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1. **Introduction**

This paper synthesizes consultations held at the regional, national and community levels throughout the Asia-Pacific region on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (the successor of the Hyogo Framework for Action or HFA2). The document is particularly targeted at countries and stakeholders from Asia Pacific for their engagement at the global deliberations on HFA2 at the Fourth Session of the Global Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction (4th GPDRR) in May 2013. It also informs all stakeholders and countries engaged in the HFA2 discussions.

The paper describes the consultation approach that has been adopted in Asia Pacific and summarizes the key issues and proposals resulting from these consultations. It highlights issues for consideration in the next phase of consultations for HFA2 post the 4th GPDRR.

2. **Background**

The ‘Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building Resilience of Nations and Communities for Disasters’ is scheduled to end in 2015. The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 66/199 requested UNISDR to facilitate the development of a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (hereafter, the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2* or *HFA2*) to be considered at the Third World Conference of Disaster Reduction (WCDR) in Japan in early 2015. To ensure that the needs of stakeholders form the basis of the HFA2, a consultation process was launched in March 2012 by the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction, Margareta Wahlström and by the Ambassador for Japan to the International Organizations in Geneva, Yoichi Otabe. This was followed by the release of the background paper *Towards the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*.

The global consultation process is being undertaken in two Phases. The first phase began in March 2012 and will conclude prior to the 4th GPDRR in May 2013. Phase I of consultations focused on broad substantive issues for a new framework on DRR. Phase II will commence after the 4th GPDRR until the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Reduction and will focus on the content and format of a draft HFA2.

There is an increasing recognition that disaster is a development challenge. The Rio+20 Outcome document calls for the acceleration of the implementation of the HFA and emphasizes the imperative of reducing risk and building disaster resilience for poverty eradication, addressing the impacts of climate change and to achieve sustainable development. The HFA2 consultation outcomes inform the two related processes; the consultations for the new Sustainable Development Goals and the Post-2015 Development Agenda (post Millennium Development Goals), and aim at translating the Rio+20 aspirations into actions: to make DRR a prominent goal in the new global development agenda post-2015.

A global synthesis of Phase I consultation and other background documents on the HFA2 are available at [www.preventionweb.net/posthfa](http://www.preventionweb.net/posthfa).

3. **Consultations in Asia-Pacific**

In the Asia-Pacific region, Phase I consultations (March 2012 – April 2013) were conducted by governments in the region and with stakeholders at the community, local, national and regional levels. Stakeholder consultations formed a significant part of the process.
The consultation process was based on the following principles: **bottom-up** – promoting local and national consultations; **inclusive** – reaching out to communities, vulnerable stakeholder groups and development sectors that have not been duly engaged in disaster risk management; **integrated** – into sector discussions, the MDGs and especially the process to prepare the Post-2015 Development Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals; and **comprehensive** – addressing the key issues learned from the HFA implementation and the emerging risks and challenges for disaster and climate resilience building which should become central in future development.

The different types of consultations that took place in the Asia Pacific region during March 2012 – April 2013 are outlined below. The list of the consultations is provided in Annex 1.

**Multi-stakeholder regional consultations**

In the Asia-Pacific region, Phase I consultations (March 2012 – April 2013) were conducted by governments in the region and with stakeholders at the community, local, national and regional levels. Stakeholder consultations formed a significant part of the process.

The consultation process was based on the following principles: bottom-up – promoting local and national consultations; inclusive – reaching out to communities, vulnerable stakeholder groups and development sectors that have not been duly engaged in disaster risk management; integrated – into sector discussions, the MDGs and especially the process to prepare the Post-2015 Development Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals; and comprehensive – addressing the key issues learned from the HFA implementation and the emerging risks and challenges for disaster and climate resilience building which should become central in future development.

The different types of consultations that took place in the Asia Pacific region during March 2012 – April 2013 are outlined below. The list of the consultations is provided in Annex 1.

**National level multi-stakeholder consultations**

Twenty-seven (27) countries of the Asia-Pacific region conducted multi-stakeholder national consultations on HFA2, several of which included consultations with local governments (e.g. Pakistan, Cambodia, India, and Philippines). The consultations focused on progress in implementing the HFA, lessons learned and gaps to be addressed in the future framework.

National level insights were also obtained through a Future Outlook section in the 2011-2013 HFA progress report. 27 out of 36 countries which submitted national HFA progress reports listed the most significant issues that must be included in HFA2.

**Box 1: National Consultations in the Pacific**

In the Pacific, 16 countries organized national consultations for HFA2 which were closely aligned with the 2011-2013 national HFA progress reviews and the development of the integrated regional strategy for disaster risk management (DRM) and climate change. This process had been valuable in obtaining the Pacific Island perspectives for the HFA2 as well as in creating a regional consensus, reflected through the Pacific Regional Platform in 2012 and upcoming in July 2013.
Local consultations

Consultations at local level and with local government leaders looked at the underlying causes of the lagging behind DRR progress at the local level – the most important lesson from the HFA implementation.

At the 5th AMCDRR, mayors and local government representatives from across the region provided inputs to HFA2 and reaffirmed their commitment for DRR through local actions. In India, the national ‘Consultation on Roadmap for DRR beyond HFA’ comprised of consultations in four different regions with participation of 25 states. In Pakistan, three provincial consultations were organized for inputs from local level and a national workshop consolidated Pakistan’s views on HFA2. In Philippines, the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) conducted a survey of more than 200 Chief Local Executives to provide inputs to HFA2 as well as a snapshot of local DRR in the country to inform the Government’s policies and planning toward local levels.

Community consultations

Efforts to engage the community level have been made through the support of ISDR system partners. Community consultations were conducted in Cambodia, Indonesia, China, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Philippines, and People’s Democratic Republic of Korea (PDRK) (courtesy of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies). These consultations focused on gathering community perspectives in relation to disaster management and risk reduction, looking back on past experiences as well as looking forward towards new opportunities.

In the Pacific, community consultations from Kiribati, Tonga, Tuvalu, Fiji, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, and Vanuatu were expressed in the Views from the Frontline report (2013) by the Global Network for Civil Society Organizations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR). This report provides insights into the thoughts of local government officials and community representatives (including civil society organizations) on HFA progress and a HFA2.

Research on the views of community members in Pakistan was conducted by the Rural Development Policy Institute who prepared the report Right from the Communities - People’s Views on Disasters and their Reduction. This report provided insights into community views in Pakistan using individual interviews and focus group discussion with nearly 1000 girls, boys, men and women from 37 villages.

Stakeholder consultations

Stakeholder groups are encouraged to organize themselves for shared views and concerns to shape HFA2 while participating in multi-stakeholder consultations.

Sustaining stakeholder engagement will be essential for HFA2 ownership, implementation and accountability. At the recent IAP meeting in Bangkok in April 2013, the stakeholder groups that were formed at 5th AMCDRR shared the progress in delivering their commitments made at the 5th AMCDRR and discussed the ways to strengthen each stakeholder group while promoting partnership among them to address issues of relevance across the groups. Participants highlighted the value of multi-stakeholder engagement in HFA2 development as learned from the process to date and reiterated
the principle that the consultation process needs to be inclusive. They also emphasized
the need to utilize the existing mechanisms rather than creating new ones.

**Thematic consultations**

Thematic consultations devoted to issues of significance in reducing disaster risk
as learned from the HFA such as land use planning, education and DRR, etc. These
consultations facilitate the engagement of various sectors in the process, to address
DRR in development.

Thematic consultations in Asia Pacific have been limited to only a few events on DRR
and recovery. On the other hand, stakeholder consultations raised a number of issues
which would require more in-depth discussions such as gender equality in disaster risk
management, disability-inclusive DRR or child-centered DRR.

**Linkage with the post-2015 development agenda**

Integrating DRR into the post-2015 development agenda has been a priority issue
in Asia-Pacific as they are so closely aligned, and efforts have been made to link the
two processes. DRR has been brought into a series of sub-regional consultations on
accelerating the MDGs and on the post-2015 development agenda in different sub-
regions in Asia-Pacific. The President of Indonesia in his role as Global Champion for DRR
and Co-Chair of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons for the Post-2015 Development
Agenda co-hosted with UNDP and other partners a global thematic consultation on this
topic in Jakarta in February 2013. Building resilience to natural-hazard induced disasters
and major economic crises was a focus of the 69th Commission of the Economic and
Social Commission of Asia Pacific (ESCAP) in April 2013.
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accelerating the MDGs and on the post-2015 development agenda in different sub-
regions in Asia-Pacific. The President of Indonesia in his role as Global Champion for DRR
and Co-Chair of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons for the Post-2015 Development
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Nevertheless, linking these two inter-related processes has been a challenge, especially
at the national level – a point to be emphasized in Phase II as Member States will enter
into negotiations on both HFA2 and the future development goals and strategies through
inter-governmental processes.

4. **Key issues and proposals**

The common issues, themes and recommendations on ways forward for a post-2015
framework for DRR identified through the various consultations at the national, community
and regional levels are discussed below. The number of national consultations that
referred to specific topics is expressed using \( n=x \) following the relevant statement.
4.1 Building on the HFA for a new framework for DRR

The relevance and achievements of the HFA received high appreciation by consultations’ participants. There exists a unanimous agreement that “the HFA made a difference” and “HFA works” and that the new DRR framework should “continue on the same approach with modifications” (India) and “with more focus on sustainability and consolidation of achievements” (Pakistan).

There was a call for stronger priorities in DRR, for example, HFA Priority 1 could be “Institutionalization of DRR at the national and local level” (India).

Consultations also highlighted the lessons learned from the HFA implementation that need to be taken into account in preparing HFA2. It is commonly acknowledged that the HFA achievements largely remain at the national level and have not reached local level in a substantial manner. Moreover, the progress varies from one HFA priority to another, with HFA priority 4 ‘addressing the underlying causes of the increasing disaster risks’ being the most challenging one.

Outstanding issues not sufficiently covered by the current HFA include: the integration of DRR and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA); addressing trans-boundary risks through regional and sub-regional cooperation; insufficient attention to cross-cutting issues such as gender and disability-inclusive DRR, and addressing the multiple risks facing communities including conflict.

There is also a call for more attention to high-frequency – low impact but recurrent disasters (extensive risk) that have devastating impacts on livelihoods, especially of the poor (India, Viet Nam, others). Climate change mitigation is also emphasized to address the root causes of increasing hazard risks, noting the limitation of adaptation (Bangladesh).

4.2 Integrating DRR, climate change and sustainable development

Regional and national consultations highlighted that the linkages between DRR, climate change adaptation and mitigation and sustainable development are fairly clear and well defined at the conceptual level but that the policy, practice and investments that deal with these areas rarely reflect these interrelationships and often occur in a disconnected, compartmentalized manner.

Consultations’ suggestions for how to achieve improved integration included:

- Building the understanding of the linkages between DRR and related themes among key stakeholders such as parliamentarians and local government leaders and officials (n=6);

- Further research to provide evidence on the relationship between disasters, development and climate change, people’s lives and livelihoods (5AMCDRR);

- Mainstream DRR into various social sectors;

- Enhance mainstreaming of climate change mitigation and adaptation (5AMCDRR);
• Ensure that resources, particularly national budget allocations consider DRR at all levels for both the short and long terms with funds aimed at achieving combined gains. For example, there are opportunities to connect social protection investments and mechanisms with DRR-CCA action and for input into private investments to facilitate reduced risk (e.g. through thoughtful construction);

• Ensure an inclusive and outcome-oriented implementation that is equally applied at all levels, involving “non-traditional DRR stakeholders” such as parliamentarians, local governments as well as science and academia to enable informed decisions;

• Create an enabling environment for integration by supporting the development of appropriate policy and legislation. Unification of relevant mandates and declarations relating to science, policy, and development into a single strategy.

There was a call to take “resilience” as a paradigm that integrates DRR, CC and sustainable development (Bangladesh).

Consultations emphasize the importance of linking the implementation of the HFA with the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and other relevant UN Conventions. Engaging policymakers in a constructive dialogue was seen as instrumental in implementing international agreements.

Regional and national consultations highlighted the need to integrate DRR and CCA into the post-2015 development agenda to measure the impacts of DRR on development outcomes (Samoa, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka).

National consultations have also specifically highlighted the need for more work to be done in reducing disaster risk through improved land use planning, particularly considering increasing the urban risks (Sri Lanka). Strategies to achieve this include integrating DRR into regulations, building code; capacity building of planners (Samoa) and development of specific guidelines for planners (n=2).

4.3 Local level action

Local level engagement took a central stage in HFA2 consultations in Asia Pacific. A wide range of issues was brought up: access to risk information, raising community awareness on DRR (and the HFA), decentralization of authorities and enhancing access to resources to enable local governments to implement DRR and, strengthening local risk governance and accountability (Stakeholder Group- Mayors and Local Government).

All consultations suggested that HFA2 considers increasing the emphasis on building local skills and capacities, especially to deal with local issues.

The need for more attention to improve vertical coordination between the different levels of the government was highlighted in regional consultations as important to enable local actions. Local consultations emphasized the need for improved governance at all levels and are discussed in more detail in section 4.7.

Community involvement, with a gender-balanced participation, should be ensured through existing tools such as Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM). Other solutions
to this were also suggested, such as: (1) working more effectively with all key stakeholders to empower communities; (2) involving communities in local government development planning that sets measurable targets for individual and community safety and resilience; (3) giving priority to local initiatives; and (4) greater outreach to community level to understand micro-level issues for more realistic approaches to penetrate DRR to the grassroots level.

Local governments are also advised to work with children to address issues on DRR and recovery; provide more opportunities for involving the children into discussion and decision-making. Community voices, their challenges and expectations need to be rightfully and adequately represented in all levels of decision and policy forums.

4.4 Turning vulnerability into resilience

During the initial years of the HFA implementation, the main approach towards addressing the issues of groups of people who are identified as ‘specifically vulnerable’ such as children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, women, and girls, etc. was reducing vulnerability.

While it is acknowledged that social and economic inequalities, existing institutional arrangements, as well as the social and cultural norms make certain social groups more vulnerable to disasters than others, it is clearly observed that even the most vulnerable members of society have capacities, skills, and knowledge valuable for risk reduction.

To this effect, the common reference to women as helpless victims in disasters is strongly challenged (Stakeholder Group dealing with Gender and Women’s issues). Recognizing and mobilizing skills and capacities of women as a social force and channeling them to enhance safety of their own families and communities have proved effective strategies in DRR.

Strong opinions were expressed during consultations in recognition and support of persons with disabilities – the most excluded group in social activities including DRR. It is recommended to raise awareness that disability increases vulnerability across all populations and decreases resilience of an entire community. Special attention and protection are required for children with disabilities (Stakeholder Group dealing with People with Disabilities).

Child vulnerability - including child-centered risk assessments - should be reflected in local level planning, development and humanitarian approaches. At the same time, children, especially school-aged children and adolescents – are to be perceived as active partners in carrying out risk assessments, designers and implementers of DRR interventions. Children, like everyone else, need to have equal opportunities to be granted to all DRR stakeholders, including information access and participation (Stakeholder Group dealing with Children and Youth).

Community member feedbacks point to different factors perceived as important to reduce their vulnerability to disaster: having safe facilities (i.e. housing, schools and hospitals), health (clean water, epidemics and disease control, food security and sanitation), livelihood security and accessibility through improved transportation.

Consultations recommended that:

- The capacities of the most vulnerable are utilized and built upon to reduce risk, beginning with official recognition of the productive and constructive role vulnerable people have in resilience building.
• Vulnerable groups are more actively engaged and their views are considered in the design and implementation of DRR and CCA interventions, including in risk assessments and risk communication.

• Measures are introduced to generate sex and age disaggregated information for DRR, CCA and development planning, implementation, and monitoring to ensure improved understanding of the issues specific to vulnerable groups. It is recommended to make gender an indicator in HFA2 and at the same time strengthen the mainstreaming of gender into national strategies, programs and initiatives at all levels.

• Protection of children, women, girls, elderly and people with disability are included in action plans for before, during and after emergencies. For example, children expressed the need for particular attention to school safety as critical for their survival and wellbeing.

In approaching HFA2, the importance of understanding multiple risks communities face, including conflict, and building their capacity to cope with the risks was brought up. The need to focus HFA2 on building resilience of nations and communities to multiple shocks, also through the ability to address issues such as hunger, food insecurity and migration has been highlighted in consultations.

The discussions also indicated an understanding of resilience in broader sense: resilience of investments or of development in general. Specific reference is made to the need to make private sector investments resilient by engaging the private sector in disaster risk reduction to ensure business continuity, corporate sustainability and increase public-private collaboration to build community resilience.

At the IAP meeting in April 2013, participants emphasized the need to unpack the idea of resilience, especially what this means for the local level.

4.5 Multi-stakeholder engagement

Consultations, especially at the national level, highlighted that multi-stakeholder approach, and the role of the National Platforms has proved as instrumental for DRR and must remain central in HFA2. The importance of the sustaining and enhancement of multi-stakeholder mechanisms for DRR consultation, planning, implementation and monitoring was recognized at all levels of consultation (n=10). The need for inclusiveness in decision-making was stressed, with private sector and vulnerable groups specifically mentioned.

At the regional level, it was suggested that this should be made a non-compromised principle that is incorporated at all levels, with specific reference to the participation of communities and vulnerable groups and the science and academia sector. At the community level, the need to engage the most vulnerable in decision-making processes and equally value their contribution was emphasized (5AMCDRR).

Engagement of the private sector was acknowledged and recommended in regional, community (n=2) and national (Cambodia, Nepal) consultations. The role of private sector is specifically emphasized with moving beyond Corporate Social Responsibility to resilient investment and business continuity. Recommendations made regarding private sector involvement from regional consultations included:
• That private sector partnership, engagement and accountability be considered as one of the pillars for resilience building in the regions;

• Improved engagement in disaster risk reduction discussions with a view to enhance corporate sustainability and resilience and enhance Business Continuity Planning and collaboration between private and public entities in building community resilience.

The importance of multi-stakeholder engagement in addressing trans-boundary issues was also mentioned. In support of this, it was recommended to create sub-regional platforms as an integral part of HFA2, establish regional coordination mechanisms to strengthen information sharing and promote risk reduction measures and collaborative response to trans-boundary hazards. Joint studies, promotion of bi-lateral dialogues and addressing trans-boundary hazard risk in broader political and development cooperation areas as well as strengthening coordination between the IGOs have been highlighted as instrumental for a more bottom approach to trans-boundary risks.

4.6 Risk governance and accountability

Many regional and national consultations recognized disaster risk as an issue of governance. Building effective governance for DRR was highlighted as a critical area to focus on in HFA2, including increasing accountability for risk reduction, disaster preparedness, resourcing and addressing trans-boundary risks.

Improved accountability at all levels (local, national, regional and international) was identified as one of the key governance issues that need to be addressed in the HFA2 discussions. This was raised in national (Cambodia) regional (5AMCDRR) and community consultations.

Suggestions for how to achieve improved accountability included:

• Development of legislated and standardized monitoring mechanisms;

• Inclusion of well-defined targets, indicators and monitoring mechanisms to measure outputs and outcomes of risk reduction interventions with targets focused on understanding both successes and failures to facilitate continual improvement (regional consultations);

• Adoption of more human development-focused indicators to measure effectiveness (n=3);

• Special attention was given to connecting accountability with the issues of vulnerability and inclusiveness. For example, inclusion of independent gender audits of programs and resources for DRR to assess if policies, practices and monitoring mechanisms adequately address gender equality;

• Development of ‘two-way’ accountability mechanisms such as:
  1. Community monitoring and partnerships (national consultations (n=3));
  2. A complaint and feedback mechanism from community to different levels of government supported by legislation (regional consultations);
3. Monitoring of resource allocations (and other commitments made by national and local governments as well as the international, regional development and donor community), including monitoring of the level of investment in integrated programmes and policies and inclusiveness of the issues of specifically vulnerable groups (regional consultations);

4. Accountability of the government at all levels - national and local - before the people; as well citizens’ legal accountability for their own safety.

Resource allocation and accountable use were strongly highlighted in regional and national consultations (n=11) as a key challenge that needs to be addressed in HFA2. The need for advocacy to encourage nations to have disaster prevention specifically dedicated in national budgets and allocated appropriately to the local levels was stressed. National and local consultations also emphasized the need for continued advocacy to ensure that governments support disaster risk reduction efforts politically. Improving cost-benefit analysis methods and capacities was highlighted as a method to support advocacy efforts and demonstrate value in preparedness investment.

National and regional consultations identified trans-boundary hazards and sub-regional cooperation as crucial for DRR and CCA. Strategies such as strengthening regional cooperation to identify and address trans-boundary issues, including the use of Inter-Governmental Organizations (IGO), were recommended to be given due consideration in HFA2.

4.7 Knowledge-based decision making

At regional and many national consultations, the need for efforts to ensure that policies are better informed by science and research was discussed.

Many national level discussions (n=7) focused on the need for improved data to ensure that decision-making is based on evidence. Data gaps were identified as barriers to reducing disaster risks, particularly at a local level and in relation to there being a lack of guidelines/methods/standards for risk assessments in the areas of loss assessment methodology, hazard definitions and multi-hazard assessments. Capacity in being able to obtain and analyze this data was also identified as a gap (n=2). Community consultations also highlighted the need for local level hazard and risk information to be able to inform local level decision-making.

4.8 What kind of new framework?

Consultations strongly recommended that HFA2 include well defined targets, indicators, clearly defined responsibilities and monitoring mechanisms to increase accountability for its implementation and to measure not only the outputs, but also the cumulative impact of risk reduction interventions.

The development of regional and national frameworks to implement HFA2 was highlighted as essential to ensure HFA2 implementation, especially at local level (India).

There was also a call to consider the new DRR framework a legally binding instrument, as a UN Convention.
With regard to the timeframe of the future DRR framework, it is recommended to ensure that it delivers DRR across both short and long-term, with a proposed long-term period of 20 years.

Putting a strong focus on implementation, consultations emphasized the critical importance of standards, tools and guidelines to answer the question of ‘How’ in DRR, building on the political commitments gained through HFA implementation.

5. Next steps

At the 4th Session of the Global Platform for DRR, deliberations on HFA2 will consolidate issues and recommendations made to date and deepen the dialogue by soliciting answers to a few important questions:

- How do we build on the HFA and yet ensure that we capture and formulate ideas to reduce disaster losses over the next 30+ years?
- What are the views on how best to encourage commitment among stakeholders? Whose engagement is essential? What are the most effective and appropriate mechanisms to ensure a new decision-taking model?
- There is a need to improve implementation of disaster risk reduction actions within HFA2. What mechanisms, tools or methods would you consider are the best means of creating this enabling environment for DRR implementation, especially at the local level?

The diagram below provides a structure of HFA2 consultations at the GPDRR:
Phase 2 of consultations on HFA2 will commence following the 4th GPDRR and will conclude prior to the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) 2015 in Japan. The key milestones of Phase II of HFA2 consultations are:

- A first draft of HFA2 prepared by end 2013, drawing on the consultations and deliberations at the 4th GPDRR;

- In 2013-2014: consultations on the draft will be sought with countries, IGOs and stakeholders. At the regional level, the 5th Pacific Regional Platform on DRM (July 2013) and 6th AMCDRR (June 2014) will be key forums;

- In early 2015: final draft of the post-HFA framework submitted for consideration at the 3rd World Conference on DRR in Japan;

- In 2015: UN Secretary-General submits a report on the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) to the UN General Assembly along with a recommendation for the UN General Assembly to adopt the HFA2.

Continued active participation from the Asia-Pacific in the next phase of consultations and in shaping HFA2 is critical given the region’s high vulnerabilities to hazards but also its significant drive in the global increasing risk trend.

Countries and stakeholders in the region will need to address several important issues in this process such as:

- How to best organize the next consultations, while maintaining the principles of bottom-up and inclusiveness. For example, how to address the language barrier.

- How to maintain the stakeholder engagement in the process at all levels (national, regional and global), noting that once the draft document is submitted to the UN General Assembly, it will be only governments who will negotiate the final outcome;

- How to leverage the existing stakeholder engagement mechanisms and partnerships in the region to build commitments for HFA2. For example, how can we encourage stakeholders that have not traditionally been active in the HFA to become more actively engaged (e.g. private sector, local government, parliamentarians)?

- How to build sub-regional and regional consensus among countries and stakeholders on HFA2. What roles could the IGO play in this regard?

- How will Asia Pacific play its role at the WCDR?

The 6th AMCDRR in June 2014 will present a strategic opportunity for building regional consensus on HFA2 as it will be the last inter-governmental platform in the region before the 3rd World Conference on DRR in early 2015.
ANNEX 1
List of consultations in Asia Pacific March 2012 – April 2014

REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Tenth meeting of the Regional Consultative Committee of the Asian Disaster Management Centre
25-27 March 2013, Mongolia

Regional consultative meeting on post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA 2) for the countries of Central Asia and South Caucasus
14 March 2013, Kazakhstan

Sub-regional workshop on MDGs and post-2015 development agenda for South Asia
8-10 January 2013, Bangladesh

Regional consultation on post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA 2)
January 2013, Japan

Asia-Pacific regional meeting on the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action
17-19 December 2012, Cambodia

Sub-regional workshop on MDGs and post-2015 development agenda for South East Asia
21-23 November 2012, Thailand

Fifth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction
22-25 October 2012, Indonesia

Pacific platform for disaster risk management 2012
17-21 September 2012, New Caledonia

Post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA 2) consultation at the second leadership development forum on developing capacity and legislation to mainstream disaster risk reduction into development
17 May 2012, Republic of Korea

Consultation on post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA 2) with the ISDR Asia partnership
11 April 2012, Indonesia

NATIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Maldives, the Republic of, April 15th 2013
Afghanistan, 16-17 March, 2013,
Philippines, 13-20 March, 2013
Pakistan, 5 March-15 April, 2013
Sri Lanka, 1 March, 2013
Cambodia, 21 February 2013
Bangladesh, 24 December 2012-19 February, 2013
Nepal, 17 February, 2013
Korea, Republic of, 14 December 2012
Japan, November 2012-February 2013
India, 30 October-29 November 2012
Viet Nam, 7 September 2012
Samoa, 20-31 August 2012
Cook Islands, 16 August 2012
Nauru, 13-21 August 2012
Tuvalu, 9-20 August 2012
Solomon Islands, 3-10 August 2012
Marshall Islands, 2-10 August 2012
Fiji, 1-31 August 2012
Tonga, 1-31 August 2012
Micronesia, Federated States of, 23-29 July 2012
Kiribati, 23 July-1 August 2012
Vanuatu, 2-23 July 2012
Niue, 18 June-1 July 2012
Palau, Republic of, 18-27 June 2012

LOCAL CONSULTATIONS

Post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA 2)
local and community consultations in Pakistan
4 February - 15 April 2013

Post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (HFA 2)
local consultation in India
30 October - 29 November 2012, India

STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

First meeting of Asian advisory group of parliamentarians
18-20 March 2013, Republic of Korea

Round Table on Disability-Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction:
Revisiting the Hyogo Framework for Action
20 November, 2012, Bangkok

ACT Alliance consultation for Asia Pacific
5-9 December 2012, Thailand

Stakeholder consultations (10 stakeholder groups) at the
Fifth Asian Ministerial Conference on disaster risk reduction
22-25 October 2012, Indonesia

THEMATIC CONSULTATIONS

Fourth expert group meeting on the Great East Japan Earthquake
21 January 2013, Japan