

[Interactive
Comment](#)

***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 help us to improve the manuscript.

[Your comments] In my opinion, this paper provides a good description and articulation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) and its outcomes; however, falls short in the title description to its link to COP21 in Paris. The paper also has some weakness on its content on Pre-Sendai negotiations, making only a link to Zero-Draft version; not taking into consideration the extensive negotiations and the feedback received in a multi-stakeholder platform that led to its inscription.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive Comment

[Our response] Thank you. Our discussion of the SFDRR started with the Zero-Draft, for which the article was designed as a brief communication or reflection on the main outcomes of the WCDRR 2015. In the revised version we will reflect on the pre-zero draft consultations.

[Your comments] I found that the most important contribution of this paper is Section 3: The Outcome, which discusses whether and in which ways, each outcome targets can be implemented. I think, at this section, the paper brings an important inquiry by discussing both success and shortcomings of the targets. In my opinion, the following short 4th section does little to provide a significant contribution, and shifts the focus eliminating the strength the paper had gained in the 3rd section. I'd suggest to either eliminate the 4th section, or to enhance the links to COP21 to strengthen this paper. If the second route is taken, I'd suggest referencing another recent publication (Kelman, I. (2015). "Climate Change and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction" International Journal of Disaster Risk Science 6:46) in this context.

[Our response] Thank you for the insightful comments. In the revised version we will extend the discussion on the link between the SFDRR and the Paris Accord, and insert the references to articles that have been published after the submission of our manuscript. The peer review of our article has been completed only after the Paris conference.

[Your comments] 1- Pg. 3957, parafs. 22: "over and over, medium and large scale disasters" Please note also that non-industrialized countries are mostly impacted by extensive disasters, which put a continuous pressure in their day-to-day living.

[Our response] Your comment is in line with the GAR2015. However, our analysis and a bulk of independently completed assessments do not support this conclusion. In fact, the intense risk (low-probability/high impact hazard events) accounts for most of the reported damage. We agree that the under-reporting might be an issue. We will revise the text to address your comment.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



[Your comments] 2- Pg. 3958, parafs 10-15: “Most of all, the HFA: Please articulate the success and shortcomings of HFA, instead of solely using this quote from a secondary source. Also, please note to provide exact referencing (with page numbers and quotation marks) throughout the document.

[Our response] Thank you. We will revise the text. The source we quoted includes an in-depth discussion of the HFA review. We will extend the discussion and highlight the outcomes of the mid-term and final reviews of the HFA.

[Your comments] 3- Pg. 3958, Paraf 23-25 “at the end of a marathon negotiation and presented to the relatively small audience. . .” I do not think that this last sentence provides an important contribution to the text as it is not a sign of success or shortcoming of the SFDRR.

[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] 4- Pg. 3959, TARGETS Please revise the targets according to the latest available document.

[Our response] We have shortened the wording of the seven targets in the main text of the article but the original wording is included in the Supplement. (This is indicated also in the manuscript itself).

[Your comments] 5- Pg. 3960, Paraf. 5 “the progress would have to be measured in . . . expressed in annual expected value” Please provide explanation to the term used.

[Our response] We will add the explanation.

[Your comments] TECHNICAL COMMENTS 1- Pg. 3956, paraf. 16” state governments and international disaster risk communities got together” Please revise this sentence to “member states and the international risk community came together”

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

2- Pg. 3956, paraf. 18-20. “ Sendai, being nearest major city . . . the choice of venue could hardly have been better.” Revise sentence structure to “ The choice of venue, as Sendai, could hardly been better, as it is the nearest major city ...

3- Pg. 3957, parafs. 16-20 “ The right to development, the declaration of which..” “To succeed, this year’s negotiations” Combine two sentences and revise sentence structure, eliminate the 30th year mention and provide exact referencing: “ To succeed, this year’s negotiations will have to attend to the Right of Development, which places a duty on countries..

4- Pg. 3957, paraf. 23. “ unindustrialized” change to non-industrialized

5- Pg. 3957, paraf. 24. “ hazards” I’d recommend to change this to “Disasters”

6- Pg. 3957, paraf. 27 “to rocket” I’d suggest to change this word to “soar” or “escalate”

7- Pg. 3958, paraf. 3. “ In the official UN language DRR has been raised as a global . . .” Please eliminate “in the official UN language” or revise it to “Within the UN System”

8- Pg. 3958, paraf. 15. “ Therefore, the WCDRR was to address” Please revise it to “Therefore, the mandate (or the goal) of the WCDRR was to address”

9- Pg. 3960, paraf. 15 and paraf. 18. “ under- by overachievers” and “underperformers” Please use alternative words. For instance, it could be: “It allows for compensation by those countries that have achieved less by those that have achieved more” Single out those that have performed less than the average?

10- Pg. 3961, last paraf. Last sentence, needs a period (.)

11- Pg. 3963, paraf. 6. “the bone of contention” Revise it to another word: potential words: “heart” or “core”

12- Pg. 3963, paraf. 8. “ Sendai will” Revise it to Sendai Framework for DRR will

13- Pg. 3963, paraf. 10. “ : : .will be interesting..” I suggest to revise the word “interest-

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



ing” or the whole sentence: “It will be interesting (for what) how the term “substantially,” [Our response] Thank you for all the valuable suggestions. The manuscript was reviewed and corrected by a professional proof-reader whose native language is English. We will ask him to check and consider your suggestions in the revised version of the manuscript.

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

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)