Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals

Key points

- Building resilience into the post-2015 development framework is essential for protecting development gains and ensuring long-term progress in the face of increasing risk.
- On-going consultations on the design of a post-2015 framework have recognised the utility of resilience in the context of natural hazards. However, more work is needed to promote an understanding of resilience that addresses the impacts of disasters, gradual stresses, 'everyday crises' and inequality, while empowering local communities.
- Resilience-related targets and indicators in a post-2015 framework need to capture more than just mortality and economic losses. The human, social and psychological impacts of disasters and other shocks and stresses have not been adequately taken into account.
- As resilience cuts across development sectors, mainstreaming into other goals such as gender, health, education, food security, nutrition and water and sanitation seems essential.
- Many options for including resilience in the post-2015 framework exist. Each have different merits and drawbacks. Some are more feasible than others, some are more easily measurable and some are more politically attractive.
- We propose and explore three practical scenarios: Embedding resilience into a poverty reduction/eradication goal; mainstreaming resilience into other sector goals; and a standalone goal on resilience.

A joint publication by:

BritishRedCross

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Developed for the British Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies by:

ODI

This paper was written by Lindsey Jones and Aditya Bahadur of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Climate and Environment Programme. It was commissioned by Samuel Carpenter, British Red Cross on behalf of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies' Post-2015 Task Force. Special thanks are owed to the members of the Task Force for giving up their time for interviews and for their detailed comments on earlier drafts of the paper. Thanks are also owed to Eva Comba for technical contributions, as well as Tom Mitchell and Jan Kellett of the ODI for their review of earlier drafts.

Introduction

Resilience needs to be at the heart of the post-2015 debate. Disasters inflict significant damage on local communities, with disproportionate effects felt by the poorest and most vulnerable. Disasters, alongside gradual stresses and 'everyday crises', are also responsible for significant setbacks in development progress, including in food security and poverty reduction efforts (see ECLAC 2005). With this in mind, a 'resilience approach'[1] is needed to safeguard progress on the goals that will be agreed under a post-2015 framework in the face of current and future risk. Looked at in another way, the next set of goals must be underpinned by a risk-sensitive development framework. This is especially relevant given that the intensity of, and exposure and vulnerability to, many disasters is increasing in light of global trends such as climate change, depletion of natural resources, urbanisation and demographic shifts.

Below we outline the case for including resilience in the post-2015 development goals and explore the characteristics of a resilient community. We briefly take stock of existing proposals for including resilience in the post-2015 framework, and make recommendations for practical options for targets and indicators based on three scenarios: Embedding resilience in a poverty goal; mainstreaming resilience in other sectoral goals; and a standalone goal on resilience. Finally, areas for further consideration in ensuring that resilience is taken up within the post-2015 consultation process are outlined.

The case for resilience

Development efforts are increasingly at risk; disasters can no longer remain simply a humanitarian concern. Not only are global drivers of risk evolving and intensifying, but exposure to these risks is accelerating: Between the 1950s and 1990s, the reported global cost of disasters increased 15-fold (UNISDR 2012). Some of this is attributable to improvements in methods of reporting disasters but much is due to the increasing movement of people and economic activities to disaster-prone areas. The impact of disasters and other shocks and stresses – whether in the form of large-scale shocks or the cumulative effect of small-scale stresses such as poor harvests, food price rises or illness – inflict persistent negative impacts on human development, particularly amongst poor and vulnerable communities. Primary impacts relate to the role of disasters in contributing to impoverishment: Entrenching existing drivers of poverty, cancelling out escapes from poverty and other development traps and causing high numbers of people to fall into poverty as their assets and means of income are destroyed.

Indeed, disasters have undermined the achievements of the current Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Perhaps the most visible impact relates to the contribution that disasters can make in reversing efforts to reduce poverty and hunger (MDG 1). For example, the 2000-01 Pakistan drought is estimated to have increased poverty-levels by more than 15 per cent in Sindh province (up to 30 per cent in rural areas). Most importantly, with women, girls and vulnerable socio-economic groups disproportionately affected, the impact of such disasters is highly unequal. However, it is not only actions to eradicate extreme poverty that have been affected. Efforts to combat the spread of disease (MDG 6) are significantly set aback when disasters and other more gradual stresses affect vulnerable populations. Indeed, epidemics like malaria, dengue and diarrhoea that spread in the wake of a disaster can, in many cases, contribute as much to the death toll as the disaster event itself (ADPC 2010). Similar negative impacts of disasters are associated with each of the other MDGs – from universal primary education to gender equality and maternal health.[2]

Ensuring that a post-2015 development framework is better able to deal with and respond to disasters and longer-term stresses is therefore crucial. This is where the concept of resilience adds value. The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (the Federation) recognises resilience as 'the ability of individuals, communities, organisations or countries exposed to disasters, crises and underlying vulnerabilities to anticipate, reduce the impact of, cope with and recover from the effects of adversity without compromising their long-term prospects' (Federation 2012a).

A 'resilience approach' (i.e. actions to promote community resilience within programmes and operations) acknowledges that operational environments are complex and highly dynamic; it is only by breaking out of sectoral silos and bringing together risk reduction, health, water, sanitation and hygiene and livelihoods support programmes that effective methods of addressing vulnerabilities, building capacity and contributing to sustainable development can be found. Such an approach also calls for longer-term perspectives and partnerships, bridging the relief and development divide to foster a more sustainable future. Ensuring a post-2015 development framework is better able to deal with and respond to disasters and longer-term stresses is therefore crucial.

1 This paper conceptualises resilience to include an approach that engages with a range of shocks (high intensity and short time span) and stresses (high intensity and slow onset), as well as the extensive risk presented by a range of more low-level and 'everyday' hazards. While for reasons of brevity we often simply refer to 'disasters', this should be seen as inclusive of other types of risk.

2 See ACPC (2010) for the impacts of disasters on each of the MDGs.

Critically, the concept places individuals and households at the centre of any apparatus for engaging with risk. This is because vulnerable communities bear the brunt of disasters, climate change and various other evolving natural and socio-economic risks. Their capacities are the first to be tested by a variety of shocks and stresses. Importantly, they are also key sources of knowledge, learning and capacity for strengthening the resilience of communities. However, this does not negate the need also to build capacity and partnerships at local and national levels, including that of Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies.

The case for resilience to be included in a post-2015 development framework is strong. Supporting and incentivising a resilience approach can limit the effects of disasters on poor and vulnerable communities. It can also safeguard important gains made in achieving development goals. For example, cyclone Bhora struck Bangladesh in 1970, killing close to a million people. A cyclone of similar intensity struck in 2007 (cyclone Sidhr) resulting in only 4,000 deaths in comparison, in large part due to a strengthening of disaster-resilient infrastructure and better risk governance (DFID 2011). Investments in resilience also have wider long-term benefits, both in economic and livelihood terms, as shown by cost-benefit analyses of Red Cross and Red Crescent programmes in Bangladesh, the Philippines, Sudan and Vietnam (Federation 2012c, 2009a, 2009b, 2011). Such investments are further underscored by the fact that resilience-building activities and other preventative measures are more cost-effective than response and recovery post-disaster. Cost-benefit analysis of case study areas in Kenya suggests that early response can save roughly USD 424 per person in a single disaster event compared with recovery efforts (Venton et al. 2012).

The need for resilience to be included in the development goals is reflected in the outcome of the 2010 MDG summit, which acknowledged that 'disaster risk reduction and increased resilience to all types of natural hazards in developing countries… can have multiplier effects and accelerate the achievement of the MDGs' (UNESCAP 2011). But how has resilience so far been addressed, and what would be the most effective approach to building it into a post-2015 framework? Below we briefly explore on-going consultations and present practical options for its inclusion.

Box 1: Characteristics of a resilient community

To be resilient, households and communities need to…[3]
> Be knowledgeable and healthy (have the ability to assess, manage and monitor their risks).
> Be organised (have the capacity to identify problems, establish priorities and act).
> Be connected (have relationships with external and internal actors that can offer support, for example family, friends, faith groups and government).
> Be endowed with strong infrastructure and services (have strong housing, transport, power, water and sanitation systems. Have the ability to maintain, repair and renovate them).
> Have access to economic opportunities (have a diverse range of employment opportunities, income and financial services).
> Manage their natural assets and resources (have the ability to protect, enhance, maintain and mobilise them).
Source: Federation (2012b)

3 It should be noted that the Federation is currently reviewing its approach to resilience, including the 'Road to resilience' discussion paper, the characteristics of resilient communities and its 'Framework for community resilience'.

How resilience has been addressed within the post-2015 consultation process

There is general consensus that the concept of resilience is integral to sustainable development and should therefore be at the core of the post-2015 framework. While the concept has had some challenges in gaining traction in the consultation process, its importance has been clearly recognised by the High Level Panel (HLP). The HLP sees resilience as being "ready to withstand, able to adapt – when it comes to health, economic or climatic shocks — and able to recover quickly'' (UN 2013). Core elements of the HLP report strongly support the Federation's approach to resilience, including an emphasis on long-term prospects; the importance of adapting to; withstanding and recovering from shocks; the focus on both shocks and longer-term stresses; and the multi-sectoral/cross-cutting nature of a resilience approach. For a comprehensive outline of how the HLP's proposed targets overlap with the Federation's characteristics of a resilient community see Annex A.

However, important elements of resilience – both as a concept and as a programmatic approach – currently remain largely neglected within the post-2015 consultation process. Drawing on the Federation's longstanding experience of building community resilience on the ground, three such elements are outlined below:

1. Engaging and empowering communities and local actors in delivering the post-2015 framework. Ownership and accountability in achieving the MDG targets has thus far focused predominantly at the national level. While national actors are central to the co-ordination and delivery of development objectives, it is primarily at the local level where actions take place. Indeed, affected communities are always the first to respond in times of disaster, and they are often a critical implementer of development and humanitarian programmes in insecure environments where access and security constraints can prevent international aid agencies from working. Yet, very little has been done to 'localise' the MDGs. Increasingly, the important role of local knowledge, awareness and engagement in promoting resilience to a variety of shocks and stresses is being recognised amongst both development and humanitarian actors. Local level engagement in both community and national level policy-making will therefore be essential to the success of any post-2015 development framework in supporting meaningful, long-term resilience. This requires local needs and priorities to be heard and addressed. It also necessitates the strengthening of links between communities, local Red Cross or Red Crescent branches, other humanitarian and development actors and local and central government.

2. A focus on stresses, not just shocks. Much of the discussion on resilience has thus far focused on responding to shocks driven by large-scale natural hazards. The HLP report gives ample mention of the importance of resilience, including a target on resilience within the illustrative poverty reduction/eradication goal. However, this is done in the framing of 'reducing deaths from natural disasters'. This approach is limited in scope and calls for additional recognition of the negative impacts of extensive risk and long-term stresses on community and household well-being. Smaller and/or more gradual stress events and processes (such as food price rises, ill health, climate change, depleting natural resources, urbanisation, demographic shifts, political instability or economic decline) can, when added up cumulatively over time, have at least as much impact on the resilience of communities, if not more so. Widening the scope of resilience, as it is conceptualised within the post-2015 agenda, to incorporate shocks (such as floods and droughts, earthquakes, epidemics etc.) as well as stresses and other low-intensity events (such as localised violence, ill health, economic hardships, etc.) is imperative. Furthermore, it must be recognised that these shocks and stresses do not impact everyone equally – they hit poor communities, women and vulnerable groups hardest.

3. More than mortality and economic losses. The post-2015 consultation process has thus far proposed to address resilience targets on disaster mortality and disaster-related economic loss.[4] While the Federation recognises the importance of reducing disaster-related human and economic losses, it also notes that focusing efforts narrowly on these two components will obscure the negative impact of disasters on the achievement of sustainable development across all sectors and their true costs on vulnerable communities. Recognising that resilience is a multi-sectoral and cross-cutting issue, the addition of other targets and indicators that capture the remaining dimensions of resilience to disasters and other shocks and stresses are needed.

4 The HLP report suggests the following target: "Build resilience and reduce deaths from natural disasters by x%" (UN 2013: 30).

Scenarios and options

Numerous options for including resilience in the post-2015 development framework exist. In trying to outline practical choices, three scenarios are presented:

1. Including resilience in a goal on poverty reduction and eradication
2. Including resilience in other sector goals (such as gender, health, education, food security and water and sanitation (WATSAN)
3. A standalone goal on resilience.

Each has associated targets and indicators that serve to catalyse action and monitor progress. Each also has different merits and drawbacks. Some are more feasible than others; some are more easily measurable; and some are more politically attractive. It is worth bearing in mind that the proposed scenarios are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, it is certainly feasible to have scenarios 1 and 2 included within the same framework (though adoption of scenario 3 will likely affect the degree to which scenarios 1 and 2 are politically attractive).

Below we outline consensus positions within the post-2015 consultation process[5] with regard to the three proposed scenarios, as well as the Federation's recommendations for improved uptake of resilience within these. The options presented here are a handful of the potentially relevant targets and indicators for including resilience. Hundreds of options exist (see Mitchell et al. 2013a and post-2015.org's goal tracker).[6] However, these represent a selection that remains feasible and relevant given the current state of the consultation process. In addition, it is entirely possible to combine and amalgamate many of the targets where relevant. For instance, targets F1 (addressing the crisis dimensions of food security) and F2 (adopting climate-smart agriculture) can be merged to prepare a single target for resilient food systems. Finally, in describing options presented by the three individual scenarios, we highlight only the targets and indicators that relate specifically to resilience. There will inevitably be numerous wider targets that tackle the primary objectives of the goal (particularly in relation to scenario 2). However, these more general human development targets are not possible to address within the limited scope of this paper.

Options for including resilience in a poverty reduction/ eradication goal

A poverty goal is presumed to be the centrepiece of a post-2015 framework. Given its high-profile nature, and close links to the drivers of vulnerability and risk, it is also the goal most relevant for ensuring that a resilience approach is implemented. To this effect, it is worth noting that the HLP makes explicit mention of the term resilience as a target within the proposed goal on poverty reduction. It also partially addresses issues of social protection systems and access to key assets – both with strong influences on community and household resilience (see Annex A). However, the report's focus on natural hazards and mortality reveals a partial conceptualisation of resilience that fails to recognise the economic, human, social and psychological dimensions of shocks and stresses. It also highlights an emphasis on outcome-based metrics that may fail to capture, or more importantly stimulate, the many process-based elements of resilience.

Several options for addressing these shortfalls exist (see Table 2). One of the most relevant relates to expanding a mortality-related target on disasters and resilience to include wider impacts. These might include injury, displacement and joblessness (option P1), but can also be widened to address a range of other socio-economic factors. The headlines regarding the impacts of disasters tend to focus on death. However, this neglects the many physical, social, economic and psychological impacts that disasters have on survivors – the impacts of which are often widespread and long-term. Indeed, for some years the humanitarian sector has been clear about the need to save livelihoods as well as lives; concerted efforts have been put in place to ensure greater coherence and collaboration between humanitarian and development communities. Though reliable and globally-consistent data for non-mortality based metrics are less readily available, their inclusion within a poverty target is feasible and likely to act as a catalyst for more improved monitoring (P1i). It also lends itself to the prospect of a composite indicator, combining a number of variables into a single index (the merits and drawbacks of which are discussed below) (P1ii).

5 Here we draw heavily on the HLP report, the Rio +20 outcome document and the outcomes of the various thematic consultations and Open Working Group meetings held to date.

6 The post-2015 goal tracker is available at http://tracker.post2015.org/.

Table 1: Strengthening the inclusion of resilience in a poverty reduction/eradication goal

Goal option	How resilience is currently dealt with in the post-2015 consultative process	Elements for further enhancement
Poverty reduction/ eradication	Notable reference and inclusion of elements of resilience within a number of proposed targets Focus remains on natural hazard-related disasters and mortality Loose conceptual interpretation of resilience and disaster risk	Need for holistic indicators of resilience, including the economic, human and social dimensions, to be embedded within targets and indicators Emphasis on more than just mortality and economic costs, as well as the long-term nature of resilience-building Importance of recognising the equity dimensions of poverty, risk and resilience A focus on processes (strengthening capacities and planning that allow communities to become more resilient) and not just outcomes

Alongside mortality, one of the most tangible impacts of disasters is economic loss (option P2). Similar to the option above, a target on economic loss offers an alternative (or complement) to mortality metrics and captures a more holistic vision of the costs of disasters over different timescales. Data are relatively accessible, though mainly confined to high-impact disasters (smaller-scale extensive risks and long-term stresses are not well represented). Many different indicators exist, and options are available to normalise economic losses (adjusted for changes in wealth and population), assess losses amongst income groups and look at loss per unit of output (for example, GDP or household output) (P2ii & P2iii). These provide a more nuanced way of incentivising and assessing the equitable distribution of loss across society (See Ranger and Surminski 2013).

Another potential outcome-related target is preventing people from falling into poverty subsequent to a disaster (option P3). For high-impact hazards (such as earthquakes and cyclones) it is unrealistic to assume that measures can be put in place entirely to prevent this. However, evidence suggests that investment in disaster risk management and early response can allow communities to bounce back to past levels of income within a short period of time (Mitchell et al. 2013b). Not only that, investment in early response and resilience-building is also more cost-effective (Venton et al. 2012). This is typically most effective in middle and high income brackets, therefore using relative income metrics may be a useful catalyst for ensuring greater support for poor and vulnerable groups. Doing so is important not only in reducing the unequal distribution of disaster impacts but in increasing the positive benefits accrued from resilience-building initiatives. It also links strongly with incentives to increase access to economic activities to marginalised people and communities.[7]

Process-based targets have a number of useful applications, often acting as a guide for how resilience can be built. In this regard, targeting the distribution and mainstreaming of resilience related principles within key poverty plans – both national and local – can encourage further uptake (option P4). Other options include expanding existing proposed targets to include elements relevant to a resilience approach (such as activities and indicators associated with option P5). However, indicators for process-based targets are hard to identify, largely due to their intangibility and difficulty in assessing (and agreeing upon) the factors of effectiveness.

A further consideration is the use of modelled data to gain a more complete picture of the economic impact of disasters (P2i & P2iii) – its application has increasingly been used by both academic and private sector actors (mainly through insurance companies). This presents a number of advantages, not least of which is the ability to project the impact (and therefore imply the effectiveness of disaster risk management strategies) of disasters on a given population and over a specific time period. Models offer a partial solution to low levels of historical data prevalent across many developing countries – this is particularly useful in the context of high-impact, low-probability events. However, they are subjective, and make a number of generalised assumptions about social, economic and environmental interactions. Recognising their various limitations, models do add value in complementing observational datasets. Inclusion in the post-2015 framework is also likely to stimulate investment and further refinement of model parameters and their application.

7 This is in-line with the fifth characteristic of community resilience, as understood by the Federation: Have access to economic opportunities.

Table 2: Potential targets and indicators for embedding resilience in a poverty reduction/eradication goal

Goal	Relevant potential targets	Indicators*
Poverty reduction/ eradication	P1 Build resilience and reduce by 50% the number of people killed, injured, displaced and made jobless by disasters P2 Build resilience and reduce disaster-related economic loss by 50% P3 Build resilience to ensure there is no increase in the proportion of people in poverty following a disaster P4 Ensure principles of resilience are mainstreamed into all local and national poverty reduction strategies P5 Ensure universal access to social protection and safety nets for the poorest and most vulnerable	P1i Rates of mortality, injured, made jobless and homeless (per 1,000 inhabitants) over a 15-year period (possibility of combining actual and modelled data). Further options to disaggregate across gender, age and income groups P1ii A composite index that includes each of the variables listed in P1i (with assigned weightings, to be agreed upon) P2i Direct economic losses as % of GDP (option of combining actual and modelled data) P2ii Normalised economic losses as % of GDP (adjusted for changes in wealth and population) P2iii Direct economic losses as % of households' incomes or assets, disaggregated by wealth quintiles (option of combining actual and modelled data) P2iv Percentage of GDP exposed to hazards P3i Proportion of population below poverty line (options include: USD 1 per day PPP, USD 1.25, USD 2, USD 4, USD 10 day per capita; or national poverty line) measured at a given time-period (1, 3 and/or 5 years) subsequent to disaster and relative to a baseline (either year prior or longer-term). A more effective measure will include long-term panel data (longitudinal datasets) P3ii Share of poorest quintile in national consumption in a disaster year P4i Number of national disaster risk reduction, resilience and climate change adaptation plans adopted and referenced in national development and poverty reduction strategies P5i Proportion of poor and vulnerable people with access to social safety nets, including: insurance, public works programmes (e.g. embankment repair), social security and labour market activities P5ii Percentage of people who are covered by social protection systems that can be scaled up when disasters hit[8]

*All targets refer to a 15-year period (i.e. 2016-2030) set against a baseline (either 2001-2015 or longer-term), unless otherwise stated.

8 This indicator is taken from a draft report from a meeting to discuss targets and indicators for addressing disaster risk management in the post-2015 development goals organised by the UNDP, UNISDR, UNICEF and World Bank GFDRR from 18-19 July 2013 in New York, USA.

Options for mainstreaming resilience into other sector goals

Table 3: Ensuring the mainstreaming of resilience in other sector goals

Goal option	How resilience is currently dealt with in the post-2015 consultative process[9]	Elements for further enhancement
Sector goals (e.g. gender, health, education, food security and nutrition and water and sanitation)	No specific inclusion of resilience targets across the various goals (though some relate to principles of resilience) Willingness to engage with the concept of resilience, but unsure as to how to include as targets Resilience not a primary focus. Many competing targets, and may have to be embedded within other targets	Important to ensure coordination between various sectors in recognition of the multi-dimensional nature of resilience Include resilience-related objectives as specific targets and indicators (e.g. disaster proofing schools and hospitals under education and health goals) Must adequately capture the need to respond to changing shocks and stresses Need to engage more clearly with issues of power and empowerment of local communities

Though issues of resilience are referred to at large, there is little acknowledgment within the post-2015 consultation process as to how disasters and other shocks and stresses are likely to influence the long-term success of sectoral goals. Even though processes of development arguably build resilience, there are strong grounds to question whether targets assigned through any of the wider goals can be sustained without embedding principles of resilience. For example, goals on health, education and WATSAN will require infrastructure and delivery systems to be designed to withstand various high and low frequency hazards (targets H1, E1 and W1). This matches the Federation's emphasis on ensuring that communities are endowed with strong infrastructure and services.[10] Progress in achieving this can be measured by gauging the adoption of hazard-resistant design (and/or climate-proofing) principles within infrastructural development (H1i, E1i, W1ii). This will, in turn, help reduce deaths from vulnerable groups such as children, elderly and the disabled (E1iv, H1iii).

Similarly, meeting targets on food security should explicitly acknowledge the influence of dynamic shocks and stresses (F1) as well as relevance of climate-smart agriculture for long-term sustainable food production (F2). There are numerous ways in which these could be measured, including assessing food consumption and malnourishment subsequent to a disaster event or during a protracted crisis (F1i, F1ii); exposure of cultivable land to disasters (F2i); and the use of climate-resilient seeds and livestock (F2ii). Investments in resource governance are paramount, as the management of natural assets and resources is seen as a key characteristic of community resilience.[11] Similarly, gender empowerment can be analysed from a disasters lens, as it is widely acknowledged that women and marginalised groups suffer disproportionately during such events (G2). Though gender issues in relation to resilience are linked to 'soft' social and cultural institutions and difficult to observe, the use of a composite index to measure the proportion of women killed, injured, displaced or made jobless due to disasters may be useful (G2i). This would be critical to asserting the equity dimensions of any enterprise aimed at building resilience.

The Federation's vision of resilience centres on enhancing the capacity of communities. It is clear that a number of proposed goals within the framework can do more to take communities from passive recipients of assistance to active agents of development that play a key role in shaping and sustaining it. Therefore, the Federation encourages greater participation of women in policy processes and consultative forums that are likely

9 This is based on inputs and consultations from the HLP; the UN Task Team; and the regional, global and technical consultations of the UN Secretary General-led process and the Open Working Group.

10 This is characteristic four in the Federation's characteristics of resilient communities: Be endowed with strong infrastructure and services

11 This is characteristic six in the Federation's characteristics of resilient communities: Can manage its natural resources and assets.

to influence them (G1), as part of any goal on gender empowerment. It is worth noting that 'resilience' is inherently about acknowledging that successfully dealing with disturbances requires work across scales. Therefore target G1 makes specific mention of the fact that gender empowerment will result from the ability of women to influence local, as well as national, policy processes. Similarly, communities should also be involved in the design and delivery of healthcare policies (H2).

Finally, while it is not possible to represent these in the form of targets and indicators, the Federation's position on ensuring the integration of resilience across these sector goals must acknowledge the manner in which the achievement of each of these goals depends on progress made on others. For instance, can we achieve effective gender empowerment without ensuring better education? Can better health for all be achieved without adequate progress on ensuring improved WATSAN services? An important contribution can be made by stressing the inter-linkages between these sectors, and the thread of risk management needed through all of them, in the global dialogue on post-2015 goals.

Table 4: Potential targets and indicators for mainstreaming resilience into other sector goals

Goals	Targets	Indicators*
Gender	G1. Empower women to meaningfully influence local and national policy process G2. Prevent disproportionate levels of disaster risk and ill health amongst women	G1i Percentage of women represented within local and government decision-making bodies G2i Proportion of women killed, injured, displaced or made jobless due to disasters, health crises and other stresses. A composite index including metrics of all the above may be relevant
Health	H1. Ensure access to resilient healthcare infrastructure for all H2. Empower communities in the design and delivery of resilient healthcare systems H3. Ensure access to health services for hard to reach and vulnerable groups	H1i Percentage of hospitals and clinics conforming with locally and nationally appropriate hazard-resistant building standards H1ii Proportion of existing health care facilities in hazard-prone areas that have been assessed for levels of safety, security and preparedness H1iii Number of people killed in health facilities due to disasters H2i Number of local and national health policy processes conducting consultations with communities H2ii Percentage of health emergency preparedness and response plans developed with the involvement of communities H2iii. Percentage of health disaster risk assessments that are conducted on a regular basis with the participation of the communities H3i. Percentage of vaccinations amongst hard to reach and vulnerable groups
Education	E1. Ensure every child is entitled to a safe learning environment	E1i Percentage of schools conforming with locally and nationally appropriate hazard-resistant building standards, codes and norms E1ii Percentage of schools that have integrated disaster risk management and climate change adaptation subjects into school formal or informal curricula and teacher professional training E1iii Number of days that school is not able to provide education and/or children absent owing to the impact of disaster or other shock or stress E1iv Number of people killed in schools due to disasters E1v Percentage of schools that implement and evaluate annual school drills to respond to the hazards they face (simulation of emergency warning system and evacuation and contingency plans)

*All targets refer to a 15 year period (i.e. 2016-2030) set against a baseline (either 2001-2015 or longer-term), unless otherwise stated

Table 4: Potential targets and indicators for mainstreaming resilience into other sector goals continued

Goals	Targets	Indicators*
Food Security and nutrition	F1 Ensure food security for all during and after disasters and protracted crises F2 Increase agricultural productivity by x%, with a focus on sustainably increasing smallholder yields, adopting climate smart agriculture and promoting access to irrigation	F1i Percentage of underweight and malnourished children in years 1, 3 and 5 following a disaster, or overall during a protracted crises F1ii Percentage of population below minimum level of dietary consumption in years 1, 3 and 5 following a disaster, or overall during a protracted crisis F2i Percentage of agricultural land located in high-risk, hazard-prone areas F2ii Percentage of farmers with access to climate-resistant crops and livestock F2iii Quantity of greenhouse gas emission attributable to the agricultural sector (in CO^2 equivalent)
WATSAN	W1 Provide universal access to safe drinking water, with a focus on rural populations and urban slum dwellers W2 Provide universal access to improved sanitation, with a focus on rural populations and urban slum dwellers	W1i Proportion of population with access to a safe water source subsequent to a disaster at a given time-period (one week, six months and three years) W1ii Percentage of critical water infrastructure that is climate-proofed and with redundant capacity W2i Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation facilities subsequent to a disaster at a given time-period (one week, six months and three years) W2ii Percentage of sanitation infrastructure that is disaster-resistant

*All targets refer to a 15 year period (i.e. 2016-2030) set against a baseline (either 2001-2015 or longer-term), unless otherwise stated

Options for a standalone goal on resilience

Table 5: A possible standalone goal on resilience

Goal option	How resilience is currently dealt with within in the post-2015 consultation process	Elements for further enhancement
Resillence goal	Unlikely to be included in the framework as a standalone goal Possibility of a multidimensional goal linking conflict, violence, climate change and/or disasters under a common headline on resilience	A standalone goal can mobilise considerable action at all levels Recognise communities at the heart of a resilience goal: i.e. resilient communities and nations Support the inclusion of other shocks and stresses (including technological, economic, biophysical, and hydro meteorological)

From a political standpoint, the most influential scenario for promoting resilience is through a standalone goal. This ensures that resilience takes centre stage alongside the other headline goals – with the global attention and finance that accompany them. The Federation's take on resilience puts communities at the fore; a suitable option would therefore be to propose a goal on "resilient communities and nations" (see Table 6). While a number of target options exist, it is likely that a focused goal on resilience would reduce the likelihood of specific resilience-related targets across the other sector goals. It may also require the inclusion of many of the headline targets proposed in the two scenarios above – such as those on disaster mortality and economic impacts (see P1 & P2).

Another advantage of a standalone goal would be to permit a more holistic set of targets and indicators. A focus on reducing the number of people at 'high risk' to disaster could be considered, as it is likely to incentivise investments in reduced exposure and vulnerability – further options may exist for disaggregating this across different income and social groups to ensure equity (option R3). There is a clear understanding of the manner in which issues of equity are critical to building resilience in academic literature (Bahadur et al. 2013).

Nelson et al. (2007) find that systems may become less resilient if issues of justice and equity are not given due consideration. Similarly, Cutter et al. (2010) examine the resilience of regions in eight states of the United States to argue that regions with higher equity are likely to be more resilient. Twigg (2007) specifies the equitable distribution of wealth and assets and an equitable economy as essential to building community resilience. Having a target focusing on local and national capacity would allow monitoring progress on specific actions aiming at building resilience (option R1) and could be a useful guide for catalysing effective action.

Finally, a target focusing on enhancing social cohesion in and across communities could be a powerful driver of change (R2). Though social cohesion is core to resilience at the local level, its measurement presents a number of challenges and may require a composite index (R2i). These four target options, supported by a mixture of outcome/impact (R2i), output (R3i) and input-based (R1i, R1ii, R1iii) indicators, would provide a more comprehensive picture of resilience across scales.

However, a standalone goal faces a number of challenges. On the one hand, a resilience goal might not be compatible with the mainstreaming of resilience into other goals as it would create duplications and overlaps. As resilience cuts across traditional development sectors, mainstreaming it into other goals seems essential.[12] In addition, there is ambiguity regarding sources of funding for an exclusive resilience goal. Yet the possibility of a single goal linking conflict, violence and disasters under a common headline on resilience or security/safety is also problematic. While such a multidimensional goal would shed light on the mutually reinforcing relationship between conflict, violence and disasters (see Harris et al. 2013), there are major political challenges and sensitivities associated with lumping together these different issues. This is notwithstanding the practical difficulties of measuring and implementing a multidimensional goal on resilience.

Table 6: Potential targets and indicators for a standalone resilience goal

Goal	Targets	Indicators*
Resilient communities and nations	R1. Build local and national capacity to prepare for, respond to, withstand, recover from and adapt to current and future threats R2. Increase social cohesion, with a focus on trust, respect and harmony in and across communities R3. Reduce by 50% the total number of people at high risk to disasters	R1i. National and local coverage with annually reviewed disaster risk management plan R1ii. Percentage of national and local annual budgets committed to reducing disaster risk and building resilience R1iii. Percentage of population connected to appropriate early warning systems; social protection/ insurance coverage; and safe schools, hospitals and other critical infrastructure R2i. Suggested composite index including: Memberships rates of organisations and civic participation, measures of trust, measures of income distribution and ethnic heterogeneity R3i. Composite index including exposure to hazards, susceptibility, coping capacity and adaptive capacity. An example is the World Risk Index (see ADW 2012)

*All targets refer to a 15-year period (i.e. 2016-2030) set against a baseline (either 2001-2015 or longer-term), unless otherwise stated.

12 For many, it also represents a more strategic option for building resilience into the post-2015 framework – see Indonesia consultation (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland 2013)..

Areas for further consideration

While this paper provides options for the inclusion of resilience across three proposed scenarios, there are a number of issues that merit further exploration. First, it is worth considering the difficulties arising from a lack of consensus on how resilience is conceptualised and measured. The most appropriate indicators for resilience arguably focus on 'pro cesses' rather than 'outcomes'. For example, a likely indicator for mainstreaming resilience into local and national poverty reduction strategies is the integration of any disaster risk reduction and resilience plans into these strategies and the frequency of cross-referencing between them. Therefore while it is possible to gauge whether the 'process' of mainstreaming is complete, it is difficult to capture whether this is leading to resilient 'outcomes'. It is also hard to quantify objectively, as successful outcomes are subjective and context-specific. This speaks to an inherent weakness in process indicators regarding the lack of certainty on whether gauging the validity/quality of the process will result in the 'outcomes' intended.

Second, 'composite indicators' have been proposed as measures for a number of targets listed above. Composite indicators are used widely (most prominently in the Human Development Index) but come with a number of inherent weaknesses. In the processes of combining different indicators into one, useful or insightful information on individual indicators may be lost; there may be problems around 'weighting' different components of the composite indicators so as to most accurately represent the outcome being measured (the process of deciding appropriate weights is also inherently subjective); and as composite indicators usually rely on vast and detailed data from different sources, their preparation can be resource-intensive. Third, as discussed in the scenario on sector goals, the presented tables do not adequately capture interdependence between goals (for example, the links between poverty and food security). This apart, it is also important to consider that individual targets should not be addressed in isolation; meeting one target is contingent on meeting certain others.

Finally, it is worth noting that the post-2015 framework cannot be considered the ultimate framework for the global delivery of resilience.[13] While it can yield important results (and catalyse action) the post-2015 goals are one of a number of relevant frameworks and commitments. Along with marking the culmination of processes aimed at appointing a successor to the MDGs, 2015 will also mark the expiration of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the adoption of a new framework for action on disaster risk reduction. The last 10 years have seen considerable development in understanding of what it means for communities to be resilient in the face of disasters and the Federation should be well positioned to support a wider push for the inclusion of resilience within any new global approach to tackling disaster risk. Similarly, plans to replace the Kyoto Protocol are afoot (to limit global emissions of greenhouse gases and promote effective adaptation). A new Protocol is expected to be developed by 2015 (and implemented by 2020), alongside the planned World Humanitarian Summit in 2015. The confluence of these processes provides a valuable opportunity for one of the world's leading humanitarian actors to ensure that key global agreements adequately accommodate the tenets of resilience. Indeed, ensuring that there is sufficient overlap, without duplication, will be crucial, particularly as these other frameworks will be much more focused on how to operationalise resilience. Overall, the Federation and its partners – both within and outside the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement – must harness synergies between these complementary global policy processes so as to ensure that the most vulnerable are resilient to evolving current and future risks.

13 See the Federation's 'Community Safety and Resilience Framework' which illustrates linkages to other current global frameworks (2008). It should be noted that the Community Safety and Resilience Framework is currently being revised, based on a broad-based consultation of Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies.

Annex 1: Synergies between the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies' characteristics of community resilience and the 'Illustrative Goals and Targets' in the High-Level Panel's report on the post-2015 development agenda

The Federation's characteristics of community resilience	Overlap with goals and targets in the HLP report	Commentary
Be knowledgeable and healthy (have the ability to assess, manage and monitor its risks)	Target 4B) Increase by x% the proportion of children, adolescents, at-risk adults and older people that are fully vaccinated. Target 4e) Reduce the burden of disease from HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, neglected tropical diseases and priority non-communicable diseases. All targets associated with Goal 3 - Provide Quality Education and Lifelong Learning.	Currently all the targets included in the health and education goals of the HLP report can be seen as congruent with the Federation's emphasis on increasing health and education levels within communities. However, as noted in Table 2, the goals would do well to explicitly engage with the impacts of disasters, shocks and stresses.
Be organised (have the capacity to identify problems, establish priorities and act).	Target 10c) Increase public participation in political processes and civic engagement at all levels. Target 10b) Ensure people enjoy freedom of speech, association, peaceful protest and access to independent media and information.	Goal 10 interplays with the Federation's emphasis on community organisation. However currently participation is included exclusively as a separate goal and the Federation should work towards ensuring the integration of the principles of participation across other goals (see target G1 and H2 as an example).
Be connected (have relationships with external and internal actors that can offer support, including family, friends, faith groups and government).	Target 10b) Ensure people enjoy freedom of speech, association, peaceful protest and access to independent media and information. Target 10c) Increase public participation in political processes and civic engagement at all levels.	Relationships and mutual support that are part of the Federation's conceptualisation of resilience find mention in the current HLP report as part of goal 10 (Ensure Good Governance and Effective Institutions). Table 5 argues for the Federation to place heavy emphasis on these as part of discussions on any standalone resilience goal.
Be endowed with strong infrastructure and services (have strong housing, transport, power, water and sanitation systems. Have the ability to maintain, repair and renovate them).	Target 1b) Increase by x% the share of women and men, communities and businesses with secure rights to land, property and other assets. Target 7b) Ensure universal access to modern energy services. All targets for Goal 6 – Achieve Universal Access to Water and Sanitation.	The Federation's emphasis on infrastructure resonates with a number of different targets proposed by the HLP. However, as Table 4 of this report shows, there is much greater scope for an acknowledgment of the manner in which the impacts of disasters and climate change will make the achievement of targets on infrastructure and WATSAN difficult.

The Federation's characteristics of community resilience	Overlap with goals and targets in the HLP report	Commentary
Have access to economic opportunities (have a diverse range of employment opportunities, income and financial services).	Target 12a) Support an open, fair and development-friendly trading system, substantially reducing trade-distorting measures, including agricultural subsidies, while improving market access of developing country products. All targets for Goal 8 – Create Jobs, Sustainable Livelihoods, and Equitable Growth.	While the Federation's emphasis on economic opportunities resonates with goals and targets in the HLP report, there is very little mention of the manner in which many of these opportunities could be diminished by a variety of shocks and stresses. Therefore Table 2 highlights the need for acknowledgement of the manner in which poverty and economic development are predicated on the ability to adapt successfully to a changing climate and deal with disasters.
Manage their natural assets and resources (have the ability to protect, enhance, maintain and mobilise them).	Target 9c) Safeguard ecosystems, species and genetic diversity. Target 9d) Reduce deforestation by x% and increase reforestation by y%. Target 9e) Improve soil quality, reduce soil erosion by x% tonnes and combat desertification.	Goal 10 links to the Federation's focus on the importance of community management of natural resources and assets. Specific mention is also made in the explanatory narrative of the links between resource management and the impacts of environmental disasters on the poorest, including on livelihoods and food security.

References

ADPC (2010) 'Disaster proofing the Millennium Development Goals' (Bangkok, Asia Disaster Preparedness Centre).

ADW (2012) 'World Risk Report 2012' (Berlin, Alliance Development Works).

Bahadur, A. Ibrahim, M. and Tanner, T (2013) 'Characterising Resilience: Unpacking the concept for tackling climate change and development', Climate and Development, 5 (1), pp. 55-65.

Carraro, L. (2005) 'Estimating the impact of large natural disasters on the Millennium Development Goals – the case of Pakistan' (Oxford, Oxford Policy Management).

Cutter, S., Burton, C. and Emrich, C. (2010) 'Disaster resilience indicators for benchmarking baseline conditions', Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, 7 (1), pp. 1–22.

DFID (2011) 'Defining disaster resilience: What does it mean for DFID' (London, Department for International Development).

ECLAC (2005) 'Poverty, hunger and food security in Central America and Panama' (Santiago de Chile, ECLAC).

Harris, K., Keen, D. and Mitchell, T. (2013) 'When disasters and conflicts collide: Improving links between disaster resilience and conflict prevention' (London, Overseas Development Institute).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2008) 'Community safety and resilience framework' (Geneva, International Federation).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2009a) 'Assessing quality and cost benefit: A Philippines case study' (Geneva, International Federation).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2009b) 'Measuring impact and cost benefit: A Sudanese case study' (Geneva, International Federation).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2011) 'Mangrove planation in Vietnam: Measuring impact and cost' benefit (Geneva, International Federation).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2012a) 'The road to resilience: Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future' (Geneva, International Federation).

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2012b) 'Understanding community

resilience and program factors that strengthen them: A comprehensive study of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies tsunami operation' (Geneva, International Federation).

International Federation of Red Cros s and Red Crescent Societies (2012c) 'The long road to resilience: Impact and cost-benefit analysis of community-based disaster risk reduction in Bangladesh' (Geneva, International Federation).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (2013) 'The global thematic consultation on conflict, violence and disaster and the post-2015 development agenda', Synthesis report (unpublished).

Mitchell, T., Jones, L., Lovell, E. and Comba, E. (eds.) (2013a) 'Disaster risk management in post-2015 development goals: potential targets and indicators' (London, Overseas Development Institute).

Mitchell, T et al. (2013b) 'Geography of poverty and risks' (mimeo).

Nelson, D., Adger, W. and Brown, K. (2007) 'Adaptation to environmental change: Contributions of a resilience framework', Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 32, pp. 395–419.

Ranger, N and Surminski, S (2013) 'Disasters and their economic impacts: Disaster resilience and post-2015 development goals: The options for economics, targets and indicators', in Mitchell, T., Jones, L., Lovell, E. and Comba, E. (eds.) 'Disaster risk management in post-2015 development goals: potential targets and indicators' (London, Overseas Development Institute).

Twigg, J. (2007) 'Characteristics of a disaster-resilient community' (London, Department for International Development).

UNESCAP (2011) 'Importance of disaster risk reduction in achieving the Millennium Development Goals' (Bangkok, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific).

UNISDR (2012) 'The economic and human impact of disasters in the last 12 years' (Geneva, United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction),

UN (2013) 'A new global partnership: Eradicate poverty and transform economies through sustainable development', The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the post-2015 development agenda (New York, United Nations).

Venton, C., Fitzgibbon, C. Shitarek, T., Coulter, L. and Dooley, O. (2012) 'The Economics of Early Response and Disaster Resilience: Lessons from Kenya and Ethiopia' (London, Department for International Development).

REFUSING TO IGNORE PEOPLE IN CRISIS

British Red Cross
44 Moorfields
London
EC2Y 9AL

Tel 0844 871 1111
Fax 020 7562 2000

redcross.org.uk

Published October 2013

The British Red Cross Society, incorporated by Royal Charter 1908, is a charity registered in England and Wales (220949) and Scotland (SC037738)

Email: production@redcross.org.uk
Tel: 020 7877 7029