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1. Background

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030) sets out the case for development to be risk-informed in order to be sustainable. Direct economic losses from disasters have increased by more than 150 per cent over the past 20 years, with losses disproportionately borne by vulnerable developing countries. Both the Sendai Framework and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) outcomes are a product of interconnected social and economic processes. As such, there is a lot of synergy between the two policy instruments. Risk is systemic in nature and to reduce risk we also must be increasingly joined up in our approaches: working cross-sectors, between and within institutions, and ensuring harmony from policy through to activity. Consequently, the Sendai Framework presents a disaster risk management paradigm to be applied across international and national agendas and sectors.

The Mid-term Review of the Sendai Framework (MTR) marks the midpoint in the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and other global policy frameworks. The MTR process outcomes will be presented in a Main Report and a Synthesis Report of the MTR. The process will conclude in 2023 at a high-level meeting of the General Assembly. The MTR and the political declaration adopted at this high-level meeting can inform inter alia the SDGs Summit, the UN Secretary General’s Summit for the Future and the recommendations for Our Common Agenda, and COP 28. For further information on the background, objectives, scope and expected results of the MTR, please see the concept note here.

The Sendai MTR has retrospective and prospective elements. It works to take stock, identify emerging issues, uncover context shifts, and build coherence with other frameworks, to better address the systemic nature of risk and so realize regenerative and sustainable development. The Sendai MTR follows the Guiding Principles of the Sendai Framework and an “all-of-society approach” by including a range of stakeholders spanning UN member states, global, regional, national and local stakeholders.

The UN System is a key stakeholder to be consulted as part of the MTR. It is against this backdrop that UNDP’s Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery for Building Resilience Team (DRT) and the SDG Integration Team (SDGIT) organized an internal Sparkblue consultation (https://www.sparkblue.org/sendai-framework-mid-term-review) to seek the inputs of UNDP staff on the MTR. The consultation ran from 28 June – 25 July 2022 and featured three (3) global webinars to kick-start reflections on the MTR review questions; four (4) discussion rooms that focused on specific themes of interest (see below); and three (3) coffee chat events with the online moderators to summarize the main messages from the responses received. Despite this outreach, the engagement of UNDP staff was rather modest with only 55 members following the discussion, and 13 respondents (not counting the moderator’s inputs).

The objectives of the consultation were to:
(i) seek the views of UNDP staff on their recommendations for potential policy adjustments and new modalities for implementation for the second half of the duration of the Sendai Framework;

(ii) seek the views of UNDP staff on integrating risk reduction and risk management into the implementation of other international agendas, and sectors and areas of work, so as to limit the unsustainable build-up of vulnerability and exposure to hazards in these sectors; and

(iii) mobilize and raise the awareness and engagement of UNDP staff around the UNDP Strategic Plan’s resilience building objective and signature solution.

The consultation was designed for UNDP experts and practitioners representing different UNDP communities of practice working at global, regional and country level (e.g. climate change, disaster risk reduction, conflict prevention, governance, PVE, health, environment, poverty, finance).

2. Findings

The consultation process generated learning and recommendations that are inter alia grounded in lived realities supported by UNDP, real world experiences of communities, reflecting specificity of context and relationships with and dependencies on natural systems. The UNDP findings and recommendations will feed into the MTR process on issues related to international or national risk governance, risk analysis and assessment, coherence across sectors and agendas, partnerships and collaboration, and priority actions and critical achievements for the period 2023-2030 to address the systemic nature of risk.

The consultation covered four broad themes, namely (i) retrospective review of experiences with implementing the Sendai Framework to date; (ii) reflections on UNDP’s role in supporting the Sendai Framework; (iii) changing risk and development context; and (iv) prospective review of recommendations for the remaining period of the Sendai Framework and beyond 2030.

Part 1: Retrospective Review

The *Retrospective Review* of experiences with implementing the Sendai Framework to date asked the following questions:

1. How have the contexts in which UNDP has been supporting the implementation of the Sendai Framework and risk management activities changed since 2015?

2. What major achievements, challenges and barriers to disaster risk reduction and the implementation of the Sendai Framework have you observed in UNDP programme countries since 2015? Have they at all been able to (i) prevent the creation of new risk; (ii) reduce the existing stock of risk and; (iii) follow the Sendai Guiding Principles?
3. Have you seen changes in the way preparedness for response and recovery (i.e., rehabilitation and reconstruction) is supported since the adoption of the Sendai Framework? Can you share any good practice? Can you share areas needing further attention to improve preparedness (e.g., finance)?

Findings and recommendations:

It was pointed out that climate change, pandemics, and conflict are risk drivers which have had a considerable impact on both rich and poor nations over recent years. The *growing unpredictability* associated with increasing levels of systemic risk has also affected the way in which risk considerations are integrated into UNDP programming and projects.

There was agreement that the Sendai Framework has positioned the *management of multidimensional risks* on the map. This is a significant achievement given the growing complexity of interacting hazards (particularly considering the pandemic). However, the Sendai Framework and its national iterations (through national Disaster Risk Reduction or Resilience Strategies) have not yet been able to significantly adjust the way in which development is planned, budgeted and executed. This was considered important because several drivers of vulnerability stem from un-checked or ill-informed development. It was mentioned that the processes that drive risk creation can only be kept in check, if we move beyond growth models. This may require challenging our assumptions and our values considering that GDP is a very weak indicator for people’s wellbeing. We may need to give a greater value to living in symbiosis with nature, engage less in activities that drive risk, and invest early on in prevention. The next phase of Sendai Framework implementation, therefore, needs to position the risk-based policy discourse and practice ‘from-within’ the mechanics of development itself. As such, the parameters or language of the Sendai Framework may need to change to be able to provide a conduit into the center of development. Some voices even pondered whether the Sendai Framework has been an appropriate vehicle for mainstreaming disaster risk into development and whether it may have contributed to siloed responses to addressing systemic risk.

It was noted that in discussions on risk management the language appears to act as a barrier to integration and engagement. For example, the continuing use of “disaster risk” (which over time has evolved to be predominantly related to natural hazards only) rather than the broader term “risk” is a factor in maintaining silos of activity and reducing engagement in achieving the implementation of the Sendai Framework by those outside of the “disaster risk community”. It was also observed that the growing use of “complicated language” – such as “multi-hazard”, “systemic”, or “cascading effects” – acts as an impediment to being able to communicate with a wider audience such as mayors, ministers or citizens in communities that UNDP is servicing.

Breaking down the siloes between development and risk reduction appears to occur more easily in times of disruption and crises and gets harder in ‘normal times’. Opportunities for integration and collaboration, therefore, should be established way before disasters unleash. The UNDP Strategic Plan invites us to be more *agile and forward looking at times of great uncertainty*. For UNDP staff to deal with uncertainty is exhausting. For breaking down the siloes and better
connectivity to link up the dots, we therefore need infrastructures of connection and collaboration that go beyond our formal institutional arrangements.

This is relevant for the support UNDP renders to its programme countries, so that they can define how existing agencies collaborate and better govern systemic risk. For this, governance structures and management strategies must become more inclusive and supported by experiential and tactical knowledge, and the people who are affected by the changes.

It was highlighted that there is still very little awareness of risk-based approaches and very little space for open exchanges, such as this consultation process. Such opportunities are considered essential to support and catalyze the “pivot towards anticipatory and preemptive mindsets” that is a stated goal of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025 and is also at the heart of the Sendai Framework. There was a call that more needs to be done to achieve the shift from “managing disasters to managing risks”.

The question what is holding UNDP back as an institution, and what is holding colleagues back from engaging with this shift was put forward. Among the constraints, the need was highlighted to servicing donors and funders who continue to offer less than 5% of all development funding for prevention related programming (for “managing risks”) and over 95% for preparatory and response related programming (“managing disasters”).

Part 2: Reflections on UNDP’s Role

The Reflections on UNDP’s Role in supporting the Sendai Framework asked the following questions:

1. Have you seen an increase or a reduction in financial resources provided to UNDP for disaster risk reduction and disaster risk management through international cooperation since 2015?

2. Do you think UNDP is appropriately set up organizationally at global, regional and country level to effectively support governments with implementing the Sendai Framework and addressing the increasingly systemic nature of risk? How have changes to the institutional set up and structure of UNDP since 2015 impacted on UNDP’s ability to provide support?

3. Have the reduction of vulnerability and underlying risks been sufficiently considered during the development of UNDP’s Strategic Plan, Country Programme Documents and work plans? How have risks related to disasters, climate change and other hazards and shocks been considered?

4. Can you share your experience with any relevant partnerships and initiatives which UNDP has been engaged in that have been successful in reducing disaster and other types of risk? – (i) at what level did they operate and which stakeholders were involved?; (ii) what factors ensured their sustainability?; (iii) what governance arrangements made them successful?; (iv) how were they funded? (v) what role did their leadership have?
Findings and recommendations:

Having disaster risk reduction (DRR) situated as part of UNDP’s resilience signature solution was believed to have paved the way for the provision of more integrated support. Nevertheless, UNDP may nowadays not be set up optimally to fulfill its risk reduction mandate. Several years back the DRR practice and programme portfolio was among the largest at Country Office level. Now, we see standalone DRR teams or programmes only sporadically which is directly linked to a reduction of funding levels which have been redirected for climate change and conflict prevention. Whilst this has sparked better integration of programme support, there are still organizational capacity needs which UNDP ought to strengthen in the area of risk-informed development. This includes: making the shift from projects to portfolios; investing in data capacities; strengthening capacities in resilience building and systems approaches; focusing more on the underlying political economy rather than only technical solutions; using the digital economy as an enabler; and make use of the CPD and UNSDCFs as entry points.

It was highlighted that collectively as an organization, UNDP must not only cope with uncertainty but embrace it. For this to happen, we need to strengthen our ability to capture trends and signals for actionable intelligence in decision-making. At the heart of UNDP’s strategy, there is a new recognition for the importance of building a more agile and anticipatory organization where foresight is involved in decision-making. At the moment, a key priority is to connect, cohere, and amplify foresight efforts to achieve greater development impacts. The Future of Development Strategy Labs seek to achieve this by looking into the future to ensure we aren’t getting tunnel vision or looking too closely in the short term. UNDP’s Future Trends and Signals System plans to use the learning from the last few years and UNDP’s network of people across 170+ countries to create an anticipatory foresight tool which captures signals as they emerge, so we develop a stronger understanding for actionable intelligence led decision-making.

It was observed that while it is human nature to react to present dangers, more distant existential risks, such as climate change, do not trigger the same reaction. Globally there are risk perception gaps where the sense of climate urgency across sectors is not shared. For UNDP it would be critical to consider how we can help humanity harness its survival instincts to be able to react and to act in advance of future risks. We all knew that a major Pandemic was looming on the horizon, and Covid-19 is a good example that it was not enough to know what risks are ahead, we needed to also take action on them. This requires an ability to govern today while still preparing for uncertain futures, by changing our culture to embed long-term thinking into our work, challenge assumptions, and imagine the different futures we may need to confront. For the future of the Sendai Framework, such considerations needed to be built in.

Several responses focused on challenges in Pacific islands countries. It was stated that siloed approaches to financing projects created additional burdens, especially for small island developing states (SIDS) in the Pacific. Most climate finance flows to the Pacific are provided through short-term and project-based initiatives and are generally “off-budget”. This approach tends to be poorly integrated into development, thereby making it harder to achieve long-term
impacts for communities. Against this backdrop, UNDP could explore more programmatic approaches that can leverage funding from development planning processes, and ensure that priority risks related to climate change, disaster risk and social inclusion are treated as core components of all its development support. A preliminary analysis on climate finance effectiveness in the Pacific and the resulting discussion paper was shared (https://www.undp.org/pacific/publications/climate-finance-effectiveness).

The experience of UNDP support in Tonga further illustrated this point. The UNDP support covered a broad range of risks related to climate, natural hazards, gender, social inclusion, politics, and culture equally and it looked at these from within the country’s development portfolio. It was noted that the Sendai Framework had not been a specific reference point in this case. The starting point was rather the processes of local government, and the systems which were already in place. This helped sustain the support provided because it was owned and driven by the local government and aimed at improving the existing system of local development.

Part 3: Context Review

The Review of changing risk and development context asked the following questions:

1. What major changes, emerging issues and topics of concern do you anticipate in the coming years until 2030 and beyond which need to be prioritized to accelerate action?

2. The COVID-19 pandemic and the climate crisis have demonstrated the systemic nature of risk and cascading effects that a multi-hazard scenario can have on development. Are there other systemic risks that we may have missed, or that are to be expected in the coming years?

3. What further actions would you recommend to UNDP and the UN system to strengthen the support to resilience building through to 2030?

Findings and recommendations:

As both the recent UN Global Assessment on Disaster Risk Reduction 2022 and the IPCC Assessment Report 6 Working Group reports have made clear, the contexts in which UNDP is operating and in which we are all now living are changing very rapidly. It was noted that we are now experiencing a new stage in disaster risk reduction where natural hazards are becoming increasingly coupled or interconnected with other kinds of hazards and risks. These ‘systemic risks’ are inter-related and may manifest in ‘polycrises’ where several events happen at the same time. Unfortunately, we have little or no experience of trying to navigate these new and increasingly dangerous contexts. The focus on context for this part of the consultation was deemed very relevant with attention on both (i) the near-term to try to identify and prioritize trends and (ii) possible emerging risks on which UNDP should now focus its attention to be able to change and adapt our strategies and action plans to deal with these new contexts.
As a systemic risk, the Covid-19 pandemic was identified as a precursor to the future of risk governance. The pandemic’s impacts have propagated across the entire development system. In many parts of the world, it resulted in a recession concerning some Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). As the pandemic occurs in tandem with climate temperature rises, and other major political and economic crises, we should consider our progress on the SDGs and embrace the possibility that the 2030 targets will slip to 2035, or even further.

Against a background of risks that are growing, compounding, and cascading, we therefore cannot operate in siloes or trade off one system against the other if we want to build resilience. It is essential that we transform the energy, industry, trade, logistics, infrastructure, ecosystems, and climate systems in parallel. This is a challenging task for which we must build partnerships between member states of the UN, and regional and local governments. These partnerships should not only be a question of mandates, but of empowerment, capacity building, and changing financial arrangements. Although we have technically feasible solutions (!), they cannot happen without the appropriate financing, institutional arrangements, and risk governance frameworks.

It was mentioned that risk management approaches now need to consider the planetary boundaries of our natural environments. We have already trespassed six of the nine major planetary boundaries and are seeing the impacts of this in the increasing frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Our previous assessments are no longer valid and, therefore, need to be reiterated. The changes we are witnessing are having differentiated impacts on different geographic locations, which means that risk assessments need to be more specific about the context and they need to be cross-cutting rather than addressing one specific type of hazard – such as natural, technological, health, societal, and planetary. Breaking down those silos and making connections between threats is one of most important challenges until 2030 and beyond.

Resilience is not just a DRR or emergency management challenge. It is also not only relevant for national or local actors with whom UNDP works. Risk management, better still resilience, is a capacity that must be permanently cultivated in UNDP and across the agencies of the UN system to rise to the challenges of the present and future. This requires a shift as articulated in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025. As the world moves past tipping points and begins to increasingly experience irreversible changes to the major earth systems (atmosphere, ocean, soil, forest, ice, water, etc.). UNDP will need to be flexible to be able to perceive the relationships between our actions and our continuing survival.

The consultation identified a few key areas of change for UNDP and its partners:

- Adapt the decision-making, institutional and funding culture, both within UNDP and across governments, the private sector and wider society, to allow these new and shifting contexts to be perceived and acted upon. This could mean moving away from a “scripted approach” to decision-making in complexity (and dealing with significant uncertainty) to adopt a perspective that is able to hold a much wider range of contexts – a type of “relational perspective” - that brings the focus to the conditions of the system in which a decision is made, rather than just to the decision taken in isolation. This would require capacities to “embrace uncertainty and
imaging the future” and building a “futures ecosystem” that supports investments in flexibility and spaciousness to allow for the shifting of perceptions to be able to meet the complexity with a better distribution of flexibility across closely-coupled, fragile systems (like finance, food, energy, health, transport and supply chains, etc.).

- Find ways and means to break the siloes of activity that still remain so “stuck” in place - almost everywhere - and shift towards integrated approaches as advocated by UNDP and the calls for achieving greater policy coherence at national and sub-national level.

- Look at the changing contexts of our partnerships as the gap between the desired implementation of the Sendai Framework and the reality on the ground continues to grow. This would also mean calling on UNDP’s experience in conflict and post-conflict programme countries during the initial period of the Sendai Framework and clarify a more integrated approach through to 2030 and beyond, especially in the context of the political declaration on risk to be agreed by member states in May 2023.

- Consider a youth perspective on changing contexts and coming through various other lenses, such as energy, when seeking a way forward for the wider changes to the landscape of the Sendai Framework (and the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals) implementation and achievement of risk-informed sustainable development.

In the context of early warning systems (EWS) – particularly in light of the Secretary-General’s bold ambition announced in March 2022 for all humans to have access to EWS by 2027, colleagues shared their views on the challenges of achieving Target G of the Sendai Framework and a more integrated approach to achieving the SDGs (almost all of which would benefit from a more systemic approach to EWS in places all over the world). They highlighted the issue that centralized warning systems tend to exclude rural areas and the most vulnerable which needs to be addressed. It was also mentioned that technological EWS alone are insufficient. More focus must be placed on how humans interact with the information ecosystems. Therefore, investment is necessary in a combination of repeated and continuous sources of information about impending dangers, and community-oriented messaging rather than just alarms. This would also improve the level of trust which people have in the warning information they receive.

Part 4: Prospective Review

The Prospective Review of recommendations for the remaining period of the Sendai Framework and beyond 2030 asked the following questions:

1. Can you suggest deliverables, innovations, processes or transformations which would bring the greatest reduction in disaster risk and the greatest increase in resilience of people, assets and ecosystems in the remaining period of the Sendai Framework to 2030 and beyond?
2. 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?

3. **Risk governance:** Given the systemic nature of risk, and experience of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic (including cascading, indirect impacts), what adjustments would you recommend in policy, regulatory and legislative frameworks, organization and investment, epistemology, and strategy to be able to capitalize on opportunities, or to mitigate new and emerging threats to the achievement of the expected outcome and goal of the Sendai Framework? How well are the institutional systems designed to produce an integrated, systemic approach to address such risks?

4. Investments: What measures would you recommend that 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?

**Findings and recommendations:**

The questions stimulated a deeper dive into the specific contexts in Viet Nam and Bangladesh; comments on the importance of systemic approaches to governance beyond silos; and a broader consideration of innovation beyond a narrow focus on new technologies.

**Insights from Viet Nam:** It is noteworthy that country stakeholders who participated in the process perceived the MTR process in Viet Nam largely as a UN process and there was only limited agreement on who is accountable for following up in the recommendations. Nevertheless, the process highlighted many of the known issues and has been clarifying in terms of foundational principles of (disaster) risk management. In a country where words such as “disaster”, “hazard” and “risk” are usually expressed with a single Vietnamese word, understanding risk will need to be brought down to simple and locally understood expressions. This applies not only to community-level (which is where a lot of the action is required to prevent the creation of new risk), but also at the national level. The question of why “hazards” turn into “disasters” requires more than just some disaster risk management training (at different levels). Policies need revisions and these revision processes need to engage other sectors (at least to start the discussion amongst the policymakers). Most importantly, investing resources in capacities, especially at sub-national levels, is required to ensure transfer of knowledge and implementation of the nationally drafted policies so they lead to meaningful risk reduction measures at local and community levels.

Preparedness and response systems are well-developed but need much greater attention on the importance of risk-informed sustainable development to address all the other Sendai targets and to reduce current and future vulnerability. Just like many other developing countries, Viet Nam has advanced levels of preparedness and response systems and procedures in place, which has led to a reduced number of fatalities. But this contributes to only one of the Sendai Framework
priority area and is not forward-looking. Given high vulnerability to the changing climate, more will need to be done around the other three priority areas of the Sendai Framework.

By the end of this decade, close to 70% of Viet Nam’s GDP is expected to be generated from coastal areas – and these are the most vulnerable regions of the country that are highly prone to climate-related hazards. UNDP has been working with the Ministry of Planning and Investment to ensure increased understanding of the risk-informed sustainable development approach that is expected to prevent the creation of new risk for public and private investments directed to coastal areas of the country. Obviously, practical implementation of these types of policies will require capacities at the sub-national level, where other sectoral departments, such as planning and finance, will need to understand the risk (i.e., how their decisions can contribute to the creation or prevention of new risks).

Building resilience of communities and reducing disaster risk will need to go beyond traditional approaches which heavily depended on grey infrastructure (e.g., expensive sea dykes and riverbank reinforcements). Nature-based solutions will need to be combined with rural and urban planning while considering increasing levels of storm surges, floods and more severe droughts.

Listening and understanding local contexts is critical, a trans-contextual awareness can create the space for all perspectives to be visible. For the most vulnerable communities living in remote coastal areas of Viet Nam, it is important to understand how their daily decisions contribute to increasing or decreasing vulnerabilities of their households to ever increasing impacts of various hazards. The implementation of the Sendai Framework will not alone achieve this. All of the international and national efforts need to come together in coherent policy and planning processes for the implementation of the Sendai Framework, the Paris Agreement and the SDGs to make meaningful changes for those who still feel left behind.

**Insights from Bangladesh:** A key lesson is that disaster risk reduction is not a sector. In Bangladesh, the National Resilience Programme (NRP) is a joint initiative by three UN Agencies (UNDP, UN Women, and UNOPS) working with four ministries, including the Ministry of Planning. The project leverages these diverse actors for policy formulation and updating for risk-informed and inclusive development and DRM for enhancing resilience. In this context developing and implementing a Disaster Impact Assessment (DIA) tool is a potential game changer for public and private investments for development and DRM. The Government of Bangladesh (GOB) adopted rigorous assessment tools, like Environmental Impact Assessments, to oversee the potential impact of interventions on disaster, climate change, and the environment for resilience. Understanding and using risk information is being supported by the Disaster Risk Information Platform (DRIP) - a supportive element to address priority 1 of the Sendai Framework and its goals, and principles.

Adaptive social protection is a vital approach for bringing transformational change for optimal use of the resources from an extensive social safety net for making programmes flexible to DRR to leverage the building of resilience. UNDP with its NRP programme added value to the GOB social protection programme through the integration of risk information to prioritize the interventions that
address the risks in the most vulnerable locations and for people most at risk. There is a pilot integrated programme of nature-based solutions (NBS), risk-proof infrastructure for DRR, and building adaptive capability. The initiative is also influencing and ensuring meaningful participation of women, persons with disabilities and youth-community volunteers in the disaster management committees and other platforms. Lessons and outcomes have been influential to integrate risk elements into planning processes and policy development and with NRP advocacy.

Addressing disaster risk from a climate-related displacement angle is one of the promising areas that UNDP has started to work on. This approach covers risk reduction, relocation and rehabilitation, and engages economic zone authorities so that integrated natural hazard reduction and development interventions can address displacement through employment and skills development. This is highly needed in densely populated and climate vulnerable countries like Bangladesh as rehabilitation and relocation comes with huge cost and impacts on sustainability.

Pre-disaster and coordinated recovery planning is one of the potential areas for cost-effective DRR and resilience instead of post-disaster response. Here there is a need for regional and global knowledge and best practice sharing.

UNDP has been supporting the government with a coordinated response to the Sendai MTR which resulted in a joint Road Map which engages all stakeholders. The discussion so far identified some key areas such as the systemic nature of risk, issues around DRR investment, climate action and gender responsiveness, LNOB, multi-hazard early warning and early action, resilient recovery planning, NBS, and the private and public sector in DRM for rural and urban resilience.

**Insights on systems thinking:** A systems approach beyond silos and artificial categories of risk will be needed to influence the underlying drivers and premises that continue to generate risks more broadly at national and sub-national level (i.e. the growth imperative of the economic system). This means moving beyond risk governance towards addressing development governance, or risk-informed governance. Even though it might sound just like wordplay, it could have meaningful implications. DRR practitioners have made and are making considerable investment to convince national DRM systems to broaden their working spaces from a disaster response focus to a risk management focus; and there is evidence that UNDP has been successful – for instance, in terms of DRM policies, coordination platforms and actors involved. However, disaster risks are still on the rise as long as the driving forces that continue to generate risks are not curbed (e.g., land use, poverty, unequal access to housing and public services, corruption in construction). Since these driving forces are more related to limitations and constraints of development processes, UNDP should be more connected to the Governance of Development, clinically identifying how risks are configured, and proposing strategies to reduce these trends. This could avoid “sectorizing” DRM and enable a full integration into the development programming.

**Insights on territorial governance:** The need to mainstream risk reduction in all interventions or investments made at local level will be essential. Effective territorial governance will permit the
integration of efforts coming from different administrative levels and types of actors, and to organize (encourage or restrict) them according to environmental conditions. This will also support drafting more effective current and future scenarios – where different hazards, conditions of vulnerability and cascading effects are combined – and propose concrete strategies for building resilience through risk reduction, preparedness or recovery.

As regards the gap in understanding issues around DRM and Climate Change there is more that needs to be done. Within governments these two sectors are usually managed by different ministries often without much coordination and cooperation. As UNDP, we encourage these government ministries to come together to develop joint or joined-up policies and strategies because it makes sense for people at the sub-national level who have to implement policies which are sometimes overlapping. This message should also be brought home at UNDP, where DRM and Climate Change are institutionally still (or again) departmentalized. This will take time for both governments and UNDP, but the context is ripe for more streamlined approaches - and maybe even a merged Sendai Framework, Paris Agreement and SDGs beyond 2030 - to surface as we come to better understand and act on the systemic nature of risk through integrated and systems approaches.

The perception of risks and a shift in the way that we work in local contexts is important. Both the focus on the local level, building capacity of communities and institutions, and the engagement with a wider array of stakeholders appear as concrete approaches at national and local level for the implementation of the Sendai Framework. Also, by pursuing these approaches, UNDP could leverage its capacity relying on its local presence, its power of convening partners, and the expertise present across the UNDP Global Policy Network. As an organization, we need to work closer together to manage risk and to pull together our skills and involve more stakeholders in the countries in which we work in order to link risk management to the governance of development in a multidimensional and systemic way.

**Insights on the perception of risk:** It was noted that risk perceptions are always influenced by cultural factors that are contextually (and trans-contextually) specific. Innovation therefore requires new ways and improvements in the way that UNDP analyses how societies conceptualize risks and what is the behavioral response to DRM policies of distinct social groups and communities.

### 3. Key Questions for Further Consideration

During the consultation several questions were raised that should be further explored by UNDP and the international community to give direction for the future implementation of the Sendai Framework.

- How has the increased unpredictability associated systemic risks affected the way risk considerations are integrated into UNDP programming and projects?
• Is the language we use acting as a barrier to further integration and engagement in risk-based discourses and practices?

• Why is there still so little awareness of risk-based approaches in UNDP and what is holding us colleagues back from engaging with the shift from managing crisis to managing risks?

• What needs to change in the decision-making, institutional and funding culture, both within UNDP and across governments, the private sector and wider society, to allow these new risk contexts to be perceived and acted upon?

• Why do silos of activity remain so “stuck” in place almost everywhere rather shifting towards integrated approaches as is now widely advocated for?