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#  Context for the Tool

## A changing risk landscape

**A changing climate and rapidly growing exposure to disaster risk present a significant challenge to achievement of the Sustainable Development goals and national development objectives.** Over the past decade, more than 700,000 people lost their lives, over 1.4 million were injured and approximately 23 million were made homeless as a result of disasters(UNISDR, 2015). Total economic loss over this period was more than USD 1.3 trillion. Changing climate is projected to increase the incidence of climate related disasters, which already accounts for the majority of annual disaster losses (IPCC, 2012) and will continue to increase vulnerability to other disaster hazards such as earthquakes, tsunamis and landsides. Amongst the hardest hit are the world’s poorest and vulnerability is further increasing as a result of socio-economic and political factors including urbanisation and competition for scarce resources (UNDP, 2010).

**Disaster and climate change risks are largely rooted in inappropriate or “flawed” development** (Aysan and Lavell, 2014)**.** Many disasters are the result of recurrent hazards such as drought, rather than one-off events. However, these hazards become disasters as a result of development decision making, which can increase or decrease vulnerability to disasters. Risks from climate change and other hazards can therefore threaten development objectives and achievements; but in turn, vulnerability to these risks is affected by development choices(OECD, 2009).It is therefore increasingly important to move towards “prospective” disaster risk management as an essential component of sustainable development that avoids the creation of new risks (Aysan and Lavell, 2014), tackles underlying vulnerabilities and support adaptation to climate change.

**Development needs to be risk informed**

“*We must shift our thinking from managing “disaster events” to addressing the “underlying risks” that are inherent in the development process”*

*Jo Scheuer, UNDP, 2016*

*Disaster and climate risk management is essential for risk informed, sustainable development.*

## An opportunity for cohesive/integrated action on risk

**Three separate frameworks guide discussions at the global level for climate change, disaster risk management and development.** Firstly, the new international treaty (the Paris Agreement) adopted under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) outlines commitments to mitigate and adapt to climate change and a roadmap for long-term action. Secondly, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, a voluntary agreement which includes seven targets and four priorities for action (2015-30) and calls for a more holistic and systematic approach to disaster risk reduction (DRR), including calibration to climate change. Thirdly, the 17 voluntary Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted at the UN summit in the United States, which supports action on sustainable development up to 2030 and is supported by the Addis Ababa Accord – the financing plan for the SDGs.

**Although the predecessors of these agreements promoted action on individual issues, and at times led to disjointed progress, the new global agendas hold significant promise for a more integrated approach.** Past separation of dialogue and policy frameworks on these issues at global and regional levels, has at times resulted in parallel processes that are mirrored in “silo” approaches evident at national level. However, the post 2015 frameworks, which reference interlinkages better than past agendas, alongside joint dialogue and new strategies at the regional level[[1]](#footnote-1) provide a significant opportunity for joint cohesive action and support for more sustainable *and* resilient development in the face of *both* climate and disaster risks.

**Building resilience to risks and addressing underlying vulnerability is a unifying goal for climate change adaptation/mitigation, disaster risk management and poverty reduction practitioners at all levels.** The adoption of resilience as a central concept of international development policy has emerged from concerns over the protection of development gains from shocks and stresses (UNDP, 2015) and the need to ensure shocks do not derail achievement of the SDGs.

**The challenge is to ensure that global dialogue and frameworks are translated into local action that is cohesive and not carried out in silos.**

*Guidance is needed to help governments implement global and regional policy frameworks on these separate issues in a more “unified” and collaborative manner.*

## Mainstreaming for risk informed development

**The solution lies in country-led efforts to mainstream *both* disaster and climate change risks and their management into every day decision making around development.** This includes mainstreaming these issues into development policy making, planning, budgeting, programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes at national, sector and subnational levels. Mainstreaming is when risk is bought into the “*mainstream*” of activities rather than dealt with as an “*add on*” issue. The ‘end result’ is when risk is embedded into development practice, is fully institutionalised within development agendas and therefore meaningfully reduces the losses caused by disasters (UNDP, 2010). Mainstreaming is a therefore a *process* rather than a goal; the outputs of mainstreaming are a “means to an end,” resulting into a development outcome (i.e. risk informed and more resilient development).

**Mainstreaming has significant potential for ensuring development is risk informed and joint approaches to mainstreaming disaster and climate change risk will support more cohesive and effective action.** Mainstreaming is dynamic process, aiming to embed “risk” at the heart of development policy and practice. It has a number of key goals: i) to ensure that development is protected from the impacts of disaster and climate change; ii) to ensure that development does not increase existing and future levels of climate change and disaster risks; and iii) to promote development as a way to reduce vulnerability to disaster hazards *and* promote adaptation to climate change.

**Ongoing programmes have developed practical resources to support mainstreaming, however, these have usually focused on eitherdisaster risk *or* climate risk; and not both**. These have been valuable for providing strategies to separately mainstream either DRR or CCA; and have been used to inform the work of UNDP in several countries, as well as multi-partner initiatives, such as the Mainstreaming Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Initiative (MADRiD) and the Integrated Climate Risk Management Programme (ICRMP).

**However, these resources need to be updated, to provide practical guidance and tools on *both* DRR and CCA issues to ensure mainstreaming coherence.**There is growing recognition that joint approaches to disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation (CCA) and sustainable development are essential.*“DRR and CCA both share an overarching goal of reducing vulnerability and building resilience as a means to achieve long-term sustainable development. However, these two practices are often implemented in silos using parallel institutional structures, policy and legal instruments, community of practices and approaches at global, regional, national, sectoral and local level. And thus creating duplications, confusion and in some cases competition that can result in limited impacts on the share goal”* (UNDP, CRM, 2014).

**However, although there is recognition that more coherent mainstreaming is needed, progress has in many cases been limited.** Practitioners are finding implementation difficult, and a number of bottlenecks to mainstreaming have been identified**.** These issues have challenged mainstreaming implementation and include: insufficient funding, lack of awareness and risk knowledge, limited political will and commitment, poor coordination, lack of capacity, insufficient stakeholder participation, lack of continuity, piece-meal approaches, and a lack of sustainability (Aysan & Lavell,2014; UNEP & UNDP, 2011/2015) (see *Box 1)*.

***Box 1: Challenges for Mainstreaming of DRR and CCA***

|  |
| --- |
| **Lack of awareness.** In many countries, risk continues to be treated primarily as a humanitarian or scientific issue rather than a core development concern (IIED, 2013). There is a lack of awareness outside dedicated government units for disaster management or climate change; and policymakers and development practitioners have limited understanding of the risk posed by natural hazards, the relation of these risks with social and gender dynamics, and how these relate to development priorities (UNDP, 2010). **Political commitment and ownership.** A lack of prioritisation of disaster risk by some government and donors is common, with investment decisions guided by political factors and short term perspectives (i.e. the promotion of growth and employment) rather than technical decisions (Aysan and Lavell, 2014). Evidence suggests that government staff feel limited ownership, with issues being mainstreamed originating from “outside” development partners (IIED, 2013). Even where officials are aware of the risks, they have not accepted responsibility to reduce them; given their own agendas and priorities (UNDP 2010).**Capacity development.** A lack of personnel, expertise and capacity to operationalise mainstreaming has also been a problem at all levels (UNDP, 2010). Often DRR is successfully integrated into policies, but these are not translated into practice because stakeholders lack the technical knowledge and skills to change their working practice. **Institutional barriers including coordination.** A reluctance of national DRM lead agencies to “relinquish power and resources” has constrained institutional and organisational change in many countries (Aysan and Lavell, 2014). Further, many practitioners are working in silos on separate sector activities for DRR and CCA with limited means for coordination. The 2009 Global Assessment Report concluded that: “*governance arrangements for DRR in many countries do not facilitate the integration of risk considerations into development. In general, the institutional and legislative arrangements for DRR are weakly connected to development sectors*.” **Financial constraints.** In national HFA reports, financial constraints were identified by governments as the main barrier to mainstreaming and the lack of progress with reducing underlying risks nationally or locally (Aysan &Lavell, 2014). DRR and CCA have not always been seen as a priority against other pressing concerns in resource scarce countries.  |

**A review of mainstreaming challenges, suggests that the focus needs to move from outputs towards action and implementation.** There has been widespread success adopting national policies, laws, regulations and plans (i.e. governance related outputs) but limited attention on the processes that generate them and put them into action (UNDP, 2015). In other words, the transformation of outputs or commitments into DRR and CCA outcomes has not always been adequately considered; “*mainstreaming requires more than just developing appropriate policies and tools… a change in organisational culture is required and this needs political commitment, motivation, including financial support*” (UNDP, 2010). Conversely, the focus has been on separate and parallel policies or projects outside of mainstreaming development policy (UNDP, 2016). What is needed, is a change in culture and behaviour supported by political commitment, motivation and financial support to drive a mainstreaming process that deliver coordinated action on the ground (UNDP, 2016).

*Recent reviews suggest that mainstreaming challenges can be overcome by focusing on action and outcomes (rather than mainstreaming outputs) and this requires a shift in thinking and behaviour of development actors at all levels.*

## Mainstreaming strengthens risk governance

**To overcome the challenges that practitioners have been experiencing, and promote behavioural change and creating an enabling environment, it is necessary to address the underlying governance issues linked to development decision-making and implementation**. Practitioners are increasingly identifying that for effective mainstreaming, it is necessary to strengthen risk governance (UNDP, 2016). “*Mainstreaming is a governance process that provides the enabling environment for ensuring risk reduction [and CCA] becomes an underlying principle of sustainable development”* (UNDP, 2010). UNDP has made strengthening disaster risk governance (DRG) a cornerstone of its efforts to understand, reduce and manage risks for the past two decades (2015). For example, the Pacific Risk Resilience Programme has been working with governments in four countries to put in place risk governance building blocks as the foundation for more permanent and institutionalised mainstreaming risk informed development and ultimately resilient development in the Pacific[[2]](#footnote-2). Similarly, in Cuba the UNDP DRM project has *been* working with the government to strengthen risk governance at the sub-national level by decentralizing DRM and supporting municipalities to integrate DRR into the investment planning process. Every public entity in Cuba is now legally obliged to include actions to reduce risk in its economic planning *[possibility to insert other examples – any suggestions?]*

**A mainstreaming approach that strengthens the core components of risk governance (e.g. institutions and stakeholders) is more likely to overcome implementation challenges and support more permanent mainstreaming outcomes** (UNDP, 2016)**.** Not only is it important to strengthen key governance aspects associated with development decision making (i.e. capacity, finance, coordination), but the fundamental principles of governance (for example, participation, efficiency, responsiveness, accountability, inclusion, transparency) can be used to characterise and guide the mainstreaming process and interactions between stakeholders enabling the achievement of development goals (Aysan and Lavell, 2014).

*Experience suggests that mainstreaming is a risk governance strengthening process (within the context of overall governance for development) ensuring that risk reduction and adaptation become underlying integral elements of development.*

# Background to the tool

*[could be merged with Section 3]*

*Increasingly, there are requests from UNDP practitioners and their counterparts in government to pursue DRR and CCA in an integrated manner and develop a mainstreaming framework or tool that converges these two areas of work. UNDP has therefore developed this tool to help national and subnational governments overcome traditional “silos” and to translate commitment to separate global agendas into joint action**at country level. This new tool will help establish connections between the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-30, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Climate Agreement; and support their joint implementation and localisation. It will provide practical guidance, grounded in experience to help national and subnational governments overcome traditional “silos” between climate change, disaster and development practitioners and help “risk inform” the 2030 agenda.*

## Approach to developing the tool

**UNDP has decades of experience in working with national governments and other partners in support of climate and disaster risk management, which has provided an opportune starting point for this work.** In particular, this tool is informed by experiences from global programmes such as the *Global Mainstreaming Initiative* (GMI), the *Mainstreaming Adaptation and Disaster Reduction into Development* (MADRiD) programme (jointly wit UNISDR and partners), and the *Integrated Climate Risk Management Programme* (ICRMP) *[Others?]*. The tool also draws upon experiences emerging from regional programmes such as the *Pacific Risk Resilience Programme* (PRRP) and the *African Adaptation Programme* (AAP) *[others?].* Specifically, this tool draws upon resources developed by a range of organisations including the following UNDP tools and experiences from the application of these:

* *Framework for Mainstreaming DRR* into Development at the National Level – A Practical Framework (2010) – UNDP;
* Mainstreaming Environment and Climate for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development: A Handbook to Strengthen Planning and Budgeting Processes - UNDP-UNEP PEI (2015)
* Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation into Development Planning: A Guide for Practitioners - UNDP-UNEP PEI (2011)
* Mainstreaming Climate Change in National Development Processes and UN Country Programming - UNDP (2011); and
* *Risk Governance Building Blocks for Resilient Development in the Pacific* (2016) – UNDP (PRRP).

**This tool is also the product of a number of activities including literature reviews, consultations, peer review, workshops and piloting.**

* **Literature review.** A review was carried out of existing mainstreaming guidelines, frameworks and tools for CCA and/or DRR that have been developed over the past two decades by UNDP and key external organisations. In total in excess of 25 resources were reviewed and each resource was profiled in a separate *“Review Report[[3]](#footnote-3).”*
* **Consultation.** A global e-dialogue to collect experiences, case studies and feedback for the mainstreaming tool was carried out. A consultation platform was developed with the UNDP Knowledge Management team, with an in-built “Google translate function” to ensure accessibility to participants from a range of countries. The consultation involved three phases: i) *identifying experiences and expectations;* ii) *collecting feedback on the outline tool and supporting case studies;* and iii) *gathering feedback on the draft tool.* A number of reports summarising findings were prepared[[4]](#footnote-4) and in total, just under 200 responses were received from over 60 countries for the first two phases, including:
* *Afghanistan, Armenia, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gambia, Ghana, Haiti, Italy, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Korea, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Netherlands, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tonga, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Vietnam and Zimbabwe.*
* **Peer review.** A preliminary draft of this tool will be peer reviewed by key practitioners from across the globe.
* **Workshop.** A workshop will be held in Armenia in mid-June to discuss the draft tool with representatives from 6 countries. The tool will be finalised based on feedback from the workshop*.*
* **Piloting**. The tool will be piloted in a number of targeted countries; although the details are yet to be agreed.
* **Dissemination***.* A roadmap will be prepared for rolling out and disseminating (and translating) the tool alongside capacity building to support its implementation.

*This new “integrated” tool is grounded in experience and has been developed on the basis of multiple stakeholder inputs.*

# Overview of Mainstreaming Tool

*[Identify different icons for key audiences, that can be used elsewhere in the tables]*

## Audience

This tool has been prepared for:

**Government policy makers, planners and practitioners from core development ministries** including: i) planning and finance; ii) key sectors such as agriculture, health and education; and iii) subnational government.

* *Rationale:* there is still only a small base of government officials versed in disaster risk management and climate adaptation, and although in some countries there have been some positive moves, more ministries of economy, planning or finance and core line ministries need the capacity to incorporate risk into development and move towards a more “prospective” approach to disaster risk management (Aysan and Lavell, 2015).



**National disaster management authorities (NDMAs) and ministries responsible for climate change** and related issues.

* *Rationale:*the fields of CCA and DRM have developed as separate disciplines.[[5]](#footnote-5) At the national level, CCA is typically still considered a new practice and climate change is a comparatively recent concern for national-level policy. CCA responsibility has often been allocated to Ministries of Environment that typically lack political clout or budget. National disaster management authorities (NDMAs) have had traditionally the responsibility for disaster management**.** There is clear rationale for increasing convergence of these separate strands of work and this tool promotes the engagement of these agencies.



**UNDP DRR Focal Points and development practitioners** **or partners from international, inter-governmental or non-governmental organisations.**

* *Rationale:* UNDP has made strengthening disaster risk governance a cornerstone of its efforts to understand, reduce and manage risk for the past two decades (UNDP, 2015). Since 2005, it has worked with national governments, communities and development partners to support disaster risk governance in 125 countries. This tool should provide guidance to UNDP and development practitioners from other organisations including inter-governmental bodies such as regional organisations (e.g. East African Community) and regional and global development banks (e.g. ADB, World Bank) as they continue to provide support to mainstream risk through risk governance strengthening.

**In addition, the tool identifies opportunities for providing incentives and actively engaging other key stakeholders** who play a fundamental role in risk informing development, including:



**Civil society**

* *Rationale:* many countries recognise that effective CCA and DRR requires strong community engagement and partnerships, building on the priorities, capacities and needs of communities and other local stakeholders. Specific attention needs to be paid to engage socially and economically marginal or vulnerable groups including women, the elderly, youth, individuals living with disabilities etc. This tool therefore identifies how civil society and community based organizations can be empowered to play an active role in mainstreaming in support of risk informed development.



**Private sector**

* *Rationale:* the tool also recognises the role that the private sector plays in risk informing the development agenda, including addressing risks to and from their own ongoing and planned business and investment activities. The tool identifies where private sector engagement is relevant – either as partners supporting DRR/CCA activities or as implementers of risk informed private sector developments.

*The tool is targeted at government practitioners, but most importantly, the tool is written from the* ***perspective of development practitioners*** *and not restricted to climate change or disaster risk management (DRM) practitioners.*

## Purpose

**The purpose of this dynamic tool is to build common understanding and commitment to risk informing the development agenda** and therefore mainstreaming both disaster and climate change risk into development policy and practice.

* **It aims to help national and subnational governments overcome traditional “silos”** and to translate commitment to separate global agendas into joint cohesive action at country level**.**
* **It aims to provide practical guidance, translate theory into action, and unpack the process of mainstreaming** to help governments at all levels mainstream climate and disaster risk into development policy, planning, budgeting, programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
* **It aims to build commitment for risk informed development** as a way to: i) protect development gains; ii) reduce vulnerability to existing and new climate change and disaster risks; and iii) enhance adaptive capacity of communities and households.

## Objectives

**It is important to note that the tool has multiple uses, depending on where a country is with respect to mainstreaming.** It can be used: i) as an advocacy tool to create support for mainstreaming; ii) an initial diagnostic tool (to map the current state of mainstreaming); iii) to help operationalise mainstreaming and identify priority entry points; and/or iv) as a checklist to monitor progress. These multiple applications are explained further in *Section 5.*

**Common objectives of the tool across these different applications are as follows:**

1. **To help development practitioners mainstream *both* climate and disaster risk**
* **To link separate global and regional policy processes** and help government implement integrate outcomes of the Sendai framework, the Sustainable Development Goals and the new Paris Climate Change Agreement.
* **To overcome silo approaches at national level and promote common understanding** amongst practitioners on shared goals (i.e. resilient, inclusive and sustainable development) under the umbrella of the SDGs.
* **To risk inform implementation and localisation of the 2030 agenda.**
* **To promote connection** and shared vision for the different communities of practice.
* **To overcome integration challenges** in relation to terminology, concepts and approaches for DRR and CCA.
1. **To develop integrated approaches to mainstreaming**

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTEGRATED APPROACHES APPROACHES

“*Recently, we just witnessed the urgency of DRR-CCA convergence implementation at community level. In one village with mountainous landscape, the community had invested in building irrigation facilities for their farming land. One night, there was a heavy rain that caused landslides in several spots in the village including in the spots of several irrigation facilities. The farmers are expecting to harvest the crop in May/June but now, the farmers are facing a possibility of crop failure. Too bad to see how much effort had been put by the community to build the irrigation facilities in a landslide prone area. They should have thought about building irrigation facilities and at the same time strengthening the surrounding slopes to protect what they have invested. A lesson to learn”* ***(Erawan, Indonesia).***

* **To provide a common language and action framework** to support coherent and coordinated mainstreaming.
* **To provide guidance that acknowledge synergies, similarities and differing priorities***,* specificities and nuances of climate and disaster risk.
* **To provide a stronger, unified advocacy message and approach** for both DRR and CCA to deal with a changing risk landscape.
* **To conserve human and financial resources.**
1. **To support implementation**
* **To provide practical, evidence-based action oriented guidance** to help governments at all levels operationalise mainstreaming and incorporate risk into development policies, plans, budgets and projects and their implementation.
* **To provide a generic and adaptable approach** that is not too prescriptive and sufficiently flexible to be tailored to country specifics.
* **To provide an implementation tool** to translate theory into action in a way that embeds risk at the “heart” of development.
* **To identify entry points** for implementing risk management in different contexts, levels and sectors.
* **To avoid duplication, parallel processes** and perceptions of risk as an “add-on.”
1. **To diagnose mainstreaming status and track progress.**
* **To support preparation of a current** **mainstreaming baseline.**
* **To measure progress** towards risk informed development.

## Scope

* **The primary focus of the tool is climate and disaster risk.** However, mainstreaming DRR and CCA needs to consider the wider “risk management” context. Therefore, the tool takes into account links with risks from other sourcesincluding environment, economics and conflict. For example, women can be more severely impacted by disasters and therefore inequalities and vulnerabilities at the heart of development need to be dealt with as part of risk mainstreaming to effect real change (UNICEF, 2016). The tool is also cognisant of associated trends such as urbanisation, migration, land conflict) and how these contribute to risk.
* **The tool supports understanding of historical, present and future risk.** It is important that any risk to development is analysed in the context of past disaster experiences, current climate variability, and takes into consideration how risks might be altered in the future due to climate change (climate scenarios).
* **The tool is applicable to different country contexts and levels**. The tool can be applied in different country contexts and levels (notably from national to sub-national levels) as well as sectors. This is because mainstreaming has many levels of intervention and is more likely to succeed if it is promoted at all levels (UNDP, 2010).
* **The tool is targeted at development processes but has relevance for recovery.** DRR and CCA should be integral to decision making before, during and after a disaster. Clearly, the tool encourages “proactive” disaster risk management, with risk treated as an essential component of sustainable development. This tool is therefore relevant also for risk informing post disaster recovery policies and programmes.

*This new tool unpacks the process of mainstreaming both DRR and CCA and provides practical guidance that is applicable to a range of country contexts and levels to help practitioners transform policy commitment into practical cohesive action.*

# Mainstreaming Principles

## Overview of Principles

Before unpacking the tool, it is important to stress some critical principles that should underpin and guide any mainstreaming effort (see *Figure 1)*. These originate from a wealth of experience captured from literature review of existing guidelines and tools, case study review and practitioner feedback from the on-line discussions. Although these build on core principles identified in earlier tools, they move beyond these and guide practitioners to adopt an approach to mainstreaming, which challenges convention approaches that deal with risk as an “add-on” and instead guide practitioners towards a flexible, context specific approach that supports transformational change to the development mainstream itself, driven by ownership and behavioural change of national practitioners.

***Figure 1: Mainstreaming principles***



## Unpacking the mainstreaming principles

1. **Mainstreaming is country owned.** Mainstreaming should be a country-driven and country-wide process to embed risk into existing development policy and practice. Issues being mainstreamed are often perceived as coming from “outside” and there is little or no sense of ownership (IIED, 2013). Experience therefore shows that mainstreaming will only be successful, pragmatic, and context specific, if it is guided by nationally driven solutions and draws upon a country’s own systems, priorities and capacities with “*planning expertise as the engine”* (IIED, 2013)*.* For example, experience in Bangladesh has shown the importance of a “*whole of government approach*” and practitioners in Korea and Malawi have identified hat ownership at the subnational and community levels is essential[[6]](#footnote-6).

*This tool supports a country led mainstreaming process owned by national champions at all levels.*

1. **Mainstreaming is flexible, non-sequential and context specific.** Mainstreaming is not a linear process; there is no blueprint and each country will have different start and end points. Experience shows that no context is the same and it is important to be sensitive to the: “*unique histories, political ideologies, cultures and aspirations”* of a country *(Mohamed, Canada).* This tool therefore advocates for a dynamic and nonlinear approach to mainstreaming. This is supported by experience in many countries, which shows that mainstreaming at times needs to be opportunistic and timing is critical: “*although it is fundamental to take a structured approach, where opportunity arises then these need to be effectively tapped” (Dalesa, 2015).*

*This tool can be applied to different country context and has the flexibility to support varied priorities and therefore differing mainstreaming entry points.*

1. **Mainstreaming is a long term process.** Mainstreaming is a long term, ongoing, iterative process given that risks and circumstances are constantly changing. To move beyond mainstreaming as a series of piecemeal governance outputs (e.g. policies, laws and plans) requires an ongoing process of change (Aysan and Lavell, 2014) to allow for engagement and innovation. A recent study found that a significant time span exists between the introduction of mainstreaming as a national priority and its effective implementation in sector planning (FAO, 2014). For example, in Bangladesh, the time delay between the 2005 introduction of mainstreaming in Bangladesh and its actual implementation in the agriculture sector in 2009 as a comprehensive plan of action, suggests that it takes time for change to materialise (FAO, 2014).

*This tool supports a long term mainstreaming process, which moves beyond “quick wins” and sees mainstreaming as an ongoing process of change.*

1. **Mainstreaming starts from “within” the development agenda.** Mainstreaming should weave, embed and institutionalise risk at the “heart” of decision making; and strengthen existing development approaches, for example by supporting achievement of national development goals and national SDG related processes. As one consultation participant noted: ***“experience with the Department of Local Authorities (DLA) in Vanuatu so far shows that quality of risk integration is better and sustainable when ‘weaved’ into a new or existing development planning system and it becomes part of the foundations of development planning as opposed to an add-on”* (Ben Tabi, DLA, Vanuatu).**

**

*This tool promotes mainstreaming from within existing development structures, systems, procedures and processes to avoid parallel activities for risk and risk as an “add-on.”*

1. **Mainstreaming supports transformational change.** Mainstreaming should encourage long term shifts in thinking and behaviour and promote risk informed development as the new “norm.” Transformative approaches to mainstreaming are needed that address underlying risk and truly embed or institutionalise risk into development policy and practice (UNDP, 2016, UNICEF, 2016). Experience from Bangladesh, shows that a change in mindset is important, and this resonates with experiences in Mozambique, where it is highlighted that changing mind-sets (rather than just increasing risk knowledge) is a key success factor for mainstreaming.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**

*This tool looks to embed risk into the very definition of development and promote significant change in ways of thinking, behaviour and organisational culture.*

1. **Mainstreaming strengthens interlinked components of governance.** Mainstreaming should address core governance challenges by strengthening risk governance from within the mainstream of the development agenda (UNDP, 2016). Recent research has exposed an increasing number of promising initiatives taking a risk governance approach to mainstreaming risk (even if not labelled as such) and a number of useful experiences are emerging. For example, in The Gambia, practitioners have been successful in strengthening multiple interlinked risk governance aspects at the national level including: political commitment, capacity, technical resources and increased cooperation and coordination (Bhusan, The Gambia). Similarly, in Tonga, practitioners are successfully strengthening a number of core governance components (relating to the actors, mechanisms and processes) of agriculture development including new “in-house” capacity for risk, risk informed plans (Tonga Agriculture Sector Plan) and coordination mechanisms (a community of practice for government agricultural specialists in the Pacific).

 **

*This tool supports strengthening interlinked components of governance to ensure more long term and sustained change in how risk is dealt with.*

1. **Mainstreaming adheres to widely accepted risk governance principles** such as equity and inclusion, participation, responsiveness, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency (UNDP, 2013). Application of these principles is not only seen as an important means of achieving and maintaining development goals, but should structure how decision making and implementation ought to be carried out (Aysan &Lavell, 2014). For example, *[any examples?]*

**

*This tool promotes use of the core values and principles of governance as a guide to how decision making and implementation around risk management should be characterised.*

1. **Mainstreaming should actively consider the gender and social dimensions** **of risk.** Mainstreaming must be cognisant of the different impacts of disaster and climate risk on members of society that can exacerbate pre-existing inequalities, social issues but also create new layers of vulnerability (e.g. displacement, urbanisation) (UNDP, 2010). As one GSI practitioner noted: *“mainstreaming requires an increased understanding of the nexus between gender and social realities and CCDRM”.[[8]](#footnote-8).* Mainstreaming therefore should promote understanding and responsiveness to the needs and priorities of socially and economically marginal groups.

**

*This tool promotes mainstreaming that examines the inequalities and root causes of vulnerability at the heart of the development agenda.*

1. **Mainstreaming involves all stakeholders.** Mainstreaming is a multi-stakeholder process, involving a wide range of stakeholder to support collective action in reducing vulnerabilities on the ground and promoting risk informed development. Recent research suggests that for mainstreaming to be successful, it will require governance (arrangements) that allow synergy and negotiation between diverse groups (Aysan & Lavell, 2014). Similarly, experience shows that for the tool to be replicable, it will need key stakeholders including local communities: “*the most critical component for mainstreaming DRR and CCA would be the community, the actual theatre for most of the activities”*.[[9]](#footnote-9)

**

*This tool identifies the differing but important and varied roles that stakeholders play to support mainstreaming and highlights how these actors can be engaged to increase success.*

**In summary, these mainstreaming principles, which have been identified from the experiences of UNDP and a broad range of practitioners, should guide the application of the mainstreaming tool.**

# Mainstreaming Components

This section provides guidance on five critical components/entry points that can help advance and institutionalize the mainstreaming process (see *Figure 3).* Each mainstreaming component is subdivided into four sub-categories.

***Figure 3: Mainstreaming Components***



The following considerations should be kept in mind, whilst working to strengthen priority components and entry points for mainstreaming.

* **The starting component is context specific.** There is no one right starting point for mainstreaming and entry points will depend on the context and the best possible combination of priority entry points that will assist in achieving the intended outcome of a specific country*.* In most cases, it will be important to work on a number of entry points simultaneously, as is shown in the case studies in *Section 7.* It is important to note that the ordering of the components in the following section, does not indicate a prescribed sequence for applying the tool in practice.

* **The components are inter-related.** The entry points are all inter-related and their interdependence helps gain traction or make progress with other components. This is because risk governance strengthening is a complex web of context specific processes and interactions of various aspects, institutions and actors. The entry-points therefore work in a dynamic way with one success leading to another. This is illustrated clearly in the case studies in *Section 7.*
* **The components are a mix of mainstreaming conduits.** The components comprise entry points that are drivers of the mainstreaming process (e.g. awareness raising) or are outputs or targets for mainstreaming (e.g. policies, plans, budgets and projects). Conversely, other entry points support implementation of these outputs, for example capacity, finance and partnerships. However, most commonly, strengthening an entry point will have multiple benefits for mainstreaming.
* **Progress will vary by component.** By simultaneously working on multiple components, if progress on one component gets stalled (perhaps for political or economic reasons), it does not preclude ongoing work or re-visiting other components.
* **Entry points for mainstreaming intervention comprise a range of related issues.** (see *Table 1).* The tool provides guidance on approaches to strengthen this entry point and support these related issues.

The key issues to be considered under each sub-component are listed in the following table. The issues are not all encompassing and could be further expanded depending on the context.e

***Table 1: Mainstreaming components***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Sub-components** | **Related Issues**  |
| **KNOWLEDGE** | **Awareness & education** | Advocacy & awareness raising; school curriculum; professional education |
| **Research & local knowledge** | Scientific research & technology; local knowledge; translation & communication of technical knowledge; knowledge sharing platforms |
| **M & E, compliance & reporting** | Enforcement, quality control, compliance, reporting, monitoring, evaluation |
| **Assessment & analysis** | Risk assessment & analysis; risk tools |
| **POLICY** | **Leadership & commitment** | Ownership; political will; prioritisation; champions, community leadership |
| **Legislation & regulation** | Laws, codes, regulations, custom law, enforcement, incentives  |
| **Policies, strategy & planning** | Global policy commitments; national & sub-national policy frameworks; national and sectoral development and DRR/CCA strategies and plans; “bottom-up/top-down” planning |
| **Standards** | ISO standards, or technical standards of professional associations (i.e. architects, builders or engineers etc.); Sendai minimum standards |
| **FINANCE** | **Budgeting & expenditure analysis** | Sustained financing or budget allocations for DRR/CCA; public financial management; public expenditure reviews; economic impact assessment |
| **Resource mobilisation** | Funding opportunities; climate finance; avoiding duplication; effective use; cost-sharing; private sector resources; taxation  |
| **Risk- informed investments** | Cost-benefit analysis; screening and appraisal; public and private sector investments; business continuity |
| **Risk financing & transfers** | Insurance & reinsurance; risk pooling; financial exposure/reserves; disaster risk transfer tools |
| **ORGANISATION** | **Capacity**  | Capacity development; dedicated staff capacity for DRR/CCA including DRR focal points; training; equipment and resources; local capacities and community training; |
| **Coordination and responsibilities** | Organizational arrangements; institutional roles and responsibilities; job descriptions; coordination platforms and mechanisms |
| **Procedures, tools and management** | Internal procedures; cross sectoral procedures/ processes (e.g. planning processes); tools and guidelines; checklists |
| **Programmes and projects** | Project/programme management cycle; logical framworks |
| **STAKEHOLDERS** | **Government**  | Apex and line ministries; commissions; parliament; councils; public institutes; police; army |
| **Civil society** | Communities; interest groups (women, elderly, youth); NGOs; CBOs; media |
| **Private sector** | Corporations; companies; for profit businesses; small and medium sized enterprises |
| **Partnerships & networks** | Private/public; inter-agency collaboration; communities of practice; south-south cooperation; civil society networks; academic networks |

## Guidance on the mainstreaming components

**The remainder of this section provides a brief overview of each component and its related entry-points**. More detailed guidance on each of the entry points is provided in *Annex A,* which includes detailed tables with the following information for each entry point:

1. Description of **what**is meant by the entry point;
2. Explanation of **why** the entry point is relevant for mainstreaming;
3. Identification of **who** is usefully involved when supporting this entry point and **where** (i.e. what level);
4. Overview of **how** practitioners could go about supporting this entry point at different levels;
5. Summary of possible **outputs/outcomes** from supporting the entry point;
6. List of relevant practitioner **experiences/case studies** and **practitioner tips**;
7. List of possible **tools** relevant to the entry point; and
8. Identification of possible **indicators** for measuring progress.

## KNOWLEDGE

**PURPOSE:**

**i) This component can help drive the mainstreaming process.** Increasing the knowledge base and raising awareness on the links between disaster and climate change risks (supported by assessment and analysis of risks to current and future development), is vital for “making the case” and galvanising support for mainstreaming.

**ii) This component also builds the foundation for risk informed** development decision making, by ensuring the information needs for evidenced based decision making is available and communicatedin a user-friendly format.

**Sub-components:**

**This component comprises four main sub-components.** Mainstreaming will involve support for one or more of these areas of intervention identified below.

* + - **Awareness raising and education.** In many disaster prone countries, general awareness of climate and disaster risk may exist, but awareness in many countries on how these risks interact with development processes is still low. Effective awareness raising and advocacy is needed to build a common understanding of why mainstreaming is needed, galvanise commitment, and mobilise resources and capacities. Integrating disaster and climate change risk into the education system via the curriculum, (including professional education) provides a sustainable approach to awareness raising on core DRR and CCA concepts. Raising awareness of stakeholders such as the community, house owners or beneficiaries is also important for providing a check-and balance from the “beneficiary” side (UNDP, 2010).

***This entry point will: i) increase awareness, understanding and prioritisation of risk informed development; ii) promote risk informed development as an accepted goal amongst key stakeholders; and iii) empower key stakeholders to reduce risk as part of development decision making and practice.***

* + - **Research, local knowledge (and communication?).** A favourable environment for risk management means access to scientific research *and* local knowledge, and when decision making is transparent and democratic (DFID, 2010). Evidence based decision making recognises the importance of grassroots knowledge to help understand local challenges, but also values the research and innovation that universities and businesses contribute (Rockefeller, 2014). Research is an important element, increasing understanding of risks and acting as a monitoring and feedback mechanism to improve the implementation of risk informed interventions. Many countries however, lack the infrastructure or technical capacities to provide high quality risk information and practitioners have had to draw upon global climate projections or risk data that is poorly matched with policy, planning and management timeframes, compounded by uncertainty and is not sufficiently sector specific, policy-relevant or actionable (USAID, 2014). Effective communication is essential to ensure climate change and disaster information is useable in different contexts (WMO, Kenya) and is accessible, tailored, user friendly, relevant and actionable.

***This entry point will: i) provide decision makers with the knowledge to make risk informed decisions; and ii) ensure that information is “translated” into the language of development actors.***

* + - **Assessment and analysis.** Risk informed development requires an assessment of specific policy objectives, strategies and projects from a risk perspective. This requires accessible risk information and research, together with risk assessment tools to analyse risk impacts. Strengthening this entry point, will support a paradigm shift toward dynamic joint risk assessments, which reveal the multiple drivers of risk, the range of impacts, the effectiveness of policies and projects focused on reducing risk, and current implementation gaps (GFDRR, 2016).

***Support for this entry point will provide critical analysis to support development decision making from a risk informed perspective.***

* + - **Monitoring & evaluation, compliance and reporting.** A number of developing countries have excellent regulations on land use planning, building codes and other ordinances intended to avoid and/or control risk on paper. However, compliance with, and enforcement of these, is one of the greatest challenges for DRR/CCA. Enforcement and quality control are generally the weakest part of the system often due to a lack of human and financial resources and political interference with the regulatory system. In many developing countries, enforcement procedures are weak or non-existent coupled with problems of weak governance and corruption leading to an abuse of land-use controls and building permits (UNDP, 2010). Further, monitoring and evaluation (M & E) is important as it helps track implementation of risk informed regulations and codes, DRR and CCA mainstreaming progress, and identifies if projects and programmes are sufficiently risk informed or whether adjustments are needed.



***Support for this entry point will: i) support enforcement of risk informed legislation; and ii) help track and report on mainstreaming progress and risk informed development.***

## POLICY

**PURPOSE:**

**This component helps to provide the enabling environment for risk informed** **development** by promoting high level commitment and leadership for risk mainstreaming, and by contributing a comprehensive and supportive legal, policy and planning framework. Policies, laws and regulations provide the foundation or “technical architecture” upon which strategies and plans can be built as the basis for integrating risk into development practice (Lal and Mitchell, 2012).

**ENTRY POINTS:**

**This component comprises four main sub-components.** Mainstreaming will involve support for one or more of the areas of intervention identified below.

* **Leadership and advocacy.** Leadership, political commitment and political will at all levels are critical for mainstreaming, essential for building support for proactive treatment of risk, and are vital for encouraging individuals and communities to take action before disasters (as well as during and after). According to the World Bank, “*the most important factor influencing the success of climate change governance to date has been engagement (or not) by top political leadership* (2009). Experience shows that: *“leadership is really critical for the mainstreaming efforts to bear real fruits”[[10]](#footnote-10)*. Although experience is showing that national level champions are essential, increasingly practitioners are identifying that community commitment and leadership are also essential if development is to be resilient: *“after all, political commitment alone cannot lead to adaptation and disaster risk reduction at the community level if community leadership is absent. Community leadership is what drives the process in sustaining development programmes”[[11]](#footnote-11)*.

***Support for this entry point will build engagement and commitment of senior champions at all levels.***

* **Legislation and regulations:** the legal and regulatory framework establishes a system of accountability for risk reduction and adaptation (IFRC, UNDP 2014). National legal frameworks are important as they provide stakeholders, decision makers and practitioners with the rationale, incentive and guidance for actions. Therefore, risk mainstreaming into these vehicles for change is essential. Ideally, both disaster and climate change risk are integrated as part of updates to existing legislation or the development of new national or sector legislation (rather than developing new “stand alone” legislation for risks). Where separate DRM and climate change legislation exists however, linkages between these and development regulations needed to strengthened and their joint implementation supported.

***Support for this entry point will provide the enabling environment for mainstreaming and establish the legal rights of citizens and the duties of the state and other stakeholders (e.g. private sector). It will help risk inform legislation and regulations, but also support identification of opportunities for linkages and joint implementation.***

* **Policies, Strategies and planning:** development planning is guided by annual, medium and long term policy cycles and articulated in policy documents and implementation strategies or plans. Integrating risk into these policy cycles and documents provides a strong foundation for action. Specifically, national, sector, sub-national and community development plans are critical entry points for mainstreaming; and ideally civic engagement in planning and decision-making processes supports a risk informed planning process based on community identified priorities, needs and capacities.

***Support for this entry point will translate political commitments for DRR and CCA into roadmaps for action and will identify activities (aligned to development goals) for delivering risk management objectives as part of development objectives.***

* **Standards:** *[to be competed]*

***Support for this entry point will…***

### FINANCE

**PURPOSE:**

**The finance component** **will provide essential support for implementation.**  Political commitment and risk informed policies, regulations and projects need to be backed by adequate resource allocations to enable their implementation (ODI, 2014). The budget is the primary political and economic expression of a government’s decisions (UNDP/UNEP, 2015). It includes decisions on both expenditure and revenue raising and can have a positive or negative effective on disaster and climate change risk. For example, positive expenditures include retrofitting housing or forestry management, whereas negative expenditures include government-funded land clearance or planned housing or tourist facilities on a floodplain or low-lying coastal area. It is important to have dedicated budget lines and funding mechanisms for risk, but this requires analysing expenditures and identifying how resources can be mobilised in order that resource allocation for DRR/CCA can be more effectively mainstreamed into the budgetary process.

**ENTRY POINTS:**

**This component comprises four main sub-components.** Mainstreaming will involve support for one or more of the areas of intervention identified below.

* **Budgeting and expenditure analysis.** Mainstreaming means engaging ministries of finance and planning – the parts of government that determine public expenditure and the fiscal policy that incentivises the private and public sector (UNDP/UNEP, 2015). Dedicated budget lines and funding mechanisms are essential for supporting the integration of DRR and CCA into development policies, plans and programmes. However, instead of creating separate budgets for risk management, ideally costs should be calculated as part of existing development budgets of policies, plans and programmes (with risk management measures built in and costed within proposals) including their implementation. Ideally, budgets for recurrent maintenance costs need to be adequate and help enhance resilience of physical structures such as schools or health clinics (UNDP, 2010). Similarly, recurrent costs for regular capacity development and training on risk informed development at all levels is essential. Analysis of CCA and DRR related spending enables decisions to be taken with a clearer understanding of the costs and potential benefits that derive from risk related investments. Analysis provides support and opportunity to strengthen budget processes for risk and to identify specific entry points for reform. It also provides a platform for more explicitly allocating and monitoring resources for DRR/CCA to the national budgeting process.

**

***Support for this entry point will strengthen budget processes for risk and ensure that risk management is costed as part of mainstream development budgets.***

* **Resource mobilisation.** Funding is a major challenge to implementation. Mobilisation involves identifying resources from public and private funding (national, regional and international) for the implementation of risk informed legislation, policies, projects and programmes. A clear understanding of the economic impact of disasters on development goals (and if necessary the cost-benefit ratio for DRR/CCA investments) may be required for stakeholders to make concrete financial commitments (UNDP, 2010). Strengthening processes and mechanisms for effectively managing financial resources can also increase access to climate finance.

***Support for this entry point will mobilise resources from key stakeholders including government, civil society, development partners, multilateral banks and the private sector for risk informed development.***

* **Risk financing and transfers.** New and dedicated funds are needed for the promotion and maintenance of specific disaster and climate risk management interventions. It is important that the government assess the finance gap faced by stakeholders for DRR (before and after a disaster). This will identify risk financing and transfer tools needed to meet the needs of the most financially vulnerable populations and segments of the economy…… *[to be completed]*

***Support for this entry point will…***

* **Risk informing investments.** Strengthening this entry point is central to mainstreaming and requires risk assessment, screening and appraisal to ensure that new or existing development investments do not create new risks or increase existing risks. For significant investments, cost-benefit analysis can show that the long-term benefit of risk-informing these investments are very significant for hazard prone areas compared to the cost of development setbacks and reconstruction. This entry point is closely related to capacity building of planners to risk inform the project planning process but also training of contractors involved in project implementation (e.g. engineers, builders) and capacity development of planners involved in post implementation monitoring and evaluation.

***Support for this entry point will ensure that new and existing development investments are risk informed and do not increase vulnerability to existing and new risk; and instead contribute to reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience and adaptation.***

## ORGANISATION

**PURPOSE:**

**This component will support the implementation of risk informed legislation, strategies, policies, programmes and projects.** Integration of risk into policies, plans and organisational processes does not automatically result in actual implementation of risk informed activities. It is equally important to strengthen the organisational aspects of the mainstreaming process and ensure that development organisations mainstream risk management into their core activities thereby internalising and ultimately institutionalising DRR and CCA. Mainstreaming DRR and CCA within an organisations’ structure and processes cannot be viewed in isolation from broader institutional challenges a particular organisation might face. Key entry points will be: i) clearly defining roles and responsibilities and incentives for risk management; ii) developing capacity to effectively carry out key roles and responsibilities relating to risk; ii) risk informing internal procedures and tools to ensure sustained integration into a department’s responsibilities and day to day activities (e.g. planning, programming); and iv) risk informing programmes and projects.

**ENTRY POINTS:**

**This component comprises four main sub-components.** Mainstreaming will involve support for one or more of the areas of intervention identified below.

* **Coordination and responsibilities:** DRR and CCA are highly interdisciplinary functions and require the collaboration of a wide range of stakeholder. It is important to ensure that DRR/CCA strategies and plans are supported or reinforced by clear allocation and implementation of roles and responsibilities for climate and disaster risk to avoid overlap or gaps. It will therefore be important to identify establish individuals/groups responsible for risk management in each ministry of agency as well as establish coordination platforms to bring together different stakeholders. Ideally, focal points are identified in each core government ministry/subnational unit and act as an anchor for DRR and CCA within an organisation. Cross-sectoral coordination and collaboration that challenge “siloed” approaches in government is critical to effective decision-making (Rockerfeller, 2014). Cross-government mechanisms are commonly cited as preferred way to “organise” around climate and disaster risk. Further, inter-ministerial and inter-sectorial coordination and collaboration is an important starting point that determines the extent to which a dialogue can be held on institutional and legal reform processes for improved risk management.

**

***Support for this entry point will ensure that roles and responsibilities for risk informing development policy and practice are clearly articulated, are implemented and promote collaboration within and between government agencies.***

* **Capacity:** capacity development refers to the process of creating and building capacities and their subsequent use, management and retention. UNDP defines capacity development as a process through which individual organisations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development over time. It is the “how” of making development work better (UNDP, 2008). To be effective, capacity development needs to move beyond traditional training approaches and support more sustained changes in behaviour. Capacity development for DRR and CCA is likely to take a number of different forms – depending on the receipient. For example, new or existing focal points for resilient development (within core planning/finance ministries, key line ministries, and subnational government) will need ongoing capacity development. Whereas to support implementation of a risk informed regulatory framework, key professionals (e.g. engineers, masons and builders) will need training, certification or technical guidance to correctly apply these codes and regulations. Community capacities will also need to be enhanced to ensure that identification of community development priorities (as part of “bottom up planning”) includes identification of possible disaster and climate change risk and ways to manage these.

***Support for this entry point ensures there is sufficient “in-house” capacity to drive mainstreaming from within the government agencies at all levels and essential capacity of key implementing stakeholders.***

* **Procedures and tools:** internal procedures and supporting tools are required to guide actions by key individuals in support of risk informed development. Procedures are: i) routinized daily activities associated with different points of a department or agencies’ programme cycle; and ii) the rules governing actions between and within institutions and individuals. It is important to ensure that responsibility for climate change and disaster risk issues including implementation of policies and plans are reinforced by internal procedures and incentives for individuals and organisations to engage. Most importantly, for DRR and CCA to be fully integrated into an organisation, procedures must exist to ensure that assessments and planning exercises for DRR do not remain one-off exercises are fully institutionalized, e.g. through risk screening guidelines/tools for sector planners; and checklists in approval mechanisms incorporating risk.

***Support for this entry point will promote risk informed procedures and tools and their daily use as part of the “new norm.”***

* **Programmes and Projects.**  The focus must be on risk informing the project and programme cycle as well as the results frameworks and related budgets, project proposal forms [to be finalized].

***Support for this entry point will promote*** *[to be finalized]*

* KEHOLDERS

## STAKEHOLDERS

**PURPOSE:**

**This component will enable the involvement of critical actors in mainstreaming.** Government cannot singlehandedly address the complexities of risk informed development, which requires an interdisciplinary and multi-level approach, and brings together knowledge, skills and resources of different stakeholders (UNDP 10b).Evidence from 17 countries, identified that repeated long-term multi-sectoral engagement can lead to incremental progress in planning (UNDP, 2015). It is therefore important that instead, governments provide incentives for the engagement of other critical actors such as civil society and the private sector.

**Strengthening this component and promoting engagement of a range of actors will support implementation of risk informed development regulations, policies, plans, programmes and projects.** Only with the participation and representation of citizens will a mainstreaming Action Plan have a sustainable and long-term impact. For example, local governments can regulate land use and building construction, but private companies and NGOs often deliver key services and are responsible for large infrastructure projects, whilst households contribute labour and assets to housing and other low-tech construction projects (ODI, 2012). Despite best intentions of relevant authorities, efforts to be more inclusive of civil society and private sector actors, and to seek better representation of communities, women and vulnerable groups, have often proven insufficient to ensure their sustained engagement in decision-making processes and in the implementation of DRR/CCA interventions.

**Strengthening this component and supporting wider stakeholder involvement will ensure broader ownership and sustainability** **of the mainstreaming process**. Putting all the components of this mainstreaming tool into place therefore requires collective action through co-operation, consultation and negotiation at different levels (local, national and international) and between a variety of relevant actors (different government authorities, legislators, academia, private sector, civil society and communities). The participation and accountability of communities will be of critical importance to ensure that all efforts have actual impact in reducing vulnerabilities on the ground.

**ENTRY POINTS:**

**This component comprises four main stakeholder groups.** Mainstreaming will involve support for one or more of those identified below.

* **Government:** Governments have the primary responsibility for implementing measures to reduce risk. Decision-makers, legislators and administrators at the national, sectoral, and local levels have to set the necessary regulations, provide resources, build capacities, plan, monitor and enforce the implementation of risk reduction and adaptation activities within development. Decentralising responsibilities and resource can help to respond to local specific characteristics and motivate local actors to improve the delivery of development services in a more resilient nature. However, government will not be able to act alone but will require the involvement and cooperation of other actors (UNDP, 2010).

***This entry point will*** *[to be finalized]*

* **Civil society engagement:** it is widely recognised that DRR/CCA is a multi-stakeholder task that needs the involvement of many stakeholder groups, beyond government alone (IFRC/UNDP, 2015). Community engagement is critical given local knowledge and capacities: *“the most critical component for mainstreaming DRR and CCA would be the community, the actual theatre for most of the activities”[[12]](#footnote-12)*. Empowering communities also establishes a check and balance mechanism to ensure that local governments deliver, and private actors adhere to DRR/CCA commitments. Similarly, NGOs are important facilitators in the mainstreaming DRR process, can support capacity development and are important actors for lobbying and campaigning for risk informed development. Moreover, they are important actors to support implementation by providing support to the government in delivering services and facilitating the participation of communities. Similarly, as identified in the “*Knowledge component”* mainstreaming will need to draw upon academia and research institutes including the many fields of science and social science dealing with everything from social inclusion issues to engineering. It may be important for ministries to recruit technical experts to directly deliver certain services, or help train stakeholders. Finally, the media is a key partner inadvocacy, can investigate and expose poor practice, can apply pressure on politicians, authorities, or private actors, but can also raise awareness of communities and constituencies on the need for risk reduction and adaptation**.**

***Support for this entry point will provide incentives for the active engagement of civil society stakeholders.***

* **Private sector:** the private sector is an important actor given its own development activities can reduce or increase potential disaster and climate change risks. The contribution of the private sector to risk informed and resilient development is not just a matter of corporate social responsibility, but increasingly a matter of cost-benefit analysis (i.e. avoiding damage and losses) or a matter of compliance, given that increasingly consent processes (i.e. Environmental Impact Assessments) are incorporating disaster and climate change risk. Further, public private partnership can provide opportunities to combine resources and expertise to act jointly to reduce risk and potential losses.

***Support for this entry point will provide incentives for the active engagement of civil society in risk informing its own development activities and partnering with the government to bring complementary skills and combine resources for greater effect.***

**Partnerships and networks:** managing risks is a concern of multiple actors working across scales from international to community levels, and often in partnership, to ultimately help individual households, communities, societies reduce risks (Twigg, 2004). Strong functional partnerships (covering the adaptation/reduction-relief-recovery spectrum) are needed, which are flexibility to cross institutional boundaries and strengthen inter-agency collaboration and cross-sectoral relationships. Formal partnerships are specific joint arrangements, bringing together the knowledge, skills and resources of different stakeholders. They improve the likelihood of effective policy or project implementation. Partnerships can be built for example based on synergies (e.g. support for resilient development), to complement each other’s strengths (e.g. between research organisations) or to increase outreach (e.g. partnerships between government and NGO). Informal partnerships or alliances can be important mechanisms to push DRR onto the agenda or generate momentum for risk informed development especially in cases where formal partnerships are not possible or stalled for example due to political context or organisational conflicts.

**

*Support for this entry point will build partnerships that combine skills, knowledge and resources of different stakeholders to increase impact and contribution to resilient development.*

# Linking the Components to Accelerate the Mainstreaming Process

**Although the previous section separates the mainstreaming components, these governance components are inter-related and their interdependence helps gain traction and increase progress.** Risk governance strengthening is a complex web of context specific processes and interactions of various aspects, institutions and actors and therefore the entry-points work in a dynamic way with one success leading to another.

**This section shares a number of case studies, which show how supporting multiple components can increase mainstreaming success.** The case studies demonstrate application of the mainstreaming tool to national, subnational and sector context; and the importance of simultaneously strengthening multiple entry points for maximum effect.

## Case study 1: National Level Mainstreaming in the Solomon Islands [format 1]

In early 2013, there was only limited understanding of the development/risk nexus and the need for mainstreaming of climate and disaster risk. However, joint **leadership** from the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) and the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC) **(policy component),** helped raise **awareness** of the relevance of climate and disaster risk for development actors; and championed risk informed development **(knowledge component).** The senior champions also advocated a need to develop “in-house” capacity to support mainstreaming from “within” the development agenda **(policy component).**

**Capacity development** within the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC) and key sectors (e.g. the Ministries for agriculture and education) through ongoing training and most importantly the creation of new Risk Resilient Development Director posts, provided in-house capacity and focal points to lead mainstreaming **(organisation component).** This has supported the mainstreaming of risk into the National Development Strategy (2016-30), which now includes Objective 4 “*resilient and environmentally sustainable development*,” the national Medium Term Development Plan and sector policies and plans, for example the Agricultural Sector Policy (2015-19) and Corporate Plan, the Education Strategic Framework (2016-30) and the National Education Action Plan (2016-20) **(policy component).**

Strengthening risk leadership, knowledge, capacity and a policy/planning framework has given momentum for MDPAC to incorporate risk into national project planning and programming **process, procedures and tools** led by MDPAC. Although in 2014 the appraisal template for new project proposals was updated to incorporate climate and disaster risk, it has taken time to development supporting tools and capacity to fully integrate risk into the project planning process. MDPAC are currently rolling out a risk screening tool (and guidelines[[13]](#footnote-13)) accompanied by training to sector planners (as part of MTDP training) to risk inform development project site selection, design and implementation **(organisation component).** The new RRD Director is also working with the MDPAC Standards Committee to integrate risk into project review **tools** to ensure risk is incorporated into budget allocations **(finance component).** The MDPAC M & E team integrated risk into the **M & E** framework for development projects **(knowledge component)**. PRRP has also worked to develop capacity (a new post in MECDM **- organisation component**) to install a newly centralized Risk Resilient Development (RRD) Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping database, which provides risk maps for planners (**knowledge & component**). Increasingly, work is needed to connect these tools (e.g. GIS maps) and the national level planning process with the risk informed community based development planning process, which is being rolled out in a number of provinces via new **capacity** (i.e. posts) in subnational government **(knowledge component).**

In terms of **coordination**, PRRP helped develop a Recovery Coordination Committee (RCC) to support more resilient and coordinated recovery and reconstruction posts disasters (led by MDPAC) and to link recovery with ongoing risk informed development planning. Initially a Risk Resilient Development (RRD) **working group** was established as an internal MDPAC forum in early 2014 to discuss the relevance of risk to planners. Gradually this was extended to specialists from MECDM and eventually RRD focal points from other sectors. The group prepared an Action Plan for Resilient Development, however, discussions are underway to elevate this to a higher-level RRD working group between Permanent Secretaries from each ministry **(organization component).** Other important coordination mechanisms that have been established are the GIS user group to promote the sharing of relevant data and risk information **(organization component)**. There are also **community networks** including community **knowledge hubs** to improve communication between farming communities and governments (including extension workers) and provide a platform for regular information exchange and training on climate resilient crop varieties and resilient farming techniques **(stakeholder component)**. Finally, climate change and disaster risk issues as well as GSI issues have been incorporated into the Draft **Environment Act** and corresponding EIA checklists and Guidelines to ensure permitting procedures take into account disaster and climate change risks **(policy component & stakeholder component).** Finally, efforts are under way to initiate a partnership with Digicel (a telecommunications provider) to link with NDMO on awareness raising activities **(stakeholder component).**

**Case Study 1: National Level Mainstreaming in the Solomon Islands**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Entry points** |
| **KNOWLEDGE** | In early 2013, there was only limited understanding of the development/risk nexus and the need for mainstreaming of climate and disaster risk. However, joint **leadership** from the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) and the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC), helped raise **awareness** of the relevance of climate and disaster risk for development actors; and championed risk informed development. The senior champions also advocated a need to develop “in-house” capacity to support mainstreaming from “within” the development agenda. PRRP has also worked to develop capacity (a new post in MECDM) to install a newly centralised Risk Resilient Development (RRD) Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping database which provides **risk maps for planners** (knowledge component). Increasingly, work is needed to connect these tools (e.g. GIS maps) and the national level planning process with the risk informed community based development planning process, which is being rolled out in a number of provinces via new **capacity** (i.e. posts) in subnational government.The MDPAC M & E team integrate risk into the M & E framework for development projects. |
| **POLICY** | This has supported the mainstreaming of risk into the **National Development** **Strategy** (2016-30), which now includes Objective 4 “*resilient and environmentally sustainable development*,” the national **Medium Term Development** **Plan** and sector policies and plans, for example the **Agricultural Sector Policy** (2015-19) and **Corporate Plan,** the **Education Strategic Framework** (2016-30) and the **National Education Action** **Plan** (2016-20).Finally, climate change and disaster risk issues as well as GSI issues have been incorporated into the Draft **Environment Act.** |
| **FINANCE** | The new RRD Director is also working with the MDPAC Standards Committee to integrate risk into project review toolsto ensure risk is incorporated into budget allocations.  |
| **ORGANISATION** | **Capacity development** within the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC) and key sectors (e.g. the Ministries for agriculture and education) through ongoing training and most importantly the creation of new Risk Resilient Development Director posts, provided in-house capacity and focal points to lead mainstreaming.Strengthening leadership, knowledge, capacity and a policy/planning framework has given momentum for MDPAC to incorporate risk into national project planning and programming **process, procedures and tools** led by MDPAC. Although in 2014 the appraisal template for new project proposals was updated to incorporate climate and disaster risk, it has taken time to development supporting tools and capacity to fully integrate risk into the project planning process. MDPAC are currently rolling out a risk screening tool (and guidelines[[14]](#footnote-14)) accompanied by training to sector planners (as part of MTDP training) to risk inform development project site selection, design and implementation. In terms of **coordination**, PRRP helped develop a Recovery Coordination Committee (RCC) to support more resilient and coordinated recovery and reconstruction posts disasters (led by MDPAC) and to link recovery with ongoing risk informed development planning. Initially a Risk Resilient Development (RRD) working group was established as an internal MDPAC forum in early 2014 to discuss the relevance of risk to planners. Gradually this was extended to specialists from MECDM and eventually RRD focal points from other sectors. The group prepared an Action Plan for Resilient Development, however, discussions are underway to elevate this to a higher-level RRD working group between Permanent Secretaries from each ministry. Other important coordination mechanisms that have been established are the GIS user group to promote the sharing of relevant data and risk information. |
| **STAKEHOLDERS** | **Community networks** were initiated including community **knowledge hubs** to improve communication between farming communities and governments (including extension workers) and provide a platform for regular information exchange and training on n climate resilient crop varieties and resilient farming techniques. Finally, in terms of private sectors engagement, efforts are under way to initiate a partnership with Digicel (a telecommunications provider) to support links with the NDMO. |

## Case study 2: National Level Mainstreaming in Mozambique [to be completed].

## Case study 3: Agriculture sector Mainstreaming in…. [*Examples from Pakistan, Kenya, Philippines?]* [to be completed].

## Case study 4: X Sector Mainstreaming in… [*e.g. infrastructure – Zimbabwe? Private sector – Nepal? What about LAC?]* [to be completed].

## Case study 5: Sub-national Mainstreaming in... [*e.g. community planning guidelines Uganda/Armenia]* [to be completed].

## Case study 6: Sub-national Mainstreaming in Vanuatu [to be completed].

[Insert summary of key observations from the case studies]

*[****Please let us know if you have additional case studies that you would like to share]***

# Results of Successful DRR/CCA Mainstreaming Efforts

[This section will be included in the final draft]

# Annex A: Mainstreaming Entry Points

[Note this Annex is work in progress]

1. In in some regions, separate regional frameworks are being replaced with more integrated dialogue or strategies, for example, the proposed “*Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilience in the Pacific” (SRDP) (PIFS, 2015).* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See “Risk Governance Building Blocks for Resilient Development in the Pacific” (UNDP, PRRP). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Draft Review Report: CCA and DRR Mainstreaming Frameworks, Guidelines and Toolkits (BPPS, March 2016).* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *E.g. “CCA and DRR Mainstreaming Framework: Consultation Findings and Case studies – Phase 1 of the E-Discussions (BPPS, April, 2016).* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Sendia Framework for DRR (2015-2013) respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Online dialogue. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Note the risk screening tool does not focus solely on climate and disaster risk, but a range of risks felt to be relevant for planners (e.g. financial, management, environmental) as well as factors contributing to vulnerability e.g. gender and social inclusion. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Note the risk screening tool does not focus solely on climate and disaster risk, but a range of risks felt to be relevant for planners (e.g. financial, management, environmental) as well as factors contributing to vulnerability e.g. gender and social inclusion. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)