

## Summary Report

# Regional Learning Platform on Policy Coherence for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience

*Ensuring Policy Coherence for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience: Innovations and Evidence-Based Approaches*

August 2018

United Nations Conference Centre (UNCC) – Bangkok, Thailand

Website: <https://www.unescap.org/events/regional-learning-platform-policy-coherence-disaster-risk-reduction-and-resilience-27-31>

A follow-up to the Regional Learning Platform on disaster risk reduction and resilience-building: Ensuring coherence across the global development agendas, October 2017, Bangkok

---

## Background

The Asia-Pacific region is the most impacted region in the world from disasters and disaster trends in the region show that risk continue to outpace resilience. Disaster risk reduction and resilience, therefore, is crucial to achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Embedded across the SDGs, disaster risk reduction is an enabler of more than a dozen goals spanning food security, human health, infrastructure, and ecosystem-related targets.

The criticality of coherence to harness the combined strengths of these frameworks is noted in Goal 17. In this context, ESCAP has been convening a Regional Learning Platform series on understanding the mechanisms to operationalize policy coherence annually since 2016.

### **About the theme of the 2018 regional platform:**

This report summarizes discussions and outcomes from the third Regional Learning Platform on ensuring policy coherence for disaster risk reduction and resilience – innovations and evidence-based approaches. Organized in collaboration with UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, this third Regional Learning Platform extended the discussions by focusing on quantitative approaches to policy coherence based on systems thinking.

Enhancing policy coherence requires an approach that can be adapted to the specific circumstances, context and needs of countries. The Sustainable Development Goals do not work in isolation- these goals are inherently linked to each other and can be mutually reinforcing or conflicting. Assessing how these goals interact, especially in each individual country context is crucial to building the institutional capacity to operationalize the policy coherence.

A systems approach to understand the integrated nature of Sustainable Development Goals can generate high value addition for policy coherence and can help us look across the goals at the possible synergies and trade-offs to prioritize policies and investments that are mutually beneficial to build

disaster resilience. It can help us to see how to change systems more effectively to further sustainable development.

To implement systems thinking at the country level, ESCAP has prepared a toolkit that presents a methodology to quantify how disaster-related Sustainable Development Goals interact as a system in five pilot countries- Bangladesh, Cambodia, Maldives, Myanmar and Nepal. Using a methodology built on the systems approach, the toolkit has mapped out country-specific and quantified synergies and trade-offs, including the key entry points for disaster resilience which can be a starting point to discuss operationalization of policy coherence. This document will be finalized to incorporate the insights and inputs that you will share with us at this Regional Learning Platform.

### **Outcome:**

Participants shared their perspectives on policy coherence and the systems analysis toolkit. The meeting addressed five domains needed for operationalizing policy coherence, namely, planning, financing and budget, data and monitoring, innovations and frontier technologies. It focused on addressing the building blocks of policy coherence and ways to use systems analysis to prioritize investments and maximize co-benefits. It demonstrated the tools in risk-sensitive sectors that can be used to assess the complexities of risk and monitor the progress at the country level. Finally, the learning platform extended the conversation on institutions and how to scale up policy coherence through institutional coordination. The feedback from the participants will further help us to support the member countries ongoing work for Voluntary National Review reporting to upcoming High-Level Political Forum.

## Understanding the building blocks of policy coherence for disaster risk reduction and resilience

**Policy coherence** is the maximization of synergies and minimization of trade-offs between different interventions for development, Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Action. It has five dimensions: temporal, horizontal, vertical, spatial, and equity:

- **Horizontal:** Various policy areas are closely coordinated. To capitalize on synergies, the three policy areas that need to be aligned - at the minimum - are disaster risk reduction, climate, and sustainable development policy areas. Solutions that deliver the desired outcomes across these three policy areas are desirable.
- **Vertical:** National policies and local government actions are consistent and mutually supportive. Domestic policies and plans are also aligned with international commitments, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, Paris Agreement and other related global frameworks and their regional implementation plans.
- **Spatial:** Policies that reduce disasters in one place do not shift risks elsewhere. In addition, the transboundary aspects of risks (e.g. flood risk within the same river basin that spans across several political boundaries) are addressed in designing policies and interventions.
- **Temporal:** The elements that determine the disaster risks in a society (hazards, vulnerabilities, capacity to manage) are dynamic, not static. Hence, policy decisions taken today accounts for future risks and vulnerabilities especially in the context of climate change.

- **Equality:** Policies and interventions should advance equality and do not negatively affect poor and marginalized people. Mechanisms and strong policy co-ordination across governments are needed to screen policies and decisions against potential impacts to poor populations.

**Translating policy coherence** from a guiding principle into practice can happen through a top down (by starting with a global frameworks) or a bottom up approach (starting with national demand), while the prioritization of the dimensions depends on the country's respective context and the problems targeted by its policy.

While examples highlight how on-the-ground national frameworks respond to global disaster risk reduction frameworks, countries brought up remaining challenges when evaluating the socio-economic impacts of multiple hazards.

Countries need to put in place the following **building blocks** to enhance coherence:

- **Coherent strategies and plans:** Coherence requires strategic frameworks and plans to ensure that policies and institutions work under a different organizing principle, that is, cross-sectoral collaboration, based on shared priorities and aligned to overarching goals, such as the Sustainable Development Goals.
- **Mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into sectors:** Many governments and other stakeholders are familiar with the concept of mainstreaming which has been around for more than two decades now. Mainstreaming is a sub-set of policy coherence. It means that through the use of risk information and other tools, disaster risk reduction is addressed by sectoral policies, strategies, plans (PPPs), geographical planning, and project cycle management.
- **Budget and financing:** A public budget document is a translation of the national and local policy priorities, which may or may not be matched by the level of financing. Current models of disaster risk reduction public financing include stand-alone and sector-integrated funding. Coherent budgeting means that specific budgetary and finance measures are not only incorporated into the mandate of institutions beyond the national disaster management agency, but that these measures should not work at cross-purposes. It also means that financing from different sources beyond the government (e.g. private, international sources) are leveraged to achieve declared public priorities.
- **Coordinated monitoring and reporting systems:** More than just tracking progress and off-track indicators, monitoring and reporting systems can be also used to provide feedback to decision makers and to the public on policy synergies and contradictions. These are useful inputs so that policies can be adjusted should there be negative or unintended effects.
- **Coherent institutions:** Seeing and considering the "big picture" in policymaking requires that governments strengthen existing mechanisms for horizontal (across sectors) and vertical (national and local levels). Government actions in the past include creating inter-agency task forces/working groups, inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms, and the like. Fostering coherent institutions require strengthening these approaches where they work or revisiting them to ensure that they are still fit-for-purpose in delivering on cross-cutting issues, such as Disaster Risk Reduction.

The agenda of the Regional Learning Platform follows these blocks.

Regarding the implementation of policy coherence, participants mentioned some **constraints to overcome** such as insufficient technical capacity and/or limits in budgets for implementation of disaster risk reduction development. Data collection and time constraints were revealed to be further hurdles. There is room for further improvement in coherence implementation, while many efforts are already ongoing.

Some **examples for countries' ongoing efforts** towards policy coherence for disaster risk reduction and resilience:

- Myanmar has established an agency implementing Sendai Framework. The country has ongoing monitoring of its implementation. Education and agricultural sector support started to include disaster risk reduction measures.
- Cambodia piloted a national action plan for the implementation of the Sendai Framework. There are monitoring efforts ongoing for disaster risk reduction indicators. The Frameworks have been translated into the national language to ensure better access by all stakeholders. The country accelerated the legal framework for disaster management and introduced mandatory risk assessments. A roadmap for disaster management implementation has been also developed based on the new legal framework. Cambodia aims to improve the early warning system.
- Nepal suggested a shift from a reactive to a proactive approach of local and national governments under institutional capacity and partnership building. Nepal puts efforts into disaster risk assessments. According to the national strategic plan, the major priority is to improve disaster research for inter- and intragovernmental capacity strengthening and the development of public-private partnerships.
- Maldives highlighted the localization based on sectors in disaster risk management implementation. The country is currently localizing indicators to avoid double reporting. Local development plans for more than 64 islands are ongoing. The country has a Sendai Framework Disaster Reduction strategy. Maldives is planning to have a more comprehensive report on Sustainable Development Goals in 2019 to better capture the economic and financial sector in disaster risk reduction.
- Bangladesh monitors Sustainable Development Goals implementation through the line ministries. The country has identified the main ministry, which is in charge of the monitoring of each targeted measure in the Sustainable Development Goals and Sendai Framework implementation. A national strategic management plan has been created with the focus of spatial land use and planning frameworks.

The session concluded the need for stronger legislation and policy alignments of regional and global policies. There is demand for trainings in implementing tools and using available data to close knowledge gaps and to overcome constraints for disaster risk reduction.

## Coherent strategic frameworks and plans

**Systems thinking** is an innovative and evidence-based tool to tackle the inter-connectedness of many policy domains. The modern complexity of issues as well as the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals require responses that go beyond the linear and static end-product. By showing the trade-offs and synergies of Sustainable Development Goals, systems thinking promotes policy coherence and helps to identify leverage points. Systems thinking was presented by only comparing specific pairs of

indicators, while interrelations between Sustainable Development Goals do not purely occur between specific pairs but between various combinations of different indicators.

All in all, participating countries welcomed the approach, which demonstrates tangible linkages and guides policies at the operational level. Participants shared their experiences on how different Sustainable Development Goals interact, and gave feedback on the usability of the systems thinking approach in their respective countries:

- Cambodia discussed the importance of the temporal dimension, when looking at linkages of different sectors. Thus, Cambodia suggested updating the tool to consider varying timescales in its analysis.
- Bangladesh found the tool practical to understand interlinkages and to identify leverage points. Bangladesh assumed that data is incomplete. The country requested trainings in data collection to achieve coherence between data collection systems.
- Myanmar appreciated the practical approach and suggested to access the datasets from its Central Statistics Organization to incorporate data from other ministries. Myanmar requested technical needs assessments to properly use the tool and to understand its concepts.
- The Maldives, where the analysis based on systems thinking was limited due to data constraints, highlighted that the cost to fill data gaps will be very high, while the available data is not available in real-time. Considering its smaller population compared to other countries, Sustainable Development Goals indicators are also too general for many applications in the Maldives. Thus, the country suggested adjustment of measures to respond to each country's individual needs. Technology and innovation could save time and money when improving the tool's applicability. The Maldives suggested knowledge sharing to strengthen Maldives' legislative frameworks by learning about operational mechanisms from other countries.
- Nepal acknowledged that data gaps exist in the tool but agreed that the approach provides practical guidance – especially for sectoral ministries when monitoring and evaluating their achievements. Nepal suggested to also make use of Nepal's data from Sustainable Development Goals status reports, localized information of indicators, and further data from administrative registers.

The development of coherent strategy frameworks and plans requires a solid disaster database. Setting up of a database demands streamlining of the database's purpose, review of country specific Sustainable Development Goals targets, country specific data collection of Sustainable Development Goals indicators, and data analysis / design thinking / visualization amongst other things. Limited availability of local and district data, existence of data gaps, lacking disaggregation of data, and time constraints in data collection are some challenges to the tool's application.

## Achieving coherence through mainstreaming disaster risk reduction

The **infrastructure and agriculture sector** have a high exposure on disasters. There is a whole range of approaches and tools to address the exposure reflected in the experience from the region such as India or Latin America namely in Nicaragua and Mexico. Improved data availability and greater applicability of relevant information feeds into Disaster Risk Management-backed policy interventions.

Countries discussed **enabling conditions** for the achievement of coherence through mainstreaming disaster risk reduction:

- Cambodia suggested an agricultural extension service for farmers' education to increase the resilience of agriculture systems. The country encourages farmers to grow specific types of crops, while ensuring that these crops have demand on the market. Such market-oriented considerations in cropping decisions help farmers to stay profitable despite changes in cropping methods.
- The Maldives encourages enhancements in technology intervention especially in water management to cope with floods and heavy rainfalls caused by climate changes. The country is planning to introduce a parametric insurance. There is need for technical assistance on how to include risk information for public investments.
- Bangladesh wishes to access detailed information on areas affected by climate change to adequately respond with respective actions and policies. The country is implementing a crop insurance program and encourages greater crop diversity. Adaptive measures, including subsidies and soft loans, have already been introduced. There is need for technical training of stakeholders responsible for the data to support risk assessment and decision-making.
- Myanmar seeks for region specific research and development, which would support cropping adaptations according to environmental changes. Seed banks, technological enhancement, and capacity building for data sharing with other departments were mentioned as further enabling conditions for implementation in the country.
- Nepal is preparing a zoning system for landslide prone areas to develop an emergency action plan. This requires a mapping tool allowing zoning. Nepal faces hurdles in the implementation of risk-informed infrastructure due to scattered information in different ministries. The country works towards an improved agricultural early warning system. An early warning system for flood hazard, vulnerability map and risk assessment data from the hydrological and metrological department including damage and loss data already exists. Nepal aims to practice financial risk assessment and better integration of disaster risk reduction in policy development.

Coherent monitoring and reporting systems at the country level:

### Emerging approaches and outlook

To **monitor** the progress of Sustainable Development Goals and the Sendai Agreements, many countries require enhanced internal government mechanisms to better coordinate data collection, data sharing and data reporting. Monitoring and reporting the goals becomes more difficult when different committees report on Sustainable Development Goals, Sendai and Climate Change.

The following **suggestions** have been discussed to enhance coherent monitoring and reporting systems:

- There is a need to harmonize Sustainable Development Goals and Sendai reporting efforts, as national Sustainable Development Goals committees may not be linked with national Sendai reporting through the National Disaster Management Agencies (NDMAs). Instead of creating a new committee, Sustainable Development Goals or National Committees may be utilized to assist Sendai reporting.

- Harmonization and improvements should be accompanied by trainings and technical support. Workshops bring all relevant government partners together and allow to identify who has what kind of data and when the data will be provided for reporting purposes.
- Online monitoring of indicators should be introduced to openly access relevant data, as existing data can feed into the measurement of several indicators.
- A shared damage and loss database for Sustainable Development Goals, Sendai and Paris Agreements would make it easier to track achievements.

**Innovative technology** can address challenges in coherent monitoring and reporting:

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research introduced **geospatial data** applications for assessing disaster risks. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research is a technology-intensive program delivering imagery analysis and satellite solutions to relief and development organizations within and outside the United Nations' system. Geospatial data can contribute in delivering deeper insights in critical areas such as humanitarian relief, human security, strategic territorial and development planning. A current challenge in data processing is that data sources are scattered, incomplete, irrelevant or outdated. Using a centralized source of geospatial data could overcome this hurdle and provide new insights into hazard data. Geospatial analysis requires proper training and manuals. The method requires inter-agency cooperation and quality management. Thus, application of geospatial data would start with recruitment of staff with adequate technical skills, acquisition of equipment, introduction of supporting policies and laws beside securing of budgets.

**Knowledge-based artificial intelligence and semantic computing** developed by the Keio University allows sensing, processing and analyzing environmental data. Application examples are the analysis of coral reef degradation, plastic pollution's effects on oceans, or mapping of forest fires. Possible outputs can feed into deeper understanding of multi-dimensional disasters and into policymaking, development of risk maps and visualization tools.

To enhance coherent monitoring and reporting systems at the country level, the session concluded three **directions** countries should be taking:

- Use resources wisely: Available data should be cross-shared among different government departments.
- Collaborate and cooperate in integrating disaster risk management mindset into an institutionalized process: Institutionalize data assessment process to ensure preparedness based on innovative technologies. Quick access to assessment maps is crucial in case of disasters.
- Utilize and enhance global knowledge sharing: While there is yet no good knowledge sharing environment set up globally, countries should make an evolutionary process in technology and data sharing. Collaboration through data sharing on regional country level might be a good first step.

What does coherent disaster risk reduction budgeting and finance look like?

As countries mobilize funds to build infrastructure, it is equally important to ensure the quality of the infrastructure. While part of infrastructure financing is supported by overseas development assistance,

the major source of funds is the **domestic public sector** in most countries in Asia. With the expected increase in infrastructure investment, there are ongoing efforts to involve private sector participants in infrastructure funding. Alternative sources are government provisions sourced from tax income, capital recycling, public borrowing, budget deficits, or government business enterprises generating revenues. These alternatives become more important when countries graduate from LDC status, as usually donor funding declines thereafter. Possible solutions are inclusion of public private partnerships (PPP) beside public budget and risk-informed public investment. However, involving different donors with different agendas makes the organization and coordination of investments at local and national levels more complicated.

With the domestic public sector as the major source for infrastructure financing, climate and disaster **risk-informed Public Investment Planning (PIP)** should be integrated into public budgeting and financing. A study by UNDP in Lao PDR, Cambodia, and Myanmar noted that the public investment planning processes usually do not require considerations for disaster and climate risk information. To build resilient infrastructure, it is important that the PIP processes in the countries seek information about disaster and climate risks to understand the risks to public investments as well as to build resilience in the event of a disaster.

The session presented some **key recommendation** for improvements in investment practices:

- Raise the awareness about making PIP risk-informed
- Introduction of coherent funding mechanisms
- Address effective coordination of Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) led by the UNDP Geneva Office
- Identify risk hotspots of country overlaid with infrastructure plans
- Develop procedures and tools to access simplified risk-information
- Provide concrete findings and recommendations to be implemented as currently there is more focus on government processes than identification of necessary action

Central banks have scope to drive **financing for** resilient infrastructure. Tax incentives, extensions for companies to invest in green projects or the issuance of green bonds are among the practical examples that are being used to incentivize climate financing.

Countries shared some of their **approaches** towards disaster risk financing:

- Nepal's Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Finance work together during annual budget planning to talk with all ministries when agreeing on government policies and programs, which should be in line with Sustainable Development Goals, disaster risk reduction and CCA. Financing for Sustainable Development Goals implementation is coming from diverse sources, including development partners.
- Myanmar published an action plan linked to Sustainable Development Goals and including considerations how to cope with natural and man-made hazards. The budget is already allocated for all priorities. Myanmar receives financial support from the ADB and the WB for its contingency plan.
- Bangladesh has a Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief, which operates with a separate budget. This year, Bangladesh is planning to spend approximately a third of its budget on disaster risk reduction. Other ministries such as the Ministry of providing disaster education at

schools, Local Governments building local shelters, or the Ministry of Environment have projects related to disaster risk reduction.

- Maldives practices central planning and budgeting. Budget is allocated based on each Sustainable Development Goals' target to be met. The country is already spending almost 30% its public spending on infrastructure of which 50% is sourced from the domestic budget.
- Cambodia secures budget year, which can be used in any flood or drought disaster. Cambodia sees a need for considering PPP due to limitations in financing from public sources.

## Putting it all together – Institutional coherence with focus on ensuring inclusiveness and equality

The most **vulnerable people** in disasters are poor, women, children, minorities (religious, linguistic, state and ethnic groups), people with disability, migrant and elderly people. Overlapping vulnerabilities (e.g. an old woman with disability from a minority group) amplify exclusion. Exclusion of vulnerable people is exacerbated in countries with special needs (e.g. fragile, landlocked, least developed, small island state, conflict-ridden states).

When it comes to **policy coherence for inclusion**, countries have their own individual policies shaped by global frameworks and standards for inclusiveness that are adopted by governments. For example, various types of social protection schemes for vulnerable people have been adopted in each country. Countries take two-pronged strategies:

- Reduced vulnerabilities or exclusion through affirmative or targeted action
- Improve vulnerable and excluded people's capacities for disaster risk reduction

These two strategies are rarely well-linked due to lack of coordination. There are often separate sets of policies and plans for actions addressing disaster risk reduction and exclusion.

To better implement inclusiveness and equality, institutional coherence among all government agencies and levels is needed. Adaptation of existing institutional frameworks can happen in different ways by setting up coordination committees, creating disaster risk reduction units in ministries, conducting programs for sensitizing policy makers, reviewing laws and/or the allocation of funds for disaster-proof programs, actions and policies. The core is to build inclusive institutions which are representative, transparent, accountable, efficient/effective, have zero tolerance for corruption, and are governed by law.

The **United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction** presented that hazard risk analysis should include vulnerability and exposure assessment to understand the **social impacts** of cascading chains of disasters. Connecting hazard risk with social risk allows earlier prevention and resilient development. Systems thinking in disaster risk reduction is a way to identify multidimensional risks. However, many countries' institutional set ups do not yet promote data, policy or financial coherence. Disasters are regarded as individual phenomena and cascading effects are ignored. To support coherent implementation frameworks, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction highlighted the release of implementation guidelines for local disaster risk reduction and resilience strategies. Guidelines for national strategies will follow.

## Conclusion, Feedback and Outlook

The **German development agency (GIZ)** presented its bottom-up approach to support practical coherence in the region. The approach is based on the premise that isolated good practices and mature experiences on how to translate the global agendas in coherent planning, implementation and reporting processes are already available on national and sub-national level in many countries. However, these experiences are often not shared with other countries and exchange on experiences in general is limited to formal exchange during regional conferences and platforms. Therefore, GIZ identified the need to establish a mechanism that supports countries between the formal meetings and facilitates synergies between interested stakeholders working on coherence in the region. The German Government is ready to support a regional mechanism supporting practical coherence across the global agendas through its Global Initiative on Disaster Risk Management (GIDRM/GIZ). The Coherence Practice Group invites like-minded partners, donors and experts to jointly inspire, capacitate and connect stakeholders in the region by offering customized advisory services to countries on a demand-driven basis and by feeding the lessons learned and good practices back into the regional and international discourse.

**UNDP** re-emphasized the need for a strong force to change how things are currently done. The session closed with the remark that great coherence in agencies and programs can better support the efforts of countries to foster coherence.

The overarching idea of the Regional Learning Platform has been to promote coherence. The learning platform shared ideas and promoted learning among countries. Countries' feedback highlighted how this platform was immensely useful for organizing development work. Participants mentioned to take what they learned and get the various ministries together to strengthen policy coherence. Some considers re-directing the country's coordination. The countries appreciated the input from multiple agencies and the knowledge sharing experience.

The co-organizers UNESCAP and UNDP intended to demystify the concept of coherence and the global frameworks by providing guidance for policymakers. While data and monitoring are challenges to overcome, technical hurdles should not constrain the application in the era of technology. New technologies are providing substantive ground for a geospatial data democracy, allowing data access for everyone. ESCAP advises countries to capitalize on this innovation, and to be open and embrace innovation more generally. Innovation can come with high technical and academic investments. However, it can have transformative impact as technologies. Innovation will facilitate development of the substantive information base, which is needed for policymaking, planning and implementation.

## Annex 1 – Agenda

**30 August 2018**

8.30– 9:00	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome remarks by Tiziana Bonapace, Director, ICT and Disaster Risk Reduction Division, ESCAP</li> <li>• Objectives of the Regional Learning Platform</li> <li>• Introduction of participants</li> </ul> <p>Lead Facilitator: Lawrence Surendra</p>
9:00 – 10:00	<p><b>Session 1: Understanding the building blocks of policy coherence for disaster risk reduction and resilience</b></p> <p>Guide questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is policy coherence for disaster risk reduction? Why is it urgent now?</li> <li>• How are the dimensions of policy coherence?</li> <li>• What are the building blocks of policy coherence for disaster risk reduction and resilience?</li> </ul> <p>Inputs: Kareff Rafisura (ESCAP)- (20 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framing policy coherence – dimensions and building blocks</li> </ul> <p>Roundtable discussion: <u>National disaster management agency representatives</u> - (40 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country perspectives on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the Sendai Framework being implemented in your country? What are the linkages with SDG implementation? Is the Voluntary National Review (VNR) linked with the Sendai monitoring and reporting?</li> <li>• What are the challenges with respect to enhancing policy coherence?-What approaches have been tried? What works? What doesn't?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
10:00 – 10:30	Break
10:30 – 12:00	<p><b>Session 2: Coherent strategy frameworks and plans (Part 1): How to prioritize investments and maximize co-benefits?</b></p> <p>Guide questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to formulate coherent strategic frameworks and plans?</li> <li>• How to identify entry points to maximize impacts of investments?</li> <li>• Within each country, where do the synergies come from?</li> </ul>

	<p>Introduction to systems mapping (interactive session) - Madhurima Sarkar-Swaisgood (ESCAP) and Pratiba Raut (UNDP) (20 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is systems mapping?</li> <li>• How can it be useful to locate synergies and tradeoffs among SDGs?</li> </ul> <p>Inputs: Madhurima Sarkar-Swaisgood with Jiwon Seo and Sooin Bang (ESCAP) (40 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to SDG interactions</li> <li>• Non-technical introduction to data sets</li> <li>• Introduce a methodology for an evidence-based approach to policy coherence</li> <li>• Presentation of key findings</li> </ul> <p>Case study: Pratibha Raut (UNDP) (30 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of district-level targets in Nepal</li> </ul>
12:00 – 13:30	Lunch
13:30 – 15:00	<p><b>Session 2: Coherent strategy frameworks and plans (Part 2): Using the analysis</b></p> <p>Country team discussions: (50 minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you think of the findings of systems analysis? Do you agree with what the data show?</li> <li>• Does the approach provide practical guidance? What can you do with the findings? Who will be able to use them?</li> <li>• What kind of policy changes would you recommend to change the constraining factors into enabling factors?</li> <li>• Do you have national datasets that can complement these analyses?</li> <li>• <i>For Maldives: Do you have data at the national level to validate the systems analysis?</i></li> </ul> <p>Roundtable discussion: Sharing of discussion highlights (40 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <u>planning</u> ministry representative of each country team will present the highlights of discussions (8 minutes each)</li> </ul>
15:00 – 15:30	Break
15:30 – 17:00	<p><b>Session 3: Achieving coherence through mainstreaming DRR: Focus on infrastructure and agriculture sectors</b></p> <p>Guide questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do the countries assess infrastructure risk? What are the challenges and opportunities for risk-informed infrastructure development?</li> <li>• Agriculture sector continues to confront critical vulnerabilities to floods, drought, cyclone and heat waves. How are countries responding to insulate the sector from these risks?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can countries in the region assess the complexity of risk in agriculture? How can the coherence policy agenda help in risk-informed decision-making?</li> <li>• What's the region's experience regarding social protection and parametric insurance?</li> </ul> <p>Country team discussions (35 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country teams will discuss the guide questions above.</li> <li>• What are the major take-aways from the ADB-led regional workshop? What are the challenges and opportunities to implement the recommendations?</li> </ul> <p>Roundtable discussion (5 minutes per country):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting back of country discussions. Each country will be represented by the <u>sectoral ministry</u> representative.</li> </ul> <p>Inputs: (15 minutes each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sanjay Srivastava (ESCAP): Science and policy innovations to mainstream DRR into infrastructure sector</li> <li>• S.S. Ray (Mahalanobis National Crop Forecast Centre, Indian Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare): Using frontier technologies to support risk-informed policy decisions and interventions in agriculture sector</li> </ul>
--	---

**31 August 2018**

9:00 – 10:30	<p><b>Session 4: Coherent monitoring and reporting systems at the country level: Emerging approaches and outlook</b></p> <p>Guide questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we design mutually-reinforcing monitoring and reporting systems across SDG, Sendai and other frameworks?</li> <li>• What are the emerging approaches in the region?</li> <li>• What direction should countries be taking?</li> </ul> <p>Inputs (15 minutes each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timothy Wilcox (ISDR) - Joint SDG and Sendai monitoring - emerging practices, what approaches are working</li> <li>• Youjin Choe (UNOSAT) - Case study on how geospatial data can enhance coherence of monitoring and reporting systems</li> <li>• Shiori Sasaki (Keio University) - Resilience monitoring from global to local; piloting SDG 9 and 11</li> </ul> <p>Plenary discussion (30 minutes)</p>
10:30 – 11:00	Signing of MOA between ESCAP and Keio University and Coffee Break
11:00 – 12:30	<b>Session 5: What does coherent DRR budgeting and finance look like?</b>

	<p><b>Guide questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can finance and budget processes serve as tools for policy coherence?</li> <li>• Regional connectivity is attracting huge investments in infrastructure sector. How these investments can be risk informed? How coherence policy agenda can help?</li> </ul> <p>Inputs (20 minutes each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tientip Subhanij (ESCAP) - How are SDGs being financed and coordinated at the country level? How can financing opportunities for Regional Economic Cooperation and Integration (RECI) support resilient infrastructure?</li> <li>• Sanny Jegillos (UNDP) - look at existing budget and finance process and how DRR is integrated- Case studies in public financing (Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Cambodia, Myanmar)</li> </ul> <p>Roundtable discussion: Participants from <u>budget/finance</u> ministries (50 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are budgeting and financing for DRR and SDGs done in their countries?</li> <li>• What are the challenges and opportunities to advance coherent financing?</li> </ul>
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:45	<p><b>Session 6: Putting it all together – Institutional coherence with focus on ensuring inclusiveness and equality (theme of the 2019 High-level Political Forum for Sustainable)</b></p> <p>Guide questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will drive coherence?</li> <li>• How to get various institutions to work together to enhance policy coherence?</li> <li>• What institutional arrangements empower subnational and local institutions to advance DRR?</li> <li>• The equity dimension of coherence - How can policy coherence deliver on "leaving no one behind"?</li> </ul> <p>Inputs: (20 minutes per speaker)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loretta Hieber Girardet/Animesh Kumar (ISDR): Coherence in local and national disaster risk reduction strategies - what does coherence mean for achieving Sendai target E (national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020)?</li> <li>• P.G. Chakrabarti (TERI): Coherence and inclusion: How can institutions use policy coherence to deliver on leaving no one behind - the overarching mandate of the 2030 Agenda?</li> </ul>

	<p>Group work (35 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each country team will do institutional mapping in reference to DRR and resilience</li> </ul> <p>Scenario building (30 minutes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the institutional arrangement in your respective countries, where should/would coherence come from?</li> <li>• How do you see the synergies?</li> <li>• Building on ongoing national efforts, what steps are needed to increase institutional coordination for DRR and resilience in the countries?</li> </ul>
15.45 - 16.45	<p><b>Session 7</b></p> <p><b>Conclusions, feedback and outlook</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What actions will the participants take upon returning to their countries?</li> <li>• Within their respective job context, what are the opportunities for making a difference?</li> <li>• Feedback on the training materials</li> </ul> <p>Inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP - Opportunities for country-level implementation</li> <li>• ESCAP - Regional support</li> </ul>
16.45 – 17.00	Closing session

## Agenda 2 – List of Participants

Please refer to: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/List%20of%20Participants%2027-31%20August%202018.pdf>