



# 14<sup>th</sup> RCC

REGIONAL  
CONSULTATIVE  
COMMITTEE on  
**DISASTER  
MANAGEMENT**

## Policies and Practices for Coherence between Global Frameworks

03-05 December 2018  
Kathmandu, Nepal

### BACKGROUND NOTE

Supported by:







	INTRODUCTION	2
	REGIONAL COOPERATION ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT	3
	COHERENCE BETWEEN POST-2015 GLOBAL FRAMEWORK	7
	KEY SESSIONS OF THE 14TH RCC MEETING	16
	REFERENCES	19



# 1. Introduction

The Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (RCC), established in 2000 by the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC), serves as a non-binding mechanism to develop action strategies for disaster risk reduction (DRR) in Asia and the Pacific; to promote cooperative programs at regional and sub-regional levels; and to provide guidance to ADPC on its future work and strategies.

The RCC is comprised of the National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs) of 26 member countries, promoting peer advocacy and exchange of expertise in DRR and climate resilience (CR). ADPC, as the Secretariat to the RCC, is committed to bringing countries in the region together to achieve common goals in DRR. The RCC mechanism enables ADPC, together with other agencies, to assist countries in implementing the commitments of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the Agenda for Humanity, and the New Urban Agenda.

The RCC meetings are hosted by different member countries in Asia and the Pacific and each has a specific thematic focus which provides a useful opportunity for members to exchange lessons and to share their best practices across

professional disciplines. It has provided a periodic forum for member countries to share information on national, sub-national and regional priorities and needs with the intention of systematically encouraging and facilitating regional cooperation in DRR.

To date, 26 countries namely, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam have participated in the various RCC meetings.

The previous RCC meetings were held in Bangkok, Thailand (2000 and 2001); Delhi, India (2002); Dhaka, Bangladesh (2004), Hanoi, Vietnam (2005), Kunming, China (2006), Colombo, Sri Lanka (2007), Manila, Philippines (2010), Phnom Penh, Cambodia (2011), Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia (2013), Naypyidaw, Myanmar (2014) Thimphu, Bhutan (2015), and Islamabad, Pakistan (2016).

The RCC continues to expand its role to assist individual countries in developing more comprehensive program approaches for wider application. Each meeting adopts an action agenda and specifically requests ADPC, as the RCC's Secretariat, to develop national programs and to provide technical support to



countries in pursuing their national DRR strategies.

The 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the RCC will be an opportunity for the participants to share best practices and lessons learnt in vertical and horizontal policy and program coordination. Discussions at the 14<sup>th</sup> RCC meeting are expected to provide practical suggestions and recommendations to enhance coherence of global frameworks.

Target E of the SFDRR talks about increasing the number of countries with national and local DRR strategies by 2020 and the RCC will guide ADPC, as the RCC's secretariat, to further support RCC member countries in achieving this in the regional context. It will also serve as a follow-up to the commitments made at the 2018 Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR) held in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia.

This background note on "Policies and Practices for Coherence between Global Frameworks" is prepared for the participants of the meeting. It provides perspective on regional cooperation for DRR and introduces the role of the RCC mechanism and the concept of "Coherence" in relation to the post-2015 global frameworks. It also outlines the expected deliberations under various sessions of the RCC meeting.

## 2. Regional Cooperation on Disaster Management

Over the past three decades, there have been unprecedented international efforts to address disaster risk and improve disaster response in the region. However, the overall impact of disasters on economies and communities continues to grow. The lack of commitment to decreasing greenhouse gas emissions is allowing climate change to significantly drive up disaster losses for the foreseeable future.<sup>i</sup> Sea-level rise, and increases in the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events threaten to exacerbate potential human and economic losses.<sup>ii</sup> Furthermore, population growth, urban migration, alongside public and private investment in extreme-risk areas such as earthquake-prone cities, tsunami- and cyclone-prone coasts, and flood-exposed river basins have generated new risks with significant environmental, economic, social, cultural and health impact.<sup>iii</sup>

During the implementation of the Yokohama Strategy and Action Plan for a Safer World (1994), and the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015), countries in the region made extensive progress in DRR through targeted



legislations and policies; advanced early warning systems, information dissemination, and awareness-raising on DRR; strengthened regional cooperation mechanisms; and improved disaster risk governance, preparedness, and response capacity at all levels.<sup>iv</sup>

However, reducing the underlying risk factors such as rapid and poorly managed urbanization, natural resource exploitation, and growing social inequalities remained a significant challenge.<sup>v</sup> This was due to a disproportionate focus on disaster response and preparedness and limited attention to mainstreaming DRR into all areas of development. The long-term advantages related to the short-term costs of risk reduction were also not appreciated, resulting in inadequate public investment and the creation of new risks from unplanned development. The need for more comprehensive and holistic approaches to building disaster resilience became imperative.<sup>vi</sup>

In the post-2015 global frameworks under the United Nations system, the SFDRR, the SDGs, and the Paris Agreement represent a significant paradigm shift in addressing risks related to disasters, development, and climate change. Not only are risk reduction and resilience deeply embedded in each framework, but the linkages between resilience and global change are frequently articulated.<sup>vii</sup> Applied together, these frameworks promote a more comprehensive

resilience-building agenda as, together, they cover the full range of potential risks to sustainable development.<sup>viii</sup> However, a coherent application will require synergies between policies, programs and institutions; strengthened coordination mechanisms and partnerships; and a breakdown of traditional silos at the national and sub-national level.<sup>ix</sup> Done well, this approach will enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, achievability, and sustainability of the frameworks.<sup>x</sup>

One role that ADPC has played throughout its life is to serve as an active, well-informed voice at global and regional forums and mechanisms, representing regional perspectives and experiences, and contributing to and shaping discourse. It has also served as a disseminator of the outcomes of global forums, as well as an institution supporting the implementation of these commitments in Asia and the Pacific.

In 2000, ADPC established the RCC mechanism to identify the disaster-related needs and priorities of countries in Asia and the Pacific; develop action strategies and promote cooperative programs on a regional and sub-regional basis; and provide strategic guidance to ADPC in its future activities. This was possible due to ADPC's long-standing relationships with NDMOs in the region. The RCC is comprised of members working in key government positions in national disaster management systems across 26 countries in the region. Recognizing the value and



importance of such periodic meetings, the RCC established itself as a mechanism and mandated ADPC to serve as its Secretariat in the Bangkok RCC 2 Declaration adopted during the RCC's second meeting in 2001.

The role of the RCC as one of ADPC's governance mechanisms was formalized in the 2005 Intergovernmental Charter. A mechanism of Chair and Vice Chair was established in 2006, with the host country serving as Chair and the incoming host serving as Vice Chair.

## RCC MEMBER COUNTRIES

### Southeast Asia

Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam

### South Asia

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka

### East Asia

China, South Korea, Mongolia

### Central and West Asia

Georgia, Kazakhstan, Iran, Jordan

### Pacific

Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste

forum for knowledge exchange, peer learning and networking among DRM leaders from national governments. Over the years, the mechanism has been strengthened and owned by the member countries. This is reflected in the continued participation and presence of high-level representatives from national agencies of planning and sectoral ministries, the generous support of host countries in organizing the meetings, and the interest and willingness of countries to host the future meetings. The exchange of dialogues among RCC member countries has emphasized the importance of regional cooperation and enhanced synergies among partners at the regional level to improve support provided to countries.

Over the last 18 years, there have been thirteen RCC meetings held at different venues in partnership with host countries. UN Agencies and DRR development partners in the region are invited as observers. The RCC has served countries as a valued regional intergovernmental



## RCC MEETINGS AND THEMES

The RCC has played a pivotal role in supporting the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in Asia and will continue this role with the SFDRR. In addition, the RCC serves as an important forum for senior government officials to prepare for and follow up on

the outcomes of the Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR) and other significant regional events in the field.

#	Year	Country	Meeting Theme
1	2000	Thailand	DRR Agenda-Setting for RCC-Member Countries
2	2001	Thailand	Flood Preparedness and Mitigation
3	2002	India	Drought Risk Management
4	2004	Bangladesh	Urban Risk Management
5	2005	Viet Nam	Mainstreaming DRR into Development
6	2006	China	Mainstreaming DRR into Development/ HFA
7	2008	Sri Lanka	Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction
8	2010	Philippines	Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction
9	2011	Cambodia	Linking DRR and CCA
10	2013	Mongolia	Integrated Planning for DRR, CCA and Sustainability
11	2014	Myanmar	Reducing Disaster Risk and Transforming Development
12	2015	Bhutan	Risk-Sensitive Development in Asia
13	2016	Pakistan	Operationalizing Global Frameworks for Risk-Resilient Development in Asia
14	2018	Nepal	Policies and Practices for Coherence between Global Frameworks





---

### 3. Coherence

## Between Post-2015 Global Frameworks

Coherence is broadly defined as “the approach and deliberate processes/actions within a country to integrate, as appropriate, the planning, implementation, and reporting of the pursuit of Sustainable Development Agenda, SFDRR, and Paris Agreement; in order to increase efficiency, effectiveness, and the achievement of both common and respective goals<sup>xi</sup>.”

However, the definition and usage of the term vary greatly among stakeholders. The 14th RCC meeting will thus serve as an opportunity for RCC member countries to establish a shared definition of coherence to facilitate the achievement of common goals.

The three key global frameworks (SFDRR, SDGs, Paris Agreement on Climate Change) guide the international social, economic, and environmental progress towards a more resilient, sustainable, equitable, and prosperous future. Although not the only global agreements that support such an objective, there is a broad consensus that these three frameworks have key influences on international, national, and local policy-making and action. The table below provides a brief comparison of the frameworks, prepared from the perspective of disaster risk reduction.



	<b>Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015)</b>	<b>Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015)</b>	<b>Paris Agreement (2015)</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	<p>Prevent new and reduce existing disaster risk through the implementation of integrated and inclusive economic, structural, legal, social, health, cultural, educational, environmental, technological, political and institutional measures that prevent and reduce hazard exposure and vulnerability to disaster, increase preparedness for response and recovery, and thus strengthen resilience.</p> <p>Para 17.</p>	<p>The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. end poverty and hunger</li> <li>b. protect the planet from degradation</li> <li>c. ensure that all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives</li> <li>d. foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies</li> <li>e. mobilize a global partnership for sustainable development.</li> </ul> <p>Pages 1, 2.</p>	<p>Strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. holding the increase in the global average temperature ...</li> <li>b. increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change ...</li> <li>c. making finance flows consistent ... towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development.</li> </ul> <p>Article 2, Para 1.</p>
<b>Areas of Implementation (directly related to Disaster Risk Reduction)</b>	<p>Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk.</p> <p>Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk.</p> <p>Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience.</p> <p>Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.</p> <p>Para 20.</p>	<p>Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation.</p> <p>Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable</p> <p>Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts</p> <p>Page 14.</p>	<p>Parties hereby establish the global goal on adaptation of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change ...</p> <p>Article 7, Para 1.</p> <p>Parties recognize the importance of averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change ... and the role of sustainable development in reducing the risk of loss and damage.</p> <p>Article 8, Para 1.</p>
<b>References</b>	UNISDR (2015a), summarized.	UNGA (2015), summarized.	UNFCCC (2015), summarized.



While the three global frameworks refer to their respective objectives and mandates for DRR, sustainable development, and climate change issues, the different themes which the frameworks address are inextricably linked with one another. These linkages have gained prominence over the last decade and more. Therefore, before, during, and after the adoption of the frameworks, emphasis has been placed on why, how, and to what extent the frameworks (and themes) can be pursued with an integrated, or coherent, approach. Various integrated efforts have already been planned and implemented at the local, national, and regional levels particularly in Asia and the Pacific. One example among many is the RCC's program of "Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Development (MDRD)," which started in 2004.

In October 2016, the 13th RCC meeting, took place in Islamabad, Pakistan, which was the first meeting after the adoption of the three global frameworks. The timely theme of the meeting was therefore "Operationalizing Global Frameworks for Risk-Resilient Development in Asia," and as expressed in the Islamabad Statement<sup>xii</sup>, participants clearly desired greater coherence in national-level planning, implementation, and monitoring of the three global frameworks in support of resilient development.

Within the meeting, the discussions on the sub-theme "Integrating Global Frameworks for Strengthened Risk

Governance" included issues of: multi-sector coordination platforms, communication structures, information exchanges and comprehensive risk assessments, capacity development for coordination, thematic institutional mandates, and linkages with humanitarian systems. Discussions on potential entry points for further coherence included: building on existing policies in support of global frameworks; greater engagement of civil society and non-governmental organizations and clarity of roles/responsibilities; monitoring and reporting processes; and creating awareness among stakeholders for more ownership and linkages to existing national policies<sup>xiii</sup>.



## 3.1 Coherence between the global frameworks

The benefits of coherent planning, implementation and reporting of the global resilience frameworks are evident. Progress made on individual agendas can contribute to the success, while lack of progress can hinder or even impede, achievement of other frameworks. This holds particularly true for the SFDRR and SDGs that share common disaster-related indicators. Coherent implementation not only promotes success of all frameworks but also limits duplication of efforts and inefficient use of human, technical, and financial resources.

Discussions on ways to translate coherence into policy and practice are still ongoing but some key considerations have already been identified:

- Resilience should be placed at the core of coherent planning as this will allow actors to pursue solutions that contribute to all post-2015 frameworks;
- Stronger awareness and clarity on coherence at the country-level is critical for further integration;

- Coherence in practice requires strong leadership, governance arrangements, and defined roles and responsibilities for implementation (within and outside government structures);
- People-centered and locally-oriented actions support practical coherence as people and communities- as beneficiaries, innovators and leaders- plays a central role in the resilience frameworks;
- Gender equality, rights-based and pro-poor approaches to coherence must be considered at all levels of planning and implementation;
- SFDRR's Target E (i.e. Development of national and local DRR strategies by 2020) is an ideal entry point to integrate sustainable development and climate change adaptation issues into DRR strategies;<sup>xiv</sup>
- Governments should explicitly reference the resilience frameworks and the need for coherence in national policies and implementation to enhance political commitments to coherence. They should also foster risk-informed decision-making and vertical and horizontal coordination within and across all sectors;
- Monitoring and reporting: targets and indicators should be aligned across the frameworks. Monitoring systems can also be improved through harmonized national reporting systems and synchronized review processes;



- Cooperation in implementation: Partnerships between government agencies, international organizations, NGOs, the private sector, and scientific and technical institutions should be strengthened through enhanced risk information-sharing mechanisms and clearly delineated roles for stakeholders in coherent planning and implementation.<sup>xv</sup>

During the 2018 AMCDRR, countries adopted the Ulaanbaatar Declaration which called on all governments and stakeholders to commit to translating coherence of global frameworks into policy and practice.<sup>xvi</sup> However, despite recent progress on these discussions, the practical approaches and entry points to coherent planning, implementation and reporting of frameworks require greater attention moving forward.

To date, the main challenges to coherence are:

- Cross-sectoral coordination: there is still a lack of clarity regarding how different ministries interrelate and how changes across different institutional frameworks can be implemented;
- Too little use of synergies by national policy processes, causing duplication and overlapping;
- Capacity gaps: the institutional capacity and technical/managerial expertise of countries need to be strengthened in order to implement the transformative frameworks;
- Lack of quality data and information across a wide range of indicators: there is a need for higher-resolution and local-scale data, as resilience-building planning processes and activities are usually implemented at a local level. With the global frameworks' strong emphasis on the need for disaggregated data, including sex, age, and disability, countries require capacity development related to its collection, analysis and application.



## 3.2 Key Messages on Coherence

In October 2017, UNESCAP held a regional event on “Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience-building: Ensuring Coherence across the Global Development Agendas,” where countries recognized the importance of coherence in implementing the global frameworks. They further acknowledged the need for better access to global best practices, tools and approaches to adopt coherence in the implementation of the frameworks, as well as for more widely available data for monitoring progress and reporting results of development programs. The need for enhanced synergy between the Asia Regional Plan for Implementation of the SFDRR and the Regional Road Map for Implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Asia and the Pacific was also articulated.<sup>xvii</sup>

During the AMCDRR in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, the Global Initiative on Disaster Risk Management (GIDRM) by GIZ launched the ‘Coherence Practice Group’ aimed towards enhancing regional exchange of policies and practices. The Group’s contribution is in line with the Ulaanbaatar Declaration, which calls for more coherence for the implementation of the Asia Regional Plan of the Sendai Framework 2018-2020. The Coherence Practice Group will support the integration of the global agendas into

planning, implementation and reporting processes at the national and local level.

In October 2018, GIZ developed the following key messages for further emphasize on Coherence;

- 1. Resilience as a guiding principle<sup>xviii</sup>**  
:All post-2015 agendas (in particular the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement, the New Urban Agenda and the Sendai Framework) share the common goal of reducing harmful effects of natural hazards and climate change on society and the environment. The achievement of sustainable outcomes by individual agendas will, however, depend on successful implementation of all agendas, as it is only in combination that they cover the range of potential risks to sustainable development.
- 2. All major international post-2015 agendas recognize the importance of disaster risk management (DRM) and that its implementation is a globally accepted requirement for all countries.** DRM is at the core of the Sendai Framework and is a cross-cutting issue in the Paris Agreement (article 8), the New Urban Agenda (chapter on ‘Environmentally sustainable and resilient urban development’) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Goals 1 /no poverty, 11 /sustainable cities, and 13 /climate action).
- 3. However, the euphoria that surrounded the development of the global agendas in 2015 resulted**



**in agreements that are only partially aligned.** The agendas are the outcome of negotiations conducted by different expert communities based on their select areas of specialization, priorities and terminology of global challenges with respect to sustainability, climate change and urbanization. Thus, the four agendas result in different commitments at national and local level concerning the development of countries policies, development and planning strategies, priority-setting in public investment, capacity-building, information and data management systems, and state regulation. This necessitates cooperation not only between ministries but also between local government units and between national and local levels. At the same time, countries must report on their progress at international level in compliance with the respective international agreement.

When it comes to the implementation of these global agendas, national and international policy processes are often earmarked with overlaps and duplication of efforts. The agendas' different funding and support mechanisms might reinforce inefficiencies. In the ongoing debate, there are frequent calls for a more systemic approach, but this appears to be undermined by departmental boundaries and is not cultivated in practice. The lack of alignment of the global agendas can be observed on multiple levels: international, national and local.

- 4. This situation has the potential to create substantial additional burden.** For example, overlapping responsibilities and replication in data collection and reporting can result in increased transaction costs. Even more significantly, opportunity costs can arise if countries do not consider DRM in their national policies on climate, urban planning and sustainable development. It is also possible that competing interests will be traded off against one another, for instance employment and investment versus climate change or DRM.
- 5. Greater coherence is clearly beneficial.** Synergies identified from an improved knowledge base can generate better policies and practices. For example, if climate data is taken into account in DRM, risk analyses become more reliable. Greater coherence allows resources to be used more efficiently.
- 6. Agenda coherence from a DRM perspective can therefore be described as jointly strengthening resilience through implementing the post-2015 agendas.** Processes such as mainstreaming, localization, harmonization, integration and alignment can all play a role in this.
- 7. However, due to the different priorities and the autonomous nature of the individual agendas, integration will always be partial.** At present, the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement carry the greatest political weight; the latter is equipped with significantly larger financial



resources for implementation. The Sendai Framework and the New Urban Agenda have considerably less political significance. Each agenda sets its own political and financial priorities geared to the visibility of specific issues and the interests of UN organizations.

**8. Greater agenda coherence will not happen automatically; it needs to be consciously promoted.**

To this end, the UN has set itself an action plan at an international level for greater coherence in the interplay between its sub-organizations. The interface between DRM and climate change adaptation is also attracting great interest at regional and national level. The adoption of the Sendai Indicators in the framework for monitoring progress on SDGs 1, 11 and 13 is an example of successful international efforts to achieve greater coherence.

**9. Suitable entry points for greater coherence at the national and local level can be found in the planning, implementation and reporting phases.**

- The 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework each have their own planning regimes, such as development plans, National Adaptation Plans (NAP) and DRM strategies. Integrating the different plans and strategies could play an important role in

fostering coherence.

- Implementing the different plans offers leverage for greater coherence, specifically in:
  - I. institutional arrangements that promote horizontal and/or vertical cooperation in the public sector and participation mechanisms that promote cooperation between all sectors of society;
  - II. financing arrangements (including innovative ways of mobilizing private resources) that facilitate expenditure independently of the agendas and public-sector investment policies that take sustainable development criteria, DRM and climate change requirements into account;
  - III. state regulation in the form of norms or standards.
- Reporting depends on a common database that can be accessed easily by all stakeholders and uses mutually defined parameters.

All processes can promote networking and interface management skills by disseminating knowledge and methodologies on, for example, system analysis, impact assessment and forms of cooperation.

**10. Silos can provide support.** Sectoral silos have existed for a long time, as administrative structures are often based on specialization of tasks. Numerous attempts to break down these silos are in progress, including for example inter-ministerial working groups, central government offices





and joint procedural rules. **Sectoral silos can nevertheless provide an effective basis** for performing tasks in hierarchies where work is divided up by specialization, for allocating responsibilities clearly and for focusing on goals. Arrangements intended to improve coherence run the risk of causing even greater complexity, thereby triggering resistance and reducing efficiency.

**11. Against the background of the global agendas and global challenges, the inability to overcome sectoral boundaries in the interests of promoting resilience is a fundamental threat.**

Ensuring that political and societal negotiation processes take this threat into account and include all members of society in the relevant processes are pre-requisites for finding sustainable solutions. Institutional boundaries will nevertheless continue to exist in the future, and with them the cost of institutional cooperation. This raises the question of how much coherence among the agendas can realistically be achieved.

**12. “Good enough coherence” could be our guiding principle:**

- There are no blueprints; instead, the aim is to get closer to ‘ideal’ coherence in specific contexts.
- Two factors are crucial: the institutional and structural framework and the ability of the state to act effectively.
- Coherence arrangements are the result of negotiation

processes that ensure the gap between winners and losers does not become too wide.

- Coherence arrangements are never permanent. They must remain adaptable and flexible.

In preparation of the 14th RCC meeting, ADPC conducted a desk review on “Coherence among major Global Frameworks: Implementation of SDGs and SFDRR at the National Level. GIZ also supported the meeting by developing a **Guidance Note: Coherence Concepts and Practices.**



---

## 4. Key sessions of the 14th RCC meeting

### Session 1: Regional Cooperation for Enhancing Disaster Resilience

The SFDRR pursues coherence across the international agendas and identifies measures for integration at all levels. In support of the SFDRR, the 13th RCC meeting reaffirmed the value of regional cooperation among member countries in the implementation of their national, regional and global commitments on gender-sensitive DRR and climate change adaptation in the broader context of sustainable development with focus on vulnerable groups.

This session will showcase and explore opportunities for regional cooperation in the pursuit of coherent implementation of the global frameworks.

**Expected outcome:** Summary of recommendations on improving regional cooperation for DRR among RCC member countries; and integration of regional and transboundary cooperation in ADPC programs/projects where relevant and practicable.

### Session 2: Addressing Coherence in SFDRR, SDGs and Paris Agreement

Representatives from UN agencies and international organizations will present their approaches to achieving coherent implementation. This session will also engage in cross-cutting issues of gender equality, diversity and rights-based approaches to disaster risk reduction and climate resilience, with focus on national strategies to ensuring women's leadership in risk resilience, mainstreaming rights-based approaches to DRR, and exploring opportunities to collect, use, and report sex-age-disability disaggregated data (SADD).

**Expected outcome:** Summary of key entry points for coherent implementation of the key global frameworks.

### Session 3: Towards 2030: Nepal's Progress and Lessons Learnt in DRM

In this session, The Government of Nepal will showcase its recent progress and lessons learnt in DRM, including their vision for 2030. This will serve as an opportunity for other RCC countries to gather information and expertise to improve DRR and climate resilience in their respective countries.



---

**Expected outcome:** Summary of key lessons learnt and best practices for uptake by other RCC countries.

#### **Session 4: Update on the implementation of SFDRR & SDGs**

In this session, the 14th RCC meeting will hear from member countries on the various challenges and priorities on the implementation of the SFDRR and SDGs. Consolidation of experiences and shared challenges will allow member countries to identify action points for enhanced coherence in policy and planning, financing and implementation, cross-sectoral collaboration, and monitoring and reporting at the national and regional level. Member countries will also generate practical recommendations to empower local authorities and communities and engage local actors.

**Expected outcome:** Summary of best practices and lessons learnt in implementing the SFDRR and SDGs.

#### **Session 5: Building a Framework for Coherence in Asia and the Pacific**

Plenary session and working group discussions.

In this session, RCC member countries will seek to establish a common understanding of coherence in Asia and the Pacific and identify key elements for building a strategic framework for coherence in the region.

**Expected outcome:** A common understanding of coherence between RCC countries and a summary of key elements for a strategic framework for coherence in Asia and the Pacific.

#### **Session 6: Building Synergy with Development Partners in Nurturing Coherent Implementation of SFDRR and SDGs**

The 14th RCC will be an opportunity to hear from development partners on their approaches to align programmatic objectives to support coherent implementation of frameworks in member countries. This will include discussions on improving data and information sharing, establishing coordination mechanisms and partnerships, and joint planning and implementation to avoid duplication of efforts and enable efficient use of resources.



---

**Expected outcome:** Summary of recommendations for improving cooperation and coordination for better synergy between development partners and government agencies.

### **Session 7: Operationalizing Global Frameworks for Risk-Resilient Development in Asia**

In this session, representatives of the RCC Secretariat will report their progress on operationalizing the global frameworks since the 13th RCC meeting in 2016. The main themes addressed in this session are risk governance, health risk management, preparedness for response, capacity-building, climate resilience and urban resilience.

**Expected outcome:** Summary of best practices and lessons learnt in operationalizing the global frameworks since RCC13.

### **Session 8: Regional Consultative Committee (RCC) and its Future**

This session will include a summary of discussions held during the first two days of the meeting and explore the future role of the RCC in supporting coherent implementation in the region.

---

**Expected outcome:** RCC Roadmap: the roadmap will outline key priorities, goals, objectives, and activities for coherent implementation of the SFDRR and SDGs in RCC member countries. It will include recommendations to support member countries in implementing the Asia Regional Action Plan from the 2018 AMCDRR for enhanced coherence in policy and planning, financing and implementation, cross-sectoral collaboration, and monitoring and reporting at the local, national, and regional level.

### **Session 9: Statements by the 14th RCC Observers**

Observers from UN agencies and development partners are invited to make a statement at the 14th RCC meeting.

**Expected outcome:** Summary of statements by the 14th RCC observers.

### **Session 10: Presentation of the Kathmandu Statement**

MoHA will present the Kathmandu Statement based on observations and key discussion points on coherence of global resilience frameworks.

**Expected outcome:** Kathmandu Statement

---

## 5. References

<sup>i</sup> CRED, *Economic Losses, Poverty & Disasters 1998-2017* (Brussels, CRED, 2018)

<sup>ii</sup> Virginia Murray et al, *Coherence between the Sendai Framework, the SDGs, the Climate Agreement, New Urban Agenda and World Humanitarian Summit, and the role of science in their implementation* (International Council for Science, 2017)

<sup>iii</sup> 2015 Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, *Asia Regional Plan for Implementation of the SFDRR 2015-2030* (2016)

<sup>iv</sup> Ibid.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid.

<sup>vi</sup> United Nations Asia-Pacific Regional Coordination Mechanism, *Building Resilience to Disasters in Asia and the Pacific through Coherent Responses to the Global Development Frameworks* (UNESCAP, 2017)

<sup>vii</sup> ODI, *'Resilience' across the Post-2015 Frameworks: Towards Coherence?* (London, ODI, 2016)

<sup>viii</sup> GIZ, *Coherence Note: Coherence Concepts and Practices* (2018)

<sup>ix</sup> Virginia Murray et al (2017)

<sup>x</sup> ODI (2016)

<sup>xi</sup> GIZ. (2018). *Coherence Note: Coherence Concepts and Practices*.

<sup>xii</sup> 13th RCC meeting, *Islamabad Statement* (ADPC, 2016)

<sup>xiii</sup> 13<sup>th</sup> RCC Meeting, *Meeting Report* (ADPC, 2017)

<sup>xiv</sup> ADPC, *Coherence among Major Global Frameworks: Implementation of SDGs and SFDRR at the National Level* (2018)

<sup>xv</sup> UNISDR, *Coherence and mutual reinforcement between the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and international agreements for development and climate action* (2015)

<sup>xvi</sup> 2018 Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, *Ulaanbaatar Declaration* (2018)

<sup>xvii</sup> UNESCAP, *Summary Report: Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience-building: Ensuring Coherence across the Global Development Agendas* (2017)

<sup>xviii</sup> *'Resilience is the ability of people and institutions – be they individuals, households, communities or nations – to deal with acute shocks or chronic burdens (stress) caused by fragility, crises, violent conflicts and extreme natural events, adapting and recovering quickly without jeopardizing their medium- and long-term future.'*



RCC Secretariat



**Asian Disaster Preparedness Center**

SM Tower, 24th Floor 979/69 Paholyothin Road  
Samsen Nai, Phayathai, Bangkok 10400 Thailand

Tel: +66 2 298 0682 to 92

Fax: +66 2 298 0012

Email: [rccsecretariat@rccdm.net](mailto:rccsecretariat@rccdm.net)  
[adpc@adpc.net](mailto:adpc@adpc.net)

URL: [www.rccdm.net](http://www.rccdm.net)  
[www.adpc.net](http://www.adpc.net)

