



CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION MAINSTREAMING FRAMEWORK

CONSULTATION HIGHLIGHTS

PHASE 1 OF THE E-DISCUSSIONS:

29TH MARCH – 15TH APRIL, 2016

Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Team, BPPSpr
APRIL, 2016

1. Introduction to this Report

This document shares the highlights findings from the first phase of on-line consultations (e-discussions) for the proposed integrated Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) Mainstreaming Framework. Note the full report is available on request.

1.1 Overview of this Report

Rationale. UNDP is currently working on an integrated Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) Mainstreaming Framework. The purpose of this framework is to provide a practical tool to help governments at all levels operationalise the mainstreaming of CCA and DRR into development policy, planning and budgeting; and translate theory into action. As a starting point, existing mainstreaming resources developed by UNDP and key external organisations were reviewed, with the findings presented in a draft *Review Report*. The next step was to initiate a global dialogue, to collect consultation feedback, case studies, and identify expectations from an integrated framework.

Consultation objectives. The three phases of on-line consultations are aimed at identifying: i) practitioner mainstreaming experiences including those that apply existing mainstreaming frameworks/guidelines; ii) the expectations of different stakeholders in relation to the proposed framework to ensure the framework is user friendly, practical and readily implementable rather than too generic or theoretical; iii) feedback on the outline and draft proposed framework; and iv) country case studies illustrating application of the mainstreaming framework in a range of country contexts.

Scope. The consultation was aimed primarily at: i) UNDP technical leads, regional advisors, country office focal points; ii) national agencies and government practitioners; iii) international organisations; and iv) targeted civil society and academic practitioners.

Approach. The consultation platform was developed with the UNDP Knowledge Management team and included an in-built “Google Translate function” to ensure accessibility to participants from a range of countries. The consultation is divided into three phases: i) identifying experiences and expectations; ii) collecting feedback on the outline framework and supporting case studies; and iii) gathering feedback on a draft framework. The first phase of consultation ran from 29th March to the 15th April.

Participants. The consultations involved participants, from over **50 countries**: Afghanistan, Armenia, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gambia, Ghana, Haiti, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Korea, India, Indonesia, Mozambique, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tonga, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Vietnam and Zimbabwe. In total, **more than 135 responses** were received for *Phase 1* of the e-discussions.

Limitations. Although the responses represent practitioners from a wide range of organisations, including technical, regional and country advisors from UNDP, it was more difficult to solicit input from government practitioners, and *Phase 1* was extended to increase accessibility to these groups. The subsequent phases of the planned e-discussion will target government participation – the main audience for this proposed framework. Further, the discussion was an open forum, which resulted in a wide range of inputs, but meant that fewer targeted responses were received.

Structure. This report shares consultation highlights from the first phase of consultation. A separate report documents the full consultation findings.

2. Consultation Highlights

This section summarises the key messages emerging from Phase 1 of the e-discussion. Note the full report is available upon request.

Box 1: Highlights – Understanding DRR/CCA Integration (Q1)

- ❖ **Respondents have varied interpretations of integration, and note that terminology for DRR and CCA has different interpretations, is confusing and inconsistent.** Respondents suggested that:
 - CCA is a stage of DRR, but both share the same goal;
 - DRR is an important element (or strategy) of CCA;
 - On the ground, DRR and CCA are not seen as different;
 - A focus on “impacts” rather than risk “sources” can reconcile the differences;
 - A focus on risk unites and promotes connection and shared visioning;
 - There is no need for debate as both are concerned about risks that undermine sustainable development;
 - It is important to identify and utilise areas of synergy and yet acknowledging differing priorities.
- ❖ **There is widespread support for the proposed integrated framework and respondents identified a number of integration benefits** providing the rationale for developing an integrated framework including:
 - A changing risk landscape making an integrated framework more relevant;
 - The need to conserve human and financial resources;
 - Evidence that integration of DRR/CCA is already happening on the ground (although not always as part of mainstream development);
 - Provides more unified and stronger advocacy message.
- ❖ **Respondents identified a number of challenges they have faced with an integrated approach:**
 - Translation of concepts into practice;
 - Silo approach to dealing with DRR and CCA;
 - Separate funding streams;
 - Leaving adequate space for non-climate DRR initiatives.

Box 2: Highlights – Current Mainstreaming Experiences (Q2)

- ❖ **Respondents identified the changing risk landscapes and its impacts on development goals as the main rationale** for mainstreaming both CCA and DRR into development.
- ❖ **Practitioners identified two key mainstreaming goals:** i) increasing resilience; and ii) sustainable development. They also identified mainstreaming benefits including avoiding duplication and parallel processes; and aligning strategies and plans.
- ❖ **Very few respondents reflected upon experiences with existing mainstreaming frameworks, guidelines or tools** although the importance of drawing upon these existing frameworks to enrich the proposed integrated framework was highlighted.
- ❖ **Mainstreaming success stories/case studies were shared for:** Mozambique, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Niger, Tajikistan, Cambodia, Arab region, Japan, Indonesia and Samoa. Sector specific case studies were also shared for Fiji (agriculture sector), Tonga (agriculture sector), and Kenya (water sector).
- ❖ **Through sharing case studies or experiences, respondents highlighted a number of success factors for mainstreaming – many of which relate to the risk governance enabling environment.** These include: i) space for dialogue, exchange and awareness raising; ii) pro-action from within ministries; iii) strong champions and behavioural change; iv) political will, commitment, and clear roles and responsibilities; v) capacity development, knowledge products and guidelines/tools; vi) participatory, inclusive and “bottom up”

approaches; vii) self-sustaining solutions or eco-based solutions; viii) systems thinking; ix) self-assessment; and x) sufficient funding and public expenditure reviews.

❖ **A number of respondents identified that mainstreaming progress has been limited to-date and highlighted a number of implementation challenges, many of which relate to the governance of risk, that help explain this lack of progress:**

- Political will, motivation and competing priorities;
- Difficulties understanding and applying mainstreaming;
- Promotion of parallel processes, which side-stream DRR/CCA efforts;
- Lack of coordination and fragmented approach;
- Perception of risk as an “add-on” rather than a core embedded component of development;
- Need to sustain change in the context of short term decision making;
- Risk based planning is quite different;
- Limited capacity and knowledge of development actors at all levels;
- Limited risk information that is user-friendly with clear communication channels;
- Importance of legal framework to facilitate mainstreaming.
- A lack of funding;
- Poor institutional coordination.

Box 3: Highlights – User expectations for a new integrated mainstreaming framework (Q3)

❖ **Respondents identified a number of potential aims for the proposed framework including to:**

- Bring practitioners together to coordinate on these issues;
- Make complex issues actionable;
- Promote risk based planning;
- Provide guidance grounded in experience;
- Act as a diagnostic tool;
- Provide a common language and common action framework; and
- Clarify concepts and identify overlaps.

❖ **Respondents identified the importance of clearly defining the target audience, and ensuring that the framework is written from the perspective of development practitioners (not just DRR/CCA).**

❖ **In terms of scope, respondents identified that the framework should be:**

- Applicable to different countries, levels and stakeholders;
- Responsive to different phases of the disaster cycle, current and future risk;
- Supportive of risks from a range of sources;
- Simultaneously integration climate mitigation action and environmental management.

❖ **Respondents identified a range of guiding principles for the framework:**

- Flexible to different context, but acknowledging ground realities;
- Sensitive to the needs of vulnerable or marginal groups and supportive of inclusion and participation;
- Promotes use of local knowledge;
- Promotes engagement with multiple stakeholders including the private sector;
- Promotes coordination, collaboration and sharing of good practice.”

❖ **Respondents recommended a number of potential approaches for the proposed framework**

- Adopt a more holistic “resilience” based approach, which strengthens existing development approaches;
- Consider a “systems” approach to resilient and inclusive development;
- Take development or sustainable development as the starting point or dominant discourse;
- Embed or weave in risk rather than treating it as an “add-on;”
- Support a more transformative approach that encourages shifts in thinking and behaviour;
- Actively consider gender and social dimensions of risk;
- Help to address root causes of vulnerability to risk;
- Help tackle the deep-seated issues of the risk governance enabling environment (including capacity development);

- Promote action at all levels;
- Be realistic and not change the way planning happens.

❖ **Only a few respondents touched upon the core components that should be incorporated in the framework (as this will be the focus of later stages of the e-discussion). They noted that guidance is needed on:**

- Providing a risk informed basis;
- Identifying entry points in development processes;
- Quantifying the benefits of mainstreaming or helping make the case for mainstreaming;
- Measuring progress;
- Co-ordinating different sectors, stakeholders and players;
- Incorporating gender and social inclusion (GSI) and links to social protection;
- Success factors including sharing practical examples.

❖ **Only a few respondents discussed recommended formats for the framework noting that it should be simple, user-friendly and available in various mediums. Again this will be explored in later phases of the e-discussions.**

❖ **Finally, it was noted that capacity building will be required to help implement the framework - another issue that will be discussed in later consultation phases.**

Figure 1: Summary of Consultation comments (Phase 1)

