

Recommendations

National policies for disaster prevention and mitigation involve cooperation across sectors and scales. Partnership for mitigation and prevention is particularly important — there is a need for active engagement and commitment of the private sector, communities and academia as well as a need to share responsibilities for development and implementation of DRM strategies. Nevertheless, the main responsibility will remain with national governments, as also reaffirmed in the SFDRR. Some further efforts will be required in order to ensure that DRM is considered a cross-sectoral topic, which requires engagement and commitment on behalf of multi-stakeholders. Understanding direct and indirect costs is crucial to selecting and investing in preventive measures as well as the stakeholders to be involved and their roles and responsibilities.

However, identifying suitable investments is not enough; presenting evidence of additional dividends to policymakers and investors could provide a narrative reconciling short- and long-term objectives, thereby improving the acceptability and feasibility of DRM investments and enhancing the business case for investment in prevention and mitigation.

Integration of mitigation and prevention policies and regulations is a key innovation in mitigation and prevention, but it is rare. Where zoning regulations, building codes and insurance policies are integrated, the mitigation strategy becomes more coherent and easier for stakeholders to implement.

Cooperation between regional, national and international communities is particularly important for preparedness and response planning given the transboundary nature of modern-day disasters. ELSI are not a separate dimension of DRM that can be addressed in isolation. Good preparedness can protect societies from exceptions that go against ordinary morals, integrity and dignity, from unintended consequences and from entrusting decisions solely on experts or governments without public engagement.

A move away from command-and-control approaches to managing disasters has opened up more opportunities for citizens to participate in preparedness and response. Strong bonds and trust within and between communities favours a more effective response in emergencies and can be harnessed by authorities. Social media can also be used to enhance self-organised mobilisation and co-ordination of local resources, knowledge and efforts for disaster preparedness and response.

Close collaboration across sectors and with affected groups is beneficial for physical, economic and psychosocial recovery processes. Recovery is complex and people and systems may not return to their pre-disaster state, but strong

multisectoral pre-disaster plans and flexibility in responses can improve the speed and efficacy of recovery, avoiding indirect and adverse impacts after the disaster.

Significant progress has been made in understanding the psychosocial impact of disasters and on (re)construction techniques to improve the built environment after a disaster. Scientific gaps still remain in understanding economic recovery given the diverse scales at which impacts are felt and potential problems created by external intervention for local economies post-disaster.

Innovation in recovery promotion is particularly seen in reconstruction and more comprehensive approaches to rebuilding in urban areas.

A comprehensive strategy for disaster financing can moderate the impacts of natural hazard risks, speed up recovery and reconstruction and harness knowledge and incentives for risk reduction.

Climate change has amplified risks and raising vulnerability may make financial protection unaffordable for some people and businesses as well as risks uninsurable in certain places.

Insurance and other financial instruments can contribute to reducing disaster risk if designed and implemented to this end.