



## Driving Innovation in Crisis Management for European Resilience

### D93.1 – Identification of opportunities for positive societal impact of CM

Grant agreement number: 607798      Due date of deliverable: 2014-12-31  
Start date of the project: 2014-05-01      Actual submission date: 2014-12-19  
Duration: 54 months

Lead Beneficiary: PRIO

Contributing beneficiaries: ECORYS; ARC; FHG-INT

#### Keywords:

“Societal Resilience”; “Value Dimension”; “Societal Cohesion”; “Societal Needs”; “Criteria”;  
“Recommendations”; “Positive Intervention”; “Reviews of  
Frameworks/Policies/Reports/Techniques”

#### Dissemination level:

PU   
PP   
RE   
CO

Release Number	Release date	Released by
0.1	1 December 2014	Mareile Kaufmann, Stine Bergersen, Christian Kloyber, Brigitte Slot, Joachim Schellekens, Linette de Swart;
1.0	17 December 2014	Mareile Kaufmann, Stine Bergersen

## Executive Summary

The main focus of D93.1 is to describe and investigate opportunities for positive societal impact, meaning it explores how societal resilience and social cohesion can be strengthened through crisis management (CM) measures in general and DRIVER tools in particular. The introduction, Chapter 1, contextualizes the work of this deliverable. Chapter 2.1 gives a short definition of societal resilience, introducing its practical and its value-dimension. Chapter 2.2 gives a broad overview of practical and value-based societal needs for crises management. Chapter 3, the core chapter, screens a set of Red Cross/Red Crescent, EU and UN policies to see how existing strategies and frameworks for crisis management and disaster risk reduction address societal needs and values and seek to foster societal resilience. Through that, Chapter 4 identifies opportunities for CM strategies to create positive societal impacts that foster societal resilience through CM. It relates general recommendations for positive intervention to key societal criteria that emphasize the importance of the value-dimension of societal resilience and crisis management. In doing so, Chapter 4 provides the necessary criteria system that will be used to evaluate the positive societal impact of DRIVER activities in the remainder of the project. Chapter 4 also functions as preparation for the further iterations of 92.1 and 92.2, where assessments of the creations of secondary insecurities and potential societal costs and negative consequences of the DRIVER portfolio of tools and measures are conducted with a similar set of criteria. Once tested and further refined, the final version of the criteria system and the recommendations will feed into the DRIVER Portfolio of Tools (PoT, SP6) and the DRIVER testbed (SP2).

## Table of content

1	Introduction .....	6
2	What is Societal Resilience? .....	8
2.1	Societal Resilience: Towards a working definition .....	8
2.2	Societal Needs During Crises .....	13
3	Insights from Existing Frameworks, Policies & Reports .....	15
3.1	Red Cross Red Crescent Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports .....	16
3.1.1	Introduction: The Fundamental Principles of the International IFRC movement .....	16
3.1.2	“The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future” 17	
3.1.3	“Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience” .....	18
3.1.4	“Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals” .....	20
3.2	EU Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports .....	21
3.2.1	Introduction: The EU approach to resilience .....	21
3.2.2	“Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020” .....	21
3.2.3	“Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action” 23	
3.2.4	“Building Resilience: The EU’s approach” .....	24
3.2.5	“AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa” .....	25
3.2.6	“Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014” .....	27
3.2.7	“The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe” 28	
3.2.8	“Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience” .....	30
3.3	UN Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports .....	31
3.3.1	Introduction: Resilience in the United Nations .....	31
3.3.2	“The Hyogo framework for action (HFA) (2005-2015): Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters” .....	32
3.3.3	“A catalyst for Change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South-East Europe” .....	34
3.3.4	“Understanding community resilience: Findings from community-based resilience analysis (CoBRA) assessments” .....	35



- 3.3.5 “United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience” .....36
- 3.3.6 “UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda: Disaster risk and resilience” .....37
- 3.3.7 “The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis, May 2013” .....38
- 3.3.8 From social Vulnerability to Resilience: Measuring progress towards Disaster Risk Reduction.....39
- 3.3.9 Towards human Resilience: Sustaining Millennium Development Goals progress in an age of economic uncertainty .....41
- 3.3.10 “Resilient people, resilient planet: A future worth choosing” .....42
- 3.3.11 Human Development Report 2014 “Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience” .....42
- 3.3.12 UN “Making cities resilient” report, 2012.....44
- 3.3.13 UN Making cities resilient handbook .....45
- 4 Conclusion: Preliminary Assessment Criteria & Guidelines for Positive Intervention and Resilience Strategies .....47
  - 4.1 Consolidated List of Criteria .....47
  - 4.2 Relevance of the Criteria System for General Recommendations about Positive Intervention 53
  - 4.3 Outlook.....56
- 5 Bibliography .....58

## List of Acronyms

Abbreviation / acronym	Description
Cf	See
CM	Crisis management
D	Deliverable
D	Deliverable
DoW	Description of Work
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EU	European Union
FD	Final Demonstration
Ibid.	As above
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IFRC	Red Cross and Red Crescent
JE	Joint Experiments
NSA	National Security Authority
PoT	Portfolio of Tools
PSS	Psychosocial Support
SotA	State of the Art
SP	Sub-project
T	Task
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicles
USA	United States of America
WP	Workpackage

# 1 Introduction

Crisis management (CM) and societal resilience, the key aspects of DRIVER, do not start when a crisis arises and end when a crisis is over<sup>1</sup>. All activities relate to the different stages of the crisis management cycle (see Figure 1), which means that crisis management takes place before, during and after crises.



Figure 1 Simplified Crisis Management Cycle

In order to deal with crises efficiently and effectively it is important that not only professional CM actors and processes are in place. In a broader sense, the whole society should be resilient, which means that **many different persons and organisations engage in opportunities to establish normality** on the one hand, and that all **crisis management activities are in line with key societal values** on the other. This goes to show that the inclusion of civil society into CM activities, a basic aspect of resilience (cf. Chapter 2), can be realized on many different levels. Firstly, it can be achieved through concrete, practical solutions that actively include individuals, communities and local governments into CM. Such solutions or measures are developed, tested and experimented with in SP3 of DRIVER. Secondly, complementary to SP3, SP9 addresses the value dimension of society. Following the understanding that resilience and CM can only be efficient and effective if they do not infringe upon, but foster societal values, SP9 develops a set of criteria that is based on key societal values. As this deliverable illustrates, these values are reflected on an overarching level, for example, in United Nations (UN), European Union (EU) and Red Cross (IFRC) CM policies. The utilization of this set of criteria constitutes the SP9-criteria system. It is used to assess CM solutions and measures developed mainly by DRIVER SP3, SP4 and SP5. As such, SP9 does not seek to create solutions for the practical inclusion of citizens, but it provides assessments and recommendations on how to plan and implement CM solutions in line with the many value dimensions of society as a whole. This means that SP3 and SP9 follow a similar conceptualization of resilience (which is sought to be made increasingly coherent throughout the DRIVER project), but each SP focuses on different ways of addressing society. The main focus of D93.1 is thus to describe and investigate how societal resilience and social cohesion can be strengthened through crisis management that respects key societal values.

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.eu.gov.hk/english/publication/pub\\_bp/files/crisis\\_management.pdf](http://www.eu.gov.hk/english/publication/pub_bp/files/crisis_management.pdf)

This deliverable starts out by giving a short definition of societal resilience and explains that resilience is also about respecting societal values when implementing CM solutions (Chapter 2.1). Chapter 2.2 gives a broad overview of practical and value-based societal needs during crises. Chapter 3 screens a set of Red Cross/Red Crescent, EU and UN policies to see how existing strategies and frameworks for crisis management and disaster risk reduction address societal needs and seek to foster societal resilience. Through that, Chapter 4 identifies opportunities for CM strategies to create positive societal impacts and foster societal resilience on an overarching level. It lists general recommendations for positive intervention and criteria that indicate societal resilience, with a special focus on strengthening the societal value dimension of resilience. In doing so, it introduces, verifies and expands the criteria system developed in the DRIVER workpackage 92, which explores the societal costs and potential negative societal impacts of DRIVER activities and outputs using the same approach and a similar set of assessment criteria. This deliverable furthermore provides a basic set of recommendations for D93.21 and 93.22, where assessments of the DRIVER portfolio of tools (PoT) will be conducted. In sum, Chapter 4 has the following functions:

1. It provides a reality check for the set of criteria for societal impact assessments that has already been developed in WP92. It gives them depth and anchors them in existing policies.
2. It identifies potential additional criteria that can be added in iterations of the criteria system of D93.2 “Tools to assess positive societal impact”, but also in iterations of D92.11 “Report on the creation of Secondary Insecurities” and D92.21 “Report on Assessment & Criteria for Societal Cost incl. Negative Impacts on Society”.
3. It identifies overarching policy recommendations for fostering resilience that is based in societal values.

Criteria and recommendations will be summarized in the concluding chapters 4.1 and 4.2 so that they are ready to be used in 93.2 “Tools to assess positive societal impact”. In deliverable 93.2, the development and refinement of criteria takes place, applying the different criteria to the different categories of DRIVER tools and measures. Once tested and further refined in follow-up deliverables, a final version of the criteria system will be merged with the criteria of 92.1 “Assessment of potential for creation of secondary insecurities” and 92.2 “Assessing the societal cost of DRIVER activities and outputs” and integrated into the DRIVER portfolio of tools (PoT, SP6) and the DRIVER testbed (SP2). Here, the criteria will serve as guideline for tool developers, implementers and end-users to ensure that opportunities for fostering societal values are utilised when implementing DRIVER measures and tools, and that negative impacts on society are avoided. The concluding chapter will present a first idea for how the integration of the criteria system into the PoT could take place.

## 2 What is Societal Resilience?

### 2.1 Societal Resilience: Towards a working definition

Since this deliverable draws key societal values from resilience and CM policies and discusses how societal resilience can be fostered by respecting these values, it is useful and necessary to define what resilience actually means. SP9 provides a broad discussion of resilience below. More detailed discussions on the concept are developed in other workpackages of the DRIVER project, for example, in the internal deliverable D31.21 “SOTA & Conceptual Framework for civil society resilience”. Both, SP3 and SP9, seek to strengthen a coherent understanding of resilience, which is anchored in the idea of including civil society into CM activities. The main difference between the resilience approaches in SP3 and SP9 is the way in which they address civil society. SP3 develops practical solutions that actively include individuals, communities and local governments into CM. SP9 emphasizes that all these resilience and CM solutions can only be efficient and effective if they do not infringe upon, but rather foster societal values. SP9 thus develops a set of criteria that is based on key societal values and addresses the value dimension of society at large. Before returning to the more concrete objectives of SP9, the next few paragraphs shall give a general overview of the different disciplinary homes of resilience.

Resilience has many homes, whether it is ecology<sup>2</sup>, socio-ecology<sup>3</sup>, psychology<sup>4</sup>, engineering<sup>5</sup> or, most recently, the field of security<sup>6</sup> and crisis management<sup>7</sup>. The International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (hereinafter IFRC), for example, defines resilience as “the ability of individuals, communities, organisations, or countries exposed to disasters and 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”<sup>8</sup>. What the resilience definitions within all of these different fields have in common is that they describe it as the ability to deal with change, stress or disturbance through learning and adaptation. In the context of crisis management, resilience also includes processes of self-organization and flexibility. As such, resilience includes both the capacity to withstand shocks (being prepared), but also to recover and to return to normality as swiftly as possible after crisis has hit. This capacity to swiftly return to normality also includes aspects

<sup>2</sup> Holling, C.S. (1973): Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4:1-23.

<sup>3</sup> Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S.R. and A. Kinzig (2004): Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society* 9(2): 5 ; Adger, W. N. (2003): Building Resilience to Promote Sustainability: An Agenda for Coping with Globalisation and Promoting Justice. *IHDP Update* 2:1-3.

<sup>4</sup> Luthar, S.S., Cicchetti, Dante and Bronwyn Becker (2000): The Construct of Resilience: A Critical Evaluation and Guidelines for Future Work. *Child Development* 71(3): 543-562 ; Masten A. S. and N. Garmezy (1985): Risk, vulnerability, and protective factors in developmental psychopathology. In: Lahey B. A. Kazdin (eds) *Advances in clinical child psychology*. Vol. 8. New York: Plenum Press. pp. 1–52.

<sup>5</sup> Pimm, S.L. 1984. The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature* 307:321-326 ; Pimm, S.L., 1991. The Balance of Nature? *Ecological Issues in the Conservation of Species and Communities*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago ;

<sup>6</sup> Perelman, Lewis J. (2007): Shifting Security Paradigm: Towards Resilience. GMU-CIPP Critical Thinking Series.

<sup>7</sup> Longstaff, P.H., Armstrong, N.J., Perrin, K., Parker, W.M., and M.A. Hidek (2010): Building Resilient Communities: A Preliminary Framework for Assessment. *Homeland Security Affairs* VI (3).

<sup>8</sup> IFRC 2012, “The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future.”



of prevention, for example avoiding the aggravation of crises by limiting the distribution of domino-effects. Some resilience definitions also include the capacity to evolve, meaning that society steps out of a crisis as more strengthened than it was before disaster occurred<sup>9</sup>, mostly due to feedback processes and learning effects. In addition, a safe and resilient community can be described as a community that is knowledgeable and physically and psychologically healthy, organised, connected, has infrastructure and services, has a sustainable livelihood providing food, health, shelter and income, can manage natural assets, and – most important for SP9 - that recognizes their values and maintains them (cf. Chapter 3).

In sum, resilience expresses how well (and sometimes how fast) a society can deal with crises<sup>10</sup>.

Which aspects societal resilience includes exactly very much depends on how one defines societal security. Manifold understandings and conceptualizations of resilience exist. A widely used definition of societal security refers to the importance of working infrastructure, such as electricity, transportation, communication, agriculture, heating, water supply, medical care, financial services etc. In that sense, societal resilience has a technical component that requires the resilience of infrastructures. Infrastructure resilience can be organized through both the logistical efforts by infrastructure operators themselves, through hardware and engineering solutions, but also through professional crisis management activities.

This work is closely linked to another important dimension of societal resilience, which is the political dimension. It involves a strong, well-informed leadership in the public sector that is prepared to take decisions under considerable pressure (this will be further discussed in SP3). Decision-making is often trained in advance through preparedness activities. Preparedness training and exercises can also ensure a functioning media and communication landscape that can disseminate important information and give advice. Media are another crucial player in societal resilience since they are influencing the public discourse about the crisis and therewith the general climate of dealing with it.

In addition to that, societal resilience has a strong psychological component that focuses on the emotional aspects of coping with disaster. Originally formulated by Garmezy<sup>11</sup>, psychological resilience refers to children who grow up under disadvantageous circumstances, but still have positive developmental outcomes. It is the ability or competence to adapt to stressful situations, which is not only a personal trait, but also dependent on the societal context individuals are embedded in (cf. relation to D31.21 “SOTA & Conceptual Framework for civil society resilience”, internal Deliverable). Strengthening psychosocial aspects of resilience support services has by now also become a task of professional crisis managers or trained volunteers, which can be part of both, the public and the private sector. This aspect will also be further explored in SP3, which also develops measures and solutions for strengthening psychosocial aspects of resilience.

---

<sup>9</sup> Luthar, S.S., Cicchetti, Dante and Bronwyn Becker (2000): The Construct of Resilience: A Critical Evaluation and Guidelines for Future Work. *Child Development* 71(3): 543-562 ; Folke, C. (2006): Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analysis. *Global Environmental Change* 16: 253-267

<sup>10</sup> Position Paper of the Red Cross EU Office Available at: [http://www.redcross.eu/en/upload/documents/pdf/2014Position\\_Papers/RCEU\\_EU\\_Resilience\\_Consultation\\_2012\\_ready.pdf](http://www.redcross.eu/en/upload/documents/pdf/2014Position_Papers/RCEU_EU_Resilience_Consultation_2012_ready.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Garmezy, N. (1973). Competence and adaptation in adult schizophrenic patients and children at risk. In Dean, S. R. (Ed.), *Schizophrenia: The first ten Dean Award Lectures* (pp. 163-204). NY: MSS Information Corp.

Finally, if societal resilience is a matter of how well a society deals with crises, it necessarily also involves the citizen's engagement, both that of the individual citizen as well as that of a community. The citizen can not only provide crucial information, often captured in the expression "citizen as sensor", because citizens know best about their local situation and share their knowledge with crisis managers through communication media. The citizen is also often understood and "recruited" as a first responder, taking on helper roles during crisis management, first and foremost by preparing for crises practically, but also by self-organizing tasks, such as (minor) medical care, search and rescue, and clean-up efforts.

Following the variety of conceptualizations of resilience one can say that it includes different strategies and actors. They range from the public to the private sector, the media, but also include the engagement of individual citizens and the community. Societal resilience thus requires strategies and responsive capacities that cover the field of technical solutions, political strategies, psychological support, communication plans and much more. Most importantly, all of these strategies include an aspect of self-organization and adaptation. This adaptive capacity is supported by the ability to "store and remember experiences" and "use that memory and experience to learn, innovate, and reorganize resources in order to adapt" (Longstaff et al. 2010: 7).

This table (see Table 1 Resilience Systematization Table) shared in the DoW, stemming from FP7 project ACRIMAS, summarizes these different activities and gives examples of the different dimensions of societal resilience.

Agent Action	Individual	Community	Third-parties (the unaffected)	Public sector	Private sector	Media
<b>Adapt behaviour</b>	<b>Responsible behaviour;</b> e.g. reducing water consumption to put less strain on the system	<b>Responsible communities;</b> E.g. organizing rationing schemes	<b>Responsible behaviour;</b> refraining from harmful behaviour, e.g. Extensive use of telephone lines into the affected area	<b>Responsible government;</b> e.g. adapting public policy to the crisis situation	<b>Responsible business;</b> e.g. reducing power consumption	<b>Responsible media;</b> E.g. refraining from reporting in a way that could jeopardize reponse
<b>Help oneself</b>	<b>Ability to cope;</b> e.g. keeping emergency food stock	<b>Community self-reliance;</b> e.g. setting up local support centres	<b>Ability to cope with secondary effects;</b> E.g. Coping with uncertainty about the situation of next of kin.	<b>Government resilience;</b> e.g. ability of agencies to stay operational	<b>Business continuity;</b> ability to stay operational	<b>Media resilience;</b> ability to keep reporting
<b>Help others</b>	<b>Citizen-to-citizen help;</b> willingness and ability to support others in need; e.g. First aid knowledge	<b>Supportive communities;</b> e.g. Opening community resources for the affected	<b>Understanding of the needs;</b> e.g. informed provision of support, as opposed to uncoordinated provision of goods	<b>Cross-agency coordination;</b> e.g. effective characterisation and communication of demand	<b>Supportive business;</b> e.g. maintaining fair prices despite surge demand, providing to those most in need	<b>Supportive media;</b> e.g. opening media channels to support search for next-of-kin
<b>Help the response</b>	<b>Volunteering;</b> e.g. adequate knowledge on how and how not to engage in the organised response	<b>Engaged communities;</b> e.g. community leaders interacting with organised reponse to find ways to support	<b>Understanding of CM among the public;</b> e.g. informed volunteering allowing better management of volunteers	<b>Professional response;</b> conducting CM at local, regional, national and EU-level in an effective way	<b>Access to commercial resources;</b> e.g. ranging from hotels for housing to excavators for clearing affected areas	<b>Engaged media;</b> e.g. helping to disseminate alerts and critical information

Table 1 Resilience Systematization Table

All of the aspects mentioned above form and inform the concept of societal resilience. An additional and very important aspect that DRIVER would like to emphasize, however, is that the resilience of a society is heavily interwoven with the values that a society shares. This value-dimension has, for example, become visible in different ways after the 9/11 attacks<sup>12</sup> on the US in 2001 and the 22/7 attacks<sup>13</sup> on Norway in 2011. Both societies drew upon shared societal values and collective identities in order to deal with the crises. Norway's then-Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg, for example, stated two days after the attack at a public gathering (24.07.11): "We are still shaken by what hit us, but we will never give up our values. Our answer is more democracy, more openness and more humanity." The mobilization of these values expressed something about the shared priorities and identity of the society and heavily influenced the general climate of dealing with the attacks.

DRIVER seeks to take account of the importance of this value dimension and integrate it into CM. Even though values differ from regional to national contexts, values such as trust, social cohesion, community, solidarity, participation (democracy) are closely related to the idea of common coping and dealing with crises and not least support the idea of helping each other. They are deeply anchored in a range of security policies that the DRIVER project draws upon and speaks to, such as those of the European Union, the United Nations or the Red Cross.

One way of integrating this value-dimension into crisis management is to consequently provide for political and communal strategies that take account of, respect and foster shared values. This means that all CM activities, measures and tools as well as resilience strategies are organized in a way that fosters mutual trust, community and participation, and that carefully and deliberately seeks to avoid negative impacts. This can be done by identifying a set of criteria and principles that CM activities can and should follow in order to minimize or avoid negative secondary impacts of CM on society. Such a criteria system can then serve as a guidance for societal impact assessments: it can be indicated as to whether a measure or tool is neutral vis-à-vis a specific societal value (which is in most cases a positive result), whether the measure or tool infringes upon that value and creates negative societal impacts, or whether a CM measure or tool in fact fosters the value related to in the criterion, which creates a positive impact on society. The latter generally takes extra considerations, which will be discussed in 93.2 "Development and Refinement of Criteria". The idea of the criteria system is thus to serve as guideline to avoid negative and foster positive societal impacts of CM, and thus to strengthen CM and societal resilience as a whole.

While the strengthening of societal resilience can generally be seen as intent to invest into society's coping capacities and positive characteristics, it is important to acknowledge that critique on resilience has grown over the past years. Major critiques are related to policies that exploit the self-organizational and adaptive capacities of societies to shift off CM responsibilities from the state to the citizen and enhance the "remote management" of crises. Remote management describes a tendency of CM professionals to stay within their comfort-zones and manage the actual crisis situation from afar via novel CM technologies instead of directly engaging with the situation – also under the premise that the citizens can "help themselves"<sup>14</sup>. Others criticize resilience policies for embracing the resilient self-organization and responsabilisation of the citizen as a typical trait of

---

<sup>12</sup> Colucci L (2008) *Crusading Realism. The Bush Doctrine and American Core Values After 9/11*. Lanham: University Press of America.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/8659028/Norway-shooting-July-24-as-it-happened.html>

<sup>14</sup> Collinson S and M Duffield (2013) *Paradoxes of Presence*. <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8428.pdf>

modern, neoliberal politics, which entails that crisis victims are left alone to fend with the crisis situation by themselves instead of experiencing the full support of CM professionals<sup>15</sup>. When fostering societal resilience, DRIVER takes account of these criticisms by reflecting on the role of resilience policies within society and by developing CM measures and tools that take the potential negative outcomes of remote management or the disproportionate responsabilisation of the citizen into account. DRIVER seeks to foster the value-dimension of resilience throughout the project, seeking to avoid negative societal impacts and taking advantage of opportunities. Negative impacts on society are discussed in 92.11 “Report on the Creation of Secondary Insecurities” and 92.21 “Report on assessment & Criteria for Societal Cost incl. Negative Impacts to Society”, which are also publicly available at this point in time.

## 2.2 Societal Needs During Crises

---

In accordance with the ‘working definition’ of societal resilience mentioned above, the resilience of a society is dependent on a variety of needs that have to be responded to or restored after crisis has hit. The UNDP definitions about essential dimensions of human needs<sup>16</sup> can give an orientation of those aspects that are also relevant in European emergencies. These dimensions include a functioning economic infrastructure, the availability of food and the provision of health services, such as efficient and operational medical care and disease control. Later reports from UNDP also refer to the role of technological infrastructure during crises, which is a dimension that is of utmost relevance to European crisis management. The reports furthermore stress the need for environmental securities, referring mainly to clean and predictable physical environments as well as the sustainable availability of natural resources. They point to the need for personal security, which is the absence of physical violence whether exercised by the state, other states, individuals, other groups of people. The report also points to the need for political security, which is the existence of stable democratic institutions including the whole range from non-repressive police services to the availability of rights, freedoms and options for participation. Finally, the report emphasizes the importance of being a member of a community that provides cultural identity and a set of values (being well aware of the fact that some communities can also exercise oppressive practices).

Despite the fact that these dimensions have been formulated for crises in the global south and acknowledging that the list of these dimensions is neither conclusive nor definitive and did in fact trigger a vast amount of debate and criticism<sup>17</sup>, these dimensions have nonetheless become conventional wisdom and part of the CM policy discourse altogether. They indicate those basic needs that are addressed by CM policies today. Emphasizing and expanding on the needs for community and societal security, the DRIVER project does not only install tools and measures that enhance resilience in terms of answering basic physical needs, critical infrastructures and services. The project will also address the value-dimension of societal and socio-political needs such as trust, social

---

<sup>15</sup> Joseph J (2013) Resilience as embedded in neoliberalism: a governmentality approach. *Resilience* 1(1): 38-52.

<sup>16</sup> UNDP (1994) Human Development Report. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>17</sup> Paris R (2001) Human Security – Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security* 26(2): 87-102; King G and JL Murray (2001) Rethinking Human Security. *Political Science Quarterly* 116 (4): 585-610; Christie R (2010) Critical Voices to Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique? *Security Dialogue* 41(2): 169-190; Marhja N (2013) Some humans are more Human than Others: Troubling the ‘human’ in human security from a critical feminist perspective. *Security Dialogue* 44 (1): 19-35.

cohesion, community, solidarity and participation that play a big role in fostering societal resilience. The value- dimension of societal resilience is thus an important part of the criteria system and SP9 in general.

Within the deliverables D92.11 and D92.21 a set of key societal criteria (cf. Figure 2 List of Criteria) has been identified and developed to guide the assessments of the societal impacts of DRIVER methods and tools. These criteria can either be infringed upon by CM policies, methods and tools, causing negative effects on society and weakening societal resilience, or they can be understood as something that can be enhanced by CM policies, methods and tools, providing opportunities for positive impacts and fostering societal resilience. While most of the criteria can work positively if being followed or negatively when being infringed upon, some criteria only refer to negative impacts.

POSITIVE/ NEGATIVE IMPACTS	NEGATIVE IMPACTS
Accountability, Applicability, Cultural & Gender Sensitivity, Dignity, Diversity, Freedoms & Protest, Economic Stability, Efficiency & Effectiveness, Employment, Integrity, International Cooperation, Legality & Legitimacy, Non-discrimination, Open society, Participation, Political Reputation, Privacy & Data Protection, Social Cohesion, Solidarity, State-Citizen Relationship, Suitability/ Necessity/ Proportionality, Transparency, Trust, Truthfulness	Unease, Suspicion, Function creep, Misuse, New vulnerabilities, Creating Technology Dependency, Negative Standardization

Figure 2 List of Criteria

For a closer explanation of the criteria categorization, and for definitions of the criteria listed in Figure 2, please check D92.11 and D92.21. The criteria that constitute the first version of the criteria system, introduced in 92.11 and 92.21 and “tested” in relation to CM policies in this deliverable, are based on and consistent with European norms that have been advanced in the political and research landscape, for example in the Fundamental Charter for Human Rights, European Policies or outputs from European research projects that assess societal impacts, as, for example, the FP7-funded projects SIRA or ValueSec, DESSI or PACT. The assessments and recommendations conducted in WP92 and following in the iterations of WP93 deliverables are a direct consequence of this selection of criteria and not to be understood as a normative judgment. The next chapter seeks to cross-check the criteria in the left box in the Figure 2 above with Red Cross/Red Crescent, EU and UN policies to explore further how existing strategies and frameworks for crisis management, disaster risk reduction and resilience address societal needs and reflect the societal value-dimensin. The list of criteria and the resulting recommendations will be developed, enhanced and fine-tuned by applying them to DRIVER measures and tools during the upcoming experimental campaigns in order to finally feed into the JEs and FD as well as into the DRIVER PoT.

### 3 Insights from Existing Frameworks, Policies & Reports

Societal resilience can be fostered by answering practical needs and value-based needs of a society in crisis. In this chapter we discuss opportunities for positive intervention to strengthen the value-dimension of societal resilience. This chapter checks to which extent the criteria (cf. Figure 2), that constitute the SP9 criteria system, are reflected in the content of the EU, IFRC and UN CM policy documents. The overall aim is to expand and strengthen the criteria system that has already been developed for WP92, the assessment of negative societal impacts, and will also be used for the assessments of positive societal impacts in 93.2. This means that the already existing criteria from WP92 are put to use in this deliverable and that *additional* criteria are identified from the policy documents that will be added to the criteria system (cf. Chapter 4).

Although the various criteria are not always literally mentioned in the analysed documents, the links between the documents and the basic understanding implied in the criteria developed in WP92 is apparent, either explicitly or implicitly. The chapter thus creates an understanding of how existing CM techniques refer to societal values and how taking these criteria into account when developing or implementing CM measures and tools can strengthen societal resilience. It furthermore highlights opportunities for positive intervention based on key societal values. By applying the criteria to existing guidelines, frameworks and CM techniques, the chapter provides an analysis in view of the following:

1. It provides a *reality-check of existing* criteria that have been developed in WP92, an overview of which can be found in D92.11 and D92.21. The list of existent criteria can be consulted in Figure 2 above.
2. This chapter furthermore identifies *additional* criteria in given IFRC, UN and EU guidelines, frameworks and reports which can be added to the list of criteria to assess opportunities for positive impacts through CM.
3. Finally, this chapter draws concrete conclusions about recommendations for positive interventions based on the given IFRC, EU and UN guidelines, frameworks and reports. The analysis focuses only on those criteria and recommendations that are overarching or general and relevant to the DRIVER context. This means that a vast amount of criteria and recommendations is not listed here, for example if they speak specifically and exclusively to the context of developing countries and cannot be generalized for the European context.

Each of the following sub-chapters has the following structure. It first gives a short introduction to the overarching CM and resilience policies of the IFRC, EU or UN. What follows is one sub-section per document, each of which introduces the document, explains the understanding of resilience used in the document, outlines the relation to the key societal criteria derived from WP92, before it finally gives general recommendations on opportunities for positive intervention, based on the insights from the relevant document. Repetitions of criteria and recommendations throughout the whole deliverable emphasize the importance of the respective criteria or recommendations. This means that recurring criteria or recommendations are not skipped even though they might already have been mentioned. However, the frequent appearance of a criterion or a certain recommendation is



not always an indicator for importance. It is crucial that the utilization of the dynamic criteria system comes with the understanding that the relevance of the different criteria is strictly context dependent. A consolidated list of criteria and recommendations for policy can be found in Chapter 4. The following three subchapters will describe the most relevant lessons learned and insights from Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports from the Red Cross Red Crescent, EU and the UN.

### 3.1 Red Cross Red Crescent Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports

---

#### 3.1.1 Introduction: The Fundamental Principles of the International IFRC movement

All reports and papers produced by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (hereinafter “the Movement”) regarding resilience are guided by the same set of values that are shared throughout the Movement and that guide all activities – the seven Fundamental Principles<sup>18</sup>:

1. **Humanity:** The Movement’s aim is to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all people.
2. **Impartiality:** The Movement makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavours to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.
3. **Neutrality:** In order to continue to enjoy the confidence of all, the Movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.
4. **Independence:** The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement.
5. **Voluntary Service:** It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.
6. **Unity:** There can be only one Red Cross or one Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry on its humanitarian work throughout its territory.
7. **Universality:** The Movement, in which all Societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.

In addition, the below mentioned principles also guide the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (hereinafter IFRC) global agenda and priorities. The current goals are laid down in the Strategy 2020<sup>19</sup> of the IFRC and closely relate to issues touched upon in this deliverable – in particular the value dimension of societal resilience. The main aims of the IFRC strategy 2020 is to:

- Save lives, protect livelihoods, and strengthen recovery from disasters and crises,
- Enable healthy and safe living,
- Promote social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.ifrc.org/en/who-we-are/vision-and-mission/the-seven-fundamental-principles/>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.ifrc.org/who-we-are/vision-and-mission/strategy-2020/>



The Strategy 2020 was adopted by the Federation's General Assembly in November 2009 and was the result of extensive consultation within the Movement and with external partners. Guided by the statutes and strategy of the Movement, it consolidated previous policies and strategies and guided the development of the strategy papers on resilience which was published after 2010.

### 3.1.2 “The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

For a long time, humanitarian efforts were confined to the immediate response post crises or disasters, but now individuals and communities around the world are being subject to simultaneous and consecutive shocks which harm or endanger their lives and livelihoods. In this perspective, resilience is not only the ability of responding to negative events, but a process of positive adaptation before, during and after the crisis (cf. CM cycle in Chapter 1). Thus it is also about addressing and reducing the underlying vulnerabilities and building the capacities of people to better cope with future shocks. This report was published in 2012 as a discussion paper, in order to offer humanitarian based reflections to key stakeholders on the topic of resilience. Based on the international perspective of the IFRC Movement, it understands resilience as closely linked to sustainable development. It defines resilience and gives practical examples of why resilience is a people centred approach not to be thought of only in terms of disaster response, but by also linking it with risk reduction, public health, sustainable development and the protection of human rights.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

The report contains the definition of resilience proposed by the IFRC and offers a comprehensive approach that addresses social and economic factors and different levels (individual, community, national and global). Therefore it is often referred to and cited (cf. definition of resilience in the DRIVER-DOW for SP3). On the one hand, the Movement's understanding of resilience is informed by the abovementioned Fundamental Principles and is thus grounded on values shared by IFRC national societies around the globe. At the same time it is not understood as an academic concept but focused on its practical application to reduce the vulnerabilities of people and save lives and livelihoods. Concrete examples of characteristics of resilient communities are given.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Legality/legitimacy:** Legal frameworks such as the Human Rights shall be respected.

**Participation:** Resilience is nothing that any outsider can simply bring to individuals or communities, but individuals, households and communities need to strengthen their *own* resilience – an effort that must be recognized and assessed through a people centred approach.

**Diversity, Cultural and gender sensitivity, Dignity & Non-discrimination:** Within any community there are groups who are marginalized or disadvantaged in some way and who may require particular attention to ensure inclusion. Groups can be excluded from participating in society on the basis of religion, gender or other grounds. These groups are often particularly vulnerable as a direct result of their limited voice in decision-making on the issues which affect them. Specific actions must be taken to consider and ensure that their views are incorporated into any analysis activities taking

place in the community. When trying to strengthen resilience, both social and cultural local values shall be maintained (if not conflicting with fundamental principles or human rights) and human dignity respected.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- If communities and households are knowledgeable and healthy, fostering resilience is an easier task. Increasing knowledge about crisis and crisis management can mean that individuals face a crisis more prepared.
- Ensuring individual health can increase the overall resilience in society, as the individuals are better equipped to be prepared if they are of good health.
- Encourage the building of networks to make individuals stay connected to each other, as awareness-raising and communicating can increase resilience in the population.
- Build and protect strong infrastructure and services to make systems and material functions more resilient to shocks and crisis.

#### 3.1.3 “Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

This paper compiled by the Red Cross EU office in 2012 presents the IFRC definition of resilience and makes eight recommendations to EU and its member states to strengthen community resilience. It is thus targeting opinion leaders, decision makers and donors.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

The report is grounded on the same resilience definition as before, stating that resilience is:

*[...] the ability of individuals, communities, organizations, or countries exposed to disasters and 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.*

It is a people-centred approach focusing on the abilities and capacities of people, based on different human, psychological, social, financial, physical, natural and political assets. The objective of strengthening resilience is to increase this capacity to withstand the effects of adversity. It points out that individuals, communities, organizations and countries are not only exposed to disasters and crises, but also to underlying causes of vulnerability. This is why the core of the IFRC resilience approach is highlighting the overlapping nature of preparedness, relief and recovery work and bridging these with development work. Eight recommendations to policy makers are formulated regarding which principles shall be followed when aiming at strengthening (societal) resilience:

1. Put people first
2. Respect local ownership
3. Ensure comprehensive cross-sectorial assessment, planning and implementation
4. Include the most vulnerable groups
5. Build Red Cross Red Crescent capacities
6. Incorporate a long-term perspective
7. Work in partnership

8. Strengthen the unique role of Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies as auxiliaries to governments and authorities to increase impact and scale

**SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Social cohesion, Participation:** Respect local ownership. According to IFRC it is important to focus on building local ownership, assets and capacity, as well as a link with local government and actors, and to avoid dependency or substitution. According to the IFRC community ownership has a direct impact on both, the success and sustainability of programs. Communities need to be consulted and included in the earliest stages of programs inception, so as to capture their support and ensure that their needs are met.

**In/equalities & in/justice:** Consider existing power relations when strengthening resilience. Previously existing inequalities and dependencies shall be reduced.

**Economic stability, Sustainability (including long-term commitment & development):** The IFRC resilience definition focuses on coping with a crisis without compromising prospects for a positive long-term development in the society. This aspect is related with the existing criterion of economic stability but go further. After a disaster, communities shall at least bounce-back to equilibrium – but preferably build back better.

**Participation, Diversity, Cultural- and gender sensitivity:** To strengthen resilience, the most vulnerable groups must be included in the planning of the resilience measures. Within any community there are groups who are marginalized or disadvantaged in some way (e.g. on the basis of gender or cultural factors) and who may require particular attention to ensure that they are included. These groups are often particularly vulnerable as a direct result of their limited voice in decision-making on the issues which affect them. They must be considered and specific actions taken to ensure that their views are incorporated into any analysis activities taking place in the community.

**General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Governments should include Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in their country development plans and bring all stakeholders on board for its implementation. Effective and sustainable security planning must prioritize DRR and early actions, because strengthening resilience to shocks is far less costly than responding afterwards.
- All actors must work in global and local partnerships to strengthen resilience, including enacting the necessary reforms of governance at all levels; to strengthen accountability and transparency in the process.
- Promote resilience by creating conditions for sustainable livelihoods and new opportunities, such as the use of new technology or by performing risk assessments.
- Governments should invest in community infrastructures and social services with a focus on access to key services, such as health.
- Governments are encouraged to establish and/or update relevant disaster- or crisis management legislation.
- The organized participation of the local communities themselves is a precondition for progressing resilience.
- Good governance in the resilience efforts requires an equitable distribution of resources.
- Establish joint accountability mechanisms based on the priorities identified through risk assessments etc.
- Aim at providing flexible and long-term funding schemes to build resilience.
- Resilience initiatives must not disproportionately infringe upon the well-being of individuals.

- Ensure good coordination between various resilience initiatives to maximize impacts and synergies.

### 3.1.4 “Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

This report was jointly published by British Red Cross and the IFRC in October 2013. It builds on the approach described above, combining resilience in the context of natural hazards with development, specifically to ensure that the post- 2015 development goals include resilience and are better able to deal with and respond to disasters and long-term stresses.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

The document is based on the IFRC definition of resilience, and regards resilience not only as an abstract concept, but seeks to take up important elements as a programmatic or planned approach. Resilience is described as a multi-sectorial and cross-cutting issue, and shall not focus exclusively on responding to shocks and implementing measures that only target to reduce loss. Also, more gradual and social events must be taken into account, such as demographic shifts and economic decline, which can, when adding up over time, have an impact on communities affected by crisis. Furthermore, a crisis does not impact everyone equally, but often hit poor communities, women and vulnerable groups harder.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Social cohesion:** Social cohesion with a focus on trust, respect and harmony in and across communities is important for resilience at local level and shall be enhanced. Possible indicators for enhancement could be derived from membership rates of organizations or from civic participation.

**Gender sensitivity:** As women and marginalized groups can potentially suffer disproportionately during and after crises, resilience enhancements could be mainstreamed with other interrelated sector goals, such a gender. Enhancement can only be reached by empowering vulnerable individuals.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Resilience should not focus exclusively on responding to shocks, and on implementing measures that only target to reduce some forms of loss.
- Resilience measures should foster and not harm social cohesion and trust.
- Especially vulnerable groups shall be empowered through enhancing community resilience.

## 3.2 EU Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports

---

### 3.2.1 Introduction: The EU approach to resilience

When it comes to crisis management in the EU, the focus on resilience has increased throughout the last decade, as shown in a number of policy documents and reports. The link between food security and resilience has been particularly strong. Resilience however, is also highly relevant in the broader context of disaster risk reduction, societal resilience, and capacity building, which will be reflected in the following. Some of the most prominent features of EU resilience are described below. Insights into the concept of resilience can be gained from the descriptions of resilience strategies and also the context in which resilience is brought up. Although a clear definition of resilience is not always set out in the documents, it appears “between the lines” (as described in the introduction to Chapter 3), and often more linked to CM preparedness, response and risk or disaster reduction. Criteria and recommendations derive from the document, but not always directly. They are sometimes interpreted in the context of CM by the authors of this document to make it DRIVER-relevant. Two of the main resilience initiatives by the EU the last decades, the AGIR-project<sup>20</sup> and the Share-initiative<sup>21</sup> are mainly about humanitarian aid and development and not CM. The aim is to generalize lessons learned from such documents, and to apply the lessons and insights to crisis management and to DRIVER. An overarching insight from the EU policies is that actions to foster sustainable resilience must be multi-sectorial, multi-partner, multi-level and strategically and jointly planned by the people affected or at risk, governments and civil society.

### 3.2.2 “Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The “Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020” was released by the European Commission on the 19<sup>th</sup> of June 2013, and describes the implementation of principles to increase resilience. It adds to resilience policies described in “The EU approach to resilience: Learning from food security crisis<sup>22</sup>” from October 2012. The EU approach to resilience in the Action Plan claims to add value to the already existing EU commitments to risk management<sup>23</sup> and resilience, including initiatives on disaster risk reduction (DRR), which is relevant for many European countries. It lays the foundation for more effective EU collaborative action on building resilience, by stressing the importance of bringing together humanitarian action, long-term development cooperation and on-going political engagement.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

As with several of the EU policy documents, resilience is here explicitly described as the ability of an individual, a household, a community, a country or a region to withstand, to adapt to, and to quickly

---

<sup>20</sup> AGIR - the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative – was launched in 2012 with the aim of achieving 'Zero Hunger' in Sahel within the next 20 years. The EU was closely involved in establishing AGIR and provides continued large-scale support.

<sup>21</sup> The SHARE initiative for the Horn of Africa was launched by the European Commission in 2011 with the goal of improving the ability of people, communities and countries to face recurrent crises.

<sup>22</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com\\_2012\\_586\\_resilience\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2012_586_resilience_en.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> Risk is here understood as «covering natural hazard, human induced disasters, economic shocks, conflict related aspects, including the interplay of multiple risks causing complex emergencies».

recover from stresses and shocks (e.g. a crisis). This would mean that resilience is linked to several actions in the crisis, both in terms of resisting and tolerating a crisis, adapting to it when it happens, and “bouncing back” to normal, all of which basically relates to something appearing *after* a crisis has hit. The Action Plan stresses that resilience shall not be understood as an “isolated objective, but as an integral part of the [...] aims of the EU’s external assistance”. The definition reflects both a people-centred approach and the inclusion of individual (life-cycle) risks, and a more practical approach, focusing on more systemic resilience. This could also include a value-dimension, if the aim is, for example, to strengthen trust or social cohesion.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Diversity:** The plan describes a people-centred approach to resilience. Resilience must bring sustainable benefits to the most vulnerable populations and households, taking into account the diversity of needs of those living in areas most exposed to risks.

**Applicability & Effectiveness:** For it to be applicable and effective a resilience approach cannot be applied to all EU assistance at the same time. A series of tools and approaches have to be further developed to support resilience in differing contexts, building on existing evidence. A thorough analysis of lessons learned is thus valuable for applicability and effectiveness, to know where and how heavy efforts should be made.

**Participation:** Provide access to knowledge and information to increase community resilience. Address social norms and improve acquisition of life skills for better health, environmental protection, peace building and employability.

**Political reputation & Accountability:** Resilience should be country-led and country-owned. National strategies will require firm political commitments and accountability, and may involve institutional change and technical support, including in-country coordination mechanisms. A lack of dedication towards this kind of progress could influence the political reputation for the state at stake.

**International cooperation:** A central and fundamental precondition for resilience is good cooperation and a common understanding of the goal.

**Suitability, necessity & proportionality:** Current practices and methods should be challenged and constantly improved. New approaches should be considered that are appropriate for different contexts, they have to be suitable for the situation, necessary and proportional.

**Non-discrimination:** The resilience approach must be people-centred and focus on values such as equity, thus be non-discriminatory.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Include resilience in national and international frameworks and strategies, as it is a precondition for sustainable results.
- Building resilience should happen on both local and national level.
- The task of fostering resilience should be country-owned and country-led in an accountable way.
- Resilience actions must be sustainable, multi-sectorial, multi-partner, multi-level and strategically and jointly planned by the people affected or at risk, governments and civil society.

- Resilience actions must take account of differing contexts, building on existing experience and through constant lessons learned.
- The resilience approach must be people-centred and focus on equity; this includes taking individual risks into account.
- It is important to agree on what the objectives for resilience are. For crisis management this could include making sure that diversity and non-discrimination is respected, by recognizing that different people have different needs in different contexts.
- Building a body of evidence on the effectiveness of new approaches to resilience is valuable for resilience to be implemented systemically in key policies,.
- Having a common understanding of the objectives of the resilience effort is important also for crisis management.

### 3.2.3 “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

“Disaster Risk Reduction” was released in September 2013 by the European commission. It is the fifth in a series of six thematic policy documents entitled “DG ECHO Thematic Policy Document”. The purpose of the document is to present The European Commission's Humanitarian aid and Civil Protection department's (DG ECHO's) current policy, priorities and practice on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR). It addressed staff in DG ECHO and other EC services, implementing partners and other stakeholders. Some of the main points of the policy document is that resilience can be increased by reducing disaster risk (mainly in humanitarian action, but not limited to it), and that DG ECHO has a people- centred approach on DRR. It focuses on strengthening resilience to shocks caused by natural hazards (again relevant for DRIVER). It should also be highlighted that while the policy document focuses on resilience in humanitarian action, its lessons may be generalized and applied (at least partly) to the area of crisis management in general.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

As many of the other EU policy documents, the definition and understanding of resilience is:

*The ability of a system, community or society exposed to a hazard to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions.*

This definition follows the 2009 UNISDR terminology<sup>24</sup>, and points to a rather structural and practical understanding of resilience, not excluding the social or value dimension, but not stressing it either. Resilience is here put in direct context with disaster risk, and the title might even suggest that the two concepts relate to each other as sort of a trade-off model.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

---

<sup>24</sup> In the terminology available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology>, there is a comment attached to the resilience definition. « Resilience means the ability to “resile from” or “spring back from” a shock. The resilience of a community in respect to potential hazard events is determined by the degree to which the community has the necessary resources and is capable of organizing itself both prior to and during times of need. »



**International cooperation:** Promoting resilience in international forums such as the G8 will underscore its importance. For countries facing recurrent crises, the EU will work with host governments, other donors, regional and international organizations etc. to create platforms at country level for ensuring timely exchange of information and coordination of short, medium and long term actions to strengthen resilience.

**Applicability:** The approach to resilience enhances risk assessments as a way of fostering applicability of the strategy.

**Diversity & Non-discrimination:** The strategy to increase resilience in the EU starts from the concept of inclusion, meaning that all groups in society should be included in the effort.

**Participation:** The approach to resilience assumes a bottom-up approach to crisis- and disaster management as a foundation for resilience. This will necessarily mean ensuring broad public participation.

**Sustainability:** The document affirms that investing in resilience and risk reduction increases the value and sustainability also in other areas. DRR is described as a good practice and essential to strengthening resilience as it enables communities to anticipate, absorb and bounce back from shocks and it is important for sustainable development (not only relevant for developing countries).

**Gender neutrality:** Community resilience and community preparedness cannot be achieved successfully if the gender roles and dynamics are not taken into account. Gender issues are to be considered when conducting a risk analysis.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Local responses to crisis and risk reduction are essential to increase resilience to emergencies.
- Resilience can only be built bottom-up.
- Action to strengthen resilience must be based on sound methodologies for risk and vulnerability assessments.
- Flexibility is important when responding to the needs of a country struck by crisis.
- When performing risk analysis to improve resilience, gender and age must be taken into account.
- Talking about resilience in international forums can underline its importance for crisis management.
- All groups in society need to be included in the resilience strategy.
- Fostering resilience in the crisis context may have positive spill-over effects in other areas.

#### 3.2.4 “Building Resilience: The EU’s approach”

##### **Introduction to the document:**

The factsheet “Building Resilience: The EU’s approach” was released by the European Commission in 2014. The main points are some key messages for building resilience, such as helping people help themselves in their local contexts, that investing in risk reduction and resilience demands less resources than responding to an actual crisis, and that integration of resilience into other countries and regions is important. The factsheet is meant as a basic introduction to the EU’s approach to resilience. It follows the general assumption that the world is facing an increasing amount of



disasters and crisis, fuelled by e.g. population growth and urbanization. Although it partly builds and refers to already existing policies and documents, the factsheet is significant because it appears as more available to the public. It can be assumed that it is more frequently used or read by the general population and thus might shape the public understanding of resilience.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

The factsheet employs the common EU definition where resilience is understood as the ability of an individual, a household, community, country or region to withstand, cope, adapt, and quickly recover from stresses and shocks such as violence, conflict, drought and other natural disasters without compromising long-term development.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**International cooperation & treaties:** Resilience is fostered through the involvement of local authorities, national governments and regional institutions. This exemplifies the importance of international cooperation and the potential need for (novel) regulatory measures.

**Efficiency & effectiveness:** Reflecting a proactive approach to resilience, investing in resilience-enhancing measures today is more effective both in terms of financial efficiency and in terms of social efficiency/ participation. This is especially the case for a country or region that is facing recurrent or anticipated crisis, such as hurricanes, ice storms or floods.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- It is important to integrate resilience into more governmental and regional policies, adding to the ongoing progress of the integration into policies regarding climate change, DRR, social protection etc.
- The investment in resilience is more cost effective than responding to a crisis that has already happened, also because it may have positive spill-over effects into other domains.
- The approach to resilience should be proactive.
- Enhancing international cooperation on all levels is crucial to enforce the societies in their resilience efforts.
- Resilience measures should be targeted at the most vulnerable population.
- Resilience and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) must be considered together.

#### 3.2.5 “AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa”

##### **Introduction to the document:**

In 2012, the European Union launched two flagship resilience initiatives, the Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience (Share) and l'Alliance Globale pour l'Initiative Resilience Sahel (AGIR). Share is designed to improve the opportunities of farming and pastoralist communities and the capacity of public services to respond to crises. AGIR seeks to improve the coordination of humanitarian and

development aid to protect some of the most vulnerable people when a drought hits. AGIR also focuses on improving early warning systems and has links to the insurance industry<sup>25</sup>.

“AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa” is a factsheet by the European Commission- Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, released in 2014. With the primary aim of achieving “zero hunger” in Sahel within the next 20 years, the AGIR project is about sustainable development and aid, but there are lessons to be learned and generalized from this approach that is relatable to a wider resilience context of crisis management. Climate change and population growth are examples of factors that can influence the implementation of resilience efforts, independent of the level of development etc.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Similar to many of the EU policy documents analysed in this Deliverable, the definition of resilience is as following:

*The capacity of vulnerable households, families and systems to face uncertainty and the risk of shocks, to withstand and respond effectively to shocks, as well as to recover and adapt in a sustainable manner.*

The definition is based on a “series of consultations between Sahelian and West African countries, regional organizations, organizations of agricultural producers and pastoralists, the private sector, civil society, financial partners and non-governmental organizations”. This definition includes both the preparatory phase and the response to the shock, where the core of the resilience can be said to be when a family, household or system (no mention of the individual in this definition) not only has recovered from the shock, but adapted to it in a way that makes it/them better prepared for encountering shocks in the future.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Participation:** The number of people who have access to basic social services is described as a benchmark for the success of resilience measures. This could for example mean to encourage the participation and strengthening of key elements in the lives of the vulnerable parts of the crisis population, such as low- income households and the unemployed.

**Gender neutrality & Dignity:** In light of cultural and gender-based factors, consider the particular roles of the different individuals in the household. This means for example that women’s role as breastfeeding mothers needs to be taken particular care of in a crisis.

**Sustainability:** Despite being a multi-level approach, it is not possible or sustainable to focus on building resilience on all levels, at all times. This necessitates deciding upon areas for priority actions.

**Trust & Political reputation:** If the crisis population does not trust the administrative- or governmental actors that are implementing the crisis effort, the implementation of the efforts is less likely to be successful. The general trust in the population will influence the trust in new measures that are suggested.

**Economic stability:** The economic stability of the community struck by crisis will influence how the community is able to act resilient in the aftermath and in the response- phase of a crisis.

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2012/oct/03/eu-policy-building-resilience-disaster>

### General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:

- Distribution of resources needs to happen according to a pre-defined plan, and should care in particular about the most vulnerable within the relevant crisis population.
- For the most vulnerable, a qualitative improvement of overall livelihood can increase resilience in case of a crisis.
- To increase resilience, it needs to be integrated both in national and international efforts and plans.
- Decide upon areas for priority action.
- The resilience measures are more likely to be successful if the population has trust in the government, and the political reputation of the implementers is not fragile.

#### 3.2.6 “Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014”

##### Introduction to the document:

The implementation plan is a “Commission Staff Working Document” released in 2011 by the European Commission. Several documents, such as the Communication “EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries” and the Communication “Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters” was communicated to the European Parliament previous to the Implementation plan, and the EU DRR Strategy was endorsed by the General Affairs and External Relations Council in May 2009. Following the Council Conclusions, the Commission established a Steering Group which resulted in the “Support Study for the Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for Supporting DRR in Developing Countries” which also fed into this Implementation Plan. The preparation of the Implementation Plan was based on stocktaking of on-going and planned EU-supported DRR activities. These identified trends and gaps in relation to the objectives, implementation priorities and actions. Also, the plan is an example of how disaster risk reduction (DRR) can contribute increasing resilience. The strategy itself, as described in the Communication «EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries» is also reflected in this subchapter<sup>26</sup>.

##### Understanding of resilience in the document:

No explicit definition of resilience is set forth in the document, but the link to and importance of the “Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) of 2005-2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters” is underlined. Taking the definition from the HFA (from the UN), it underscores the value and importance of lessons learned to increase resilience within a “social system”.

*The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure. This is determined by the degree to which the social system is capable of organizing itself to increase this capacity for learning from past disasters for better future protection and to improve risk reduction measures.*

This approach to resilience emphasizes participation and the responsibility of the crisis population, the link to DRR and the acknowledgement of the *acceptable* level of risk.

<sup>26</sup> [http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8653\\_COM200984ENACTEf.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8653_COM200984ENACTEf.pdf)

### SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:

**International collaboration and Participation:** Resilience is an integrated approach where consultations with civil society and international organizations have to be done in a thorough way. Groups have to actively contribute.

**Gender neutrality:** DRR and mitigation approaches need to be integrated and cross-cutting issues such as gender need to be paid attention to and reflected upon in terms of adaptation.

**Applicability:** DRR remains an approach that is still only emerging with regard to the policy agenda of most countries. This points to the fact that there the translation from words into action is crucial.

**Participation & State-citizen relationship:** Governments need to value and work with community-based achievements for effective vulnerability reduction as a way of fostering resilience. In the specific context of crisis management, this can mean to engage in crisis preparedness activities in local communities, such as communities in immediate proximity to lakes and rivers particularly prone to flooding.

### General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:

- Include the civil society and relevant organizations when planning for resilience measures.
- Ensure a multi-angle approach to fostering resilience.
- Consider both slow- and rapid-onset disasters, and large-scale as well as localized but frequently occurring disasters.
- Improving communication and cooperation between states and regions is not a one-shot target, but something persistent.
- Include all organizational levels in the action plans on DRR/ fostering resilience, especially on regional and local level.

### 3.2.7 “The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”

#### Introduction to the document:

“The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe” is a policy proposal (Communication) from the European Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, released in November 2010. EU Security Strategy puts forward a shared agenda for Member States, the European Parliament, the Commission, the Council and agencies and e.g. civil society and local authorities. In this document, the actions for implementing the strategy builds on what Member States and EU institutions have already agreed upon, and proposes how collaboration throughout the next four years can be “more effective in fighting and preventing serious and organized crime, terrorism and cybercrime, in strengthening the management of our external borders and in building resilience to natural and man-made disasters”. The Internal Security Strategy sets out the challenges, principles and guidelines for how to deal with the most urgent security challenges, in a five-step approach. Natural and man-made disasters (maybe most relevant in the context of DRIVER) is one of the most prominent threats, together with serious and organized crime, terrorism, cybercrime and

border security. The Lisbon Treaty<sup>27</sup> acts as a legal framework for the Internal Security Strategy in Action.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

No explicit definition of resilience is described in the document, but overall, resilience is put into the context of security. It is also put in direct linkage with *building resilience to natural and man-made disasters*. Later, it is explicitly referred to as resilience of network and information infrastructure, which is a more material and structural, and less people-centred form of resilience approach as some of the other documents described in this Deliverable, for example the Action Plan: «Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020».

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**International cooperation:** The strengthening of international cooperation is important, especially in relation to legal and structural developments for improving the security and safety of international supply chains and movement of goods across EU borders.

**Necessity & Applicability:** In recent years there has been an increase in the frequency and scale of natural and man-made disasters in Europe. The need for a stronger, more coherent and better integrated European crisis and disaster response capacity has appeared, as well as capacity for the implementation of existing disaster prevention policies and legislation.

**Social cohesion & State-citizen relationship:** Enforcing social cohesion is a way of preparing and strengthening society and local communities against future crisis. This can include the prevention of radicalization and the recruitment to criminal and terrorist networks.

**Legality:** The introduction of the so-called solidarity clause in the Lisbon Treaty<sup>28</sup> introduces a legal obligation on the EU and its Member States to assist each other when a Member State is the object of a terrorist attack or a natural or man-made disaster. Fostering resilience is to aim for better organization and preparedness, both in terms of response and preparation.

**Efficiency & Solidarity:** The potential crises Europe is facing (climate change, terrorism and cyber-attacks) necessitate improvements of long-standing crisis and disaster-management practices in terms of efficiency and coherence. They require “both solidarity in response, and responsibility in prevention and preparedness with an emphasis on better risk assessment and risk management at EU level of all potential hazards.”

#### **General Recommendations & Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- In general, strengthening social cohesion, such as protecting values like freedom and diversity, can make the population more resilient against shocks, and potentially influence the state-citizen relationship in a positive way.
- As all other electronic and digital systems, crisis management tools may potentially be subject to criminal acts or attempts of intrusion. Increasing the capability of dealing with cyber-attacks is thus another action point for crisis management.
- Being able to quickly assemble and put together resources is important after a crisis.

---

<sup>27</sup> Article 222 TFEU.

<sup>28</sup> Article 222 TFEU.

- Effective coordination between different crisis actors requires a coherent general framework to protect classified information.

### 3.2.8 "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience"

#### Introduction to the document:

"Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience" is a Communication (a policy proposal) from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic & Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions. It was released in March 2009. The document describes how some of the ICT (Information and Communication Technologies) infrastructures are a vital part of European economy and society, providing goods or services or supporting other critical infrastructures. Some ICTs are regarded as critical information infrastructures (CIIs), which if disrupted would have serious implications on vital societal functions. The aim of the document is therefore to focus on prevention, preparedness and awareness and define a plan of immediate actions to strengthen the security and resilience of CIIs. Four broader challenges are highlighted as important to strengthen resilience and security:

- 1) Uneven and uncoordinated national approaches to resilience and security,
- 2) the need for a new European governance model for CIIs,
- 3) limited European early warning and incident response capability, and
- 4) international cooperation.

#### Understanding of resilience in the document:

No explicit definition of resilience is described in the document, but resilience is linked to the security and preparedness of ICT infrastructures. Wherever resilience is explicitly mentioned throughout the document, it is almost always paired with security.

#### SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:

**Diversity, Applicability, Transparency, Trust & Accountability:** In order to utilize ICT structures to the fullest, in terms of social and economic opportunities, it is important that all stakeholders have a high level of trust in them. This depends on various elements, the most important of which is to ensure their high level of security and resilience. Diversity, openness, interoperability, usability (applicability), transparency and accountability are key drivers for security development and resilience.

**Trust & Truthfulness:** A key goal is to strengthen of the security and the trust in the information society. This means e.g. to coordinate efforts to build trust and confidence in electronic communications and services. Truthful information is a precondition for generating trust.

**Integrity:** Integrity is an important aspect of network security and resilience, which means that the operators' obligation to meet risks in an appropriate way and to report security breaches has to be strengthened.

**International cooperation & treaties:** With cyber-threats, European societies are facing a borderless threat. It is thus important to join and coordinating efforts to increase resilience.

**Economic stability:** Systematically strengthening critical information infrastructure is vital for the economic resilience and societal growth of the EU.

**Effectivity & Efficiency:** Resilience means being able to respond to known and unknown threats. National approaches to resilience are too fragmented and inefficient across overall Europe. Agreements on resilience and risk policies among member states and shared policy objectives can counteract this and also stimulate cooperation in other fields.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Stakeholders need to be aware of potential threats. A good understanding and analysis of the attacks, crisis or disasters is important to move forward and increase resilience.
- Ensuring resilience and security of all ICT structures cannot be a task for one single stakeholder. A Europe-wide multi-stakeholder governance network needs to bridge the gap between national policy-making and operational reality on the ground.
- Crisis management will be truly effective only if all participants have reliable information to act upon.
- Simulating incidents and running exercises to test response capabilities are strategic in enhancing the security and resilience of CIs, in particular by focusing on flexible strategies and processes for dealing with the unpredictability of potential crises.
- Coordinated action during the crisis, and a more structured exchange of information and good practices can improve the capability during crisis.
- For resilience of the internet, there is a need for targeted action, but at the same time the distributed nature of the internet and other infrastructures is one of the key components to resilience and stability. This can help a faster recovery than would normally be the case with over-formalized and top-down approaches.

### 3.3 UN Resilience Frameworks, Policies & Reports

#### 3.3.1 Introduction: Resilience in the United Nations

Within the United Nations, the focus on resilience is related to various policy documents. Through the review of the Yokohama Strategy<sup>29</sup> (see 3.3.3), several lessons learned and gaps identified are underscored. These include, for example, ensuring more systematic action to address disaster risks and building resilience by enhancing national and local capabilities to manage and reduce risk. The review stresses the importance of a more pro-active approach to informing, motivating and involving people in all aspects of DRR in their own communities. The World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005 adopted the strategic goal of strengthening institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards<sup>30</sup>. The UN has also adopted a common definition of resilience, which is: “The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and

<sup>29</sup> Review of the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World (A/CONF.206/L.1).

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.unisdr.org/2005/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf>



restoration of its essential basic structures and functions”<sup>31</sup>. A special focus has also been directed at making cities resilient, as described in the “Making Cities Resilient: My City is getting ready!” campaign, launched in May 2010, which addresses issues of local governance and urban risk<sup>32</sup>. In sum, resilience must be considered a central goal and priority in the UN.

### 3.3.2 “The Hyogo framework for action (HFA) (2005-2015): Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The World Conference on Disaster Reduction was held from 18 to 22 January 2005 in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan, and adopted this Framework for Action 2005-2015. It provides a systematic and strategic approach to reducing vulnerabilities to risks and hazards, and underscores the need for ways of building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters and crisis. The scope of this framework encompasses disasters and hazards of natural origin and environmental and technological risks and hazards. Thus, it takes account of a multi-hazard approach to fostering resilience. The Framework stresses a more pro-active approach to informing, motivating and involving people in all aspects of disaster risk reduction in their own local environments. With the main goal to reduce disaster losses, the following strategic goals are identified in the Framework: a more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, the development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels that can systematically contribute to building resilience, and the systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

The Framework for Action uses the definition of resilience put forth by the UN, which underscores the value and importance of lessons learned to make a “social system” more resilient towards disasters and crisis. Overall, the Framework for Action has an approach to resilience that very much emphasises the responsibility of the crisis population.

*The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure This is determined by the degree to which the social system is capable of organising itself to increase this capacity for learning from past disasters for better future protection and to improve risk reduction measures.*<sup>33</sup>

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Legality:** Countries should develop legislative and institutional frameworks and/or policy for disaster risk reduction to increase general resilience. Such a legislative framework can contribute to the creation and strengthening of national integrated disaster risk reduction mechanisms, such as multi sectorial national platforms, integrating risk reduction as integral part of development policies and planning at all levels of government, and a decentralization of responsibilities and resources for disaster risk reduction to relevant authorities.

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology#letter-r>

<sup>32</sup> <http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/about>

<sup>33</sup> UN/ISDR. Geneva 2004.



**Participation:** Promote community participation in disaster risk reduction through the adoption of specific policies, the promotion of networking, the strategic management of volunteer resources, the clarification of roles and responsibilities, and the delegation and provision of the necessary authority and resources. The Framework for Action has an approach to resilience that very much emphasizes the responsibility and participation of the crisis population. This includes the value of building a spirit of volunteerism through active engagement of the community.

**International cooperation and Transparency:** The starting point for promoting a culture of resilience lies in risk identification and transparency in knowledge sharing, both nationally and internationally. To ensure swift and efficient disaster management it is therefore crucial to work with international established formats on risk analysis.

**Efficiency and effectiveness:** To increase knowledge and capacities for crisis management, relevant authorities need to promote and support dialogue, exchange information with the community and coordinate the efforts before, during and after a crisis.

**Diversity & Cultural and gender neutrality:** Early warning systems should be people-centred, generate warnings that are timely and understandable to those at risk, taking into account the demographic variables, gender, cultural and livelihood characteristics of the crisis population.

**Freedom & protest:** According to the framework, the media should be engaged in order to stimulate a culture and climate of resilience and community engagement.

**Economic stability:** The framework points to the fact that a world that is vulnerable due to changing demographics, technological and socio-economic conditions, unplanned urbanization etc. and which is constantly threatened by various risks and hazards, indicates a future where disasters (and crisis) could increasingly threaten the stability of the world economy.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Countries should develop a strong independent legal framework to increase general resilience.
- A disaster resilient society should (a) collect, (b) compile and (c) disseminate its risk disaster information on all appropriate levels.
- States and regional and international organizations should foster greater strategic coordination among international organizations to build resilience.
- An approach to resilience must be integrated in policies and planning at all levels.
- Fostering resilience can happen systematically if institutions and mechanisms (especially at the local level) are strengthened.
- Learning from previous crisis is crucial to prepare for the next one.
- Promote the standardization of international standard terminology.
- Promote gender and cultural sensitivity training as integral components of education and training for disaster risk reduction.
- Engage the media to stimulate a culture and climate of resilience and community engagement.
- Active engagement and involvement of the citizens can be a constructive way of fostering resilience, but be careful not to shift too much or the responsibility on the citizens.

- Make effort to create a culture and climate of resilience and community engagement that is well-balanced between public involvement and fostering feeling of safety and security for the citizens.

### 3.3.3 “A catalyst for Change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South-East Europe”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

This report outlines the results and impact of the HFA implementation in South- East Europe (SEE). It aims to present some evidence-based elements of success and key regional achievements in addressing the HFA, as well as highlighting areas for further work at regional and national level. The review process included the study of documentation and consultations with key actors in the SEE countries. The literature review involved a range of resource material, e.g. National and Regional HFA Progress Reports and other information shared by informants.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

No explicit definition of resilience is found in the document, but the definition set forth in the HFA is the basis for the document: The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**International cooperation:** Structured dialogue and teamwork, and the development of a common vision (also national consensus on priorities) can also strengthen countries’ coordinated efforts towards disaster resilience. By promoting information sharing and the transfer of knowledge, it may also empower local governments, private entities and civil society in resilience efforts.

**Sustainability:** Take a pro-active approach to reducing risk and adapting, instead of simply responding, to hazardous events. It is crucial to further ensure that DRR/ resilience policies and programmes operate in synergy with strategies on other areas in both the regional to the national and local level, and that the policies are integrated in all sectors.

**Applicability:** Decentralizing disaster risk reduction-related measures to the appropriate level is key to resilience. Some disaster risk reduction tasks are best centralized. Others are best undertaken when they are specific to local needs and are locally owned and managed.

**Efficiency & effectiveness:** Risk assessments helps identify hazards to which countries are exposed to, and are necessary to develop risk mitigation policies and measures through evidence.

**Participation:** Public awareness activities can contribute to empowering people in risk reduction actions at all levels of society through improving community participation.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Expand networks and collaboration among key national stakeholders.
- Empower local risk governance and improve coordination between national and local levels
- Improve countrywide risk assessments to support risk mitigation measures.

- Enhance the flow of information between researchers and disaster risk management practitioners and policy-makers to support disaster risk reduction actions and evidence-based decision-making.
- Raising public awareness and understanding of risk reduction to affect a further shift from response to mitigation.

### 3.3.4 “Understanding community resilience: Findings from community-based resilience analysis (CoBRA) assessments”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The CoBRA methodology is developed to identify indicators for measuring community resilience as part of ECHO’s wider Drought Risk Reduction Action Plan. The approach is largely qualitative, based on understanding resilience from a community perspective. It does not identify any preconceived components of resilience but rather allows communities to define it, assess their progress in achieving it, identify households that are more (or fully) resilient and specify the interventions they believe best build resilience. The CoBRA methodology has four broad objectives: 1. Identify the priority characteristics of disaster resilience for a target community; 2. Assess the communities’ achievement of these characteristics at the time of the assessment and during the last crisis or disaster; 3. Identify the characteristics and strategies of disaster-resilient households; and 4. Identify the most highly rated interventions or services in building local disaster resilience. The findings of this study provide government authorities and other stakeholders with a list of practical policy recommendations.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Based on the four broad objectives described above, the CoBRA approach is largely qualitative, based on understanding resilience from a community perspective. The approach does not identify any preconceived components of resilience, but it rather allows communities to define it for themselves, assess their progress in achieving it, identify households that are more (or fully) resilient and specify the interventions they believe best build resilience..

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Sustainability and State-citizen relationship:** Policy and planning need to increase their emphasis on raising awareness of natural resource management. Communities’ often lack awareness, or knowledge, of the importance of natural resources and of maintaining the long-term health of local ecosystems that form the basis for their livelihoods. Cooperation between the state and local communities, focussing on education and natural resource management, would enforce sustainable and resilient communities in the long-run.

**Applicability:** Social resilience consists of many factors. Policy makers need to combine resilience policies with policies from other sectors to become socially resilient.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- To build resilient communities, enforce knowledge levels and education.

- Cooperation between regional, local and international actors will enforce sustainable resilience development.
- Combine resilience policies with policies in other sectors.

### 3.3.5 “United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The Plan of Action outlines a set of core commitments and actions, a shared approach to measure impact and progress, and steps for implementation for DRR. It embraces the international momentum to use “resilience” as a common outcome that integrates poverty reduction, DRR, sustainable livelihoods and climate change adaptation, as integral to sustainable development. The Plan of Action is the next step in achieving the vision of the Hyogo Framework for Action to substantially reduce disaster losses. The following three commitments, made by the UN, are set forth in this report: 1. Ensure timely, co-ordinated and high quality assistance to all countries where disaster losses pose a threat to people’s health and development; 2. Make disaster risk reduction a priority for the UN system and organizations within; 3. Ensure disaster risk reduction for resilience is central to post-2015 development agreements and targets. This report sets-out the actions-, objectives- and goals of the commitments made under the Plan of Action. These commitments contribute to the sharing of disaster risk/management information, create a platform for international cooperation, increase efficiency of current policies focussed on resilience building and provides evidence for the need of policy integration when it comes to resilience policy.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Resilience is the ability of a system to reduce, prevent, anticipate, absorb and adapt, or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, including through ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Efficiency and effectiveness:** Disaster risk reduction has to be part of broader, comprehensive resilience-building effort to enhance its effectiveness.

**Applicability:** To increase resilience, disaster management should be approached holistic and be applicable to critical areas.

**International cooperation:** Institutions, such as the UN, should create global strategies which provide national and regional stakeholders with a framework for action.

**Transparency:** Countries need to develop and enhance national and local risk assessments and risk information based on common, transparent, accessible and regularly updated data on different hazards and risks.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Promote multi-stakeholder national and local disaster risk governance systems and plans supported by effective regulatory frameworks and coherent institutional capacity-building efforts.

- Promote the integration of disaster preparedness for relief and recovery with development programmes that reduce disaster risk and build resilience.

### 3.3.6 “UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda: Disaster risk and resilience”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

According to the UN system task team, disaster risk and resilience received insufficient emphasis in the original Millennium Development Goal agenda. Whilst there is universal acceptance that disasters can erode and destroy development gains, there is limited recognition of the role that different approaches to development play in creating or increasing vulnerability. The understanding of such trends has improved during efforts in recent years (for example through climate and weather related evidence), that show how the impact of disasters caused by natural hazards and vulnerability will continue to intensify, presenting an increasingly significant challenge to development. Disaster risk reduction and resilience therefore requires more central consideration in the development agenda if the objectives of sustainable development are to be achieved.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Resilience is the ability of a system, community or society, which is exposed to hazards, to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**International cooperation:** The expected increase in climate hazards especially impacts least-developed countries. Climate change as a hazard has a global nature. Therefore developing countries and industrialized nations both need to increase their cooperation when it comes to reducing risks and increasing their resilience. International conferences on climate change already have a significant impact on reducing the effects of climate change, for instance the Kyoto protocol on CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> and the Montreal protocol on CFCs.

**Proportionality and sustainability:** Early-warning systems can increase resilience by allowing the crisis population to be prepared for the crisis and act in time to reduce the damage and loss. The sharing of historical data from early warning systems can increase resilience by raising awareness and thus make measures more proportional and sustainable.

**Applicability:** International criteria and/or standards should be used as a guideline to be consulted by national/local policy makers when developing their resilience indicators/infrastructure/policy.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- The incorporation of disaster risk reduction and resilience into development work through public and private sector strategies and planning for development and growth must be a priority.

- More explicit recognition of the importance of reducing disaster risk and building resilience – with a goal and targets against which made efforts could be measured – would be a major contribution to meeting the challenges to be faced with sustainable development.
- Increase international cooperation on resilience.
- The preparatory effect of early-warning systems can increase resilience by preparing individuals for acting according to a crisis and reducing loss. Ensure applicability of resilience measures by adhering to international standards and regulations.

### 3.3.7 “The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis, May 2013”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) report was published in 2013. It analyses how societies can be more resilient to natural disasters (including climate change) and economic crisis. The report provides a significant contribution to the regional policy dialogue that addresses the pressing question of how people, organizations, institutions and policymakers can work together to weave resilience into the everyday fabric of our social and economic lives. The report highlights the fact that global financial crisis, food and fuel crises, and the consequences of natural disasters may seem to be unrelated, but, in fact, they are the result of shocks applied to complex systems that interlink social, economic and environmental factors.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

The report adopts a broad definition of resilience: The capacity of countries to withstand, adapt to, and recover from natural disasters and major economic crises – so that their people can continue to lead the kind of life they value. Resilience is the ability to: 1. quickly bounce back and restore a stable equilibrium after stresses, ensuring reduced risks and disturbances from shocks, 2. mitigate disruption and reconfigure from shocks so as to maintain a functioning system, 3. reorganize and transform in order to respond to crises, absorb their impact and maintain the system’s core purpose.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Applicability:** Resilience is considered as a systemic whole in this report, focussing on challenges as being part of a complex system which affects society as a whole. Any effort thus needs to address and be applicable to society as a whole.

**Efficiency and effectiveness:** During the crisis, both governments and community leaders will need to produce accurate up-to-date information and disseminate it quickly. This can happen effectively in a variety of ways – print, radio, television, the Internet (social media) and mobile phones.

**Legality:** Governments should design legal, regulatory, and policy structures that minimise the risks of certain sectors that are inherently vulnerable and can either cause a crisis or act as transmitters of a localized crisis to a larger system. A legal foundation for improving resilience can be useful, such as disaster laws.

**Participation:** Participation of stakeholders and communities is crucial to resilience. This should involve community leaders, civil society, and the private sectors.

**Social cohesion:** Those most exposed to economic crises and disasters are the poor. People facing disasters are rarely passive victims. Most will try to cope by drawing on all their economic, social and natural resources.

**Solidarity:** Inclusive development is crucial for building resilient societies. This will involve greater investment in social infrastructure, particularly in education and health services.

**State-citizen relationship:** Some of the most effective public support, especially for more frequent disasters, is likely to come from local governments. They can support community responses, engage vulnerable groups in decision-making and help them become more resilient. To do so, they need to involve those groups in every step of the development process – from vision setting, planning, and implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Disaster prevention and preparedness is far more effective and less costly than recovery and relief efforts.
- An important contribution to greater local resilience is effective decentralization, which can improve the delivery of key public services.
- As many of today's shocks are trans-boundary, they need transnational responses. By working together, governments can produce solutions that are greater than the sum of individual country responses.
- A regional framework for resilience building is important.
- Governments should support community resilience in a number of ways. For example by strengthening systems of social protection.
- Coordinate and cooperate on resilience efforts to make them sustainable.
- Synergize regional resilience efforts, and pool resources for better preparedness.
- Technological innovation can improve monitoring and early warning.

#### **3.3.8 From social Vulnerability to Resilience: Measuring progress towards Disaster Risk Reduction**

##### **Introduction to the document:**

Disasters consistently pose a challenge to society's resilience. The concentration of people and assets in high-risk areas combined with insufficient preparedness, response and mitigation approaches are contributors to this escalation of losses. Creating disaster-resilient communities by enhancing and building adaptive capacities through investments in disaster prevention and preparedness avoids future losses<sup>34</sup>. A reduction in the level of exposure, reducing vulnerability and improving resilience are mechanisms for stabilizing and perhaps even reducing losses from hazards. This report draws on discussions and presentations given at the UNU-EHS 2012 Summer Academy and reviews existing

---

<sup>34</sup> Investments in resilience are generally lower than the total of yearly expected damages of the hazard for which the investment in resilience is made (Government of Mexico and World Bank, 2012).



research at the hand of the following questions and outlines the current state of resilience assessments.

- Who is resilient and to what?
- Whose resilience is it?
- When is someone or something resilient?
- How does someone or something acquire resilience?

It concludes with several suggestions for and steps towards answering the above questions and moving resilience research forward.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Resilience is ‘the ability of a system, community, or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions’ (UNISDR, 2009).

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Applicability:** Resilience studies need to be applicable, but the various methodological and conceptual resilience assessments used and developed by different studies limit the generalizability and applicability of the results obtained. Their applicability will increase, if (1) a methodology to capture adaptive complex systems of resilience is developed, or (2) current methodologies would align and improve generalization and comparability of results<sup>35</sup>.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Resilience is largely interpreted as a system response, including time of recovery and degree of risk reduction. Insight in the relevant systems of a resilience framework is therefore important to policy makers. Both physical, human, social, institutional, technical, economic, environmental and ecological systems need to be taken into account as much as possible when creating a resilience framework<sup>36</sup>.
- The different systems that generate resilience share synergies, linkages and interactions across spatial as well as temporal scales. Resilience can therefore be interpreted as a system of systems<sup>37</sup> and complex adaptive system<sup>38</sup>.
- Use existing resilience assessments as a starting point from which to further advance methodologies and conceptual frameworks.
- Additional effort needs to be directed at reducing uncertainties and use knowledge to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.

---

<sup>35</sup> Available types of methodologies are: (1) Outcome-driven approaches – focusing on estimating and/or modelling losses, recovery times and similar. (2) Input-driven approaches – identifying underlying factors that influence resilience, including vulnerability. (3) Scenario-driven approaches – documenting past or future system responses to a specific risk. (4) Complex system approaches – inventorying independent elements of resilience with unknown feedback loops.

<sup>36</sup> For more information regarding integrating resilience frameworks see: Berkes and Ross, 2013.

<sup>37</sup> Bristow et al., 2012

<sup>38</sup> Allen et al., 2005



### 3.3.9 Towards human Resilience: Sustaining Millennium Development Goals progress in an age of economic uncertainty

#### **Introduction to the document:**

More than ten years have passed since the adoption of the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2000. Many countries have made impressive strides towards the achievement of MDGs, but these achievements have been uneven across regions and within nations. Significant disparities still exist. Efforts to accelerate MDG achievements and progress towards these targets can be difficult due to shocks and crises from various sources such as conflicts, natural disasters, climate change and financial and economic collapses. Action should be taken to ensure that the progress already achieved is sustained and protected against risk of reversal. This report recognizes the importance of various sources of vulnerability, its main focus is on financial and economic crises and how such macro-level shocks impact the sustainability of MDG progress. In this context, the report examines the concepts of vulnerability and resilience, identifies the transmission channels by which such shocks impact the sustainability of MDG progress, and proposes policy options to build resilience to such adverse events.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Resilience typically refers to the country's ability to cope with or recover from a shock. That is, a country's resilience reflects its ability to counteract (quickly recover from) or withstand (absorb) the impact of a shock. The indicators used to assess a country's resilience typically include some measure of fiscal capacity, institutional strength, and level of social development.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Economic stability (1):** The development from national to a global economy made specialized exporting countries relying on a small number of exporting sectors more vulnerable to economic shocks.<sup>39</sup> A reduction in dependency of these export products, for example primary commodities, would decrease the vulnerability of these countries from economic and financial crisis.

**Economic stability (2):** In small, low-income countries a threat to economic stability are uncertain and volatile sources of foreign investments.<sup>40</sup> Diversify economic activities to reduce vulnerability. Avoid, however, too large dependencies on official development assistance to reduce vulnerability.

#### **General Recommendation and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

---

<sup>39</sup> For example, African with export concentrated in few sectors experienced the largest drop in export earnings and economic growth, following the 2008 crisis. Asian countries on the other hand, having a more diversified export portfolio, experienced in the same period a below-average decline in export revenues and decline in economic growth.

<sup>40</sup> For example, Zambia received in 2007 75 percent of its share in GDP through foreign private capital. This attraction of FDI is a boost to a country, yet the form of investment is very volatile with respect to economic crisis. Namely, the FDI for developing countries dropped by 23 percent in one year after the 2008 economic crisis.

- Resilience can be increased through a more stable, perhaps through (long-term) legal binding, flow of investments, flow and allocation of development assistance and diversification of export sectors.

### 3.3.10 “Resilient people, resilient planet: A future worth choosing”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon launched the High-level Panel on Global Sustainability in August 2010. The Secretary-General asked Panel Members, serving in an expert capacity, to reflect on and formulate a new vision for sustainable growth (including building resilience), along with mechanisms for achieving it.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

No explicit definition of resilience is described in the document, but following UN terminology, resilience can be described as ‘the ability of a system, community, or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions’ (UNISDR, 2009).

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**International cooperation:** Governments, international financial institutions and major companies should engage in international cooperation on innovation- and technology-oriented resilience measures.

**Effectivity and efficiency:** Vulnerability assessments and risk assessments can improve resilience measures, and governments and international organizations can increase resources allocated to DRR and resilience to make the implementation of them more efficient.

**State-citizen relationship:** If particular goods and/or activities are identified to have a negative impact on societal resilience, governments can act through adapting or developing policy measures. The goal of these measures would be to indirectly increase societal resilience and to create additional awareness of the risks and vulnerability to potential hazards at the level of consumers.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Sustainable growth and development have similarities to societal resilience through the mutual goal of environment preservation. Identify spill-over effects.
- Societal resilience has its focus point in economic- and livelihood security through hazard risk reduction, taking into account that the cost of inaction far outweighs the cost of action.

### 3.3.11 Human Development Report 2014 “Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience”

#### **Introduction to the document:**

This report explores the policies and institutional reforms that can build resilience into the fabric of societies, particularly if they are focussed on groups that are excluded from society. It examines universal measures that can redress discrimination and focuses on the need for collective action to resolve vulnerability that stems from unresponsive national institutions and the shortcomings of global governance. In particular, attention is needed at sensitive periods—investments in early childhood education, a focus on employment opportunities for youth and support for older people enhance life capabilities. This report further highlights some of the key policies, principles and measures that are needed to build resilience—to reinforce choices, expand human agency and promote social competences. It also indicates that achieving and sustaining human development progress can depend on the effectiveness of preparedness and response when shocks occur.

#### **Understanding of *human* resilience in the document:**

*Human resilience* means to ensure that people's choices are robust, now and in the future. It furthermore means that people can cope and adjust to adverse events. Resilience underpins any approach to securing and sustaining human development. At its core, resilience is about ensuring that state, community and global institutions work to empower and protect people.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**Solidarity:** Universal provision of social services is crucial for building resilient societies. Universal access consists of, among others, the following basic social services: education, health care, water supply and sanitation, and public safety. National states have in this regard the primary responsibility to extend these social services to the entire population as part of increasing societal resilience.

**Social cohesion and trust:** Countries that are characterised by conflicts and violence, exclusionary policies, elite rent-seeking and unaddressed social grievances are more vulnerable due to a lack of combined effort in resilience building and trust. In countries with these characteristics programmes that enhance social cohesion can improve resilience and damage management efforts. Policies and institutions that fight exclusion and marginalization create a sense of belonging and the opportunity of upward mobility. Such a development can build trust and lay the foundation for infrastructural development to recover from crises in the short run and increase resilience of future crises.

**International cooperation:** Hazards such as, pollution, natural disasters, conflicts, climate change and economic crises do not respect political boundaries and cannot be managed by national governments alone. Today's global institutions are neither accountable enough nor fast enough to address pressing global challenges and better coordination is needed to limit transnational shocks and respond to the effects of climate change. A step to a stronger, responsive (through a legal and increased finance base) and more-representative global governance is essential for more-effective global action, to prevent such crisis from occurring and to reduce their magnitude.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Improve social protection programmes to redress unemployment insurance, pension possibilities and labour market regulation, in order to offer protection against risk and risk adversity throughout people's lives and especially during phases of heightened vulnerability

(economic crisis, drought or a flood). Universal social protection policies provide not only individual resilience; they also improve the resilience of the economy as a whole.

- In the case of disasters, prevention and response frameworks can contribute significantly by improving risk information, strengthening and establishing early warning systems, integrating disaster risk reduction into development planning and policies, and strengthening institutions and mechanisms for response. Such planning for preparedness and recovery should be pursued at all levels—global, national, regional and community—and can be enhanced by information sharing and solidarity in action.
- Policy responses to vulnerability should prevent threats, promote capabilities and protect people, especially the most vulnerable
- The effects of crises, when they occur, can be mitigated through preparedness and recovery efforts that can also leave societies more resilient (build-back better principle).

### 3.3.12 UN “Making cities resilient” report, 2012

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The aim of the report is to provide a global snapshot of local-level resilience building activities and identify trends in the perceptions and approaches of local governments toward disaster risk reduction, using the “Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient” developed by the campaign as a framework. This report also analyses the factors that enable urban disaster risk reduction activities. The Making Cities Resilient Campaign seeks to encourage and support all urban centres to reduce risks and become resilient to disasters. This includes urban centres that meet the conventional definition of a ‘city’ in terms of land size and population, as well as other sub-national administrations of different sizes and levels, including regional, metropolitan and provincial areas, as well as municipalities and townships. The cities analysed by this report have four recurring types of activities in place to enhance resilience. They consider disaster risk reduction in new urban planning regulations, plans and development activities; establish councils/committees/disaster management structures dedicated to DRR, and engaging in multi-stakeholder consultations; construct or enhance hazard mitigating infrastructure; establish education, awareness and training programs.

#### **Understanding of a resilient city in the document:**

A resilient city is characterized by its capacity to withstand or absorb the impact of a hazard through resistance or adaptation, which enable it to maintain certain basic functions and structures during a crisis, and bounce back or recover from an event.

#### **SP9 Criteria (existing and new) derived from the document:**

**International cooperation:** International actions and cooperation are playing an important advocacy role for disaster risk reduction at the global level. They present disaster risk information to local leaders and provide them with essential resources to take stock of, and improve, their activities. International cooperation is of value as an enabler of urban resilience building, based on the evidence presented by cities and interviews with local governments.

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Motivate local governments to take action on disaster risk reduction.
- Show strong leadership and political will.
- Build sustainability of institutional capacities and resources at local level.
- Engage in high-impact activities early on.
- Build partnerships and city-to-city learning opportunities.
- Integrate disaster risk reduction across sectors.
- Identify and recognize the improvements needed to make infrastructure more resilient.

### 3.3.13 UN Making cities resilient handbook

#### **Introduction to the document:**

The Handbook is primarily designed for local governments and policy makers to support public policy and decision making as they implement disaster risk reduction and resilience activities. It offers practical guidance to understand and take action on the “Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient”. The Handbook is built on a foundation of knowledge and expertise of Campaign partners, participating cities and local governments. It provides an overview of key strategies and actions needed to build resilience to disasters, as part of an overall strategy to achieve sustainable development, without going into great detail. Each city and local government has to determine how to apply these strategies to their own context and capacities. There is no one-size-fits-all solution.

#### **Understanding of resilience in the document:**

Resilience means the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of the hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions (UNISDR). Resilience furthermore focuses investment on increasing a city area’s overall ability to support a vibrant, healthy society and economy under a wide range of circumstances (ICLEI).

*There are no concrete criteria mentioned in the document, but a few overarching recommendations are important.*

#### **General Recommendations and Lessons Learned vis-à-vis SP9:**

- Pay attention to disaster risk reduction to avoid deterioration of the economy and ecosystems and a loss of trust by the population and investors. Business and private investors may shy away from cities with a perceived indifference to acting to reduce disaster risk. To overcome the perception that the disaster risk management budget competes for scarce resources with other priorities, risk reduction must be an integral part of local development. Holistic disaster risk management is more attractive when it simultaneously addresses the needs of many stakeholders and competing priorities.
- Disaster risk reduction is everyone’s job. Disaster risk reduction, being a team effort, provides a unique opportunity to strengthen local community participation. In the city, the local government must lead the effort, as their community knowledge offers the best insight into who, what and when something is needed. Citizen groups in risk-prone areas, including

informal settlements, local business and other groups should participate in development of risk assessments and the results must be shared with them.

- Local governments must, as part of this formal-informal method, coordinate their actions and activities with national authorities, and vice versa, to apply and adapt national policies and legislation to local conditions.
- Take into account the variation in culture, geography and disaster risks.
- There is no one-size-fits all solution when it comes to resilience building, but learning from practical best-practices is a good starting point for local governments when designing the future city.

## 4 Conclusion: Preliminary Assessment Criteria & Guidelines for Positive Intervention and Resilience Strategies

Throughout this document altogether 23 policy documents, frameworks and reports have been analysed, with the aim of contextualizing, cross-checking and refining the assessment criteria based on core societal values developed in WP92.

This chapter prepares the criteria and recommendations discussed above for being put to use in 93.2 and further iterations of WP92 deliverables. The findings of the document analyses conducted in Chapter 3 are in the following combined to provide

1. A consolidated list of assessment criteria for *positive* intervention, showing where they have appeared in the different analysed documents (Chapter 4.1). Some new criteria have been identified through the document analysis. They are being described and added to the existing criteria system, which is understood as a dynamic tool that will be refined as the project develops. This, for example, means that SP9 will be present at the experimentation taking place within SP3-5. As such, the criteria will be applied to the experiments, and SP9 will conduct de-briefs with the relevant sub projects afterwards.
2. General policy guidelines for positive intervention and resilience strategies and their link to key societal criteria (Chapter 4.2). These are overarching and recurring recommendations derived from the analysis in Chapter 3. In-depth assessments of DRIVER measures and tools are conducted in 93.2.

When tested and further refined by their application during DRIVER experiments, the final version of the criteria system will feed into the DRIVER PoT.

### 4.1 Consolidated List of Criteria

After showing the relevance of the criteria and their role for positive intervention in Chapter 3, this list summarizes the criteria and indicates in which documents they have been mentioned - directly or indirectly (see Table 2 Consolidated List of Criteria). Below the table, additional criteria are listed and defined, which can be added to the criteria system.

Criteria for <i>positive</i> intervention	Documents relating to the criteria
Accountability	"Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020", "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience".
Applicability	"Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020", "Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action", "Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting



Criteria for <i>positive</i> intervention	Documents relating to the criteria
	<p>disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014”, “The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, “Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience”, Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”, “A catalyst for Change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South-East Europe”, “Understanding community resilience: Findings from community-based resilience analysis (CoBRA) assessments”, “United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience”, “UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda: Disaster risk and resilience”, “ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis”, “From social Vulnerability to Resilience: Measuring progress towards Disaster Risk Reduction”.</p>
Cultural & Gender Sensitivity	<p>“The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”, “Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience”, “Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals”, “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”, “AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel &amp; West-Africa”, “Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014”, “Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”.</p>
Dignity	<p>“The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”, “AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel &amp; West-Africa”.</p>
Diversity	<p>“The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”, “Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience”, “Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”, “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”, “Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience”, “Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”.</p>
Freedoms & Protest	<p>“Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”.</p>

Criteria for <i>positive</i> intervention	Documents relating to the criteria
Economic Stability	"Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience", "AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa", "The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe", "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience", Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) "Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters", "Towards human Resilience: Sustaining Millennium Development Goals progress in an age of economic uncertainty".
Efficiency & Effectiveness	"Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020", "Building Resilience: The EU's approach", "The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe", "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience", "A catalyst for Change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South-East Europe", "United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience", ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis", "Resilient people resilient planet: A future worth choosing".
Integrity	"The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe", "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience".
International Cooperation	"Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020", "Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action", "Building Resilience: The EU's approach", "Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014", "The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe", "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience", "United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience", "UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda: Disaster risk and resilience", "Resilient people resilient planet: A future worth choosing", "HDR 2014 Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience", "Making cities resilient report 2012".
Legality & Legitimacy	"The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future", "The EU Internal Security Strategy in

Criteria for <i>positive</i> intervention	Documents relating to the criteria
	Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis” .
Non-discrimination	“The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”, “Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”, “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”.
Participation	“The road to resilience. Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”, “Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience”, “Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”, “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”, “Building Resilience: The EU’s approach”, “AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa”, “Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014”, “Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”, “A catalyst for Change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South-East Europe”, ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis”.
Political Reputation	“Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”, “AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa”.
Privacy & Data Protection	“The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, “Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience” .
Social Cohesion	“Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience”, “Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals”, “The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis”, “HDR 2014 Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience”.
Solidarity	“The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis”, “HDR 2014 Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience”.
State-Citizen Relationship	“Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting

Criteria for <i>positive</i> intervention	Documents relating to the criteria
	disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014”, “The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, “Understanding community resilience: Findings from community-based resilience analysis (CoBRA) assessments”, ESCAP, Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis”, “Resilient people resilient planet: A future worth choosing”.
Suitability/Necessity/Proportionality	“Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”, “The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”, “UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda: Disaster risk and resilience”.
Transparency	"Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience", “United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience”.
Trust	“AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa”, "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience", “HDR 2014 Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience”.
Truthfulness	"Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience".

**Table 2 Consolidated List of Criteria**

SP9 follows an understanding of societies as centred on values and identities and that the resilience of a society is dependent on the values and identities a society shares, which also determines the societal acceptability of CM measures. These values are sought to be represented by the criteria system that can be used to assess the positive and negative societal impacts that CM measures and tools may produce. An extended definition of all criteria given above can be accessed in deliverables 92.11 and 92.21.

As shown above, each of the criteria mentioned in the SP9 criteria system are reflected throughout EU, UN and IFRC CM policies. A reference to the actual word may not be explicit, but the policy documents may refer to basic principles, concepts, definitions and ideas that reflect the concept. A policy document stressing, for example, the importance of taking the different backgrounds of societal groups into account when devising CM policies may thus relate to cultural sensitivity, diversity and/or participation.

In addition to the criteria listed in the table above, new important criteria have been identified through the analysis of the policy documents in Chapter 3. New criteria were included when the existent list of criteria did not cover them already. Such new criteria thus fill gaps in the original list, add depth to the future analysis, and illustrate that the criteria system is dynamic – just like societal values as such.

None of the criteria in the original system did cover the value of sustainability in resilience measures properly. Hence, it was added as a new criterion. The same is the case for the criterion in/equality

and in/justice. Brief definitions of them are given below to ensure that a common and consistent understanding of the criteria exists, both, for those who write the assessments and those who access and follow the assessments and recommendations. The aim of the following definitions is not to provide an exhaustive discussion of the concepts, but to deliver a functional definition of the criteria.

### **In/equality & in/justice:**

While providing support for the most affected and the most vulnerable first, ensure the fair distribution of help and resources during crises. Make crisis management as fair, equal and just as possible under stress. Equal treatment cannot always be a given, since time and resources are often limited and sometimes seemingly unfair decisions have to be taken and priorities set. The idea is to avoid unfair, unequal or disproportionate treatment of two social groups or between two individuals wherever possible. In a similar vein, injustice would include a partial, wrongful or unfair treatment of someone. In the context of this deliverable, the criterion relates to the document “Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience”. It is closely linked to the criterion of non-discrimination or gender- and culture-sensitivity.

*Example: As women are generally underrepresented when it comes to political participation in CM<sup>41</sup>, ensuring the inclusion of women in all levels of crisis management organization, locally, regionally and internationally, could help foster political participation and influence by women in decision-making about crisis management, and thus reduce inequality.*

### **Sustainability (including long-term commitment & development):**

Although sustainability can refer to a number of things, in this context it refers to the principle of ensuring that a measure or tool lasts for a significant amount of time and in various different contexts. The sustainability of social systems can be strengthened e.g. by increasing public participation and the access to public goods.

In the context of this deliverable, the criterion relates to the documents “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”, “A catalyst for Change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South-East Europe”, “Understanding community resilience: Findings from community-based resilience analysis (CoBRA) assessments”, “UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda: Disaster risk and resilience” and Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”.

*Example: Investing in resilience and focusing on risk reduction can increase the sustainability in other areas as well. Resilience measures could thus have a positive spill-over effect into other societal domains, such as strengthening social cohesion by enforcing shared values among the (crisis) population.*

The criteria identified in WP92 include criteria for assessing societal costs, negative societal impacts and the creation of secondary insecurities. This deliverable emphasized the role of the same criteria to create *positive* societal impact. The criteria that exclusively relate to societal costs have not been subject to analysis in this deliverable, which are: Unease, Suspicion, Function Creep, Misuse, New

---

<sup>41</sup> See e.g. [http://www.weforum.org/pdf/Global\\_Competitiveness\\_Reports/Reports/gender\\_gap.pdf](http://www.weforum.org/pdf/Global_Competitiveness_Reports/Reports/gender_gap.pdf)

Vulnerabilities, Creating Technology Dependency, Negative Standardization. However, they strongly relate to the criteria presented in this deliverable as they can influence the level of compliance with the criteria given above (e.g. suspicion leads to a reduction of trust). Two of them, Technology Dependency and Unease, are mentioned below, because some of the documents' recommendations pointed to their relevance. Two further criteria, namely the "Impacts on market (production, consumption, and innovation)" and "Employment" are considered too difficult to assess or evaluate at this point in time by means of the given reports.

## 4.2 Relevance of the Criteria System for General Recommendations about Positive Intervention

---

This chapter summarizes key findings that follow from the documents discussed above. They are presented as general recommendations for positive intervention. The recommendations will reflect the relevance of the criteria system as a whole and some criteria in particular, not only to point out that it is important to respect these values in implementing CM measures and tools, but also illustrating how that can be done (based on the findings in the documents). The recommendations can be used as advice for creating positive societal impact altogether.

Not each criterion will refer to a concrete recommendation and some recommendations may overlap with regards to the criteria they address, but the list will include those key criteria that recurred throughout the CM policy documents the most. Many of these aspects brought up here will be discussed and implemented within SP3. The purpose of the recommendations in this document is first and foremost to **show the relevance of the criteria system in fostering the value dimension of CM**. After listing criteria and recommendations, this chapter will discuss how these findings will be used throughout the remainder of the project, where the given criteria system will be applied to the DRIVER measures and tools, resulting in more concrete and operational assessments, examples and recommendations.

- **Accountability**

Make sure that CM measures and tools follow the principles of accountability and are considered legitimate solutions in order to foster a positive state-citizen-relationship. Devise CM approaches and policies as transparent as possible. This applies also to the distribution of resources and help after crises.

- **Applicability & Suitability/Necessity/Proportionality**

Create applicable policies that can address complex problems. Most measures, tools and solutions work best if they take account of the context they are deployed in. Draw on research results wherever possible to inform crisis management. Ensure that the specific context of the scenario and the affected population is taken into account in CM policies. Harmonized and flexible solutions that can be adapted to many contexts without harming (specific groups of) the affected population are most effective.

- **Cultural & Gender Sensitivity & Dignity**

Design resilience tools and measures that are gender-, age- and culture-sensitive and take account of gender-, age- and culture-related vulnerability situations and risks to respect each individuals' and group's dignity, in all phases of the CM cycle (Chapter 1).

- **Diversity**

Different people have different needs in different contexts. Follow the principles of diversity when administering crisis management and providing measures and tools.

- **Freedoms & Protest**

No concrete recommendation, relevance will be explored in 93.2.

- **Economic Stability**

In order to avoid economic instability and foster stability during crises, have specific emergency funds available that can be spent ad hoc to support the efficiency of responses. The development of hazard information can contribute to effective resilience investments.

- **Efficiency & Effectiveness**

Build a body of evidence for the effectiveness of new measures and tools. CM tools and measures are more likely to be included in future policies if proven effective. Create concrete goals for fostering resilience against which efforts can be measured. Create functional assessment frameworks that take account of various resilience indicators to foster effectiveness.

- **Employment**

No concrete recommendation, relevance will be explored in 93.2.

- **Integrity**

No concrete recommendation, relevance will be explored in 93.2.

- **International Cooperation**

Fostering resilience needs to follow a multi-level approach. It has to be organized across various scales, including international and inter-institutional cooperation. Harmonization is often considered the key to functional cooperation. Regular inter-institutional CM exercises will contribute to cooperation, harmonization and preparedness. To further ease international cooperation, build functional networks to strengthen collaboration and share information among key national and international stakeholders. Create dedicated platforms for that and foster these cross-border relations over time. This will enhance the timely flow of information. Explore also how informal networks can contribute to resilience. Collect and analyse information across sectors that can contribute to lessons learned. Establish a common knowledge base after disasters.

- **Legality & Legitimacy**

Develop concrete legislation that enables better cooperation for DRR, CM and resilience management. Integrate resilience into legal frameworks. Harmonize and update regulation and legislation wherever sensible so that the involved countries or organizations follow the same set of rules and can implement the foreseen (cross-border) measures. Legal frameworks should furthermore decrease the risk level in important sectors and should allow for appropriate levels of decentralized responsibilities. In the case of the latter, local authorities need the legality, capacity and authority to perform their required tasks during a hazard.



- **Non-discrimination**

Follow principles of equality and non-discrimination. While identifying and supplying the most affected and the most vulnerable first, ensure the fair distribution of help and resources during crises.

- **Participation & Open Society**

Enable the participation of affected populations and actors through local and context-relevant solutions and training. Make resilience programs and policies people-centred and open. Clarify the roles that communities can play within DRR. Facilitate the positive engagement of local communities and support local ownership of CM governance without overburdening populations or buck-pass responsibilities that should be fulfilled by the state. Enable participation through bottom-up approaches and promote state-citizen dialogue. Promote volunteering, because it can also mitigate the strong effect that disasters can have on societal cohesion. Draw conclusions on best practices under the participation of the affected populations.

- **Political Reputation**

No concrete recommendation, relevance will be explored in 93.2.

- **Privacy & Data Protection**

Protect classified and private information to allow for effective collaboration and mutual trust.

- **Social Cohesion**

To foster social cohesion prioritize the most vulnerable populations when protecting the population and strengthening resilience.

- **Solidarity**

To foster solidarity, provide for specific crisis management funds. Governments and other stakeholders need to support unskilled, poor communities in sustainable methods. A protection fund and micro-financing possibilities can empower local authorities and individual measures.

- **State-Citizen Relationship**

Identify existing resilience policies and harmonize policies between the different actors and sectors (public and private) wherever sensible, paying attention to the specific national contexts and potentially affected groups, as well as the type of crises. Where possible, develop these policies inclusively and under the participation of relevant societal groups and stakeholders, also to utilize local knowledge and foster a good state-citizen-relationship.

- **Transparency & Truthfulness**

Communicate clearly, transparently, truthfully and carefully during crises and to avoid misunderstandings when information flow is critical.

- **Trust**

Further and foster trust in governmental CM approaches by including bottom-up approaches and local opinions into CM tools and measures.

Even though this deliverable addresses opportunities for positive intervention, some recurring recommendations also refer to the positive effect of avoiding negative impacts. In particular, it relates to:

- **Technology Dependency**

Align communication strategies where possible. Here, it is important not to overly rely on classic communication media in case they break down. Have backup solutions for such communication technologies in place. Diversify communication channels. Utilize, for example, social media to disseminate information. This is also relevant on local levels (workpackage 35 addresses these issues concretely in “Crisis Communications”).

- **Unease**

In general, resilience is best fostered proactively through well-balanced preparedness strategies that raise public awareness about and understanding for potential problems without alienating or causing unease in populations.

### 4.3 Outlook

---

These criteria and recommendations will serve as a basis for the more concrete assessment of the DRIVER measures and tools. These assessments will be conducted in task 93.2 “Development and Refinement of Criteria”. In order to conduct these assessments, the framework developed in 92.11 “Report on the creation of secondary insecurities” is going to be used, which clusters the different DRIVER measures and tools into categories of tools which are then assessed with regards to their potential for positive impacts. These assessments will include

- An introduction to each category of measures and tools, which consists of a short description of the category’s relevance for CM in general, and then points to the specific relevance for DRIVER tools and measures by giving some example tasks. This introduction generally also points out if there is a group that is specifically addressed by this measure or tool in order to specify the context of the assessments.
- The assessments vis-à-vis the relevant criteria. The impact on each criterion is described in one or two sentences and – if available - borrows examples from relevant fields of CM. They describe potential for positive impacts.
- An example that speaks to the specific DRIVER context to illustrate how the criteria could be taken into account during the implementation of DRIVER measures and tools.
- A set of recommendations, which are formulated as concrete suggestions that should be followed when developing and implementing tools and methods within DRIVER. They can also serve as inspiration for the development of CM tools and measures in general.

In the follow-up deliverable to 93.21 “Tools to assess positive societal impacts”, SP9 will visit SP3-5 experiments as observers to update criteria and recommendations one more time and make them more operational before they feed into the DRIVER Portfolio of Tools (PoT), a large portfolio of different CM tools that can be combined in different ways and different contexts.

The integration of the findings and assessments conducted in workpackages 92 “Mitigation of negative impacts to society” and 93 “Implementing societal values into CM” into the PoT and testbed is the ultimate aim of these WPs and will be enabled through the final versions of all 92 and 93

deliverables, the last of which are due in M47. A concrete methodology for integration will thus be developed throughout the next three years alongside the further development of the PoT and the testbed. A first suggestion for the criteria integration, however, is to create a kind of “alert system” that at the same time enables decision-makers, end users and stakeholders to understand and assess the kind of impact that a tool or measure can have on society – positively or negatively. This would include the following steps:

1. The selection of criteria, their definitions, the assessments, examples and recommendations are being developed, refined and iterated through participation in DRIVER experimentations. A refined version of the full set is delivered in the final versions of deliverables, latest in M47.
2. The categorization of tools suggested in 92.11 is equally being updated and refined throughout the DRIVER project.
3. Both, criteria, recommendations, examples and tool categories are being “tagged” with a tagging system that allows for different combinations of tools and with different scenarios.
4. When a specific category of tool or a combination of tools is being retrieved from the PoT, the relevant criteria will appear on a dedicated area on the PoT screen. The tagging system will ensure that these criteria match the researched tools/combinations and the particular context. The user could then have several options: a) The user can click on each criterion to read a definition in order to learn more about this criterion, its relevance and the way it is being understood. b) To follow-up, the user can upon further clicks retrieve example assessments and recommendations in order to understand which next steps to take and what to pay particular attention to in the implementation.
5. A mechanism for ensuring that criteria and recommendations are actually being paid attention to in the implementation will have to be developed. A suggestion is that the user cannot proceed with the ongoing operation in the PoT unless s/he has given a short written reflection about how to avoid negative and foster positive societal impacts.

Please note that these are *preliminary* ideas and suggestions for the integration of criteria into the PoT. They will first have to be discussed in detail in SP9 and eventually planned and realized with those partners who develop the PoT and the testbed. This work will, as indicated, start once the concrete planning for the PoT’s structure has actually begun. It will furthermore have to be discussed whether the tagging of criteria to different tools and contexts is a realistic plan and how to identify the underlying structures and logics for this tagging system.

## 5 Bibliography

Allen, C.R., Gunderson, L.H. and A.R. Johnson (2005): The use of discontinuities and functional groups to assess relative resilience in complex systems. *Ecosystems*, 8(8), pp. 958–966.

Adger, W. N. (2003): Building Resilience to Promote Sustainability: An Agenda for Coping with Globalisation and Promoting Justice. *IHDP Update* 2:1-3.

Berkes, F. and H. Ross (2013): Community resilience: toward an integrated approach. *Society and Natural Resources* 26, 5–20.

British Red Cross & IFRC (2013): “Options for including community resilience in the post-2015 development goals”. Available at: <http://www.redcross.org.uk/What-we-do/~media/BritishRedCross/Documents/What%20we%20do/Preparing%20for%20emergencies/Community%20resilience.pdf>

Bristow, M., Fang, L., and K.W. Hipel (2012). System of systems engineering and risk management of extreme events: Concepts and case study. *Risk Analysis* : An Official Publication of the Society for Risk Analysis, 32(11), pp. 1935–1955.

Collinson S and M Duffield (2013) Paradoxes of Presence. Available at: <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8428.pdf>

Commission of the European Communities (2009): Communication “EU Strategy for Supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in Developing Countries”. Available at: [http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8653\\_COM200984ENACTEf.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/8653_COM200984ENACTEf.pdf)

Christie R (2010) Critical Voices to Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique? *Security Dialogue* 41(2): 169-190

ESCAP (2013): “Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis”. Available at: <http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/ThemeStudy2013-full2.pdf>

EU Red Cross Office (2012): “Position paper: Contribution to the preparation of the European Commission Communication on Resilience , REF. RCEU 07/2012 – 001” Available at: [http://www.redcross.eu/en/upload/documents/pdf/2014Position\\_Papers/RCEU\\_EU\\_Resilience\\_Con\\_sultation\\_2012\\_ready.pdf](http://www.redcross.eu/en/upload/documents/pdf/2014Position_Papers/RCEU_EU_Resilience_Con_sultation_2012_ready.pdf)

European Commission (2009): "Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience". Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0149:FIN:EN:PDF>

European Commission (2012): “The EU approach to resilience: Learning from food security crisis”. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com\\_2012\\_586\\_resilience\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2012_586_resilience_en.pdf)

European Commission (2010): “The EU Internal Security Strategy in Action: Five steps towards a more secure Europe”. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-2014/malmstrom/pdf/news/internal\\_security\\_strategy\\_in\\_action\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/malmstrom/pdf/news/internal_security_strategy_in_action_en.pdf)

European Commission (2011): “Implementation Plan of the EU Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries 2011-2014”. Available at: <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?!=EN&f=ST%206666%202011%20INIT>

European Commission (2013): “Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020”.

Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com\\_2013\\_227\\_ap\\_crisis\\_prone\\_countries\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2013_227_ap_crisis_prone_countries_en.pdf)

European Commission (2013): “Disaster Risk Reduction. Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action”. Available at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention\\_preparedness/DRR\\_thematic\\_policy\\_doc.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf)

European Commission (2014): “AGIR – Building Resilience to food and nutrition crisis in the Sahel & West-Africa”. Available at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/sahel\\_agir\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/sahel_agir_en.pdf)

European Commission (2014): “Building Resilience: The EU’s approach”. Available at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/thematic/EU\\_building\\_resilience\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/thematic/EU_building_resilience_en.pdf)

Folke, C. (2006): Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social- ecological systems analysis. *Global Environmental Change* 16: 253-267

Gall, Melanie (2013): “From social Vulnerability to Resilience: Measuring progress towards Disaster Risk Reduction”. Available at: <http://www.ehs.unu.edu/file/get/11125.pdf>

Garnezy, N. (1973). Competence and adaptation in adult schizophrenic patients and children at risk. In Dean, S. R. (Ed.), *Schizophrenia: The first ten Dean Award Lectures* (pp. 163-204). NY: MSS Information Corp.

Holling, C.S. (1973): Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4:1-23.

IFRC (2012): “The Road to Resilience: Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future”

International federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies – June 2012. Available at:

<http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/96178/1224500-Road%20to%20resilience-EN-LowRes%20%282%29.pdf>

IFRC: The seven Fundamental Principles. Available at: <http://www.ifrc.org/en/who-we-are/vision-and-mission/the-seven-fundamental-principles/>

IFRC: Strategy 2020. Available at: <http://www.ifrc.org/who-we-are/vision-and-mission/strategy-2020/>

Joseph J (2013) Resilience as embedded in neoliberalism: a governmentality approach. *Resilience* 1(1): 38-52.

King G and JL Murray (2001) Rethinking Human Security. *Political Science Quarterly* 116 (4): 585-610

Luthar, S.S., Cicchetti, Dante and Bronwyn Becker (2000): The Construct of Resilience: A Critical Evaluation and Guidelines for Future Work. *Child Development* 71(3): 543-562

Longstaff, P.H., Armstrong, N.J., Perrin, K., Parker, W.M., and M.A. Hidek (2010): Building Resilient Communities: A Preliminary Framework for Assessment. *Homeland Security Affairs* VI (3).

Marhia N (2013) Some humans are more Human than Others: Troubling the ‘human’ in human security from a critical feminist perspective. *Security Dialogue* 44 (1): 19-35.

Masten A. S. and N. Garnezy (1985): Risk, vulnerability, and protective factors in developmental psychopathology. In: Lahey B. A. Kazdin (eds) *Advances in clinical child psychology*. Vol. 8. New York: Plenum Press. pp. 1–52.

Official Journal of the European Union (2007): Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007.

Available at: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/;ELX\\_SESSIONID=hQ27JQKTPSgV1KPwh1SFvyDwMXBvVTYNPQnB2Rt31yDcXjh1ybm9!1904515977?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:TOC](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/;ELX_SESSIONID=hQ27JQKTPSgV1KPwh1SFvyDwMXBvVTYNPQnB2Rt31yDcXjh1ybm9!1904515977?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:TOC)

Paris R (2001) Human Security – Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security* 26(2): 87-102

Perelman, Lewis J. (2007): *Shifting Security Paradigm: Towards Resilience*. GMU-CIPP Critical Thinking Series.

Pimm, S.L. 1984. The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature* 307:321-326 ; Pimm, S.L., 1991.

*The Balance of Nature? Ecological Issues in the Conservation of Species and Communities*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago ;

Tran, Mark (2012): EU to focus on building resilience to disaster among world's poorest. *The Guardian*. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2012/oct/03/eu-policy-building-resilience-disaster>

UNDP (1994) *Human Development Report*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UN ISDR (2005): “Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) “Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters”. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/2005/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf>

UNISDR: Terminology. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology>

UN system task team on the post 2015 UN development agenda (2012): “Disaster risk and resilience”. Available at: [http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam\\_undf/thinkpieces/3\\_disaster\\_risk\\_resilience.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/thinkpieces/3_disaster_risk_resilience.pdf)

UNDP (2011): “Towards human Resilience: Sustaining Millennium Development Goals progress in an age of economic uncertainty.” Available at:

[http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Towards\\_SustainingMDG\\_Web1005.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Poverty%20Reduction/Towards_SustainingMDG_Web1005.pdf)

UNDP (2014): “Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerability and building resilience”. Available at: <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr14-report-en-1.pdf>

UNISDR (2012): “Making cities resilient handbook”. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/toolkit/handbook>

UNISDR (2012): “Making cities resilient report 2012”. Available at: [http://www.unisdr.org/files/28240\\_rcreport.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/28240_rcreport.pdf)

UNISDR (2014): “A catalyst for change: How the Hyogo Framework for Action has promoted disaster risk reduction in South East Europe”. Available at:

<http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/39269>

United Nations (2014): “United Nations: Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience”.

Available at: [http://www.preventionweb.net/files/33703\\_actionplanweb14.06cs1.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/33703_actionplanweb14.06cs1.pdf)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2014): “Understanding community resilience: Findings from community-based resilience analysis (CoBRA) assessments”. Available at:

[http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/sustainable%20land%20management/CoBRA/CoBRA\\_Assessments\\_Report.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/sustainable%20land%20management/CoBRA/CoBRA_Assessments_Report.pdf)

United Nations ESCAP (2013): "Building Resilience to Natural Disasters and Major Economic Crisis". Available at: <http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/ThemeStudy2013-full2.pdf>

United Nations Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Global Sustainability (2012): "Resilient people resilient planet: A future worth choosing". Available at: [http://uscib.org/docs/GSPReportOverview\\_A4%20size.pdf](http://uscib.org/docs/GSPReportOverview_A4%20size.pdf)

United Nations University. Institute for Environment and Human Security: Social Vulnerability Summer Academy. Available at: <http://www.ehs.unu.edu/article/read/summer-academy>

Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S.R. and A. Kinzig (2004): Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society* 9(2): 5

World Economic Forum (2005): Women's Empowerment: Measuring the Global Gender Gap. Available at:

[http://www.weforum.org/pdf/Global\\_Competitiveness\\_Reports/Reports/gender\\_gap.pdf](http://www.weforum.org/pdf/Global_Competitiveness_Reports/Reports/gender_gap.pdf)

#### **DRIVER Deliverables:**

D92.11 – *Report on the Creations of Secondary Insecurities*

D92.21 – *Report on Societal Costs and Negative Impacts on Society*

D93.21- (forthcoming) *Tools to assess positive societal impact*

D31.21- *SOTA & Conceptual Framework for civil society resilience*



