
APPRAISING THE SENDAI FRAMEWORK: PLACE OF WOMEN IN DISASTER RISK MITIGATION

Nkiruka Evangeline Obi-Aso¹; *Nonso Izuchukwu Ewurum²; Kenechi Peter Ifeanacho²

¹Department of Estate Management, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra, Nigeria

²Department of Estate Management, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Enugu, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *Natural disasters pose significant threats globally, and to manage it, a disaster reduction policy was enacted in 2015 establishing the Sendai Framework of Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR). Since statistics from several accounts indicate that women are disproportionately affected by disaster events, their contributions should ideally be integrated in disaster management processes for the generation of sustainable outcomes. To enthrone this philosophy in practice, the study examined SFDRR's recognition of women in such projects. Content analysis of all 50 Articles and 4 Priorities for Action within the Framework was conducted. Findings showed that women are recognized as core partners and worthy leaders in disaster risk mitigation. It was concluded that the SFDRR established grounds for building disaster resilience through acknowledgement of women as vital stakeholders in disaster risk governance, and provided research agenda for further studies on the extent to which nations in the global south adopt and implement the policy.*

KEYWORDS: disaster risk reduction, disaster vulnerable groups, gender stereotypes, sendai, framework, sustainable development

INTRODUCTION

Data from the World Bank approximates global female population to 50%, specifically 49.6% in 2019 (The World Bank, 2019). This statistic corroborates data from the 2019 revised United Nations Population Division's World Population Prospects. This ratio of the global demography emphasizes the significance of women in every aspect of global discourse especially in the fields of economics and planning. A crucial consideration that accentuates this fact is the risk posed by disasters. Empirical accounts of vulnerability from natural disaster identify the female gender as the most affected during and post natural disasters. By vulnerability, we are concerned with mortality rates, displacements, and low recovery, resilience, anticipation and coping levels.

A fascinating insight into the relatively high female disaster vulnerability can be found in the study of Neumayer & Plümper (2007) which outlined a 12-year chronicle of the effect of disaster on the female gender across 141 countries. First, the study started with the hypothesis that "natural disasters do not affect people equally", a proposition that was found to be accurate with the findings indicative of a "relatively higher female mortality rate" during natural disasters. Chew and Ramdas (2005) examined trauma, displacements and death toll from tsunamis in Asia and Africa, hurricanes such as Katrina and Stan in the United States and Guatemala respectively, cyclones, earthquakes and mudslides, and came to the

conclusion that while they are spatially distributed globally, they still share the same outcome with women and children disproportionately affected.

Lending an unambiguous credence to the foregoing, a 2012 World Development Report on gender equality designate women disaster fatality representation at an “estimated 61% after the 2008 Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, 70% after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami in Banda Aceh, and 91% after Cyclone Gorky in Bangladesh in 1991”. That other reports from the World Health Organization, Non-Governmental Organizations, pundits and civil societies continue to accentuate this grim reality shows that it is not surreptitious, instead what may appear baffling is the relatively paucity or inadequacy of commensurate attention to the fact by scholars, and disaster relief and reconstruction agencies, especially in the global south. This paucity of empirical data provides an unacceptable level of insufficiency of gender-specific practical guidance and stakeholder salient approach to disaster risk mitigation and recovery.

With the social, moral, cultural, religious, psychological and economic existential threats to the female gender in several parts of the world, arguably predominantly in the global south, it is increasingly becoming unquestionable that this disproportionate vulnerability statistic may continue to escalate without commensurate reaction. More so, these overlying gender-specific stereotypes make it even more purposeful for a prioritization of this vulnerable group in disaster relief and reconstruction, especially when viewed from the lenses of their relative closer affinity to children, another disproportionate vulnerable group. In approaching this issue, we focus our attention on pre-disaster resilience of the women demography as a means of attenuating the evident disproportionate during and aftereffect disaster vulnerability of women.

METHODS

In embarking upon our research problem, we conducted a systematic review of the global disaster risk mitigation benchmark developed by the United Nations, the Sendai Framework. Sendai Framework, as the scope of the study, is informed by two considerations – first, it is not national nor regional but global; second, it is the most recent (2015) disaster risk reduction policy for global mitigation, reconstruction and restoration programmes. Therefore, qualitative research method was employed by the study, and data was analyzed using Content Analysis.

Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Mitigation

Primer

In a bid to address lingering, and seemingly inevitable natural disaster occurrences, a compendium of global policy frameworks and agreements have been formulated as guide for sustainable action. Recently, global movements in this regard have seen a paradigm shift from disaster management towards a more sustainable approach which heightens the prioritization of disaster risk reduction. The concept of Disaster risk reduction (DRR) has a generic delineation that developed from the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) which sees it as, “minimization of vulnerabilities and disaster risks

throughout a society for the prevention or mitigation of adverse impacts of hazards, within the broad context of sustainable development” (UNISDR, 2004). Impliedly, it is the identification and mitigation of disaster risk through socioeconomic resilience building amongst vulnerable groups and the environment in general.

With its global acclaim and recognition, also comes the criticisms of DRR as a broad spectrum. Critiques of the DRR strategy leverage their argument on the need for a more streamlined approach to delineating it for policy formulation and implementation purposes. In what might be viewed as a response to the criticisms and also one which might have been accelerated by the devastating impacts of the 2004 Tsunami in Asia, the United Nations in its World Conference on Disaster Reduction which held in Kobe, Japan in 2005 offered a more streamlined conceptualization of DRR. This led to the development, acceptance and establishment of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) as a global parameter for DRR.

It must be noted that the HFA, did not effectively address our query on the extent to which the peculiarities of the female gender are addressed in DRR. In the entire document, issues on gender that focus specifically on women appeared only twice. It appeared first, in the General Considerations section which served as the introduction to the Priority Actions. In other words, it seemingly was not even deemed fit to be a crucial priority principle. Precisely, the sweeping statement was made in Article 13(d) of the document which states as follows:

“A gender perspective should be integrated into all disaster risk management policies, plans and decision-making processes, including those related to risk assessment, early warning, information management, and education and training” (p. 4).

While the document has done well to bring in the gender discourse, it offered no panacea to the earlier identified broadness criticism of the DRR agenda. One would have thought that as a simplifier, the HFA would have provided a more delineated approach to its gender argument, to enhance its appreciation and implementation. While the next consideration of the HFA document on women did not clear up this ambiguity, its identification of women and vulnerable groups as DRR stakeholders is commendable. Of more interest is its inclusion of this stakeholder approach in the Priority for Action Number 3 which focuses on the utilization of “knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels”. As a result, Number 3ii(m) on Education and Training identified women as stakeholders applicable for disaster risk mitigation capacity building. Specifically, it states as follows:

“Ensure equal access to appropriate training and educational opportunities for women and vulnerable constituencies; promote gender and cultural sensitivity training as integral components of education and training for disaster risk reduction 3ii(m)” (p. 10).

Other feeble and ambiguous attempts were made within the HFA which called for a consideration of vulnerability groups in DRR, yet without requisite recognition as a Priority for Action, nor a clear delineation of particular vulnerable groups with their peculiarities. The Hyogo Framework would be periodically reviewed to ascertain its global implementations

and performance, and it is from one such review in 2013 that led to a rethinking and reengineering of the framework in consistency with sustainable development.

In 2015, the United Nations developed the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030) at the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Sendai, Japan, and subsequently approved it as a global DRR Framework. It operates on the following priority objectives of:

- A. Understanding disaster risk
- B. Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk
- C. Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience
- D. Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response, and to building back better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction (UNISDR, 2015).

Sendai Framework: Content Analysis

Perhaps, an early indication that the Sendai framework will offer more emphasis on the women demography may have been found in the composition of the third WCDRR that birthed the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR). The Conference was chaired by a woman, Eriko Yamatani, and the event held in the city of Sendai, Japan, with the City Mayor, a woman named Eriko Okuyama, also in attendance. With such formation, one would hope that a substantial beam would be directed on the vulnerability of women during and after natural disasters.

This optimism may not be too far from reality as the first direct reference of women as a vulnerable group in disaster occurrences appears in the document's preamble, specifically Article Number 4 on page 10. Interestingly, this section of the document focused on a presentation of lessons learnt from the HFA, and the way forward. It commenced with fatality, displacement, economic and vulnerability statistics, and subsequently expounded that vulnerability groups have been disproportionately affected. Perhaps, in what might be deemed a sign of improvement from the HFA, the SFDRR succinctly identified this disaster period vulnerable demography as "women and children", as stated:

"Overall, more than 1.5 billion people have been affected by disasters in various ways, with women, children and people in vulnerable situations disproportionately affected" (p.10).

While the HFA recommended the integration of a gender perspective, the SFDRR strengthened the argument by beginning with a grim reminder, backed with statistics, that a vulnerable group exists, and they are women and children. This stark reminder served as premise for further discussion on gender integration and consideration in the planning, implementation and engagement obligations of disaster risk management agencies. Echoing our logic, the SFDRR further stressed the need for stakeholder engagement in DRR, with women identified as a crucial stakeholder. This is premised on gaining operations intelligence from the experiences and insights of this demography which provide crucial information on issues which make vulnerability tracking and tackling effective. Article Number 7 on page 10 emphasizes this explicitly:

“There has to be a broader and a more people-centred preventive approach to disaster risk. Disaster risk reduction practices need to be multi-hazard and multisectoral, inclusive and accessible in order to be efficient and effective. While recognizing their leading, regulatory and coordination role, Governments should engage with relevant stakeholders, including women, children and youth, persons with disabilities, poor people, migrants, indigenous peoples, volunteers, the community of practitioners and older persons in the design and implementation of policies, plans and standards. There is a need for the public and private sectors and civil society organizations, as well as academia and scientific and research institutions, to work more closely together and to create opportunities for collaboration, and for businesses to integrate disaster risk into their management practices” (p.10).

This stakeholder salient approach to disaster risk mitigation makes it people-centred and further strengthens the opportunities for public participation and inclusiveness which sees every hands on deck thereby taking the reduction of disaster risks beyond government and response agencies. Stough and Kang (2012) attach a fair degree of significance to stakeholder salience in DRR design and implementation especially where vulnerable groups are identified and engaged as stakeholders, a situation which transcends equity towards pragmatism in planning and development.

In another demonstration of the less broad composition of the SFDRR, especially when compared to the HFA, a vivid stakeholder engagement and inclusive representation and plan is delineated which offers a clear elucidation of DRR implementation. This was contained in the Guiding Principles of the framework which anchors on an inclusive, indigenously characterized and legal consistent DRR that meets global best standards. Specifically, Sections (a) to (b) on page 13 captures the argument as follows:

(a) *“Each State has the primary responsibility to prevent and reduce disaster risk, including through international, regional, subregional, transboundary and bilateral cooperation. The reduction of disaster risk is a common concern for all States and the extent to which developing countries are able to effectively enhance and implement national disaster risk reduction policies and measures in the context of their respective circumstances and capabilities can be further enhanced through the provision of sustainable international cooperation”;*

(b) *“Disaster risk reduction requires that responsibilities be shared by central Governments and relevant national authorities, sectors and stakeholders, as appropriate to their national circumstances and systems of governance”;*

(c) *“Managing the risk of disasters is aimed at protecting persons and their property, health, livelihoods and productive assets, as well as cultural and environmental assets, while promoting and protecting all human rights, including the right to development”;*

(d) *“Disaster risk reduction requires an all-of-society engagement and partnership. It also requires empowerment and inclusive, accessible and non-discriminatory participation, paying special attention to people disproportionately affected by disasters, especially the*

poorest. A gender, age, disability and cultural perspective should be integrated in all policies and practices, and women and youth leadership should be promoted. In this context, special attention should be paid to the improvement of organized voluntary work of citizens”;

Section (d) of the Guiding Principles make reference to the significance and pertinence of vulnerability groups in DRR and this emphasis promote it to a certain level of essentiality for disaster risk mitigation programmes and plans. Within the global south climes, inclusiveness and stakeholder salience of women and the economically disadvantaged are complex issues in policy design and implementation. Stakeholder salience does not illustrate the welcoming of conflicting stakeholder views by project managers, but also one which indulges the views of the societally disadvantaged or displaced, especially where they are disproportionately affected by the subject of the matter. It is a concept that speaks to the ability of women in places like the Middle East and Africa to not just be heard but also listened to.

Inclusiveness, on the other hand, has been likened to the “intent to assimilate the needs” of vulnerable groups in “emergency planning” for equitable delivery of DRR services (Stough et al., 2015). Going beyond this assertion, inclusiveness is not just about engaging the vulnerable groups, it is indeed about engaging them at all stages of the process, from forming and conceptualization of the programme, through plan formulation and implementation, to all aspects of project management, monitoring, supervision and feedback organization (Ewurum, 2019). Inclusiveness is also firsthand knowledge of the peculiar needs of each vulnerable demography and a determination of the correlation between these needs and disaster vulnerability.

Empirical Perspectives

Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction

There exists an arguably low level of empirical accounts of sustainable DRR through inclusive and stakeholder salient approaches, especially in comparison with the greater number of studies (Gartrell et al., 2020; Hasan et al., 2019; Ronoh et al., 2017) advocating for adopting similar approach in DRR practices, especially in the global south. Some of the few attempts at capturing the efficacy of inclusiveness in DRR have presented convincing evidence that it provides a substantial pathway to sustainable disaster risk mitigation. Pertiwi et al. (2019) examined inclusive disaster preparedness projects in Indonesia. The study employed a multiple case study research design over a population of disabled persons. It was found that disabled persons were not just included in the project but also led it efficiently in spite of identified cultural encumbrances. The study also showed that this inclusiveness advanced community resilience to disaster effectively.

Villeneuve et al. (2021) had 7 focus group discussions with 190 representatives of vulnerable groups in Queensland Australia on the performance of inclusive disaster risk reduction. The research design was Structured Interview Matrix. Data was analyzed qualitatively using inductive analysis. The study found that the inclusive nature of the project enthroned a capability approach which enabled stakeholder collaboration that culminated in rise in safety and resilience prospects.

Jones et al. (2014) conducted a chronological analysis of disaster risk reduction initiatives in Nepal. The scope of the study was the “National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management” and the “Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium”. The study employed in-depth interview schedule and found the significance of stakeholder engagement as disaster risk reduction model in post-conflict countries. Mojtahede & Oo (2014) conducted a qualitative exploration of stakeholder issues in DRR. The study reviewed extant literature with a view to developing a theoretical framework stakeholder proactiveness and reactiveness in DRR projects. The study found that “stakeholder organizational attributes and decision-making paradigms were fundamental in DRR projects”. These submissions reinforce the prospects of inclusive DRR as contained in the SFDRR and offers a reengineering opportunity for DRR governance in the global south.

Priority 4 of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction also stresses the consequences of various levels of exposure to disaster risk. While Paragraph 4 of the framework elucidates this with the phrase, people “affected by disasters in various ways” (Stough et al., 2015), Article 32 within the Priority 4 sees such recognition as a sustainable and resilient building approach to DRR. It states thus:

“The steady growth of disaster risk, including the increase of people and assets exposure, combined with the lessons learned from past disasters, indicates the need to further strengthen disaster preparedness for response, take action in anticipation of events, integrate disaster risk reduction in response preparedness and ensure that capacities are in place for effective response and recovery at all levels...”

“...Disasters have demonstrated that the recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction phase, which needs to be prepared ahead of a disaster, is a critical opportunity to “Build Back Better”, including through integrating disaster risk reduction into development measures, making nations and communities resilient to disasters” (p.21).

Priority 4 also offered an extension of the inclusiveness of other sections of the Framework with its significant emphasis on the empowerment of women to not just partake in the process for equity reasons, but also to lead the process. Explicitly, it states thus:

“Empowering women and persons with disabilities to publicly lead and promote gender equitable and universally accessible response, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction approaches is key” (p.21).

This is a fascinating *convertat et certe*, and one which is insightful for sustainable DRR in the global south regions of the Middle East and Africa. One concern which might be raised about this clause, is the stated phases, if not, starting point of women DRR leadership. The clause seems to negate the mitigation and preparatory stages which is equally key, if not more significant that the response phase of the process. This argument rests on the premise that where women leadership also encapsulates disaster risk mitigation processes, greater insight about vulnerability groups will be efficiently obtained, effectively appreciated and integrated in the formulation and implementation frameworks (Alam & Rahman, 2017; Enarson, 2013).

However, the Sendai Framework may have corrected this anomaly with the development of its stakeholder salient methodology for DRR with the articulation of stakeholder responsibilities and obligations. It also identifies who constitutes a stakeholder while advocating for a collaborative arrangement that highpoints the obligations, interests and contributions of each group. Typically, Articles 35 & 36 posit thus:

“While States have the overall responsibility for reducing disaster risk, it is a shared responsibility between Governments and relevant stakeholders. In particular, non-State stakeholders play an important role as enablers in providing support to States, in accordance with national policies, laws and regulations, in the implementation of the present Framework at local, national, regional and global levels. Their commitment, goodwill, knowledge, experience and resources will be required” (35; p.23).

“When determining specific roles and responsibilities for stakeholders, and at the same time building on existing relevant international instruments, States should encourage the following

actions on the part of all public and private stakeholders:

(a) Civil society, volunteers, organized voluntary work organizations and community-based organizations to participate, in collaboration with public institutions, to, inter alia, provide specific knowledge and pragmatic guidance in the context of the development and implementation of normative frameworks, standards and plans for disaster risk reduction; engage in the implementation of local, national, regional and global plans and strategies; contribute to and support public awareness, a culture of prevention and education on disaster risk; and advocate for resilient communities and an inclusive and all-of-society disaster risk management that strengthens synergies across groups, as appropriate. On this point, it should be noted that:

(i) Women and their participation are critical to effectively managing disaster risk and designing, resourcing and implementing gender-sensitive disaster risk reduction policies, plans and programmes; and adequate capacity building measures need to be taken to empower women for preparedness as well as to build their capacity to secure alternate means of livelihood in post-disaster situations;

(ii) Children and youth are agents of change and should be given the space and modalities to contribute to disaster risk reduction, in accordance with legislation, national practice and educational curricula;

(iii) Persons with disabilities and their organizations are critical in the assessment of disaster risk and in designing and implementing plans tailored to specific requirements, taking into consideration, inter alia, the principles of universal design;

(iv) Older persons have years of knowledge, skills and wisdom, which are invaluable assets to reduce disaster risk, and they should be included in the design of policies, plans and mechanisms, including for early warning;

(v) Indigenous peoples, through their experience and traditional knowledge, provide

an important contribution to the development and implementation of plans and mechanisms, including for early warning;

(vi) Migrants contribute to the resilience of communities and societies, and their knowledge, skills and capacities can be useful in the design and implementation of disaster risk reduction;

(b) Academia, scientific and research entities and networks to focus on the disaster risk factors

and scenarios, including emerging disaster risks, in the medium and long term; increase research for regional, national and local application; support action by local communities and authorities; and support the interface between policy and science for decision-making;

(c) Business, professional associations and private sector financial institutions, including financial regulators and accounting bodies, as well as philanthropic foundations, to integrate disaster risk management, including business continuity, into business models and practices through disaster-risk-informed investments, especially in micro, small and medium-sized enterprises; engage in awareness-raising and training for their employees and customers; engage in and support research and innovation, as well as technological development for disaster risk management; share and disseminate knowledge, practices and non-sensitive data; and actively participate, as appropriate and under the guidance of the public sector, in the development of normative frameworks and technical standards that incorporate disaster risk management” (36; p.23).

“Media to take an active and inclusive role at the local, national, regional and global levels in contributing to the raising of public awareness and understanding and disseminate accurate and non-sensitive disaster risk, hazard and disaster information, including on small-scale disasters, in a simple, transparent, easy-to-understand and accessible manner, in close cooperation with national authorities; adopt specific disaster risk reduction communications policies; support, as appropriate, early warning systems and life-saving protective measures; and stimulate a culture of prevention and strong community involvement in sustained public education campaigns and public consultations at all levels of society, in accordance with national practices” (36; 24).

Perusal of Article 35(a)(i) produces evidence of the recognition of women leadership role at the disaster risk mitigation stages and the significance of their insight to DRR planning and implementation. This specific reference enriches the prospects of significant proportion of women involvement in DRR, though this also begs the question on the extent to which this is adhered to in the global south. Lending credence, Arora (2016) posits that the big data deficiency in several countries populating the global south make this analysis a challenging prospect. This problematic situation is most pronounced in light of the SFDRR’s call for implementing the priorities at indigenous levels. In a reflection of the Incheon Strategy, Stough et al. (2015) asserts that inclusion of the disaster vulnerable demography as a variable in emergency planning surveys would signal the their cruciality in the process design and implementation phases. However, there really needs to be commensurate empirical guidance

in disaster risk management literature, as it seems there exists relatively limited number of studies on the extent to which SFDRR priorities have been implemented in various countries.

Disaster Risk Management: Empirical Perspectives on Women Inclusiveness in Disaster Risk Governance (DRG)

Yadav et al. (2021) examined the gender inclusiveness of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of Nepal (2017). The study operated on the following research questions – extent to which gender attentive DRR research has enhanced gender inclusiveness, relationship between gender inclusiveness and vulnerability reduction, and transformational potentials of gender inclusive DRR policies. The study hypothesized that increased gender inclusiveness in DRG would not improve social inequality and institutional performance. The study interviewed 105 persons and 11 groups of displaced, pregnant, newly delivered women, health workers, policy makers and corporate bodies in a series of 3 focus group discussions. The study made the finding that inclusiveness of women in disaster risk governance exposed biases within extant DRRR policies while enhancing prospects of transformative social change in DRR.

Hemachandra et al. (2017) appraised the role of women in DRG. The study highlighted the significance of women in DRR, specifically at the household level but decried the limited opportunities granted them in DRG. The study employed qualitative research method and found women leadership to be significantly vital in resilience building in disaster-prone areas. The study also identified sociocultural, individual, legal, institutional and socioeconomic barriers to the discharge of this obligation. From the few available literature on the role of women in DRG, it can be concluded that more opportunities for women leadership in DRR is a predictor for resilience building and reduction in disaster vulnerability.

FINDINGS

From the content analysis of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the study made the following findings:

1. The SFDRR advocated for conscious effort to survey, identify and recognize disaster vulnerability groups and their level of exposure, as significant precursor to engaging them as stakeholders.
2. The SFDRR improved upon lacuna in the HFA by identifying women as vulnerable demography in pre, during and post disaster occurrences.
3. The Framework recognizes the significant role of women at the household level and advocated for women-friendly collaboration and stakeholder salient initiatives, strategies and approaches.
4. The SFDRR recognized and campaigned against societal stereotyping of women in the global south.
5. The Framework also recognizes the utility of women societal stereotype and disaster experiences in DRG. Thus, advocating for increased gender inclusiveness in disaster risk governance.
6. The SFDRR advanced a sustainable collaborative framework of vulnerability groups, policy makers, academia, government agencies, corporate bodies, civil society groups, media, community representatives and volunteers as core stakeholders of DRR and DRG.

7. The Framework initiated perspectives of local-driven DRR that anchors on multilateral international partnerships that meets global best standards.

8. It argued for an integration of disaster risk policies and measures into community development plans as a means of promoting the build back better principle of sustainable development.

9. There was a paucity of emphasis on the financial costs and benefits of implementing the SFDRR Priorities, especially in light of the economic power disparity amongst nations.

DISCUSSION

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction provided a distinct delineation of who constitutes disaster vulnerable demography, severally cited their place within DRR policy, while also utilizing the opportunity to highlight the ills of societal stereotypes as they disproportionately affect certain gender and classes of people. Two initiatives were presented in this policy, one is a proposition for inclusive disaster risk reduction; the other is gender inclusive disaster risk governance with a view to building and sustaining community resilience. This observation and its collaborative and stakeholder salient approach, as encapsulated in various articles within its Priority sections, made it an arguable upgrade from the Hyogo Framework for Action.

It also improved upon the relative ambiguity which characterize certain sections of the HFA, by stipulating clear pathways towards sustainable disaster risk mitigation in the global south. For instance, it associated a learning market approach anchored on obtaining intelligence from the experiences of vulnerable groups with the initiation, planning, implementing and management of DRR. The essence is to incorporate the positions and perceptions of this demography with a view to effective and sustainable policy design and implementation. Through this stakeholder salient policy, the Framework established grounds for the identification and recognition of the roles and obligations of women in DRR and DRG as significant pathway to building back better.

Setting an Agenda

With all the testimonials accorded the SFDRR, it still remains a conceptual and theoretical product. Therefore, more work is needed from the perspectives of practice and further research. Significant volume of research is needed to assess the performance of the Framework in various countries, especially in the global south with a view to extricating the country-specific operationalization, encumbrances and prospects of its implementation from a gender perspective. From such studies, improvement strategies can be developed for a more suitable Framework or for process improvement. This, it is believed, might attenuate the paucity of evidence issue on the subject as it concerns the global south.

There is need to improve of data collection capabilities so as to provide a more detailed, current and running disaster vulnerability statistics on women in developing countries for the purpose of further planning and research. We agree with Stough et al. (2015) on the observation a possible shortcoming of the SFDRR in its limited attention on the financial implications of the implementing the Priorities. DRR requires huge capital outlay, and while this differs with each country, a benchmark should have been established for the purpose of

directing the espousal of the Framework for sustainable DRR. One may argue that our reference to financial matters may constitute a deliberate diversion from the subject of the place of women in DRR, but we contend that its significance lies in the clarity the financial elucidation aspect offers implementing agencies and the private sector, thereby boosting confidence in the comprehensiveness of the Framework as a guide.

In conclusion, gender inclusive DRR and DRG should not be considered a privilege or special consideration. Instead, it should form the bedrock of the organizational structure and culture of disaster risk mitigation policy and practices. Literature has also provided evidence on the efficacy of a stakeholder salient DRR policy in building back better and strengthening resilience. Impliedly, given the significant and crucial place of women in the society and pre, during and post disaster periods, gender inclusiveness should not end in consultation but transcend towards engagement as core partners in the process.

References

- Alam, K. & Rahman, H. (2017), "The role of women in disaster resilience", *Handbook of Disaster Risk Reduction & Management*, pp: 697-719.
- Arora, P. (2016), "Bottom of the data pyramid: Big data and the global south", *International Journal of Communication*, Vol. 10.
- Chew, L. & Ramdas, K. (2005), *Caught in the storm: The impact of natural disasters on global fund for women*. <https://www.globalfundforwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/11/disaster-report.pdf>. Retrieved in January 2021
- Enarson, E. (2013), "Two solitudes, many bridges, big tent: Women's Leadership in climate and disaster risk reduction" in Alston, M., Whittenbury, K. (Eds.) *Research, Action and Policy: Addressing the Gendered Impacts of Climate Change*, Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5518-5_5
- Ewurum, N.I. (2019), *Stakeholder management and sustainable public housing delivery in South East, Nigeria*, PhD Dissertation, Estate Management, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra, Nigeria.
- Gartrell, A., Calgaro, E., Goddard, G. & Saorath, N. (2020), "Disaster experiences of women with disabilities: Barriers and opportunities for disability inclusive disaster risk reduction in Cambodia", *Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 64.
- Hasan, R., Nasreen, M. & Chowdhury, A. (2021), "Gender-inclusive disaster management policy in Bangladesh: A content analysis of national and international regulatory frameworks", *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, Vol. 41
- Hemachandra, K., Amaratunga, D. & Haigh, R. (2017), *Role of women in disaster risk governance*, 7th International Conference on Building Resilience; Using scientific knowledge to inform policy and practice in disaster risk reduction, ICBR2017, 27 – 29 November, Bangkok, Thailand
- Jones, S., Oven, K., Manyena, B. & Aryal, K. (2014), "Governance struggles and policy processes in disaster risk reduction: A case study from Nepal", *Geoforum*, Vol. 57 pp: 78-90
- Mohammad, H., Mojtahedi, S. & Lan, B. (2014), "Stakeholders' approaches to disaster risk reduction in built environment", *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Vol. 23 No. 4 pp: 356-369. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-11-2013-0209>

- Neumayer, E. & Plümper, T. (2007), “The gendered nature of natural disasters: The impact of catastrophic events on the gender gap in life expectancy, 1981–2002”, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 97 No. 3 pp: 551-566, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8306.2007.00563.x
- Pertiwi, P., Llewellyn, G. & Villeneuve, M. (2019), “People with disabilities as key actors in community-based disaster risk reduction”, *Disability & Society*, Vol. 34 No. 9-10 pp: 1419-1444, DOI: 10.1080/09687599.2019.1584092
- Ronoh, S., Gaillard, J.C. & Marlowe, J. (2017), “Children with disabilities in disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction: Focusing on school settings”, *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 15 No. 3 pp: 380-388
- Stough, L.M., Kang, D. (2015), “The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and persons with disabilities”, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* Vol. 6 pp: 140–149, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-015-0051-8>
- The World Bank (2019), *Population, female (% of total population)*, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL.FE.ZS>. Retrieved in January 2021.
- UNISDR (2005), *World Conference on Disaster Reduction 18-22 January 2005, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan*, www.unisdr.org/wcdr. Retrieved in January 2021.
- Villeneuve, M., Abson, L., Pertiwi, P. & Moss, M. (2021), “Applying a person-centred capability framework to inform targeted action on Disability Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction”, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. Vol. 52
- Yadav, P., Saville, N., Arjyal, A., Baral, S., Kostkova, P. & Fordham, M. (2021), “A feminist vision for transformative change to disaster risk reduction policies and practices”, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.102026 (In press)