

Interactive comment on “Brief Communication: Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction – success or warning sign for Paris?” by J. Mysiak et al.

J. Mysiak et al.

jaroslav.mysiak@feem.it

Received and published: 20 April 2016

Thank you for your insightful comments that will help us to improve the manuscript.

[Your comments] This paper needs improvement of the English to correct misuse of tenses, dangling clauses, errors of usage and misuse of verbs. Abstract: "In March 2015, a new international blueprint for disaster risk reduction (DRR) has been adopted in Sendai..." - was adopted (past definite). Page 2, lines 11-12: "2015 has the potential to mark a key milestone" - please do not start sentences with figures.

[Our response] Thank you, we will revise the text. The manuscript was reviewed and

C3393

corrected by a professional proof-reader whose native language is English. He might have overlooked some errors.

[Your comments] Page 2, lines 14-15: "At the same time there is a growing risk of further inaction if no political agreement can be found." - This presupposes that international conventions are necessarily the motor of action. The authors need to ask - and answer – the question of to what extent countries need to be coerced into taking action on DRR and CC.

[Our response] We will revise the sentence. In no way we meant that international commitments 'coerce' any actions. However, it was made clear (for example the EC Communication 'The post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing risks to achieve resilience', COM(2014) 216 final, ec.europa.eu/echo/files/news/post_hyogo_managing_risks_en.pdf) that the new Framework was to develop mechanisms to hold the various actors accountable for their actions.

[Your comments] Page 3, lines 23-26: "The global annual average economic losses from natural hazards to the built environment alone, as estimated in the 2015 edition of the Global Assessment Report (UNISDR, 2015), would rank 36th in the list of countries sorted by their nominal GDP." - What does this mean? It is incomprehensible.

[Our response] The sentence only stresses that the magnitude of the global annual average loss caused by natural hazards is comparable to the gross domestic product (GDP) of the 36th largest economy in the world. We will revise it to make the point clearer.

[Your comments] Page, 4, lines 5-6: "Since 2005, the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA, 2005–2015) provided guidance" - has provided guidance. Page 4, lines 21-22: "Vainly, as it turned out." - this is a clause, not a sentence.

[Our response] We will ask the proof-reader to check and correct the sentence.

C3394

[Your comments] Page 4, lines 24-25: "...stretched out until late hours on the last conference day, and presented to the relatively small audience of participants that remained to learn the outcomes." First, this does not explain why negotiations were so protracted, which was mainly because countries with few resources did not want the non-binding SFDRR to be tied to the binding negotiations on emissions and climate change. Secondly, the fact that few people remained at the end of the negotiations is misleading: there was no shortage of audience, it was merely the middle of the night.

[Our response] We agree. The article was written as a short communication and we occasionally use colloquial expression typical for opinion articles. The sentence is not important for the piece and will remove it.

[Your comments] Page 5, lines 15-16: "Disappointingly none of the targets specifies a quantitative degree of progress to be made." - That was never the purpose of treaties such as the SFDRR, but UNISDR literature makes it clear that it was intended to be worked out separately and after the SFDRR had been inaugurated. To quote a UNISDR publication "UN organizations have increased their accountability by adopting a single set of indicators to measure progress as they accelerate and mainstream disaster risk reduction into their operations." - If the SFDRR had contained targets they would have been unrealistic because of the complexity of the problems and the differences in disaster risk around the world, and also the differences in countries' risk reduction capacities.

[Our response] We disagree on this point. It was generally expected that the new Framework would specify quantitative targets to be achieved. In the Zero- and Preconference-Draft the targets were specified as a percentage point change compared to a base reference value (as the Supplement of our article). In the revised manuscript we will reinforce this argument. The Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology Relating to Disaster Risk Reduction (OIEWG) was indeed established and held meetings in September 2015 and February 2016. However, the mandate of the OIEWG is to develop 'a set of possible indicators

C3395

to measure global progress in the implementation' of the SFDRR (UN GA Resolution A/RES/69/284). The OIEWG is not meant to further specify the level of the targets.

[Your comments] Page 6, lines 2-3: "the ten years over which the countries' progress will be judged." - The SFDRR applies over 15 years. This paragraph is not correct or meaningful because it ignores the separate process that the UN is using to develop indicators of progress. See: <https://www.unisdr.org/archive/45961> "Work starts on Sendai indicators".

[Our response] Yes, but the progress made between 2020-2030 is measured in relation to the baseline reference period 2005-2015. In the sentence we refer to the baseline period which is indeed 10 years long. We are aware of the OIEWG work and familiar with its results so far. We have contributed to the OIEWG discussion in several ways, including a written submission (see <http://www.preventionweb.net/drr-framework/download/0b8s8i73l?validate=30623873386937336c59>)

[Your comments] Page 6, lines 11-12. "DRR progress will be accounted through collective assessments of all countries." - This was not true for the Hyogo Framework and will not be true for the SFDRR. In this paragraph, the authors seem to have confused the working of the SFDRR with carbon trading arrangements.

[Our response] Literally, the targets are stated as 'reduce global disaster mortality', 'reduce direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product', 'reduce the number of affected people globally', etc. We agree that the individual contributions towards can and will be disentangled. We will revise the sentence accordingly.

[Your comments] Page 6, lines 21-22: "better coordination of disaster risk activities with development, civil protection, and other sectorial policies" [sectoral] - I wouldn't exactly call development a 'sectoral policy'.

[Our response] Thank you, we will revise the sentence.

[Your comments] Page 8, section 4: Rather than simply lamenting that the SFDRR is

C3396

not like the climate convention, the authors of this piece would do well to consider why that is so. Establishment of international liability for disasters is fantasy, especially if one accepts the 1983 'radical critique' on the primacy of vulnerability. In my view, there are two main reasons why this paper presents an unsatisfactory view of the SFDRR. First, it ignores the collateral work which is intended to operationalise the treaty, for example work on the creation of databases and indicators, and their subsequent application in particular countries. In that sense, it mistakes the fundamental nature of the SFDRR: it is a framework, not a statute to be applied or a standard to be achieved. Secondly, the paper contains no critique or evaluation of the fact that the UN process is 'top-down'. This is important, as two very comprehensive independent evaluations of the Hyogo Framework were carried out at the local level (in 2009 and 2011). They concluded that it had had little impact at the local scale. Finally, if the SFDRR must be evaluated in the light of the climate convention, the first thing to do should be to recognise the functional differences between the two instruments.

[Our response] Thank you for the comments. We explained earlier that we are familiar with the 'collateral' work of the OIEWG. We submitted our article in May 2015 shortly after the SFDRR had been adopted. The OIEWG was established in June 2015. The peer review of our article was completed in January 2016. Our article is not meant to analyse the UN governance. In the revised article we will include reference to the HFA reviews and try to respond, where appropriate, to your suggestion.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 3955, 2015.