and urges the Commission to enshrine disaster preparedness and prevention systematically in all EC external relations aid programmes (see page 19: The European Parliament).

Tearfund's recommendations:

- 1** The Commission should have a clear strategy and action plan setting out how the different services will work in a coordinated way on DPP. As an initial confidence-building step, the Commission should ensure that each relevant service has a focal point for DPP and there is a functioning cross-service working group.
- 2** The Commission should ensure that the relevant Directorate-Generals (especially DG DEV and DG RELEX) have a strategy and capacity to enable them to integrate DPP into all external aid programmes and instruments in disaster-prone countries. These should include CSPs, RSPs and National Indicative Programmes (NIPs) where appropriate.
- 3** DG DEV should take adequate steps to provide resources for integration of DPP into CSPs and NIPs for 2007–2012 for key countries. This would include: clear leadership; a dedicated 'champion of the cause'; additional capacity; and support to enhance skills, knowledge and understanding.

Where recipient governments in disaster-prone countries do not view DPP as a priority, the EC should engage in non-coercive dialogue with them.

- 4** The Commission must ensure that the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility does not become a distraction from ensuring that integration of DPP into CSPs and RSPs takes place.
- 5** ECHO needs to free up time for more leadership on DPP, with dedicated, well-resourced staff to ensure internal coordination, undertake advocacy and manage relations with other Commission services.

Introduction

Hazards are having an increasing impact on societies because of rising levels of human vulnerability. Helping vulnerable people reduce disaster risks is a core priority for Tearfund. This includes working to increase donor government commitment to implementing pro-poor disaster risk reduction policies and practices. Significantly, there is now a strong global mandate for this in the Hyogo Framework for Action agreed at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) in January 2005.

The purpose of this study was to determine EU progress with mainstreaming disaster risk reduction (DRR) into its relief and development policy and practice. In 2003, Tearfund research on institutional donor policy on DRR⁴ found that, within the European Commission, disaster risk reduction was not awarded sufficient attention outside ECHO. An ECHO working paper produced in 2003 confirmed this, observing that disaster risk reduction is '*not systematically enshrined in all EC external relations aid programmes and related legal documents*'.⁵

Tearfund has now expanded on the research undertaken in 2003 by looking in more depth at the level of priority placed by the EU on DRR measures within its relief and particularly development policy and practice. A consultant carried out the study in December 2005 and January 2006 through desk-based research and correspondence (including interviews) with Commission officials and other key stakeholders.

The following services are all involved in what the Commission refers to as disaster preparedness and prevention (DPP):

DG	Responsibility for response to poverty	Commissioner
ECHO	All short-term responses to humanitarian crises.	Louis Michel
DEV (Development)	Development policy and development aid to Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.	Louis Michel
RELEX (External Relations)	Development aid to Latin America and Asia.	Benita Ferrero-Waldner
EuropeAid (or AIDCO)	Implementation of all the external aid instruments of the EC that are funded by the EC budget and the European Development Fund.	Benita Ferrero-Waldner

⁴ Tearfund (2003), *Natural Disaster Risk Reduction: the policy and practice of selected institutional donors*

⁵ ECHO (2003), *Disaster Preparedness and Prevention (DPP): State of play and strategic orientations for EC policy*

In addition to these services, several other Directorate-Generals have an involvement in DPP. These include Environment, Information Society, and Research. However, as the focus of this study was on the integration of DPP into relief and development policy and programming, the study assessed ECHO, DG DEV and DG RELEX.

The study revealed that, while ECHO has taken positive action to integrate DPP into its humanitarian operations, DG DEV and RELEX need to make significantly more progress

with systematically integrating DPP into development planning and programming. This report presents the findings of the study in detail and offers five recommendations for action. The Appendix describes a practical tool that the EU could use to measure and monitor its progress with mainstreaming DPP.

2 The European Commission: public positions on DPP

In a communication in February 2002,⁶ the Commission made a public commitment to *'integrate disaster prevention into European Union development and environment policies'*. This was reiterated in several key documents and statements in 2005:

January 2005

On 21 January, 2005, José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, spoke on the **Tsunami and Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response** at the General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC).⁷ This was in response to a proposal for an EU Action Plan from the Luxembourg Presidency. He indicated that the Commission was developing a five-point action plan including *'reinforced preventive measures, early warning and disaster preparedness'* and stated that *'the Commission will come forward with a strategy to address the needs of countries prone to natural disasters.'*

April 2005

In April 2005 the Commission issued a communication entitled **Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response in Third Countries**⁸ which was a formal response to the EU Action Plan. Although the emphasis within the document is on the response to the South Asia tsunami, and enhanced responses to disasters, it had an encouraging statement based upon the Hyogo Framework for Action:

'Reflecting this strategic framework, the Commission will put particular emphasis on:

- *Integrating disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and into programmes in countries that have been affected by disaster;*
- *Strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels that can build resilience to hazards and disaster preparedness, both inside and outside the EU;*
- *Development of people-centered early warning, better management and exchange of information on risks and protection, education and training;*
- *Identifying, assessing and monitoring disaster risks, enhancing early warning;*
- *Reducing the underlying risk factors.'*

July 2005

GAERC reviewed the communication on 18 July, 2005, along with other documents relating to civil protection. In its published conclusions, it *'invites the Commission to submit as soon as possible more complete proposals on strengthening preventive action, inspired by the terms of the Civil Protection Action Programme, the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015 and the European Union Action Plan on the earthquakes and tsunamis in the Indian Ocean, and enhancing detection and early warning systems in general, and in particular for the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean.'*⁹

⁶ *Towards a Global Partnership for Sustainable Development*, COM (2002) 82 final, 13.2.02

⁷ Speaking Points for GAERC, Brussels, 31.1.05

⁸ COM (2005), 153 final, 20.4.05

⁹ *Official Journal of the European Union*, 1.12.05

December 2005

In December 2005 the **European Consensus on Development**¹⁰ was signed, reflecting a joint position agreed by member state development ministers, the Commission and Parliament. Again, the document contained broad statements indicating support for DPP (on pages 9, 17, 20, 26) including:

- [Para 22.] *‘Some developing countries are particularly vulnerable to natural disasters, climate change, environmental degradation and external economic shocks. The Member States and the Community will support disaster prevention and preparedness in these countries, with a view to increasing their resilience in the face of these challenges.’*
- [Para 89] *‘The Community, within the respective competences of its institutions, will develop a comprehensive prevention approach to state fragility, conflict, natural disasters and other types of crises.’*

EU Action Plan on Climate Change

The Commission has also acknowledged DPP in the **EU Action Plan on Climate Change in the context of Development Cooperation**¹¹ that GAERC adopted in November 2004. The Action Plan recognises the links between climate change adaptation and DPP, with sub-actions to *‘build on work linking adaptation measures to disaster preparedness and prevention concerns’*¹² and *‘examine ways to mainstream disaster preparedness and prevention into EU development cooperation. Draw on the expertise of research institutions and civil society representatives’*.¹³

Summary

Commission statements contain a commitment to support DPP, to develop a strategy to address the needs of vulnerable countries, and some indication of what elements of that strategy might include. However, there has not been a comprehensive statement of what the strategy will involve, or an Action Plan similar to that for Climate Change. Council has asked for more complete proposals as soon as possible.

¹⁰ Joint statement by the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission on the European Union Development Policy, signed 20.12.05

¹¹ *EU Action Plan on Climate Change in the Context of Development Cooperation*, Brussels, 24.11.04

¹² Action 1.2.2

¹³ Action 1.2.3

3 The positions of ECHO, DG DEV, DG RELEX and the European Parliament

3.1 ECHO

ECHO is widely acknowledged to have led the process of bringing DPP into the activities of the European Commission. This started with the establishment of DIPECHO in 1996.

DIPECHO provides funding to NGO-managed community projects in six regions: Andean Community, Caribbean, Central America, Central Asia, South Asia and South-East Asia (with the possibility of a special programme for drought preparedness in the Horn of Africa starting in 2007). Between 1996 and 2004 DIPECHO provided more than €78 million for more than 319 projects worldwide. In this, DIPECHO sees its role as a strategic one, using the funding of its projects to bring about more widespread adoption of DPP. So, one of the criteria used in the selection of DIPECHO's projects is the potential for replication, or to make a strategic input at national or regional level.

DIPECHO's budget has been growing with increased recognition of the importance of DPP. From being approximately €8 million per year from 1996 to 2003, it was increased to €14 million for 2004, and it is now confirmed that it will be €19 million in 2006.

Due to ECHO's mandate as a disaster response agency, much of DIPECHO's funding has been for disaster preparedness rather than prevention. However, DIPECHO has recognised the importance of prevention, and has sought to promote it with other agencies. Following a review in 2003, ECHO has four 'pillars' for its work on DPP:

- The DIPECHO programme
- Integration of DPP into ECHO humanitarian operations – ECHO will now accept proposals with both relief and DPP components. ECHO put DPP into the objectives of the decision statements for the responses to both the South Asia tsunami (2004) and the Pakistan earthquake (2005). For example, reconstruction of houses in Pakistan should be based upon earthquake-resistant designs.
- Advocacy for DPP mainstreaming across the Commission and by other development funders.
- Strengthening the preparedness of mandated international agencies such as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

Mainstreaming disaster preparedness is clearly within ECHO's strategy for 2006. The strategy states: *'The tsunami has shown the importance of integrating disaster preparedness into humanitarian aid operations, but also – at a higher level and for longer term – into development cooperation ... DG ECHO intends to press for the introduction of a disaster preparedness dimension into development policies and into development cooperation, and for a better articulation and complementarity between the different levels of intervention ...'*¹⁴

In 2005, a group of DIPECHO desk officers and experts formed to look at the best way to promote and mainstream disaster preparedness in relief operations, and engage more

¹⁴ ECHO (2006), *Operational Strategy*

proactively in the Commission's 'linking relief, rehabilitation and development' (LRRD) process with other stakeholders.¹⁵ Using this expertise, ECHO now needs to define a more focused strategy and design appropriate tools (including training) to be used by all ECHO staff. The need for a dedicated person on DPP at ECHO headquarters has been recognised, to ensure internal coordination, undertake advocacy and manage relations with other Commission services and international stakeholders. Once ECHO has a focused strategy and dedicated staff, it could make rapid progress.

Pressure from the European Parliament has played a significant role in the growth of ECHO's work on DPP. The Parliamentary resolution of January 2003, which stipulated that five per cent of humanitarian expenditure should go to DPP, has been key (see SECTION 3.4). Consequently, DIPECHO's budget has increased. For 2006, Parliament actually requested that DIPECHO's budget be increased from the proposed €15 million to €25 million. A compromise of €19 million was reached.

Summary

ECHO, particularly DIPECHO, is a key player in promoting DPP mainstreaming across the Commission. However, ECHO needs to have dedicated, well-resourced staff for leadership on this.

3.2 DG Development

Two major themes have been running through DG DEV's approach to DPP since early 2005:

- The adoption of the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility in mid-2005
- The integration of DPP into the next round of Country and Regional Strategy Papers, to cover the period 2007–2012.

DG DEV's recent, more active approach to DPP reflects pressure from ECHO staff, as well as the coincidence of the South Asia tsunami and the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005, which caused interest in what should be done to prevent similar catastrophes.

3.2.1 The ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility

The Joint ACP-EU Council of Ministers agreed to the Facility in June 2005, following a formal request from the ACP Secretariat for Commission support for DPP within ACP countries. This was driven by Caribbean states. The request was for a facility modelled on other Commission facilities (such as Water, Energy and Peace), to be managed jointly by the ACP Secretariat and the Commission. DG DEV tasked an experienced official to manage its response. The modalities of the Facility were published in May 2005.¹⁶

The ACP Secretariat requested €50 million for the Facility. However, it was decided at a joint ACP-EU Council meeting (following a proposal from the Commission) that €12 million would be assigned for the first phase of the Facility from intra-ACP funds from the 9th EDF. (It was also requested that a considerable amount be set aside for DPP in the

¹⁵ A Commission communication on linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD) was adopted in 1996

¹⁶ *Modalities for an ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility*, ACP Secretariat, Brussels, 18.05.2005

10th EDF.) There is now agreement that the €12 million will be divided equally between six regional institutions for capacity building, and the proposals are with EuropeAid for processing.

The ACP Secretariat has requested a further €50 million for the second phase of the Facility, from new funds from outside the 9th and 10th EDFs. Indications from DG DEV are that it is reluctant to agree to the continuation of the Facility, as it does not want to establish a new instrument with associated staffing implications. Instead, DG DEV is intending to integrate DPP into the next generation of CSPs and RSPs (2007–2012).

3.2.2 The integration of DPP into Country and Regional Strategy Papers

The next round of CSPs and RSPs should take effect in January 2007 for most papers. Funding does not flow until the more detailed National Indicative Programme (NIP) is approved for a three-year period (eg: 2007–09, 2010–2012). So, the CSPs and RSPs need to be completed by mid-2006 so the NIPs can be based on them.

The Commission made public statements in late 2005 that DG DEV is looking to integrate DPP into the next round of CSPs for ACP countries. ECHO's DG, António Cavaco, stated this at the ECHO Partners' Conference on 8 December, as did Commissioner Louis Michel in a speech in Geneva on 12 December.¹⁷

Whilst this commitment is welcome, there is cause for doubt over whether the Commission has correctly anticipated what support should be in place to ensure a successful process, or taken adequate steps to provide this. The CSP¹⁸ is negotiated in-country between the Commission delegation and the recipient government and organisations. A CSP is intended to reflect priorities for the government, but in reality the delegation often initiates the process, and hands over a draft for response. The CSP is usually limited to a few focal sectors. So, the challenge for integrating DPP into CSPs is to ensure that delegations are sufficiently aware of the case for DPP to raise it with the national government as a potential priority. The other challenge is to ensure that governments see the advantage of having DPP as a focal sector among other competing demands, particularly those with more immediate and predictable benefits.

17 *Lessons from the 2005 'annus horribilis': improving effectiveness, timeliness and equity of the international humanitarian response. The European Commission's view on the reform of the international humanitarian system, Inter Agency Standing Committee, Geneva, 12.12.05*

18 All references to CSPs also imply RSPs, where RSPs are applicable.

19 Inter-American Development Bank (2005), *Draft Disaster Risk Management Policy*

To meet this challenge, it may be necessary for the Commission to engage in 'dialogue' with recipient governments in order to raise awareness of the importance of DPP. The Inter-American Development Bank views dialogue as an important component of its mainstreaming agenda, asserting, *'The Bank will seek to include discussion on proactive disaster risk management in the dialogue agenda with borrowing member countries.'*¹⁹ Dialogue is important for awareness-raising but should never have a coercive agenda, recognising that countries have the right to decide their own development priorities.

It is doubtful whether DG DEV has an appropriate approach to ensure that DPP will be adequately reflected in 2007–2012 CSPs. There is no clear DRR 'champion' or focal point within DG DEV. Although there will be a paragraph on DPP within formal instructions to delegations, this doesn't seem adequate to make the case. Some delegations submitted draft CSPs before receiving the guidelines.

Integrating DPP into CSPs could lead to much greater levels of support for DPP long-term than the Natural Disaster Facility; it could be a more sustainable process that would not

require a new bureaucracy. However, if the process is not properly supported, competition with other issues and lack of information and confidence could result in DPP appearing in very few CSPs. There is an immediate need to act to ensure that the process does receive appropriate support.²⁰

Summary

DG DEV has increased its commitment to DPP. It has supported the provision of €12 million for the first phase of the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility. As for the second phase, DG DEV favours the integration of DPP into the CSPs being developed for the ACP countries. However, DG DEV needs to provide significantly more support if this process is to be effective.

3.3 DG RELEX

In April 2005, DG RELEX drafted a Commission-wide coordinated communication entitled **Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response in Third Countries** (see page 13).²¹ This was followed up by a progress report in November 2005.²² The communication and progress report contain sections on Reinforcing Preventive Measures, Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness.

While these documents are a welcome contribution from RELEX to the Commission's work on DPP, there are two important things to note. Firstly, the sections referred to above focus on preparedness significantly more than prevention. Yet, as was pointed out in ECHO's working paper *DPP: State of play and strategic orientations for EC policy*, RELEX should be a main actor in disaster **prevention**:

*'Because of their possibility to integrate DPP into broader development programmes ... other RELEX services should become the main actor in DPP and in particular in preparedness at national level and in prevention. DPP must be integrated within the project cycle, from the identification up to the implementation. ... Nation-wide mitigation and prevention projects ('preventing the disaster from happening') should be tackled by DGs DEV, RELEX and to AIDCO, as well as the institutional support and broad dissemination of best practices.'*²³

Secondly, RELEX must ensure preparedness initiatives incorporate **community-based measures** (such as evacuation training and community hazard mapping), which help to reduce a community's dependence upon external assistance. This is crucial, as most lives are saved in the first few hours of a disaster, and very often emergency relief aid from the international community does not arrive until a few days later. The need for community-based preparedness is stressed by ECHO in the opening paragraphs of its strategy for 2006: *'DG ECHO supports disaster preparedness action within local communities in several regions around the world, so as to help communities react rapidly and in an appropriate manner in case of a disaster, thus allowing many lives to be saved.'*

Finally, regarding the need for systematic integration of DPP into RELEX development cooperation, the communication **does** refer to the need to integrate disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies (SECTION 5.2), but it is not clear how this will be done and by which services.

²⁰ Commissioner Louis Michel has agreed with the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) that the next generation of CSPs for the ACP will be prepared with WMO expertise, in order to 'map the risks for each country' and 'integrate the risk factors in the development programmes'. However, it is important that other agencies with whom the EC liaises such as the UN-ISDR, which have relevant experience and expertise, are also consulted.

²¹ Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM (2005) 153, 20.4.05

²² *Progress Report on the European Commission's Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami of 26 December 2004 and Reinforcing EU Disaster and Crisis Response in Third Countries*, 8.11.05

²³ ECHO (2003), *Disaster Preparedness and Prevention (DPP): State of play and strategic orientations for EC policy*

In terms of measurable DPP action, there are two contrasting aspects to DG RELEX:

- Lack of central coordination of DPP to ensure integration of DPP into development programming. There is currently no focal point or central contact on DPP in RELEX. Members of Unit B4 were involved in leading the writing of COM (2005) 153 in April 2005, but are no longer focused on DPP.
- Strong support for DPP in Latin America. Whilst there is no coordinator for DPP within DG RELEX, the Latin America Directorate has already integrated DPP into strategy papers. For example, the current Regional Strategy for the Andean Community²⁴ and for Central America²⁵ both have DPP as one of their priorities.

Summary

There is no clear coordination of DPP within DG RELEX to ensure integration of DPP into development programming. However, the Latin America Directorate has already integrated DPP into strategy papers. In contrast the Asia Desks are not addressing DPP adequately, and there is a need to ensure that the Asia Directorate acts to integrate DPP into forthcoming CSPs.

3.4 The European Parliament

In December 2002, Maria-Arlette Carlotti MEP presented a report to the Committee on Development and Cooperation responding to ECHO's Annual Report for 2000.²⁶ In a vote in Parliament in January 2003, MEPs overwhelmingly supported the consequent resolution. The recommendations contained significant references to DPP:

Parliament's recommendations following the Carlotti Report

[The European Parliament] ...

- 6 Insists that disaster prevention and preparedness should be considered as priorities in promoting a 'culture of prevention' as a central element of the European Union's external action, and calls on the Commission to include disaster preparedness in all technical cooperation and development programmes*
- 7 Recommends making greater use of new technologies in the field of disaster prevention and preparedness*
- 8 Calls on the branches of the budgetary authority to allocate more resources to risk reduction and recommends that, as part of the aforementioned budgetary increase, funding be significantly stepped up in this area to reach 5% of humanitarian expenditure by 2005 by strengthening this type of action within both DIPECHO's humanitarian operations as such and its capacity-building, awareness-raising and training.*

²⁴ *Regional Strategy: Andean Community of Nations 2002–06*

²⁵ *European Commission Regional Strategy Paper for Central America 2002–06*

²⁶ *Report on the Commission communication on the annual report on humanitarian aid 2000 A5-0433/2002, 10.12.02*

During 2005, the energy within Parliament for DPP came from the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA). With the JPA, parliamentary representatives of the 77 ACP states meet with 77 MEPs in plenary session for one week twice a year. There are also three Standing Committees (Political Affairs; Economic Development, Finance and Trade; and Social Affairs and the Environment) which meet twice a year and draw up

substantive proposals for the next JPA. Social Affairs and the Environment has significant representation from the Caribbean and Small Island States. At the JPA in Edinburgh in November 2005, this Committee presented a report on the causes and consequences of natural disasters.²⁷ The JPA then adopted a resolution on the same issue which called for a number of responses to climate change and support for DPP:

JPA Resolution on causes and consequences of natural disasters Edinburgh, November 2005²⁸

The ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly ...

26 Calls on Member States to focus on the internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration, to provide an overarching framework for global disaster risk reduction and to look for measures to address their vulnerabilities and to build resilience.

27 Whilst appreciating the creation of the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility, which it had requested during its last meeting in Bamako in April 2005, regrets the very low level of resources allocated to the Facility despite the reality of the increasing frequency and intensity of natural disasters and calls on the EU to allocate adequate additional financial resources to the Facility under the 10th EDF and other EU budget lines.

28 Calls upon the Commission to enshrine disaster preparedness and prevention systematically in all EC external relations aid programmes, in Country Strategy Papers and National Indicative Programmes, and in other legal documents; furthermore suggests that a significant share of disaster relief funds should be allocated in support of disaster prevention and preparedness programmes.

Interestingly, the JPA's support for both increased funding for Phase 2 of the Facility, and integration of DPP into strategy papers is at variance with DG DEV's position, which, as mentioned before, is reluctant to agree to the continuation of the Facility.

Summary

The European Parliament has played a key role in promoting DPP – through the Carloti report, and the ACP-EU JPA Social Affairs and Environment Standing Committee in 2005.

²⁷ See www.europarl.eu.int/intcoop/acp/92_01/soc_edinburgh_en.htm for the draft report and amendments.

²⁸ ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly Resolution on causes and consequences of natural disasters. Adopted on 24.11.05 in Edinburgh, UK

4 Conclusions and recommendations

As was observed in ECHO's working paper on DPP, *'the European Union is well placed to assume a leading role in the pursuit of a disaster reduction strategy within the context of global sustainable development.'* In recent years a number of EU member states²⁹ have taken significant steps to integrate disaster reduction into their development processes and practice, but the European Community has not led the way. While ECHO has taken positive action to integrate DPP into its humanitarian operations, there is still a long way to go before DPP is *'systematically enshrined in all EC external relations aid programmes and related legal documents.'*³⁰

As previous Tearfund research on DRR³¹ has indicated, mainstreaming is a complex and lengthy process. It requires strong, high-level leadership at the outset, dedicated staff to champion the cause, technical support, additional capacity, and a strategy for ensuring that staff are well-informed.

Nevertheless, the EU needs to make faster progress on adopting a more systematic approach to reducing disaster risks, not least because there is now a strong mandate for this through the Hyogo Framework for Action. Moreover, with climate change increasing the frequency and severity of extreme weather events, the need for action has never been more urgent.

Recommendation 1

The Commission should have a clear strategy and action plan setting out how the different services will work in a coordinated way to maximise the efficiency of the Commission's response to the Hyogo Framework for Action.

As an initial confidence-building step, the Commission should ensure that each relevant service has a focal point for DPP and that there is a functioning cross-service working group.

LEVERAGE President's statement January 2005 and Council request July 2005.

Recommendation 2

The Commission should ensure that the relevant Directorate-Generals (especially DG DEV and DG RELEX) have a strategy and capacity to enable them to integrate DPP into all external relations aid programmes and instruments in disaster-prone countries, including CSPs, RSPs and NIPs.

LEVERAGE Commitments made in COM (2005) 153, European Consensus on Development, and EU Action Plan on Climate Change. Resolutions of Parliament of January 2003 and ACP-EU JPA of November 2005.

29 Eg: the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida)

30 ECHO (2003), *Disaster Preparedness and Prevention (DPP): State of play and strategic orientations for EC policy*

31 Tearfund (2003), *Natural Disaster Risk Reduction: the policy and practice of selected institutional donors*

Recommendation 3

DG DEV should take adequate steps to provide the resources required for integration of DPP into 2007–2012 CSPs, RSPs and NIPs for key countries. This would include clear leadership; a dedicated ‘champion’; additional capacity; and support to enhance skills, knowledge and understanding.

Where recipient governments in disaster-prone countries do not view DPP as a priority, the Commission should engage in non-coercive dialogue with them.

LEVERAGE Commitments made by Commissioner Louis Michel, and ECHO DG in December 2005.

Recommendation 4

The Commission must ensure that the ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility does not become a distraction from ensuring that DRR is integrated into CSPs and RSPs.³²

LEVERAGE Resolutions of ACP-EU JPA of November 2005.

Recommendation 5

ECHO needs to free up time for more leadership on DPP, with dedicated, well-resourced staff to ensure internal coordination, undertake advocacy and manage relations with other Commission services.

³² This is the position of DG DEV and, interestingly, echoes that of Tearfund and Wateraid on the EU Water Facility. In Tearfund and Wateraid’s paper *An Empty Glass* (2005), it is recommended that the Water Facility is disbanded to ‘free up’ officials’ time to ensure that water and sanitation get their necessary share of funding through donor-supported national budgets.

Appendix Monitoring the EU

In 2003, Tearfund undertook an extensive piece of research into the policy and practice of institutional donors on natural disaster risk reduction.³³ This research revealed three key issues acting as barriers to integrating risk reduction into development: lack of knowledge and understanding of the subject within development sectors, lack of ownership of the issue by either relief or development sectors, and competition with other pressing development agendas. These issues were further discussed by donor organisations and NGOs at a conference convened by Tearfund in 2003. Participants at the conference identified and prioritised methods of mainstreaming risk reduction into institutional practice.

It was clear from both the research and the conference that a lack of tools was a key constraint to mainstreaming. While there is increasing recognition among donors and other organisations of the need to mainstream disaster risk reduction, very little work has yet been undertaken to identify how this could be done.

Consequently, Tearfund, in collaboration with Professor Ian Davis (Cranfield University) and in consultation with John Twigg (Benfield Hazard Research Centre), developed performance targets and indicators to help organisations assess, measure and monitor progress on integrating risk reduction into their relief and development planning and programming. It is expected that the targets and indicators will be used as ‘templates’ for measuring mainstreaming and adjusted as necessary to suit the specific conditions that prevail within any organisation.

The targets and indicators are contained in Tearfund’s report *Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction: a tool for development organisations*.³⁴ They cover six key areas of organisations’ work: policy, strategy, geographical planning, project cycle management, external relations and institutional capacity.³⁵ They are categorised under different levels of attainment:

LEVEL 1 Little or no progress

Level 1 represents little or no progress with mainstreaming. The organisation undertakes disaster risk reduction in an ad hoc manner and has little or no awareness of the relevance and importance of adopting a systematic approach to reducing disaster risks within its relief and development processes.

LEVEL 2 Awareness of needs

Level 2 refers to an early stage of mainstreaming. The organisation has a growing level of awareness and understanding of the value and requirements of mainstreaming, and recognises the need for action. (It may also have **decided** to take action.)

LEVEL 3 Development of solutions

Level 3 refers to an intermediate stage in mainstreaming, where there are identifiable actions to consolidate the gains made in level 2. The organisation is developing plans and tools

33 Tearfund (2003), *Natural Disaster Risk Reduction: the policy and practice of selected institutional donors*

34 This can be found on the Tearfund website: www.tearfund.org/campaigning/policy&research

35 The targets are based on Twigg’s ‘Indicators of Institutionalisation’ identified within the Humanitarian Practice Network’s *Good Practice Review* on disaster risk reduction.

to address the requirements of integrating risk reduction into its relief and development processes.

LEVEL 4 **Full integration**

Level 4 refers to a situation where risk reduction is fully absorbed into relief and development processes. The organisation places high importance on reducing disaster risks in a sustainable programme of action at multiple levels and within multiple sectors, and there is a comprehensive demonstration of practice. Thus level 4 describes a situation where disaster risk reduction is 'institutionalised'. However, this is not to suggest that an optimum level of attainment has occurred: there is still a need for further progress.

Tearfund recommends that the EU uses Tearfund's targets and indicators as templates to assess, measure and monitor its own progress with mainstreaming. The targets and indicators should enable the EU to:

- recognise where it is, or what stage it has reached, in mainstreaming risk reduction activities into its ongoing relief and development work
- identify priority issues to be addressed and develop a mainstreaming strategy over a period of time, with definable, realistic and measurable goals.

Tearfund Disaster Risk Reduction Briefing Paper 1
Transforming the Commitment into Action:
EU progress with mainstreaming disaster risk reduction

Authors: Nigel Taylor and Sarah La Trobe

Tearfund contact: Sarah La Trobe
sarah.latrobe@tearfund.org

Cover photo: Flood rescue drill, Bihar, North India
Caroline Irby / Tearfund

Tearfund briefing papers provide a summary of our latest
understanding of key development issues.

© Tearfund March 2006

Tearfund is an evangelical Christian relief and development
agency working with local partners to bring help and hope to
communities in need around the world.



CHRISTIAN ACTION WITH THE WORLD'S POOR

100 Church Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8QE, UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 8977 9144

Website: www.tearfund.org

Registered Charity No. 265464