



HELP-GWP consultation on Draft Principles on Investment and Financing for Water-related Disaster Risk Reduction

Special Session: 19th WaterNet/WARFSA/GWP-SA Symposium

31 October 2018

Chair: Dr. Kuiri F Tjipangandjara, Chair, Global Water Partnership-Southern Africa (GWP-SA)

<p>Overview of Session by Chair</p>	<p>The Chair of the session welcomed all participants to the session and gave a brief overview indicating that Disasters are becoming more common over the world and investments directed towards addressing these disasters are by far exceeding investment aimed at disaster risk mitigation. He provided the objective of the session as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase understanding of disaster risk reduction options • To propose possible strategies on how to reduce disasters and prevention measures through adopting HELP principles
<p>Overview of DRR actions in the SADC Region</p>	<p>Dr. Dominic Mazvimavi, Director, Institute for Water Studies, Professor of Environmental & Water Sciences, Department of Earth Sciences, University of the Western Cape, provided a presentation on DRR actions in SADC Region, with the following summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Africa has the second highest total number of extreme events • There is an increasing trend of water related disasters (1900-2012), however the question is “is it a trend of events or is it the way it is being reported? How is it measured? What are the indicators? Number of people affected?” • Challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inadequate monitoring networks (surface waters) ○ Insufficient information- so how can we monitor? ○ Annual flows are declining- Lake Malawi, Zambezi River (periods of abnormally high and dry



	<p>rainfall- periods of floods and droughts- no information to understand the causes the variability is available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inadequate capacity for risk reduction analysis and developing appropriate responses ○ There is a general focus on providing relief as opposed to preparedness ○ Inadequate skills for providing appropriate and timely information for planning and managing/responding water related disasters ○ No data from Earth Observation- skills are inadequate to interpret information to prevent disasters ○ Land Use change and degradation (e.g. Botswana- Boteti Catchment) ○ Poverty and Disaster directly correlated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Common Africa position on Disaster Risk Reduction ○ SADC Regional Water Policy ○ Strengthen IWRM strategies ○ SADC established a Climate Services Centre (how effective is? To be discussed) ○ SADC HYCOS- Successes ● Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prevention is important- for socio-economic development ○ Disaster Risk reduction is an important element of IWRM and Integrated land use management ○ Strengthening of science and translation of science into practice- especially for government departments ○ Develop risk reduction strategies relevant at local level (how is it integrated in to local level management (inclusion of traditional authorities as part of warning system) ○ Sustainability of interventions is critical ○ Financing at national level- tricky- how is this done- can you include it governmental budgets- should it be separate or should it be part and parcel of development budget
<p>Discussion (summary of Group Discussions)</p>	<p>The following issues were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Financing should be done as part of the planning process. Disaster risk reduction should be part and parcel of plans- otherwise systems remain vulnerable to disasters and it is time to be proactive rather



	<p>than reactive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The norm is that funds are budgeted at government level, however if there are other emergencies, the first budget that is cut- is that for disaster risks. • Collaboration with local partners and communities was emphasised. It should not be top-down approach. • How people plan depends on the definition of disasters. There are various definitions- either at planning and scientific level, therefore there is need to define what a disaster is. Especially at the level of decision makers versus those that are affected directly by the disaster • Poverty is critical- risk is linked with poverty- the poorer- the higher the risk of affected- the issue is governance- how resources are managed in terms of disasters. Drought management in poor countries differs from richer countries. In richer countries, it can be planned from the beginning and dealing with the disaster is easier, however in poor countries there are conflicting priorities. The political dimension in poorer countries should also be considered when it comes to planning for country needs. The issue is “priorities at expense of preparedness of disasters”. • Do we quantify cost of disasters in our countries? This is not done- because the magnitude of impact is measured at how many people are affected or dies- instead of looking at other issues- if no body dies- then its considered not severe, however the consequences and further action that is required after the disaster is neglected and increasing the chances of reoccurrence. • Should there be something around accountability? Who should be held accountable- Government (i.e Department of Water Affairs) who fails to put upstream monitoring stations; Water Utilities- opening sluice gates; or community- who settled downstream; local authorities that allow people to settle in that area?
<p>Presentation by HELP secretariat: contents of the draft Principles on Investment and Financing for Water-related</p>	<p>Mr. Tomoyuki Okada, High Level Experts and Leaders Panel on Water and Disasters (HELP) Secretariat presented on the draft principles of investment and financing for water related DRR. The following are highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently 90% of emergency response is spend on 10% of affected area. • Case study: Effect of preventative measures in Japan- 2000 rainfall- it caused 670 – Billion Yen worth of damage, which is why Pre-Disaster prevention measures should be prioritised • Management of Aging Infrastructure is key and Government should improve their fiscal systems and secure sufficient budget



Disaster Risk Reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect of flood management investment (clear link between prevention measures and fatalities) • Various funding sources should be mobilised (PPP cooperation) • Science and technology should support decision making on better investment <p>Collect comments on proposed principles – various consultations- first in Africa (principles and implementation plan will be launched next spring in NY – which is very critical for input</p>
Group Discussions	<p>The discussion included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of Build-Back-Better was discussed in detail, such that after the Disasters, whatever construction takes place should be more resilient and stronger- so that when the disaster at the same level hit the same building- it can withstand it. • Effect on reversing the current funding model of 10-90% was discussed in the context of climate change, where there is so much uncertainty and investment options are limited given current economic crisis- so in the end, the effect might be the same. There might be a need to have a balanced % approach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to experience- and cases in world- prevention measures works better than recovery- - eg. Case of Japan- and Hurricane Katrina- prevention measures are less costly. Governments are encouraged to focus more on prevention measures which will lead to eventually reduction on recovery costs. That is the goal of the principles. • The issue of the Levee reinforcement (% on tax) was discussed at length. Local governments should budget for it- and should take responsibility for management of recovery facilities. • There are dedicated offices in Government responsible for Disaster Risk management- instead of having local government- River Facilities- in Japan is done by Ministry of Infrastructure- and local governments have river management sections- and they are responsible for disaster risk and should budget for it accordingly.
	<p>Participants were given time to complete the Questionnaire during the session after which a discussion followed with the presenters</p>
Group Discussion based on Questionnaire	<p>The following summarises the discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact differs from place to place, therefore it is difficult to talk about DRR and even more difficult to be quantified? However there are places where baseline data is available and trends can be deduced to predict



certain disasters. It is important that thorough stock is taken after the events, so that better planning/intervention can take place.

- The current framework on monitoring disaster risks- have indicators- data collected from every country- and based on that progress can be planned as well as measured/quantified.
- The discussion on principles are summarised as follows:
 - Principle 1 is overarching since it deals with socio economic development and therefore takes into consideration all principles
 - Principle 3- is seen to be most difficult to implement, because it is not clear how to separate the allocation – or if it should be part and parcel of the planning. It will be difficult to lobby for only this item- but if it is part of other issues- might be easier. Again it is linked to poverty- how is this prioritised versus funding for education/health etc.
 - The financing of DRM- there is a continuum- where all nationals are asked to look at prevention, response and recovery. The basic agreement is that it should - so now new school of thought- how can we build in the issue be part of the infrastructure costing from the beginning- as part of the life cycle costing approach- for Capital development.
 - Donors are not interested in life cycle costing- so how do we as practitioners influence donors to consider above mentioned point?
 - Biggest challenge is the level of awareness- once decision makers are aware- then they can buy in.
 - Ideally a similar workshop should take place at national level- with people responsible for DRM- such Office Prime Minister, Works and Infrastructure Ministries etc.
 - There is holistic development approach towards all sectors- but are the units capacitated and well financed? The focus is not to respond- but to reduce the risk vulnerability- prevention. For example, drought- can never be a disaster- if planning is done proper- then if it occurs there must be responses, food and water- if the systems are working- then there will be no disasters- But this depends on levels of severity.
 - Investing and Financing are different - disaster investment in infrastructure- vs financing is for actual disasters.

The question posed to the participants “What role can we play in disaster management?” resulted in the following discussion points:

- Through education, training, awareness raising at household level and individual level- preparedness-



	<p>early warning systems- making people understand the manifestation of disasters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example in Angola there are monitoring stations- warning systems for flood, which can indicate the magnitude and then the response units can plan and be prepared. How can we have such monitoring stations in place- perhaps scientists must convince policy makers ○ The biggest challenge observed is that knowledge is not shared- people get their degrees (PhD and Master’s) but how is the knowledge shared? How do the people on the ground in villages benefit from such knowledgeable people amongst them? It is thus important that the most affected should be targeted to ensure they have access to relevant information and that they understand basic survival versus planning. ○ There is a need to move beyond the “fear of sharing/ transmitting knowledge”. For example, take all policies relating to DRM- who is the target group- only those who draft it understands it. It needs to be translated and interpreted properly so that it makes targeted impacts. ○ Responsibility to make research findings well understood is critical and how it can count towards the lives of the ordinary citizen.
<p>Way Forward/Conclusion</p>	<p>The Chair summarised the discussions of the session as the following that requires attention moving forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Governance issues (Accountability) ● Interpretation/translation of DRM ● Financing (Integrated costing at construction)- budgeting processes (levies) ● Capacity building and awareness raising to those affected and practical implications. <p>The way forward is proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is important that all those that are able, assist to disseminate the work further ● GWP is to take it as a project and organise a bigger forum- and invite those that actually work with the issues- take the discussions at the higher level.