

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION JULY 2009
HYOGO FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION
MID-TERM REVIEW 2009-2010

ANALYTIC FRAME FOR THE MTR

The HFA includes a call for it to be “appropriately reviewed”. Thus, the approach taken for the mid-term review (MTR) and its scope should be organised in line with the original layout of the HFA¹, and use the specific indicators of progress designed and promoted by ISDR². The **initial baseline** against which the MTR is conducted could be the situation prevailing at the time of the Hyogo Conference in early 2005.

It is suggested that the MTR is conceptualised in two parts: first, a *retrospective* examination of the period 2005-2010, and second, a *prospective* scan of 2010-2015 and even perhaps towards the horizon beyond.

As this is an interim stock-take that is barely half way through a ten-year work programme, the MTR should be realistic in focusing principally at the level of indicators for *inputs* and *outputs*, equating roughly to the HFA structure as follows:

- the extent to which the “key actors” have performed the “critical tasks” they were requested to do in the HFA, including the extent to which the stated “general considerations” have informed the way implementation has taken place. (This is largely a measure of “input”).
- the extent to which the “key activities” identified under the “priorities for action” in the HFA have taken place, including the extent to which the stated “cross cutting issues” have been incorporated. (This is a measure of “output”)
- the resources that have been expended in implementing the HFA. (This is a measure of “input”)

Secondarily, the MTR could exercise best judgement in relation to indicators of *results* and *impact*, equating roughly to the HFA structure as follows:

- the extent of advancement of the “strategic goals” of HFA. (This is a measure of “results”)
- the extent of achievement of the “expected outcome” of HFA. (This is a measure of “impact”)

¹ The HFA specifies an overarching *expected outcome* for delivery through the progression of *three strategic goals*, realised through *five priorities for action*. The associated implementation and follow-up framework sets out a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach with recommended actions by *key actors* (states, regional institutions, international organisations, and ISDR partners and secretariat, with civil society included) who are asked to give due consideration to stated *cross cutting issues* and *critical tasks*. There is additional explicit emphasis on *resource mobilisation*. (From Summary of the HFA 2005-2015, *ISDR, 2005*)

²Indicators of progress: Guidance on measuring the reduction of disaster risks and the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. *ISDR, 2008*

4.5 The criteria for assessing the extent of progress that has been made in each of the above dimensions could be the five-point achievement scale contained in the HFA Indicators Set.

4.6 Having measured inputs and outputs as rigorously as possible and expressed judgements on results and impact as best as we can, these findings will need to be contextualised by interpreting them against the background of the changes (eg thinking on climate change) that have taken place since 2005 including:

- advances in scientific and technical understanding;
- political and policy evolution;
- institutional developments;
- national, regional and international cooperation frameworks;
- public awareness and expectation; and,
- financing patterns.

The first – retrospective - part of the MTR analysis would conclude by answering the following:

- ⇒ What has been done well and not so well?
- ⇒ What have been the gaps and constraints in delivery?
- ⇒ What improvements need to happen?

The second – prospective - part of the MTR would start with an analysis of global trends covering the same factors as indicated earlier ie. our best judgement on anticipated trends in scientific knowledge, policy, institutions, cooperation frameworks, public expectation, and financing. This would conclude by answering the following:

- ⇒ What can each of the “key actors” do to enhance HFA implementation towards 2015?
- ⇒ In particular, how can HFA strengthen practical linkages and bring convergence in relation to closely related issues such as climate change?
- ⇒ In particular, how can HFA resourcing be placed on a predictable and sustained footing?
- ⇒ And, looking beyond 2015, what could a successor framework to HFA look like and how should we start thinking and working towards that?

MODALITIES OF THE MTR

The HFA is founded on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement that has been widened by the inclusion of other groups. Accordingly, the suggested modalities for conducting the MTR seek to maximise participation by all HFA “key actors” and to be efficient through utilising existing ISDR system processes and mechanisms such as national platforms, regional and sub-regional forums, international organizations and meetings, supported by the UNISDR web facilities. It can also draw on monitoring processes in other policy areas outside the ISDR system. Perhaps special consultations among key stakeholder groups may be needed, e.g. with donor governments in relation to financing strategies; or among countries sharing common exposure or vulnerability to certain hazards. It will draw on available information, thus interconnecting better and bringing clarity, coherence, and ownership of the resulting analysis. At the same time, the MTR also provides an opportunity to foster honest self-reflection and to stimulate creativity and innovation in looking forward. This is vital to the objective of strengthening HFA commitment and delivery.

The following methods for harvesting information and analysis are proposed:

- Reviewing available reports from countries and agencies in relation to disaster reduction related reporting systems, as well as other reports in relation to humanitarian and development action such as progress reporting on national development strategies, achievement of the MDGs etc.
- Drawing on the analysis contained in the 2009 Global Assessment Report
- Commissioning national, regional, and thematic platforms to use their forthcoming or, if necessary, additionally arranged meetings to conduct reflection on progress according to a standardised checklist of questions and to produce their MTR reports according to a standardised format
- Issuing a general invitation to national, regional, and international agencies (including UN agencies, International Financial Institutions, Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, NGOs, academic bodies, and other civil society groups, to submit their reflections on progress according to a standardised format. This includes the agencies that are part of the ISDR System joint Work Programme.
- Commissioning special sub-studies on key topics eg on financing, and on the interface with climate change.
- Conducting special consultations with key stakeholder groups eg. donor governments in relation to financing strategies; or, among countries sharing common exposure to certain hazards; civil society and community perspectives; research bodies; financial and private sector.
- Utilising modern communications technology to hold some global e-conferencing through discussion forums or other equivalent means on selected topics. The intention here is to inform and learn, and to popularise and establish a supportive public climate which ultimately impacts on government policies.

ORGANISATION OF MTR

A team approach is envisaged drawing on capacities and expertise from around the globe. All collaborating ISDR partners (in governments and agencies) could be asked to nominate their focal points for the MTR through whom consultation and dialogue can be conducted. These focal points would together comprise the **MTR Reference Panel**. A representative sample³ of these focal points and a few other selected experts may be constituted as the **MTR Steering Group**. Both bodies would conduct their interactions largely through electronic means and tele-conferencing, though meetings may be arranged as needed.

A shared electronic workspace would be available through the ISDR preventionweb. The ISDR Secretariat is charged with managing and servicing the MTR process, and will need some dedicated capacity for doing so in addition to the lead consultant.

TIMESCALE FOR MTR

The MTR process started at the 2nd session of the Global Platform in June 2009 and conclude at its 3rd session in June 2011 with publication of the final set of MTR reports. **The MTR should be a “living process” and, along the way, a series of intermediary outputs could**

³ Recommended that this is up to 20 people maximum so as to facilitate ease of working.

be expected in line with the spirit of MTR to catalyse reflections on varied aspects of the risk reduction agenda at all levels.

The proposed timeline for MTR process could be phased⁴ as follows:

Phase	Timing	Output of phase
1	By June 2009 at the Global Platform on DRR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of work for MTR discussed • Informal discussions among ISDR stakeholders including consultations with governments and agencies
2	By September 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTR Steering Group, and ISDR Secretariat designated management capacity constituted • Detailed TORs for MTR components drafted and agreed; working modalities also agreed including timeline for key events that will consider elements of the MTR
3	By December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools (eg standardised templates and formats) agreed. • Reports and special studies commissioned
4	By June 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports received • Consultations held • Sections of draft report done, to be reflected in SG report to GA
5	By Sept 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidated Draft 1 produced and peer reviewed at regional and thematic meetings in preparation for 3rd Global Platform (Sept-Dec 2010)
6	Quarter 4 of 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued consultations and analysis of reports • Discussion on HFA progress and emerging MTR findings at UN General Assembly (side event)
7	By February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidated draft MTR report ready and peer reviewed by Steering Group and ISDR system focal points
8	May 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch of final MTR report at 3rd session of the Global Platform on DRR and subsequent other launches (note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • • • • • • how will this be managed in parallel with GAR launches)

⁴ The timing of these phases could be adjusted to take account of key events or other meetings.

9	July 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• MTR conclusions and recommendations also presented to UN General Assembly (Sept) as part of SG report on ISDR (July)
10	May-July 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Post MTR dissemination process to ensure understanding and ownership of conclusions and messages, and rapid follow up actions.