Re-Energize DR3 HLPF 2022 Side Event Transcript Report

Enhancing Governance to Help Address Vulnerable Groups – Building Back Better

Edited by Rene Marker-Katz and Cameron McBroom-Fitterer, Re-Energize DR3

A sdg 2030 Series Report by Stakeholder Forum and Re-Energize DR3

ABOUT STAKEHOLDER FORUM

[Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future](#) (SF) is a not-for-profit international organisation working to advance sustainable development at all levels. For more than 25 years SF has been a bridge between stakeholders of all kinds and the international intergovernmental forums where sustainable development, and in particular the environment and issues related to its good governance are debated, global goals are established, and strategies mapped out. Our work aims to enhance open, accountable, and participatory decision-making and good governance for sustainable development through the continuous involvement and participation of stakeholders in these forums, and in the action that flows from their work.

To this end, we work with a diversity of stakeholders globally on international policy development and advocacy; stakeholder engagement and consultation; media and communications, and capacity building – all with the ultimate objective of promoting progressive outcomes on sustainable development through an open and participatory approach. In consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) since 1996, SF also works with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) under an MOU to expand the engagement and participation of the Major Groups and other Stakeholders in the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) and HLPF processes.

ABOUT RE-ENERGIZE DR3

[Re-Energize DR3](#) is a funded project (April 2020-March 2023) focusing on the governance of disasters risk reduction and resilience to boost the sustainable development goals hosted at UCL Energy Institute.

The number of weather-related hazards such as droughts, floods and heat waves has tripled, and their frequency and intensity are expected to continue increasing, adding greater pressure on resource availability. These risks are amplified by climate variability and change and made more complex by changing patterns of human activity. By 2030 there could be 325 million people exposed to the full range of natural hazards and climate extremes.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

On 11 July 2022, Stakeholder Forum conducted a webinar as part of the official side events schedule of the 2022 High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development the HLPF. "Enhancing Governance to Help Address Vulnerable Groups – Building Back Better" was designed to link the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)

agenda discussed at the 7th Global Platform to the 2022 High-level Political Forum theme of "Building back better from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) while advancing the full implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development."

A link to the recording can be found on the [Stakeholder Forum YouTube page](). As issue four of Stakeholder Forum's SDG 2030 Series, we hope it will help to promote ideas and solutions to help deliver the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The decision to host the event at the 2022 HLPF resulted from the recently held Seventh Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (GP2022) in May of 2022. The Global Platform is recognised by the UN General Assembly as the:

"Forum to assess and discuss progress on the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and to advance concerted implementation of disaster risk reduction, sustainable development and climate change mitigation and adaptation. Embodying the all of society approach, the Global Platform is an inclusive and accessible multi-stakeholder platform." (UNDRR, 2022)

The side event looked at adaptive governance capabilities at the national, sub-national and local levels to enable equitable disaster risk reduction and resilience in development planning and development programmes, and compared a developed country and a developing country approach and what lessons might be gained on governance and approaches to vulnerable groups.

It recognised the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development's commitment to 'Leave No One Behind,' with a discussion around SDG 5 on Gender Equality and other vulnerable groups, and the critical role that sustainable development education - the focus on SDG 4 - can play in building stronger capacity within the research field in developing countries.

The ultimate aim of the discussion was to contribute to an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary agenda, where governments' plans for disaster risk reduction and resilience will lead to enabling equitable disaster risk reduction and resilience in development planning and development programmes.

Stakeholder Forum appreciates the opportunity to have sponsored this event and will continue to support Re-Energize DR3 at the COP 27 climate talks in Sharm El Sheikh in November 2022.

In closing, I would like to thank Charles Nouhan, Chairman of Stakeholder Forum, and Stakeholder Forum Associate Tanner Glenn for their support in organizing the webinar and for their help to produce this report.

Irena Zubcevic, Director, Stakeholder Forum

CATALINA SPATARU

Dr. Catalina Spataru is a professor in global energy and resources, the head and scientific director of Islands Research Laboratory, and the Director of Energy Institute at the Bartlett School of Environment, Energy and Resources at University College London in England. She is also the principal investigator and project lead for the Re-Energize DR3 project. Her expertise ranges from theoretical investigations to implementation,

research and practice in energy, environment, resource nexus, risk assessment and resilience in climate adaptation and mitigation. As the head of the Islands Laboratory, Dr. Spataru coordinates a team of researchers who study innovative solutions for islands and coastal areas that focus on a circular economy and assess trade-offs between resource use under different climatic conditions.

Re-energize DR3 project encompasses more than 32 researchers from four continents and seven countries addressing the simultaneous interaction between climate-related natural disasters and the development for effective disaster risk management. We acknowledge the important role of community involvement in management planning, and the role those legal institutions play in reducing asymmetries of knowledge and power within society.

The primary goal of Re-Energize DR3 is to build an integrated, interdisciplinary approach to adaptive governance that includes a normative institutional dimension with cross-stakeholders and cross-scale interactions. First, we do this by taking qualitative and quantitative data into actionable insights for better disaster risk governance, then combine that data to apply different methods utilized across a consortium of partners informing each other and supporting each other. Our final product is a toolbox, where we combine these quantitative and qualitative methods to cultivate an interdisciplinary approach according to values and principles in the selected area.

These analyses create a diagnosis that are applied to a balanced scorecard within the stakeholder process, where we use climate adaptation modelling scenarios through the lens of the global agenda and the Sendai framework to define a process for the stakeholders to apply, which then can inform users on a social media modelling framework.

Using 455 indicators, we consider the gaps related to the resource nexus including water, energy, materials, and environmental justice in the context of resilience that align with the three agendas. The reason we took this approach is to expand on the notions of the balanced scorecard and relate it to dimensions of fairness, especially considering vulnerable groups in consideration to the variations of scoring in risk and/or resource allocation.

The uniqueness that Re-Energize DR3 brings to vulnerability indicators is the consideration for temporal timestamps on the scorecard; these indicators highlight variance between resource allocation and political agendas by using a multi-stakeholder story of change to track progress through stakeholder selection, mapping process, and engagement.

We conducted a series of workshops and surveys with stakeholders in the islands of Fiji and Mauritius, in coastal cities of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro and Maceio, and in Ghana in Accra. We then applied a policy Delphi approach to engage on validation of balanced scorecard gaps to identify issues involving resources and sectors and equitable DR3 governance. We also ran a survey focusing on social media, pre-emergency phases, cross sectoral resilience, and governance. We target islands from the data list and had 15 additional participating islands in the surveys. The key aspect of this engagement was to get validation of our approach with as many stakeholders as possible and their input as well.

4

To look at integration of a free global agenda at the local level, the pre and post emergency phases, ranking of resources, the sectors, environmental justice dimensions and vulnerability dimensions as well, we need to look to those stakeholders in every location we can. We counted with a short questionnaire, followed by a round of discussions, and then applied an iterative process of discussion. We captured as many opposing and similar positions and reasonings through the reactions and gathered assessment of different views by counting for the pros and cons of recommendations to advance equitable resilience and reduce disaster risk.

With this data we had stakeholders from wide participatory groups, and all the stakeholders recognize the usefulness of our tools and approaches to monitor advanced planning for disaster risk reduction. Participants also found the detailed six step approach useful to match local needs and overcome the high focus on post emergency. The lack of comprehensive estimation of the budget allocated to disaster risk has been recognized by all of the stakeholders in terms of shortage of indicators to enable the assessment of the effectiveness of adaptation. Actions in reducing climate risk also has been recognized by all the stakeholders.

The dimensions of environmental justice were considered very important for balanced scorecard across locations including participation, social inequalities, and distribution of environmental costs and benefits, which is the allocation of resources and the different capabilities. Getting a whole picture of vulnerability is an issue across all locations, and most of them are not able to make advances in the area because of lacking capacity, lacking data, and processes that are key to support this understanding.

In parallel, we are running a household survey that was developed by our partners and with our help. We are currently in the process of running these surveys in selected locations, looking at most vulnerable locations to floods and droughts in these geographies. These two elements in particular play a major role in the DR3 implementation and it is what we need to ensure an efficient exchange of information data processes across stakeholder groups for participatory and equitable decision making to influence the DR3 processes.

This is where the promise of artificial intelligence to provide early warnings and verify reports in real time is duly significant. But we need to apply different methods to apply for that. We collected data from social media platforms by various partners, using artificial intelligence for digital response developed by Qatar Computing Research Institute. We collected the data for different locations to try to understand the benefits of social media. Here at University College London (UCL) we developed our own method for social media data analysis framework, because you can collect the data, but you have to do something with those data. We then used machine learning to filter binary classifiers based on deep neural networks, then trained the AI machines and benchmarked the data sets of disaster responses for various events there.

With the development of a multiclass classification approach, we compared with results in one of the benchmark datasets containing the largest number of disaster related categories, to then build a classifier model for benchmarking data sets containing different disaster related categories. Not only for droughts and floods and heatwaves, but also earthquakes and other type of disasters. We continued to further develop methodologies to analyze the social media data and multiple disaster related collections

of floods and heatwaves. Finally, we proposed methods using machine learning classifiers based on trained machines to analyze a set of behavior indicators and match them with climate variables.

We are now decoding Synoptic Records to align behavior indicators along with climate variables to provide additional valuable information which can be considered in different phases of a disaster and applicable to extreme weather events. To also show the transferability of this approach, which can be applied to any social media data collection, we conducted analysis in different collections. This generates data to show all the plots aligned to the same point in time, starting from the top. The first and second plots show the count of positive messages and total activity messages in the same way as when we apply the sentiment analysis and then shows the values of average air temperature, maximum temperature, precipitation, pressure and relative humidity, wind speed and so on. From this we can find correlations between behavior and climate variables from the social media.

Another important point is about the actors and institutions of this systematic transformation. Here is where we are looking at different scenarios to assess with the stakeholder engagement process and social media. To wrap up, we generated some key findings from the stakeholder engagement, which is important integration of the agenda and capacity building of all concerned institutions in social vulnerability. Vulnerability was context sensitive as well and based on location, but getting a whole picture for vulnerability is an issue across all locations and especially while there are no tools there really needs to be, which is where we step in. Through the implementation of our tool, we can provide some of these insights.

DR. MANTA DEVI NOWBUTH

Dr. Manta Devi Nowbuth is an associate professor and head of the Civil Engineering Department at the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Mauritius in MOKA, Mauritius. She is a civil engineer by training and received a master's of Science in Hydrology and Environmental Management from Imperial College, London. Manta completed her PhD in hydrology and undertook a postdoctoral research position with the United States Geological Survey in San Diego in the field of containment transport. Her research has focused on the water sector, examining climate related hazards such as flood and drought. She has established a good local network with institutions concerned with these problems and has worked with a much more extensive network of organizations in southern Africa.

The island of Mauritius is located approximately 2-kilometers northeast of the Republic of Madagascar in the Southern Indian Ocean. Mauritius is considered a high island because it is characterized by a central plateau surrounded by coastal plains, but the island itself is small and isolated. Because of that nature, it has various vulnerable areas.

In regards to climate change, Mauritius' 330-kilometer coastline is highly vulnerable, and exposure to cyclones is extremely high. While there have been major disasters related to cyclones, there has also been an increased hazard of flooding. Most notably, in 2013 the island had witnessed its most deadly flood event, caused by 150mm of constant torrential rain that fell within a two-hour timeframe. This situation has not recurred since 2013 because of implemented precautionary measures, but the increasing incidence of torrential rain is growing to the point that recent documentation for 2021 recorded that the island experienced 400mm of rainfall over a 24-hour timespan, which resulted in problems of landslides.

In 2021, flood-prone locations were recorded at 290 sites across the island, with 48 high-risk area sites. These sites are now even higher in 2022, and it is being attributed to the increasing intensity of rainfall and a longer duration of high intensity rainfall events. This data is shown through generated maps that illustrate floodplains spread out over the entire island, not in one isolated area. Compounding incapacities such as inadequate drainage, lack of maintenance, and debris clogging storm drains, create consequential disruptions to existing mitigation techniques.

Some of the changes in practice for Mauritius have been the mechanization of agricultural lands, where water that was being contained in specific areas are now flowing freely. However, this creates further complications when considering the effects of construction in floodplains. Oftentimes in Mauritius, construction developments do not know they are in a floodplain prior to the conception of the project and is oftentimes discovered through soil erosion during the building process. Additionally, when the water moves to a low-lying area and brings sediments to form the riverbeds, river overflows can occur. The practice of storm management is still not being fully addressed but it is changing due to current circumstances.

Experience is forcing us to learn to do better. In regards to hazards and vulnerability, a recent study has noted that Mauritius is at risk to 41 types of hazards. Not only natural hazard, but also chemical and technological. Being a small, isolated island, when disaster strikes it affects the entire island, and geographic circumstances don't allow for Mauritius to get aid from neighbors. Cyclones have been an ongoing prominent hazard that Mauritius has faced, and now flooding has become the second most impactful risk to disaster. While the land drainage authority has taken many precautionary measures to ensure the reduced risk of flooding on the island, there is still extreme vulnerability through an annual increase of hazard.

Coastal erosion is an obvious primary concern for a small island, especially one that uses the tourism sector to generate a strong economy. The economic pillar of oceanic resources is extremely prominent to the livelihoods of those who live on the island. Marine pollution control measures and coastal protection has been ongoing, but now the conversation about coastal conservation is being addressed. There has been a lot of discussion about nature-based solutions, and while some coastal villages may consider the option for relocation, a more robust toolkit of protection measures are being formulated.

Through the DR3 project, we have considered one of the coastal zones, the Riviere des Galets. This coastal village was chosen because it is a high-risk location from experiencing both inland flooding as well as sea level rise due to low elevation. Using shoreline analysis and satellite imagery, we have been able to confirm areas of erosion to then pair with field surveys that confirm regular (once per year or more) storm surge sites. Additionally, we have conducted household surveys on the impacts of storm surge and livelihood, and have found that residents are reporting flood duration to be longer and more severe, between three hours and in some cases up to six hours long. Although these surveys are helpful, we feel the community engagement structure we currently have is not strong enough, as our policies still exhibit a top-down approach rather than a bottom-up approach. Given these interactions it is also evident that residents are not very clear about what they can do to alleviate flooding impact and reduce risk, so there needs to be further insight on how these bottom-up approaches can best support the most vulnerable in our population.

CAMERON MCBROOM-FITTERER

Cameron McBroom-Fitterer is a second-year master's student at the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill's Department of City and Regional Planning, where he specializes in land use and environmental planning, focusing on climate adaptation and resilience planning. Before attending UNC, Cameron earned a bachelor's degree in history from the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida. His experience growing up and living in Miami informed his interest in studying effective and innovative responses to change in climatic conditions and natural hazards. Cameron joined the UNC Re-Energize team, led by Professor Felix Dodds in June of this year. Later this month, he will begin an internship with the Federal Emergency Management Agency—known as FEMA in the United States—with the Region II Recovery Division.

First, a brief overview of what will be covered—we will go over some of the background and context, matter, work, vulnerability and outreach events that we've participated in recently. Then we will look at three existing vulnerability indices within the UN system. And then lastly, we will examine some key takeaways about how these indices can evolve, improve or inspire future work, as well as consider some questions that we think are integral to future efforts. The general takeaway is this: As always, climate crisis impacts most heavily on the world's most vulnerable people. Those who have done the least to cause the problem are suffering the most. Even in the developed world, the marginalized are the first victims of disasters and the last to recover.

Our central question is: how can we address disaster vulnerability at the regional and global levels in a way that is also applicable at the local level? The US Re-Energize team has been studying governance and disasters in the US at the federal, state, and local levels, using North Carolina as a general case study. Through a series of stakeholder workshops, a key finding was that there is currently no existing global vulnerability index for vulnerable groups. This observation suggests that a more robust examination of resiliency investment and the ways a more coherent approach to vulnerability indices would benefit vulnerable groups. Through partnership with the International Science Council (ISC), who have helped engage with academics and practitioners to complement existing UN processes, the Re-Energize DR3 team was able to present the 2022 United Nations Disaster Risk Reduction Conference in Bali, Indonesia. Re-Energize DR3 will continue to present their findings in the coming year to further the conversation around a global vulnerability index.

One vulnerability index that is currently utilized is the Economic and Environmental Vulnerability Index (EVI), designed in the year 2000. It was revised in 2005 and renewed every three years, and has been identified as one of the earliest vulnerability indices operating at a regional and global level. Since 2005, the EVI has served as one of the three criteria that the UN Committee for Development Policy has used to identify and graduate nations as the least developed countries (LVCs). The index utilizes eight indicators and considers two dimensions of vulnerability. As its name suggests, these dimensions are economic and environmental dimensions. The methodology behind the index has been agreed upon during review sessions, and the index contains data from 143 countries that date back from the year 2000. This breadth of coverage 143 countries all the way back almost 20 years, over 20 years, is considered a key strength.

The Multi-Dimensional Vulnerability Index (MVI) was created specifically with small island developing states in mind, following a directive from the UN General Assembly in December of 2020. The MVI expands on the existing framework of the EVI, utilizing 11 indicators as opposed to eight from the EVI, and increases the EVIs two dimensions of vulnerability to four. Financial and geographic factors are included in the MVI, where

they obtain publicly available data sources from the FBI and the World Bank. Despite its initial focus on small island developing states, the MVI is still applicable globally as it includes data that covers 126 countries. One development that sparked interest from our team is work being conducted by the UN Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries, and Small Island Developing States. This office has proposed linking the MVI to factors of resilience using dimensions and structural vulnerability and structural and policy resilience. We think that this work can be a promising step forward in both comprehensiveness and integration as we move forward.

Another index is UNICEF's Children's Climate Risk Index (CCRI), which was designed to measure the vulnerability of children around the world. Developed in 2021, the CCRI is divided into two pillars. The first pillar considers exposure to climate and environmental shocks and stresses. This includes natural hazards such as tropical cyclones, as well as other occurrences such as air pollution and water security. The second pillar addresses vulnerability through a lens of poverty, communication, assets and social protection, water, sanitation and hygiene, education, health and nutrition. We believe the UNICEF CCRI has the potential to be a template for additional indices that focus on other vulnerable and marginalized groups. These might include indigenous populations, people with disabilities, ageing populations, and a host of others. Second, the indices of vulnerability that are developed must be regional in their applicability.

In general, we believe that indicators need to be customized by region to capture local dimensions and better reflect the needs of multiple vulnerable populations. Third, factors of peace and security are missing from current indices. The COP27 presidency emphasized this point as critical, especially within the context of African countries. Finally, our overarching takeaway is that the current UN system approach to vulnerability is made up of fragmented processes. We believe that further coordination, conversation, and collaboration that leverages existing vulnerability work can be key to elevating the power and utility of indices while preventing further fragmentation.

FARAH KABIR

Farah Kabir has been working with ActionAid Bangladesh as the country director since June 22, 2007. She has nearly three decades experience in the field of development and research, making her a renowned human rights advocate and climate justice defender at home and abroad with an uncompromising voice against human rights violation. Farah is engaged with multiple national and international professional societies. She is a member of the Advisory Committee of Bangladesh's NDA to the Green Climate Fund, a member of Child Rights Committee National Human Rights Commission and a board member of UCEP, to name just a few. She was the chair of Global Board of the Global Network of Disaster Risk Reduction for two terms from 2015 to 2021. Board member of Climate Action Network South Asia since 2019 and Advisory Committee Member of Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE).

ActionAid is a 50-year-old global federation with members from 45 countries, and we reach out to about 15 million people from communities and grassroots, including refugees and people living in conflict. We think of 2015 as a historical year as the world adopted the Agenda 2030, Sendai Framework, Paris Agreement, Finance for Development, and then in 2016, the Agenda for Humanity. However, even with all these collaborations and contracts, it did not prepare us for a global pandemic. Now we are facing disasters at a

40% increase, and according to UN convention conferences, all current international commitments are off track and it will take at least 30 years to achieve the SDGs as well as the realization of all other agreements. Can women, girls, persons with special needs, and young people wait for another 30 years? Can governments wait for another 30 years? This is something that we are being faced within the current world's context.

The conversation today really needs to revolve around how to face the reality of compounding global stress related to climate change, added with a pandemic, where we are witnessing an increase in floods, drought, heatwaves, and other climate hazards on top of public health crises. This lens is especially prominent when addressing the disproportionately affected communities. When addressing adaptive governance capabilities at national, subnational and local levels, it is important to understand both how disaster risk reduction (DRR) or disaster risk governance (DRG) is understood. It is the systems of institutions, mechanisms, policy, legal frameworks and other arrangements that guide, coordinate and oversee DRR. It is related to good governance and it expects that these governance systems will be transparent, inclusive, collective and efficient to reduce the existing disaster risks and avoid creating new ones.

If we understand that vulnerability to disasters is socially constructed then we can leverage that understanding for more robust support networks that will benefit our most vulnerable groups: women, persons with special needs, young people, people living in grassroots and far to reach areas are all especially vulnerable. When we talk about risk, we have to understand the perspective of the most vulnerable, consider the contexts they live in, which are social, political, institutional, environmental, economic, cultural and so on. In terms of this context, it is important to understand whether it is rural, urban, and then further break down the components of that vulnerability. It is important to understand these layers and understand these different analyses to be able to support good governance, understand disasters, and recognize how it negatively impacts people.

In Bangladesh, for instance, people in rural areas have less resources and will be more affected than those who are well-off, who have the financial means to mitigate personal risk. Limiting the global temperature through limiting emissions will reduce risk to vulnerable groups on a global scale, but we are not reaching the emissions goals. One of the recent reports by WMO says that there's a 50/50 chance that we will be cross the 1.5-degree threshold within the next five years, which means more catastrophes, conflicts and hunger and food insecurity.

Relating to the Ukraine War, increased conflict over resources leads to food insecurity, leading to mass migration, compounded with the increase of droughts, floods, the increase gender-based violence, increasing inequality and other health issues. Therefore, our aim should not just be to talk about adaptive governance. It is critical to know that we need to work together at national, local level, but also at regional level.

For instance, in reducing risk and building resilience in the Nile River, the Nile Delta, the Ganges Brahmaputra Delta, and the Mekong Delta uses existing development planning that is often top down, trying to achieve a political commitment into reality that is contingent on multiple factors, but not necessarily prioritizing the most vulnerable. This method is not always transformative, but we need transformative risk reduction capacity, which we should not take for granted, to exist among the policymakers or the bureaucracy or the institutions. These top-down policies are why we are witnessing the

dragging of decisions, watching the consequences that slow policies that are relevant to climate, conflict, humanitarian development, intersectionality is not necessarily understood by all our policymakers or decision makers, even now. There is, since the IPCC report, a greater attention to conflict, stress and issues of resilience that are being discussed. People must read the planning where think tanks, bureaucrats, and policy makers can understand the importance of the reality of today.

Climate change and the pandemic has lifted the veil on the idea that developed nations will be able to use their resources to combat disaster more quickly than developing countries, because we are seeing the vulnerability can be equally high in different parts of the world. The key differences between developed and developing countries that influences the governance approaches are economic status, technological advancement, and social structure. Developed countries do have a stronger economy, but now we can see how that is also being shaken to create better infrastructure to be disaster resilient while LDCs, small island countries, are exposed on a much higher level.

Strong community cohesion law led designing of disaster governance is what the indices and countries in the South celebrate. For instance, in Bangladesh, we used to have death by cyclones and floods in hundreds of thousands. Now, with our early warning system cyclone preparedness, we have really brought it down. There are incremental celebrations through certain preparations that have led to a reduction in the disasters and the outcomes of the disasters. But we cannot forget that these disasters, both the vulnerability and governance issues, are all entwined because of the vested interest, because of the absence of equity, because of realization of the need to take climate change and transition much more seriously.

Our recommendation, therefore, would be that we recognize that climate change and green transitions are not something to be thought of in the next 5-10 years. It's today. To be able to do that, we have to recognize that in society there are gaps in policy, planning, and budget for the most vulnerable. We have to recognize the value of contributions of community-based adaptation and mitigation, the contributions of women, and young people. And we have to prepare with them. We need to establish effective implementation and monitoring mechanisms. We also need to ensure that the climate finance is there. It seems that you can mobilize finance when there is a conflict or war, but it takes decades to mobilize finance to address issues of climate change and its impacts. This is where we need to see global leadership and commitment, and we have to do much greater collective advocacy. Otherwise, the governance in terms of disaster risk reduction, and approaches of institution building, will not meet our aspirations. And more than the aspirations, we just have one planet. It begs the question whether we'll still be able to continue living. Business as usual is not going to work.

REBECCA "BECKY" MURPHEY

Rebecca "Becky" Murphy holds a master's in disasters adaptation and development from King's College, London University and a first-class B.Sc. geography degree from the University of Reading specializing in her thesis on climate change adaptation. She is currently the acting interim co-executive director for the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction, where her substantive role is policy lead heading up policy and advocacy, membership engagement and external communications teams

for the GNDR. Rebecca is also co-chair of the UN DRR Stakeholder Engagement Mechanism and co-chair of the NGO Major Group within the SEM. She has spent over ten years working toward resilience of disaster, disaster risk technical advisor for humanitarian teams, and at ActionAid and CFOAD.

We are the largest international network of civil society organizations working on disaster reduction. Currently, we have 1436 members organizations across 127 countries, and growing with that, the UN stakeholder engagement mechanism (SEM) is a very important space in governance of risk reduction. This is really where all non-state actors have the opportunity to feed into the implementation and the monitoring of the Sendai framework. The same was established back in 2019 and today has over 200 members and is made up of 17 constituencies, the majority of which are civil society and local organizations. This makes it a key and formal but open space to feed into the UN processes.

Very recently the SEM hosted a stakeholder forum at the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia. Some declarations fed directly into the co-chair summary of the Bali Agenda for Resilience, and we feel there are some really important messages that we would like to thread through from the global and regional platforms around disaster risk reduction into the high-level political forum and the Sustainable Development Goals, because they really do link through and it's important that we're connecting the different frameworks.

At the GPDRR, the SEM called for an all of government approach to ensure an all of society approach to risk reduction and resilience. We are trying to take that one step further and call for an encompassed United Nations approach to enable this "all of government" and "all of society" approach for the level of risk informed development that's required to reach and maintain the SDG targets in our current global context of increasing of systemic risk and vulnerability.

We know that risk is increasing and we know that the poorest and most marginalized are on the front line of that risk and are bearing the brunt of the cascading impacts of COVID 19, climate change, and conflict, and the ripple effects that they are having. One of the pieces of work that gender does is called views from the frontline. This is our flagship piece of work where we collect views from communities on the front line of risk in 50 high risk countries from across the globe. And our work continues to evidence this increasing level of risk linked to this. We have a program called Local Leadership for Global Impact, which aims to champion local voice and urge global decision makers to make sure we're not leaving anyone behind in the global COVID recovery.

Through listening to local recommendations, local knowledge, local voice, and including local actors in decision making, we know that COVID 19 has reversed progress on all of the SDGs. We are hearing that climate change is really being felt and described as a super risk driver by our communities and GNDR recognize then the cascading impact of conflict like that in Ukraine and the impact that that has had on things like food security across the globe. This is why we are calling on decision makers at all levels of governance to recognize this level of urgency and take immediate action on risk informed sustainable development and clearly demonstrate how the second half of the Agenda 2030 will address the increasing kind of systemic nature of risk and support that all of Agenda 2030

framework to make sure that any development is risk informed and is threaded across the humanitarian development peace nexus.

Leading up to the recent Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, we put together a stakeholder engagement mechanism declaration based on this local knowledge, this local voice, and the lived realities that we are hearing from our communities on the front line of risk, and came out with eight specific call to action recommendations that we'd like to see threaded through into pieces of work like this analyzing and understanding vulnerability, but also going forward as we strengthen the SDGs in the second half of the implementation of the 2030 agendas. We felt that this really these are really important messages that need to be taken into the SDGs, so we will run you through the eight recommendations very quickly and then offer some insight for how we can strengthen this going forward.

Firstly, the key message that was coming out from our members in the Global South is to listen to communities, to those on the frontline for risk, the first responders, those living in communities on the front line of risk have the local knowledge, the expertise, the capacity to significantly strengthen risk governance in policy and in practice. One of GNDRs projects on local leadership and global action has really demonstrated the power of local led, risk informed interventions in preparing for and preventing disasters. We know that localization must be championed not just in the Sendai framework, but across and into the SDGs and all of the 2030 framework agendas as well if it is going to be meaningful, and if it's going to be sustainable.

Second, is the importance of investing at the local level, by prioritizing and ensuring risk reduction finance both public and private really reaches that local level. It is crucial to both empower and finance locally led grassroots action and include local leaders in decision making spaces at local, national and global levels on where and how that finance should be spent.

Third, our members are calling for improved coordination and coherence, particularly recognizing civil society as being that enabler to lead the coordination and coherence required for risk informed development and that "all of society" approach. We must recognize the role that civil society organizations have to lead that collaboration, then we must empower and support them.

A fourth key area is the importance of empowering women leaders. We really are calling both with GNDR and the stakeholder engagement mechanism to recognize and tackle gender inequality as a driver of risk by recognizing that gender inequality as a is a barrier to achieving our agenda 2030 targets across all of them. We must empower women leaders to meaningfully engage in decision making at all levels.

Our fifth area is the importance of strengthening DRR governance in conflict affected states. We've seen the cascading impact of conflict on risk and vulnerability, and those on the front line of this risk in fragile states specifically call on the global community to implement risk governance and support conflict affected and fragile states to implement risk reduction and risk inform development, governance, policy and plans within their fragile context and support them to do that in a meaningful way.

Sixth is the importance of youth and children. Our stakeholder engagement mechanism highlighted the importance of a multi-generational action for risk reduction and risk

informed development, and the need to meaningfully include children and youth leaders in all levels of decision making.

Next, something we've heard a lot about is this need to learn from COVID 19 to understand and address the weaknesses in governance that COVID 19 demonstrated and increased; one of the recommendations that we have is a need to increase the number of UN Member States equipped with quality multi-stakeholder DRR governance that includes civil society representation and adequately reflects all parts of society for risk informed development. We see within the UN system the different kind of bodies have a stakeholder engagement mechanism, but we are especially calling on the member states as well to open up and to bring in civil society, as well as relevant SEM structures to make sure the "all of society" approach is really there and is really structured and embedded in risk governance going forward.

Last but certainly not least, is the importance of integrating inclusion across all levels, and transitioning away from seeing inclusion as a standalone topic. We are here to recognize the intersectional dynamics of marginalization in relation to risk and meaningfully integrate inclusion across all the areas of the 2030 agenda frameworks.

you can read a bit more in depth about these recommendations in a couple places. We have a global report on civil society reflections of the Sendai mid-term review, a stocktaking moment where our GNDR members stopped and looked at the progress of this very important Sendai framework mid-term review point. You can see that on our on our website. You can also see on gndr.org, if you go to the resources tab (you can also see this on prevention web) look at the UN DRR SEM to find our formal declaration, which pulls out key messages on the importance of implementing the whole of government approach, promoting localization, ensuring local financing, and making sure that we are leaving no one behind and learning from the governance failures and successes that we saw in COVID 19.

To finish, yes, the UN is calling on global decisionmakers, member states, and fellow civil society organizations to take this further and integrate meaningfully local voice, local knowledge and expertise into all of the SDG work for meaningful risk informed development. Listen to those recommendations being made at the local level and meaningfully include those in the front line of risk of decision making. Otherwise, we are not going to tackle this really important issue of vulnerability, of risk governance, and achieve and sustain the SDGs.

TARRYN QUAYLE

Tarryn Quayle is a professional office officer at ICLEI Africa, working across climate adaptation, water sanitation, disaster risk reduction and nature. For over 15 years, Karen has managed and implemented numerous water, sanitation and climate resilience projects over her time with equity, which is the course for the local governments for sustainability organization. That work includes a multi-country water and climate project that focuses on climate risk and vulnerability assessments, disaster risk reduction assessments and strategy development, water and sanitation, asset mapping and management, cost benefit analysis, institutional mapping policy review, financial mechanisms, assessments. and the development of local water and sanitation action plans in several African cities. Tarryn has many years of experience in applying co-

production approaches and fostering multi-level governance approaches to enhance dialogue and cooperation for improved governance within the thematic areas in which she works.

ICLEI is the world's oldest and largest network of cities with a global network of more than 2500 local and regional governments working together to promote sustainable development. ICLEI is a core member of the UN, running a campaign to making cities resilient toward the 2030 initiative. Part of that campaign, we are happy to see the removal from dialogue and discourse more towards implementation and action on the ground, and to see how we can support cities and all levels of government to ensure that climate change is really embedded across all departments rather than a standalone, and that we can really embed resilient and sustainable development at the local level.

With climate change being a multi-sectoral issue and we need integrated and systemic approaches to tackle this. This is why multi-level governance is pivotal to ICLEI's approach to working with cities and harnessing cross-scale multidisciplinary relationships, which are needed for inclusive governance and decision making at the local level. This "whole of government" approach is needed whereby bringing in ministries, public administrations, and public agencies to ensure that they are aligning their efforts in order to achieve maximum effectiveness. We also bring civil society organizations and communities to ensure that our planning is inclusive from the outset. Collaborative governance can really improve municipal planning and local planning, and increase the resilience of cities to the impacts of climate change and numerous social development challenges.

At ICLEI this approach is mainstreamed across all of our work, and we would encourage those who are interested in multi-level governance to have a look at ICLEI's recent publications which include a guide to implementing multi-level governance in action. We know that this is one of the most indispensable tools we have in fostering national and international resilience and to strengthening multilevel governance collaboration, which should be the first step in addressing local climate resilient development.

One of our flagship projects called UNAA, which stands for Urban Natural Assets for Africa, has been active in ten cities and eight countries for close to ten years now, and the original aim of the program was to integrate nature into urban planning to foster local resilience. The latest project of the UNAA program is looking at UNAA resilience, namely resilience for urban natural assets and how we can bring in a human rights-based approach into our urban projects to really ensure that we are addressing the needs of the whole of society, and in particular, vulnerable groups in our cities.

Fundamental to this approach is understanding what the socio-economic drivers are at the local level, that present both barriers and opportunities to building resilience at the local level. This program has developed a variety of tools and process documents that can be used when developing local risk assessments and strategy development to improve urban planning. Some of the key pillars that have been developed in terms of process documents include looking at how we can examine alternative planning approaches that are tailored to local contexts and not a one size fits all. To also look at local planning approaches that are specific to developing countries, rather than imported from developed countries.

We have other documents and handbooks that look at how we can work with both formal and informal governance structures and the critical need to include both of these in dialogues. This data comes from when we are working with communities, when we are working with city structures, and also with the private sector to really understand what the formal and the informal governance structures are and how they can be incorporated into the dialogue for inclusive planning. There are a lot of materials about how to promote co-production and multi-level governance from the outset, using creative tools and methodologies to include communities and planning and implementation, such as Minecraft and Urban Tinkering.

We have a number of projects which we did in Addis, using Minecraft to involve women and vulnerable groups in planning nature based resilient projects on the ground and to allow them to fully participate in the planning process, the implementation and the design process, and mechanisms such as urban tinkering, which is looking at small experiments that can be done in an urban landscape to make scalable change across the city.

We also have a number of mechanisms and methodologies that are used to foster trust and build relationships using innovative and interactive exercises, and also to create spaces for reflection and effective dialogue, including ensuring power dynamics are taken into account, especially when we're looking at fostering inclusive planning. In addition to these tools and mechanisms that have been developed as part of the UNAA program, ICLEI, together with the UNDRR has also supported 50 cities in Africa to apply the disaster risk reduction scorecards for cities which were developed as part of the Making Cities Resilient campaign. These scorecards essentially provide the opportunity to work with cities both virtually and in person, to ensure that cities have access to key data and provide a baseline for risk management in their city. Both access to and management of data is one of the fundamental challenges that we have across all levels of governance, but especially at the local level.

Undertaking these detailed baseline assessments provides a point of departure for cities to coordinate resilience interventions across different sectors, and identify what the gaps and opportunities are at the local level. The scorecard operates on essentially ten pillars, or ten essentials. It looks firstly at what plans currently exist in the city and assesses the type of risk associated at the local level. For instance, in undertaking a hazard assessment, it looks at how cities can strengthen their financial capacity. It looks at how nature-based solutions can be used to leverage resilience at the local level, the institutional capacity of the city, the society's capacity for resilience, taking an assessment of infrastructure at the local level, and then finally, identifies specific disaster risk reduction responses that can be implemented at the city level.

The scorecard that was applied in the 50 cities in Africa can also be found on the Making Cities Resilient dashboard, which is available through the UNDRR and provides you an overview of the methodology which has been trialed in many cities across the world while also providing a baseline for developing local disaster risk reduction strategies. This is a very short overview of some of the mechanisms and methodologies that we have used as we try to promote inclusive planning.