
Consultations, Stocktaking and Review

Organisational Review and Stocktaking: Individual organisations are encouraged to undertake internal consultations and review in the context of the MTR SF and are invited to develop organization-specific reports as formal inputs to the MTR SF. Organisations may wish to draw from the core, strategic and guiding questions provided in this document, as well as the Concept Note of the MTR SF and the Guidance for Member States.

Thematic Commissioned Studies: UNDRR will identify a limited number of dedicated studies on a specific topic or theme, for which insight and material additional to that generated by other aspects of the MTR SF is deemed necessary. Stakeholders may be invited to contribute or lead enquiry and development of selected studies.

Thematic, commissioned studies.

Action by: UNDRR, Stakeholders, independent experts

When: November 2021 through to August 2022

Stakeholders are encouraged to commence consultations, review and stocktaking at their earliest convenience and are recommended to have concluded by 31 August 2022, so as to meet the deadline for submission of the stakeholder reports and inputs to the MTR SF of 30 September 2022.

Stakeholders wishing to participate in and contribute to the MTR SF are kindly requested to inform UNDRR and the SEM at their earliest convenience. In so doing, stakeholders are invited to identify the person and/or office that will coordinate inputs to the midterm review process and communicate this to UNDRR.

Stakeholders are strongly recommended to review and respond to as many core questions as possible, and to enrich and add value to the review are encouraged to utilise the probing questions provided.

Individual organisations undertaking internal consultations and review in the context of the MTR SF are invited to develop organisation-specific reports as formal inputs to the MTR SF, for which stakeholders may wish to adopt the reporting structure recommended for Member States (presenting retrospective review, context shift and emerging issues, and prospective review).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome and Goal [Section III. A.]</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has there been a reduction of disaster risk and the impacts of natural- and man-made hazards on persons, businesses, communities, and ecosystems, as a result of actions taken and approaches adopted in your country/context/community in implementing the Sendai Framework since 2015?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It depends on whether the reply concerns risk reduction in education (e.g., safer schools) or via education (using education to promote a culture of risk reduction at a societal/community level). The two dimensions are equally important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In both cases, one fact is clear: from 2015 to 2022, devastating disasters (earthquakes, climate-related hazards such as cyclones/hurricanes) have impacted the education sector directly each year (a timeline of key events can be prepared if helpful). Other disasters (e.g., droughts) have impacted the education sector indirectly – by impacting the school community (students, teachers, etc.) in all aspects of their lives, affecting livelihoods and limiting access to basic services, including education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the many DRR initiatives and interventions (generally on a scale up / including many innovative approaches / increasing budgets, etc.) in schools / through the education sector have mitigated the impact of occurring disasters, or prevented others to occur, requires data and evidence generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probing Question:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify at least one way in which actions and approaches adopted in implementing the Sendai Framework have resulted in a reduction in disaster risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does your constituency consider to have been the major achievements, challenges and barriers to the implementation of the Sendai Framework since 2015?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>From the perspective of the education sector:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achievements: awareness-raising among Member States (particularly in regions hard-hit by natural hazards) about the need to build resilience in the education sector, as illustrated by the 60+ countries signatories of the Worldwide Initiative for Safe Schools (WISS) and the roll-out of the Comprehensive Safe School Framework (CSSF) (a new version of the CSSF, the CSSF 2022-2030, was launched in September 2022: [462] Global Launch of the Comprehensive School Safety Framework 2022-2030 - YouTube).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Challenges: the scale and frequency of disasters (overwhelming for most education systems) and the lack of available finances at national level (especially in LDCs ad SIDS). The COVID-19 pandemic has been both a challenge - as it slowed down on-going initiatives and efforts - and an opportunity to re-think resilience in the education sector from a renewed perspective (= investments were made possible, which would have been unimaginable prior to the pandemic, i.e., transition to online education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Barriers: lack of capacity/readiness within the education sector to adapt in terms of policies/budgeting (no or very limited DRR budgets for education in most countries), intersectoral collaboration (lack of collaboration with NEMAs and/or Environment/Climate Change ministries, etc.) and vision (lack of risk-sensitive planning, in the form of e.g. a transformation of curricula, investments in TVETs to respond to the urgency of the climate crisis, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probing Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In respect of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. preventing the creation of new risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts since 2015 have aimed at both reducing the existing stock of risk and preventing the creation of new risk; however, not in a way that is commensurate with risk levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. reducing the existing stock of risk

Efforts since 2015 have aimed at both reducing the existing stock of risk and preventing the creation of new risk; however, not in a way that is commensurate with risk levels.

f. strengthening resilience

There are numerous examples of initiatives and interventions contributing to strengthening the resilience of the education sector (in terms of infrastructure, preparedness, educational content), especially at school-level (but also at sub-national, national, regional and global levels). However, factual evidence points to the growing vulnerability of education systems in spite of past/on-going efforts and increased levels of investment.

g. the Guiding Principles

(a) Primary responsibility of States to prevent and reduce disaster risk, including through cooperation: progress made with some countries/regions ‘championing’ DRR in education more than others.

(b) Shared responsibility between central Government and national authorities, sectors and stakeholders as appropriate to national circumstances: there is generally still a lack of intersectoral collaboration and joint vision on how to build resilience in/through education. The private sector is usually not engaged as it could/should be.

(c) Protection of persons and their assets while promoting and protecting all human rights including the right to development: in case of major disasters, there is still limited capacity to protect the school community from impacts.

(d) Engagement from all of society. There are still many gaps: lack of engagement of children as agents of change; vulnerable groups are often excluded/marginalized (e.g., out-of-school children, migrant/refugee children, children living a disability).

(e) Full engagement of all State institutions of an executive and legislative nature at national and local levels. Decentralization is often at a nascent stage or local authorities lack resources, while education is usually within their competences.

(f) Empowerment of local authorities and communities through resources, incentives and decision-making responsibilities as appropriate. Same as above.

(g) Decision-making to be inclusive and risk-informed while using a multi-hazard approach. There are major data gaps to support inclusive and risk-informed planning in the education sector. In terms of multi-hazard approach, the trend is a unified approach (natural hazards, conflict, pandemics, violence in school such as bullying, etc.), which can be an opportunity for more coherent/comprehensive approaches, but also a risk that some agendas will be left out (i.e., resources / all coordination focusing on some agendas more than others).

(h) Coherence of disaster risk reduction and sustainable development policies, plans, practices and mechanisms, across different sectors. Efforts to mainstream SDG implementation, climate action and DRR at a policy level. Too often, national committees remain on paper only and lack of integration/intersectoral collaboration prevails.

(i) Accounting of local and specific characteristics of disaster risks when determining measures to reduce risk. In spite of a lack of fact-based/statistical evidence, it is possible to state that efforts to build resilience in the education sector are often initiated locally or at school-level, including in terms of “understanding risk”, which should be encouraged.

(j) Addressing underlying risk factors cost-effectively through investment versus relying primarily on post-disaster response and recovery. One of the main difficulties for risk management, in the education as well as in other sectors, is to shift away from disaster preparedness / post-disaster response to risk reduction through addressing the root causes of vulnerability.
(k) «Build Back Better» for preventing the creation of, and reducing existing, disaster risk. Efforts are being made and new investments available to “build back better” (and “build better before”), as illustrated by pioneer projects funded by the Green Climate Fund in Antigua and Barbuda (approved in 2019), and the Adaptation Fund in Haiti (approved 2021).

(l) The quality of global partnership and international cooperation to be effective, meaningful and strong. While funding is available to support education in crisis contexts or LDCs, the question is how effective current strategies and investments are to reduce risk. The World Bank, which has launched the Global Program for Safer Schools (focusing on safe educational infrastructure) in 2014, is the largest external financier of education in the developing world. In fiscal years 2021 and 2022, it committed about $7.92 billion for education programs, technical assistance, and other projects designed to improve learning and provide everyone with the opportunity to get the education they need to succeed. Its current portfolio of education projects totals $24 billion. This is eight percent of total World Bank lending. Regarding the European Union, the share of education in emergencies (EiE) in its humanitarian budget has substantially increased in the last years, starting from 1% in 2015. It is maintained at 10% of the humanitarian budget as of 2019. It is unknown how much of it can be categorized as “DRR-related”, however the percentage is minor.

(m) Support from developed countries and partners to developing countries to be tailored according to needs and priorities as identified by them Efforts are being made to enhance DRR needs of LDCs, SIDS and African countries through finance, technology transfer and capacity-building. However, social sectors such as education are among the least covered (if at all).

Risk Assessment, Information and Understanding [Section III.B.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probing Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Are the root causes and underlying drivers of disaster risk better understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How have vulnerability and/or exposure characteristics been addressed? (For example, in respect of gender or income inequalities, setting and applying of building codes or land zoning regulation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What progress has been made in approaches to better understand/assess disaster risk in all its dimensions of vulnerability, exposure (persons and assets), hazard characteristics, capacity, and their inter-relationships?

New tools have been created or used at scale (VISUS assessment, PDNAs, etc.) to better understand/assess disaster risk in the education sector, although the focus has primarily been on post-disaster response and/or recovery. UN agencies such as UNESCO, UNICEF and UNDRR have also expanded their analysis of disaster risk from a narrower focus on climate impacts on education infrastructure and on student’s attendance, to a more systemic approach on the fundamental role that education systems can – and must – play in the climate change agenda, as reflected in the Paris Agreement’s Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) Framework.

Several countries have developed new building guidelines for the education sector, such as the Commonwealth of Dominica and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) in the aftermath of Hurricanes Irma and Maria in 2017. The challenge is to mobilize the resources required to implement such guidelines. Over the past years, there has also been a growing consensus among researchers that girls’ education is one of the keys to combat the climate crisis. In particular, research suggests that girls’ education can strengthen climate strategies by empowering girls and advancing their reproductive health and rights, fostering girls’ climate leadership and pro-environmental decision-making, and developing girls’ green skills for green jobs.
c. Is the systemic nature of risk\(^1\) addressed across all sectors, administrative levels and disciplines?

The COVID-19 pandemic forced education stakeholders to take into account systemic risks in their planning and financing of the sector, given the unprecedented impacts of the pandemic on education. Many COVID-19 response programmes (focusing on education or related sectors such as WASH and social protection) have been linked to broader resilience programmes aimed at building shock responsive systems and sectors.

d. In respect of people and assets in your country, what progress has been made in:
   i. reducing exposure to hazards? Although school rebuilding/retrofitting is a key issue in post-disaster contexts, there is not much data on the proportion of schools damaged/demolished by disasters that have been rebuilt/retrofitted/relocated to areas where they will be less exposed to future disasters (similarly for school surroundings where roads are damaged, at risk of flooding, etc.). Besides, the question of exposure is complex as most exposed schools are usually attended by students living in “most exposed communities”, meaning that it is not only about relocating a school but an entire community.
   ii. reducing their vulnerability? Efforts to reduce vulnerabilities in the education sector have been mostly “humanitarian”, with school feeding programmes being in many contexts a primary factor of school attendance, whether in a post-disaster environment or in countries/areas affected by chronic food insecurity and malnutrition (often linked to climate hazards). Efforts are being undertaken to use education as an instrument to reduce vulnerability (through knowledge/skills) but the roll-out of DRR/climate education remains marginal if looking at the scale of needs.
   iii. augmenting their capacity for risk reduction? In addition to students, there is a lack of focus/efforts to build the capacity of teachers and other education stakeholders (from principals to Ministerial staff) to address DRR needs in the sector/at school level.

e. When developing your constituency’s plan (or equivalent), how are underlying disaster risks considered? UNESCO has a long-term approach to education planning, with a focus on system strengthening. Such work is mostly “upstream”, i.e., UNESCO rarely supports interventions that directly address underlying factors of disaster risk.

How are traditional, indigenous and local knowledge and communities, in addition to scientific and technological insights, participating and guiding risk assessment and risk-informed decision making and investment?

UNESCO identifies and documents local and indigenous knowledge and develops educational and awareness-raising materials and tools combining it with scientific knowledge. It also supports community research, creates networks and partnerships in support of the inclusion of indigenous communities within climate change decision-making. In May 2022, UNESCO launched a new brochure as part of the Living heritage in emergencies initiative, which includes a strong DRR component.

In 2018, the Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (LINKS) Programme published a report based on an indigenous knowledge conference it hosted with pastoralist communities from six African countries (Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania), as part of a five-year project named Knowing our Changing Climate in Africa. The event supported transdisciplinary dialogues with indigenous knowledge holders, scientists and policy makers on how indigenous knowledge could contribute to enhancing knowledge on adaptation by highlighting the views of pastoralist communities. The event contributed to a growing body of methods on how adaptation plans in Africa can draw on indigenous knowledge.

---

\(^1\) The systemic nature of risk is based on the notion that the risk [for instance arising from a policy, action or a hazard event], depends on how the elements of the affected systems* interact with each other, either aggravating or mitigating the overall effect of the constituent parts. [adapted from, UNDRR and the International Council for Science (forthcoming 2022)]

* these could be inter alia social, natural, economic, political and governance systems, and/or food systems, energy systems, climate systems (non-exhaustive)
### Risk Governance and Management [Section III.C.]

**How has national and local public policy, legislation, planning and organisation changed to align with the Sendai Framework?**

UNESCO has been mandated to lead, coordinate and monitor implementation of the SDG4-Education 2030 agenda. In this capacity, UNESCO has an important role to play in working with Member States and partners to strengthen the resilience of education systems and to improve the delivery of quality education, particularly in crisis-affected and post-disaster contexts. Specifically, UNESCO’s strategic engagement on DRR & Education is reflected in its Education Sector’s Theory of Change Strategic Outcome 3 (Enhance knowledge for climate action, biodiversity, water and ocean management and disaster risk reduction) and Output 1 (Education systems are equipped to promote inclusion, address marginalization and advance rights, including in crisis-affected and post-disaster contexts), both of which are aligned with institutional commitments reported in UNESCO’s Medium-Term Strategy (2022-2030) and Programme and Budget (2022-2025).

UNESCO’s Strategy for Action on Climate Change (2017-2021) was explicit about linkages between UNESCO’s approaches to climate change and DRR: “The links between climate change and disaster risk reduction point to the need to increase the resilience of communities to climate change and extreme weather phenomena through systematic planning and capacity development, including through gender responsive components. UNESCO will assist Member States to provide a platform for enhancing cooperation in knowledge-sharing, policy advice and education for disaster preparedness and mitigation and supporting the further development of risk reduction networks hazard warning systems (such as storm-surges, storms, floods, landslides and droughts)”.

Several UNESCO field offices address DRR as a strategic priority – usually along with climate change. For instance, UNESCO’s 2018-2022 Pacific Strategy notes that “climate change and disaster risk management are major challenges facing the region and require a multisectoral approach that includes education, health, environment and youth employment programmes to be addressed effectively”. As of June 2022, UNESCO Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSA) was completing the draft of a DRR Strategy 2022-2025, covering DRR Education and School safety and wellbeing among five priority action areas.

**Probing Question:**

- Is the national DRR strategy or plan being implemented? If not, what are the reasons? **There are usually major challenges to implementing national DRR strategies (lack of capacity, lack of updating, lack of resources, lack of data, lack of political will/leadership) and the education sector is usually not covered. In some countries, Ministries of Education have developed safe school policies (e.g., Nepal, Guyana, Antigua and Barbuda), DRR strategies for the education sector (Zimbabwe – under preparation) or contingency plans for the education sector (Djibouti).**
- What percentage of local DRR strategies and plans are being implemented? **Unknown/not applicable**
- What changes have been observed in diversity in DRR leadership since 2015, particularly in terms of inclusive and diverse decision-making? **Government and regional entities are committed to engaging youth in DRR (as well as climate change) policymaking, which materializes in the organization of youth fora, appointment of youth representatives in national committees or delegations, etc. This is often combined with school/university outreach activities. However, the extent to which such engagement is meaningful or tokenistic is to be evaluated.**

**How important has the establishment of regional, sub-regional, national and local disaster risk reduction strategies and plans been to the realisation of the outcome, goal and targets of the Sendai Framework?** **The adoption of comprehensive DRR strategies at national level has been (and remains) vital to the realisation of the outcome, goal and targets of the Sendai Framework. There are often challenges in translating such strategies at sub-national level.**
The development of DRR strategies for the education sector is far from being as common as “general” DRR strategies.

**Probing Questions:**

- a. Has the establishment of national and/or local DRR strategies and plans resulted in expanded efforts in risk reduction? **Unknown/not applicable**
- b. How are national and local strategies being integrated within plans and actions supporting the realization of the goals and targets of inter alia the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement? **Unknown/not applicable**

Since the adoption of the Sendai Framework, to what degree has understanding disaster risks, their root causes and their incorporation in public and private decision making and investment become a ‘due diligence’ requirement by law? **Unknown/not applicable**

How has the Guiding Principle of shared responsibility between central Governments and local authorities, sectors and stakeholders been applied? Describe good practices

**Probing Questions:**

- a. What measures has the country / countries in which you operate taken to enable integrated management of disaster risk across institutions and sectors? **In many countries, an inter-Ministerial DRR committee/platform (including the education sector) is in place. More often, it is a climate change committee/platform. In the Republic of Guinea, a National Committee on Climate Change, created by decree in 2021 and composed of all sectoral ministries, civil society organizations and the private sector, was created along with a network of 30 focal points appointed at Ministry level. These focal points (including from the Ministry of Education) are part of a Climate Change Dialogue Platform, integrated into the CNCC. A challenge to the integrated management of disaster risk is the lack of functioning/coordinating among the members of such committees/platforms.**
- b. To what extent is the Sendai Framework known and being applied at sub-national and local levels? **Unknown/not applicable**
- c. What measures has your constituency taken to integrate disaster risk reduction and management with actions addressing climate change, sustainable development, biodiversity, public health risks and sustainable food systems? **See above reply on all-hazards approaches to DRR in the education sector. There is an urgent need to fully integrate DRR with climate change adaptation (CCA), particularly when it comes to addressing underlying causes of vulnerability. In the education sector, DRR and CCA should be integrated simultaneously (see for instance new CCMA/DRR curriculum developed by the Ministry of Education of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines).**

### Investment in Risk Reduction and Resilience [Section III.D.]

To what extent have investments by your constituency in resilience (through structural and non-structural measures) increased since 2015?

UNESCO has long supported efforts to better understand the origin of natural hazards, and their impacts, as illustrated by a UNESCO Symposium on typhoons organized as far back as 1954 in Tokyo. Today, UNESCO operates at the interface between Natural Sciences, Social & Human Sciences, Education, Culture and Communication & Information (i.e., UNESCO’s five Major Programs), playing a vital role in constructing a global culture of resilience. From a DRR perspective, it assists countries in building their capacities to prevent, be prepared for and respond to disasters. Since 2015 and the publication of a brochure entitled DRR: UNESCO’s contribution to a global challenge, UNESCO has focused on 8 cross-cutting thematic areas: 1) Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) for Resilience; 2) Early Warning Systems (EWS); 3) Built Environment; 4) Education and School Safety; 5) DRR for Culture and Sites; 6) Ecosystem-Based DRR; 7) Post-Disaster Response; and 8) Risk Governance and Social Resilience. UNESCO has long identified the need to reduce the risks posed by natural hazards to the education sector, such as through seminal research on “school building and natural disasters” in 1982, covering DRR and schools as it relates to risks caused by earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, cyclones/hurricanes and flooding. However, its work on DRR
& Education has significantly increased from the 2000s onwards, especially in the aftermath of the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami and subsequent disasters in Pakistan, Myanmar, Haiti and Nepal. Since 2006, the main coordination platform on DRR in Education has been the Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector (GADRRRES), which has developed the Comprehensive Safe School Framework (CSSF) and facilitates its dissemination. UNESCO has been playing a lead role since its inception, serving as the Alliance’s chair on an alternate basis with UNICEF. UNESCO’s chairmanship will resume in September 2022.

Over the years - in particular most recently (post-2015) - UNESCO has implemented Education in Emergencies (EIE) interventions in the context of natural hazards, sometimes with a DRR component. In 2015, following the 7.9 magnitude earthquake that hit Nepal, UNESCO Kathmandu reviewed existing integration of DRR on school curricula, based on which a comprehensive framework on the integration of DRR in School Curricula was developed. In 2017, in Peru, a project contributed to re-opening schools that had been severely damaged by heavy rains, mudflows and floods in the Piura Region. The project supported the set-up of temporary classrooms and bathrooms for students and the elaboration of protocols for risk management in the targeted localities. The Regional Directorate of Education was also supported in developing a DRR plan, linking the emergency response to system strengthening interventions. In 2021, UNESCO Kingston Office provided technical and financial support to the Ministry of Education of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to support continuity of learning following the eruption of La Soufrière Volcano in April.

**Probing Question:**

a. To what purposes have such investments been directed?
   i. to structural measures [as described *inter alia* in Paragraph 30 of the Sendai Framework]
   
   Historically, UNESCO’s involvement in the GADRRRES has mainly been through its Natural Sciences sector. One of UNESCO’s direct contributions has been under Pillar 1 of the Comprehensive Safe School Framework (CSSF), in the form of a multi-hazard school safety assessment tool called VISUS (for Visual Inspection for defining the Safety Upgrading Strategies), developed in collaboration with UNESCO’s Chair on Intersectoral Safety for DRR and Resilience i.e., the SPRINT-Lab (Safety and Protection Intersectoral Laboratory) of the University of Udine, Italy. Since 2009, VISUS has been utilized in Italy (2009), El Salvador (2013), Indonesia/Bandung, Laos (2015), Indonesia/Ambon (2016), Peru, Haiti, Antigua and Barbuda in 49 schools following Hurricane Irma (2017), Mozambique in 100 schools (2017-18), Zimbabwe in 15 schools (2021) and Bosnia Herzegovina in 40 schools (2022). UNESCO’s DRR Unit is planning the introduction of VISUS in the Dominican Republic through the BERLAC project, while UNESCO Jakarta Office is exploring possibilities to introduce the methodology in Malaysia. In 2022, a breakthrough in the future application of the VISUS methodology was the approval of a large project funded by the Adaptation Fund in Haiti, with UNESCO as the Implementing Entity (IE). The 3-year, USD9.9M project, entitled Implementing Measures for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction Mitigation of School Facilities in Haiti, is a first-of-its-kind globally and includes a budget of USD612,000 to assess a target of 700 schools, to be followed by retrofitting activities (USD6.2 million). Additionally, as part of reconstruction and rehabilitation operations in the areas affected by the 7.2 magnitude earthquake of 14 August 2021 (followed by Tropical Depression Grace), UNESCO has been supporting the Government of Haiti since December 2021 to build semi-structured permanent schools (USD130,000).

ii. to non-structural measures [as described *inter alia* in Paragraph 30 of the Sendai Framework]

Since the mid-2000s, UNESCO has largely contributed to the increasing recognition of the importance of DRR in Education. The establishment of the GADRRRES followed the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action, which set three main goals for DRR in schools: student and staff protection; educational continuity; and a culture of safety. In the years that followed, UNESCO contributed to raising awareness about the role of DRR in education policy and practice, as illustrated by a UNESCO-UNICEF document published in 2010, *Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in education: an imperative for education policymakers*. Related to Agenda 2030, UNESCO’s Education Sector contributed to defining the methodologies and methods of data collection, analysis and synthesis for several SDG targets related to DRR & Education, including targets 4.7 and 13.3.
UNESCO supports schools in setting up disaster management plans, training school administrators as well as teachers and students in the process. Every year, UNESCO mobilizes over 11 700 members of UNESCO’s Associated Schools Network (ASPnet) around International DRR Day (13 October) and World Tsunami Awareness Day (5 November). The 2014 book series on DRR, “Stay Safe and Be Prepared” (with separate editions for students, teachers and parents), created in this context, promotes school-level action to protect lives and spread good practices across communities. In 2019, the ASPnet launched a Global Art Contest, “My School Protects Me”, the winners of which were announced in October for International DRR Day during a UNESCO event.

In 2017-2018, UNESCO in Nepal supported in the development of a Teacher Training Manual and Self-Learning Material on developing basic lifesaving skills and hygiene awareness for improving the psychosocial well-being of children exposed to emergency and post-emergency situations, enabling them to pursue or resume a healthy life. Training was further imparted to teachers from flood affected schools in 12 districts.

In 2021, UNESCO Beijing Office supported the Asia-Pacific Culture Center for UNESCO (ACCU), based in Japan, in promoting dialogues on DRR at community level in Tohoku region through the organization of a workshop on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and DRR in December. As a follow up, a Junior High School was due to join an inter-country training program on community based DRR in 2022.

UNESCO also supports Governments in integrating DRR and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) into curricula. In February 2022, the Government of Haiti carried out a two-day workshop, with support from UNESCO, with the aim to develop a national strategy to strengthen the safety and resilience of the educational community through the integration of DRM in the curriculum, from preschool to tertiary level. In March, Haiti formally joined the University Network of the America and the Caribbean for Disaster Risk Reduction (REDULAC/RRD). Several UNESCO Field Offices are currently in the process of planning the implementation of projects involving the integration of DRR in curriculum. In addition, many Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and Climate Change Education (CCE) initiatives and projects include curriculum development/revision components, sometimes covering DRR.

| To what extent have such investments been quantified? If yes, provide values. | Unknown/not applicable |

UNESCO is building DRR capacities among its Member States, including in the education sector. As a UNESCO Category I Institute, the International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP-UNESCO) has prioritized crisis-sensitive educational planning (CSP), which includes planning for various aspects of DRR from disaster prevention and preparedness to responding to climate change impacts on education. In 2021, IIEP-UNESCO re-launched a pre-existing website, Planning for a brighter future | IIEP-UNESCO Education 4 Resilience, which hosts key resources on the protection of education in crisis situations. In the same context, the Ministry of Education of Guyana recently adopted a National Risk Management Policy for the education sector (2021-2026), developed with technical support from IIEP-UNESCO and UNICEF. The Ministry created risk profiles and hazard maps for all ten regions and the capital, Georgetown, outlining communities at risk (from flooding to bushfires and drought), vulnerable areas, as well as the existing capacities and new strategies to help the education system not only cope, but build back better. In 2022, the IIEP-UNESCO also supported the Ministry of Education of Jordan in conducting the mid-term review of the country’s Education Strategic Plan, with a focus on crisis response in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

UNESCO is delivering training on thematic areas related to DRR & Education. Training and the exchange of experiences have long been among IIEP-UNESCO’s core activities. In March 2022, IIEP-UNESCO organized a virtual knowledge-sharing forum on Ministry of Education leadership during crisis (with no specific focus on DRR). Speakers included representatives from the Government of Kenya, Jordan and South Sudan. In 2021, through its Regional Office for Southern Africa in Harare, Zimbabwe, UNESCO offered a MOOC on Resilient Schools and DRR Education, to support ministries of education, related stakeholders, practitioners, and other interested parties, on different elements on DRR and Safe School programming. This MOOC, which focused on Africa, was structured around the CSSF, and divided into eight modules aiming to provide a wide-ranging overview of the challenges and
opportunities to ensure resilient schools and DRR education. Each module consisted of presentations, lecture notes, a reading list, and related resources such as videos, reports, and case studies. So far, 1,400 education planners and practitioners have been trained. The MOOC is being adapted to the West Africa context by the Dakar Office, and OREALC/UNESCO Santiago, in collaboration with UNICEF Office for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Other UN agencies (which UNESCO is collaborating with in the education sector) are promoting risk-informed programming. UNICEF is committed to operate based on the following change strategy (Strategic Plan 2022-2025): “Risk-informed humanitarian and development nexus programming across all contexts will contribute to crisis prevention and preparedness, building strong, resilient systems and strengthening social cohesion and accountability to affected populations. With its partners inside and outside of the United Nations system, UNICEF will work to make health facilities and schools climate-resilient and prepared for natural disasters and public health emergencies and will use conflict analysis to inform its programmes in education, health, child protection, social protection and WASH, so that they do not exacerbate inequalities and rights violations that can lead to social tensions”.

Probing Questions:

a. What developments have been installed in fiscal instruments to integrate disaster risk reduction considerations and measures? **Unknown/not applicable**

b. What developments have been installed in financial regulatory mechanisms to integrate disaster risk reduction considerations and measures? **Unknown/not applicable**

c. What financial or regulatory incentives have been developed since 2015 to build the resilience of business and industry sectors to disaster risk from natural and man-made hazards, and encourage private investment in disaster risk reduction? **Unknown/not applicable**
   i. describe the impact of these measures where this has been assessed.

If applicable, have financial resources provided to your constituency for disaster risk reduction through international cooperation increased since 2015? **Unknown/not applicable**

Probing Question:

a. How has technical cooperation, technology transfer and resources for capacity building increased? **Unknown/not applicable**

Disaster Preparedness, Response and ‘Build Back Better’ [Section III. E.]

How has preparedness for response, as well as for recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, changed since the adoption of the Sendai Framework? Cite good practices

**Probing Questions:**

a. How has this manifested in terms of “Build Back Better”?

b. How have women, persons with disability, youth and other marginalised groups contributed to these efforts?

While UNESCO advocates for an inclusive approach to education response, more needs to be done to mainstream gender equality into its programmes. From a DRR & Education perspective, mainstreaming gender is a key strategy to reduce risks while addressing gender inequities. Indeed, those most affected by disasters are generally populations whose access to services are already limited – in particular women and girls. With fewer resources and less mobility, the latter are put in exceptionally vulnerable situations when crises arise and are further exposed to gender-based violence and sexual exploitation. This is the reason why DRR activities (including DRR & Education) can only be successful if built around the gender specific needs, strengths and vulnerabilities of men and especially girls and women. At the regional level, the Nairobi Office has focused on DRR policy review and development from a gender and social inclusion (GSI) lens in Eastern Africa. At country level, UNESCO in Niger through the CapED project (for Capacity Development for Education Programme) trained 130 secondary teachers and school principals in gender-responsive teaching in scientific disciplines. The principals represented 15 secondary schools selected as
**pilot institutions** where some 20,700 girls (40% of 54,500 students) were due to be stimulated to participate in classroom activities and receive a less gender-biased education in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM).

Examples of projects covering the education-indigenous knowledge-DRR nexus: in Southern Africa, the CliMWaR project, implemented from 2016 to 2021, was designed with the Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (LINKS) Programme to determine how best to incorporate indigenous knowledge, based on advice from specialists who had experience in working with indigenous knowledge on EWS. In the Caribbean, specifically Guyana, the Natural Sciences Sector organized in 2019 a workshop on “Mobilizing Indigenous and Local Knowledge Solutions: Addressing Climate Impacts and Vulnerabilities”, in cooperation with the Kingston Office and the Guyana National Commission. The workshop explored perspectives from the Caribbean regarding indigenous and local knowledge solutions to address climate impacts and vulnerabilities, including case studies on DRR, ecosystem resilience, recovery strategies. In 2020-2021, UNESCO implemented a pilot project in the Philippines and Honduras aimed to strengthen capacities for safeguarding living heritage in disaster contexts through the integration of disaster risk reduction into inventories of intangible cultural heritage. Drawing on UNESCO’s unique training curriculum and network of facilitators, the project held online workshops and pilot activities with local communities, disaster specialists, national authorities and civil society representatives to help them better understand how their intangible cultural heritage may help disaster risk prevention and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration, Partnership and Cooperation [Section III.F.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What partnerships and initiatives have been most successful in reducing disaster risk?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider relevant partnerships that may be (non-exhaustive) – local, sub-national, national, sub-regional, regional, transboundary and/or multistakeholder, civil society, public-private, south-south and triangular cooperation, or combinations thereof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO has established a wide range of partnerships related to education, DRR, climate change and related topics, with UN agencies, civil society organizations, research bodies, and others. These partnerships have ranged from inter-agency coordination and joint project implementation to scientific research and the translation of such research into policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO has long collaborated with UNICEF in the field of DRR &amp; Education. Both agencies have been chairing the GADRRRES on an alternate basis and published joint reports on DRR &amp; Education, since at least 2011 (see above). At both global and regional levels, UNESCO is also collaborating with UNDRR (for instance Cairo and Montevideo Offices) and UNFCC. Collaborations are also in place with the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), UNDP and UNEP through interagency thematic platforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO is a member (and a founding partner in several cases) of a number of global initiatives aimed at improving coordination and facilitating collective action in the field of EiE and/or DRR &amp; Education:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector (GADRRRES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geneva Global Hub for Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Global Education Cluster, through IIEP-UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO has initiated various programmes bringing stakeholders working on DRR, climate change and related topics together. These include Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB), founded in 1971; International Geoscience and Geoparks Programme (IGGP), founded in 1972; International Hydrological Programme (IHP), founded in 1975; and Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems Programme (LINKS), founded in 2002. The International Platform for Reducing Earthquake Disaster (IPRED), which UNESCO established in 2007, is a collaborative network of research, training, and education in the field of seismology and earthquake engineering. Composed of national centres of excellence from ten earthquake-prone countries, its mission is to identify gaps and priorities by sharing scientific knowledge and experience in the field of seismology and earthquake...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
engineering, to support the development of political will and public awareness, and to improve earthquake preparedness and build a culture of safety for communities across the world.

UNESCO collaborates with the following DRR-related bodies: the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (the seventh session took place from 23-28 May 2022 in Bali, Indonesia); the International Platform for Recovery (IPR), established in 2005 following the Second UN World Conference on DRR held in Hyogo, which led to adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action; the Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR), which is a clearinghouse for knowledge, training, advocacy and practice on Eco-DRR, established in 2008; and the International Network on Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (IN-MHEWS), established in 2015 following the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Reduction held in Sendai, which led to the adoption of the Sendai Framework for DRR.

In 2014, UNESCO joined the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI Partnership), deploying specialized expertise in response to country demand for CADRI services in the areas of education, protection of cultural heritage, as well as water related disasters and science. In 2020-21, CADRI partners joined forces to develop a digital tool for capacity diagnosis and planning, in order to support governments in identifying integrated solutions to address climate and disaster risks across various sectors (including education), through a participative and inclusive process. The tool was made available to governments in May 2022.

In 2021, UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre with the Group on Earth Observations (GEO) launched the GEO Urban Heritage Climate Observatory (UHCO). The collaboration aims to apply the tools of Earth Observation to understand and document the impact of climate change on World Heritage cities. UHCO serves as a forum for partners to share practices, needs and expertise; to match user needs with Earth observation data; to enrich and coordinate monitoring and management of urban heritage; and for communication and advocacy related to climate action. The ultimate goal is to develop a global platform to collect and integrate Earth observations and complementary data, information and relevant indicators to address the risks and impacts of climate change on urban heritage and enable appropriate adaptation measures.

In 2021 as well, UNESCO established a tripartite committee, together with the Government of Greece and the WMO, to coordinate a Flexible Mechanism (FM) on the protection of cultural and natural heritage from climate change impacts. This initiative, so far supported by 93 countries, aims to leverage UNESCO’s cultural expertise and networks to monitor the impact of climate change on culture and provide Member States with insights on how to mitigate its effects.

In 2021, UNESCO, the SIDS Group at UNESCO with the support of the Governments of Australia, Cook Islands, Japan and New Zealand organized the very first UNESCO Global SIDS dialogue series and the theme of event was DRR. It provided member states the opportunity to share the impact of natural hazards on various sectors including education. The meeting raised awareness about the lessons learnt and needs of SIDS that have been affected by natural hazards and the opportunities available for SIDS to address them. Consequently, a preconcept note is being prepared to mobilize funds to support African SIDS in this area, which is being led by the DRR unit. This activity complements, DRR activities, which are implemented in the respective UNESCO Field Offices. The second edition is planned in October 2022.

Collaboration with regional government entities: UNESCO is collaborating with several DRR entities at regional level, such as with CDEMA (Kingston Office), the SADC (Harare Office) and the Pacific Community or SPC (Samoa Office).

Probing Questions:

a. How have genuine and durable partnerships been established?

b. How were they developed?

c. How are such partnerships governed?

d. How are they funded or resourced?
13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>e. What are the leadership roles and partnership evaluation methods?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How has cooperation and collaboration in risk reduction across national, regional or international mechanisms and institutions in the implementation of relevant international agendas, frameworks and conventions evolved since the adoption of the Sendai Framework? Cite examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As indicated in section 13, there have been a significant growth in the number and reach of regional or international mechanisms, institutions or partnerships in the implementation of relevant international agendas, frameworks and conventions since the adoption of the Sendai Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress in achieving the Targets of the Sendai Framework [Section III.G.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>What progress has been made by your stakeholder constituency in achieving the seven global Targets of the Sendai Framework?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the education sector, UNESCO has contributed to Target 4: Substantially reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, among them health and educational facilities, including through developing their resilience by 2030, primarily through standard setting and support to the GADRRRES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Probing Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What have been some of the major challenges? <strong>Unknown/non applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context Shifts, New and Emerging Issues [Section IV.]

Context Shifts and New Issues – Retrospective (2015 – 2022) [Section IV.A.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>What have been the major changes to the contexts within which your constituency has been implementing the Framework since 2015? Including emerging issues and topics of concern.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the past two decades – marked by devastating natural hazards, from the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami to powerful earthquakes and cyclones up to 2022 – significant changes have occurred, both at a normative and operational level. A recent evolution has been the increasing recognition of the systemic nature of risk, associated with globalization and the cascading impacts of multiple hazards that spread within and across systems and sectors, as illustrated by the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on access to education. Climate change, which is the defining crisis of our time, is the cause of more frequent and intense extreme weather events, adding a sense of urgency to the need for increased focus on DRR and resilience building in the education sector. While protecting the sector from the impacts of disasters is essential, it is equally important to recognize the transformative role of education as a fundamental instrument to reduce risks and build environmental, economic and social resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Probing Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. How have existing risk governance and risk management mechanisms and approaches fared in the COVID-19 pandemic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a response to the COVID-19 pandemic, UNESCO has taken a transversal approach in line with its mandate, in order to design and deliver appropriate responses to the crisis, especially in the education sector. In 2020, it launched the Global Education Coalition together with more than 175 members of the UN family, civil society, academia and the private sector to protect the right to education during the pandemic. Coalition members rally around three flagships, namely connectivity, teachers and gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What impact is the deepening climate crisis having on the implementation of the Sendai Framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The implementation of the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework need to be planned, thought and funded alongside. Climate change is the cause of more frequent and intense extreme weather events, adding a sense of urgency to the need for increased focus on DRR and resilience building in the education sector. While protecting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the sector from the impacts of disasters is essential, it is equally important to recognize the transformative role of education as a fundamental instrument to reduce risks and build environmental, economic and social resilience.

Since 2018, there has been an increase in climate change programming across UNESCO’s Major Programmes, particularly at country level. For instance, nearly all of UNESCO Jakarta Office’s planned projects for the period 2020-2021 referred to climate change. A May 2021 evaluation of UNESCO Strategy for Action on Climate Change (2017) listed a total of 221 projects implemented over the previous four years. In terms of Climate Change Education (CCE), a UNESCO Associated Schools network (ASPnet) project - piloted in 258 schools from 25 countries between 2016 and 2018 - attested to UNESCO’s unique positioning in leveraging its expertise and networks to advance climate action. The project supported schools in adopting a Whole-Institution Approach to Climate Action, involving nearly 240,000 students and an additional 14,000 teachers. In 2021, ASPnet launched a new Teacher guide on action learning for sustainable development (translated in Arabic, Chinese, French and Russian), proposing ways to engage learners and communities around trash, waste management and, more widely, education for sustainable development (ESD).

c. How has the implementation of the Sendai Framework been affected by shifts in biological diversity and health of ecosystems? **Unknown or non applicable**

Emerging Issues and Future Contexts – Prospective (to 2030 and beyond) [Section IV.B.]

What major changes / emerging issues / topics of concern are anticipated in the period to 2030 and beyond, and which will need to be considered in prioritising, accelerating and amplifying action?

**Probing Questions:**

a. The COVID-19 pandemic and the climate crisis are two of the most obvious recent exemplars of the systemic nature of risk, what else is on the radar? **Unpredictable disastrous events are very likely to occur by the end of the decade. However, it is vital to accelerate climate action (= treat it as a priority) and build the resilience of education systems to more frequent and intense (unpredictable but very likely) natural hazards. Besides, education needs to be valued as a key instrument to reduce risk and build environmental, economic and social resilience as a response to the escalating climate crisis and the growingly systemic nature of risk.**

MTR SF – Prospective Review (to 2030 and beyond) [Section V.]

Outcome and Goal [Section V.A.]

What 5 deliverables, innovations, processes, or transformations, etc. would bring the greatest reduction in disaster risk and the greatest increase in the resilience of people, assets and ecosystems in the remaining period of the Sendai Framework and beyond 2030? **Unknown/not applicable**

**Probing Questions:**

a. What are the key measures that must be taken to build the resilience of critical infrastructure and basic services? **Education systems could be added to the list.** One first step is to have key indicators to evaluate the resilience of education infrastructure and conduct regular assessments. Examples of indicators: A systematic plan for assessment and prioritization for retrofit and replacement of unsafe schools is developed, and is being implemented (GADRRRES), Guidance and regulations for safe school construction are in place (GADRRRES), Education authorities promote routine maintenance and non-structural mitigation for increased safety and protection of investments in public schools (GADRRRES), What zoning, design standards and building codes apply to construction of schools, universities and other education institutions? (UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies), Is there a nationally agreed methodology for assessments of school and pre-school facilities? (CADRI), Does the assessment focus on:
(i) hazard exposure of school facilities; (ii) integrity of structures; (iii) state of school facilities and utilities; (iv) risk awareness of educational officers; and (v) level of preparedness (CADRI). Are there legal provisions focusing on school safety? (i.e. school preparedness, safe infrastructures) (CADRI), Efforts taken to properly manage hazardous materials (CDEMA).

i. health systems
ii. food systems
iii. water and sanitation systems
iv. energy systems
v. financial systems

Risk Assessment, Information and Understanding [Section V.B.]

How can risk knowledge and insight be improved? – including in improving understanding of the systemic and interconnected nature of risk

Probing Question:

a. What measures can be taken to ensure that this is systematically integrated in all decision-making?

Integration of risk reduction into Education Management Information Systems (EMIS): UNESCO is supporting countries in strengthening their EMIS in areas relevant to DRR in Education. In Bangladesh, a pilot study from 2015, entitled Climate Change Education for Sustainable Development and conducted by UNESCO with the Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS), gathered and analyzed disaster-related impact data from 1,800 education institutions covering 12 disaster-affected areas. BANBEIS continues to gather climate change and disaster vulnerability data according to the study’s variables, using secondary data from education sub-sectors. A chapter on “Climate change and disaster impacts on education institutions” has featured in the annual Bangladesh Education Statistics since 2017.

Guyana’s National Risk Management Policy for the education sector (2021-2026) contributed to reshaping planning tools like the Education Management Information System (EMIS) so that risk-related indicators are integrated.

b. How can indigenous wisdom and traditional/local knowledge be more systematically included in generating risk knowledge?

SAME EXAMPLES OF ABOVE - Examples of projects covering the education-indigenous knowledge-DRR nexus:

In Southern Africa, the CliMWaR project, implemented from 2016 to 2021, was designed with the Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (LINKS) Programme to determine how best to incorporate indigenous knowledge, based on advice from specialists who had experience in working with indigenous knowledge on EWS. In the Caribbean, specifically Guyana, the Natural Sciences Sector organized in 2019 a workshop on “Mobilizing Indigenous and Local Knowledge Solutions: Addressing Climate Impacts and Vulnerabilities”, in cooperation with the Kingston Office and the Guyana National Commission. The workshop explored perspectives from the Caribbean regarding indigenous and local knowledge solutions to address climate impacts and vulnerabilities, including case studies on DRR, ecosystem resilience, recovery strategies. In 2020-2021, UNESCO implemented a pilot project in the Philippines and Honduras aimed to strengthen capacities for safeguarding living heritage in disaster contexts through the integration of disaster risk reduction into inventories of intangible cultural heritage. Drawing on UNESCO’s unique training curriculum and network of facilitators, the project held online workshops and pilot activities with local communities, disaster specialists, national authorities and civil society representatives to help them better understand how their intangible cultural heritage may help disaster risk prevention and management.

---

2 Covering general DRR situation, impact of disasters, vulnerability, level of preparedness, coordination and stakeholders, and capacity assessment.
| 20 | Given the systemic nature of risk, and experiences of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic (including cascading, indirect impacts), what adjustments are required in policy, regulatory and legislative frameworks, organisation and investment, epistemology, and strategy, to be able to capitalise on opportunities, or to mitigate new / emerging threats to the achievement of the expected outcome and goal of the Sendai Framework? **Probing Questions:**
| a. at the national level? **Unknown/not applicable**
| b. at the local level? **Unknown/not applicable**
| c. at the regional level? **There needs to be more experience sharing or efforts to scale up best practices. Ex: regional entities that are most advanced in the field of School Safety, such as South-East Asia or the Caribbean (or countries that are pioneering in the field of DRR/climate education) could share their experiences with other countries/regions so by 2030, all Member States are equipped to prioritize DRR in education.**
| d. at the international level? **Education needs to be prioritized by international climate finance mechanisms**
| e. within specific systems or domains? **Unknown/not applicable** |

| 21 | The Sendai Framework states that responsibilities for disaster risk reduction are shared by central Governments and relevant national authorities, sectors and stakeholders. What must be prioritised to ensure that responsibilities are shared in risk identification and reduction? **Probing Questions:**
| a. What is required to promote women’s empowerment and leadership in disaster risk reduction? **Unknown/not applicable**
| b. What measures can be taken to ensure that ‘no one is left behind’? **Promote DRR through non-formal education (NFE) or literacy programmes. Scale up public education along with efforts in the education sector.**
| c. What measures can be taken to ensure that ‘no ecosystem is left behind’? **Unknown/not applicable** |

| 22 | What priority actions can be taken to empower local authorities and local partnerships to strengthen risk reducing action at the subnational and local levels? **Train teachers and school principals** |

| 23 | What are the adjustments or key measures that must be taken to ensure that disaster risk management is no longer treated as a ‘sector’ in itself, but is a practice systematically applied across all sectors? **DRR integration into teacher training and practice** |

| Investment in Risk Reduction and Resilience [Section V.D.] |
| 24 | What measures can non-State stakeholders and public institutions take at national and international levels to ensure risk is priced more accurately within all financial transactions, and not treated as an externality and discounted in public and private investment? **Unknown/not applicable** |

| 25 | What further actions are required through to 2030 to strengthen the resilience of business and industry sectors to disaster risk? **Unknown/not applicable** |

| 26 | What further actions are required within your constituency through to 2030 to strengthen the resilience of your domain(s) of work to disaster risk? **Education to be prioritized by climate finance and vice versa, DRR/climate action to be prioritized by global education funds.** |
In accelerating and amplifying action pursuing the outcome and goal of the Sendai Framework:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>What new or emerging initiatives and partnerships will need to be developed to support governments in the period to 2030? <strong>UN system (on education): close cooperation between UNDRR, UNESCO, UNICEF, UNFCCC and UNDP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>In which priority areas are more partnerships required for risk-informed sustainable development to be possible? <strong>DRR/climate education. The education sector cannot achieve a ‘transformational shift’ by itself. All stakeholders need to be involved/collaborate with the education sector.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>How can development partners and the international community provide better support? <strong>Support the adoption of collective targets that are SMART and ‘trackable’ (or mandatory), e.g., DRR/climate education should not be an option and progress made reported in National Communications to UNFCCC or UNDRR. And mobilize resources needed to provide such support.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix I**

**Strategic Questions**

**Purpose**

1. How have (development) decisions in public and private sectors, as well as civil society, been made more sustainable through implementation of the Sendai Framework? **Unknown/not applicable**

2. Are the root causes and underlying drivers of disaster risk better understood, and more systemically addressed across all sectors, scales and disciplines? When analysing trade-offs and co-benefits between development pathways, reflective of the interconnections across the Sustainable Development Goals, how is their impact on underlying disaster risk considered? **Unknown/not applicable**

3. What do governments and other stakeholders consider to have been the major achievements, challenges and barriers to implementation of the Sendai Framework, and lessons identified? **See above**

4. What have been the major changes to the contexts within which governments and other stakeholders have been implementing the Framework since 2015? What major changes / emerging issues / topics of concern are anticipated in the period to 2030 which will need to be considered in prioritising, accelerating and amplifying action? **See above**

5. What adjustments are required in policy, regulatory and legislative frameworks, strategy, epistemology, organisation or investment to capitalise on opportunities or to mitigate new / emerging threats to the achievement of the expected outcome and goal of the Sendai Framework? **See above**

6. What deliverables would bring the greatest reduction in disaster risk and the greatest increase in the resilience of people, assets and ecosystems in the remaining period of the Sendai Framework and beyond 2030? **The education sector needs to be prioritized (= more than it has been during the initial period).**
Expected Outcome

7. Has there been a reduction of disaster risk and the impacts of natural- and man-made hazards on persons, businesses, communities, countries and ecosystems, as a result of actions taken and approaches adopted in implementing the Sendai Framework since 2015? **See above**

8. What is the trend for the achievement of the expected outcome of the Sendai Framework for the period to 2030? **Risks (in particular climate risks) are growing much faster than resilience in the education sector. In addition, in most countries, the “school population” (and the number of schools) is growing fast as per countries’ demographic trends. So increased ambition and action is needed to meet the expected outcomes of the Sendai Framework in the education sector.**

9. In respect of people and assets in your country, business, community or organisation, what progress has been made in: reducing exposure to hazards? Reducing their vulnerability and augmenting their capacity for risk reduction? Where relevant how have hazard, vulnerability or exposure characteristics been modified / their threat reduced (e.g. man-made hazards)? **See above**

Goal

10. What do governments and other stakeholders consider to have been the major achievements, challenges and lessons identified in: preventing the creation of new risk? reducing the existing stock of risk? strengthening resilience? **See above**

11. What are the prospects for the achievement of the goal of the Sendai Framework by 2030 based on progress since 2015 and expectations for the period 2023 to 2030? **See above**

Global Targets

12. How have quantitative targets supported efforts to realise the goal and outcome of the Sendai Framework? **There is a need for more specific, disaggregated and context-specific targets & indicators in the implementation of the Sendai Framework in the education sector.**

13. What have been your experiences and issues with reporting on the Global Targets, using the internationally agreed indicators? **Unknown/not applicable**

14. How important has the establishment of national and local disaster risk reduction strategies and plans of action been to the realisation of the other targets, goal and expected outcome of the Sendai Framework? If yes, have these proved useful, and if not, why not? Have national custom indicators been established? And how are national and local strategies being integrated within plans and actions supporting the realization of the goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement? **See above**

Application of the Guiding Principles

15. How has national and/or regional public policy, legislation, planning and organisation changed to align with the Sendai Framework? How must it change in the period to 2030? **DRR frameworks at national level existed prior to the Sendai Framework. In many countries, challenges/bottlenecks have remained the**
same. In addition, too few national/local stakeholders know about the Sendai Framework to be able to use it to improve national and/or regional public policy, legislation, planning and organisation.

16. How has the principle of shared responsibility between central and local authorities, sectors and stakeholders been applied? What measures have countries taken to enable integrated management of disaster risk across institutions, sectors, the private sector and other stakeholders? See above

17. What enabling measures have been implemented to integrate disaster risk reduction and management with actions addressing climate change, sustainable development, biodiversity, and other relevant domains? Some countries have set up Ministries in charge of both Sustainable Development and Environment (e.g., Djibouti as of May 2022) or Sustainable Development and Education (Saint Lucia).

Priorities for Action

18. Since the adoption of the Sendai Framework, to what degree has understanding disaster risks, their root causes and their incorporation in public and private decision making and investment become a ‘due diligence’ requirement by law? Unknown/not applicable (little known evidence that risk understanding and due diligence have increased as a result/outcome of the Sendai Framework).

19. What progress has been made in approaches to pre-disaster risk assessment – for disaster risk prevention and mitigation, as well as for the development and implementation of appropriate preparedness and effective responses to disasters – that consider disaster risk in all its dimensions of vulnerability, capacity, exposure of persons and assets, hazard characteristics and the environment? Early action (also known as anticipatory action), which is an innovative approach systematically linking early warnings to actions designed to protect communities and their assets ahead of a hazard, may form an integral component of DRM in the education sector.

20. What do governments and other stakeholders consider to have been the major achievements, challenges and lessons identified since 2015 in developing disaster risk governance mechanisms and approaches? See above

21. Given the systemic nature of risk, and experiences of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic (including cascading, indirect impacts), what adjustments are required to existing disaster risk governance and management approaches at the national and local, international and regional levels? Unknown/not applicable

22. Have increases been observed in investments in resilience since 2015, are investments by public and private sectors increasingly risk-informed, and if yes, by what measures? Are disaster risk reduction considerations and measures integrated in financial and fiscal instruments? Has there been an increase in guidance for risk-informed public and private investment? See above

23. How has the resilience of business and industry sectors to disaster risk, including from natural and man-made hazards, evolved since 2015? What further actions are required through to 2030? Unknown/not applicable

24. How has preparedness for response, as well as preparedness for recovery, rehabilitation and recovery, improved or deteriorated since adoption of the Sendai Framework? And how has this manifested in terms of “Build Back Better”? See above

---

3 including through enhanced multi-hazard early warning systems
Stakeholders – Integrated, inclusive multi-stakeholder engagement, action and partnership

25. What partnerships and initiatives have proved most successful? How and why? See above

26. To what extent is the Sendai Framework known and being applied at sub-national and local levels? Little

International cooperation and global partnership

27. How has cooperation and collaboration in risk reduction across mechanisms and institutions in the implementation of relevant international instruments evolved since the adoption of the Sendai Framework? See above

28. How important have been regional and subregional disaster risk reduction strategies and plans in supporting national and local efforts to implement the Sendai Framework? Important, e.g., Caribbean Safe School Initiative (CSSI) supported by GADRRRES and regional stakeholders in the Caribbean

29. What have been the trends in financial resources provided to developing countries for disaster risk reduction through international cooperation since 2015? Likewise technical cooperation, capacity building and technology transfer? Including through bilateral, multilateral, north-south, south-south, and triangular cooperation. See above

The Strategic Questions are supplemented by additional guiding questions (in Appendix II) that can generate further information and insight to the review.
Appendix II

Additional Guiding Questions for consultations and dialogue

Member States and stakeholders may also wish to include the following additional guiding questions in consultations and dialogues.

Progress, Achievements, Gaps and Challenges

General:

- What do Governments and other stakeholders consider to have been the greatest advances to date in implementing the Sendai Framework? What are the principal reasons for progress made? For instance, what structures, policies or processes have proved the primary enablers of progress? See above
- What have been key barriers to implementation of the Sendai Framework? See above
- How could your country/city/community/business/organisation/partnership/sector have been better supported in the implementation of the Sendai Framework? More collaboration between UNDRR and UNESCO
- In which areas has progress been easiest, and in what areas has it been most difficult? Unknown/not applicable
- How has implementation of the Sendai Framework been supported by other international agreements, conventions or frameworks (e.g., 2030 Agenda, Paris Agreement, Addis Ababa Action Plan, SAMOA Pathway, Convention on Biological Diversity, etc.)? Clear link between the Sendai Framework and the Paris Agreement. At regional level (SIDS), the SAMOA Pathway has helped increase the resilience agenda in the region.

Targeted:

- To what degree has multi-hazard/all risk management been incorporated in public sector decision making and investment at all levels, as well as within and across all sectors? See above
- How have approaches – including integrated, multisectoral approaches, as well as those adopted through local, national and regional DRR strategies and plans – succeeded in addressing disaster risks posed by both natural and man-made hazards and related environmental, technological and biological hazards and risks? Unknown/not applicable
- To what degree are risk assessments systematically undertaken to assure risk-informed decision making? Do they consider trade-offs and co-benefits in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals? Are methodologies and data regularly reviewed and updated? Has there been an increase in the availability of loss data, including economic loss data? Unknown/not applicable
- To what degree are traditional, indigenous and local knowledge and communities, in addition to scientific and technological insights, participating and guiding risk assessment and risk-informed decision making and investment? See above
- How have genuine and durable partnerships been established? How were they developed? How are such partnerships governed? How are they funded? What are the leadership roles and partnership
evaluation methods? What challenges have been experienced in implementation? In which priority areas are more partnerships required for risk-informed sustainable development to be possible? See above
Priorities and options for the way forward:

**General:**

- What priorities must be set in order to ensure the implementation of the Sendai Framework by 2030? **The education sector needs to be prioritized.**

- What new initiatives and partnerships will become available to governments and other stakeholders going forward? Climate funds (Green Climate Fund, Adaptation Fund and Global Environment Facility) are looking at prioritizing the education sector, while Global Education Funds (GPE) are looking at addressing climate change. Existing partnerships/investments need to be strengthened.

- How can development partners and the international community better support the realisation of the expected outcome and goal of the Sendai Framework? **The education sector needs to be prioritized.**

- At a national level, how must policy planning change to facilitate implementation? DRR processes that exist on paper (legal framework, institutional arrangements, etc) need to be operational.

- What more needs to be done to hasten the shift from disaster management to integrated and anticipatory disaster risk management; from managing events to managing the processes which create risk? A culture of risk reduction through “addressing the root causes” (versus a culture of disaster preparedness and response) need to be instilled in National Emergency Management Agencies (NEMAs) beginning with a clear mandate and corresponding institutional capacities.

- What are the adjustments or key measures that must be taken to ensure that disaster risk management is no longer treated as a ‘sector’ in itself, but is a practice applied across all sectors? **Risk analysis to be conducted at sectoral level, particularly in sectors that are less the focus of national DRR strategies (e.g., education sector). Based on the risk analysis, development sectoral DRR strategies and action plans.**

**Targeted:**

- What must be prioritised to ensure that responsibilities for disaster risk reduction are shared by central Governments and relevant national authorities, sectors and stakeholders so as to facilitate multistakeholder risk management and transdisciplinary, multiscale risk governance? **Unknown/not applicable**

- What adjustment or strengthening is required to make more effective the institutional framework at international, national and local levels, including compliance mechanisms? **Unknown/not applicable**

- What priority actions can be taken to empower local authorities and local partnerships including institutions, the private sector, civil society, academia, scientific and research institutions to strengthen risk reducing action at the subnational and local levels? **See above**

- What are the priority capacity deficits that should be prioritised for development if implementation of the Sendai Framework is to be accelerated? **Building the capacity of education stakeholders**

- What are the key measures that must be taken to build the resilience of critical infrastructure, including health systems, food systems and financial systems? **See above (on education infrastructure)**