Inclusive Approaches to Disaster Risk Management—A Qualitative Review

Summary Note
I. Introduction

This report presents a qualitative review of inclusive approaches to disaster risk management (DRM)—part of a stocktaking exercise led by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) — to assess lessons learned and generate knowledge to help mainstream inclusive approaches and strategies across GFDRR activities. The findings are based on a literature review, analysis of portfolio data, and internal consultations with World Bank task team leaders of GFDRR-funded activities. The reviewed literature includes GFDRR project documentation and knowledge products, World Bank operational documents and research findings, and relevant publications by other scholars and organizations. The stocktaking exercise emphasises gender, disability inclusion, citizen engagement, and community participation. It will help create a framework for GFDRR engagement in inclusive DRM and inform development of an inclusive DRM workplan for implementation beginning in fiscal year 2022.

This report is aligned with the SDGs and the Sendai Framework to achieve gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls, the World Bank’s goal is to ensure equal opportunities for women and girls. In support of this commitment, the World Bank Group’s (WBG) Gender Equality Strategy tackles the challenges facing Gender equality. The strategy emphasises outcomes and results, which requires: (i) Strengthening the country-driven approach, with better country-level diagnostics, policy dialogue, and sex-disaggregated data; (ii) Building more systematically on what works by developing and bringing evidence to WBG task teams and clients; (iii) Adopting a strategic approach to project design and implementation, including more robust monitoring and evaluation system; and (iv) Leveraging partnerships for effective outcomes. Building on the World Bank corporate commitments, GFDRR’s inclusive DRM initiative is aligned with the World Bank vision and strategy on gender, expanding the scope to incorporate all aspects of inclusion. The Initiative also builds on the 2018 World Bank Group’s ten commitments to accelerate global action for disability-inclusive development in key areas such as education, digital development, data collection, gender, post-disaster reconstruction, transport, private sector investments, and social protection. The inclusive DRM initiative supports countries’ commitment to post-disaster reconstruction and, more generally, promotes universal accessibility in all GFDRR financed activities. Finally, GFDRR remains dedicated to mainstreaming citizen engagement as outlined in the World Bank’s Strategic Framework for Citizen Engagement (2014) to increase inclusive citizen engagement by engaging the community and facilitating citizens to be leaders for the production dissemination and review of risk information. Thus, creating ownership and improving the development impact of DRM activities.

Ultimately, social inclusion in DRM is about promoting opportunities for, abilities of, and dignity of marginalized groups in all aspects and stages of the DRM continuum. Although not unique to the disaster context, mechanisms of exclusion tend to exacerbate existing inequalities during disasters. Therefore, inclusive DRM is a critical component of the broader social inclusion agenda. Moreover, DRM actions will not effectively reduce disaster risks for everyone if the needs of vulnerable or marginalized groups are not considered. Although the underlying patterns driving disaster vulnerability are sometimes difficult to assess and quantify, failure to address them is likely to result in enormous social and economic costs; yet, inclusive DRM approaches are not just about supporting disadvantaged groups that suffer disproportionately from the effects of disasters—it is about empowering marginalized people to help increase the resilience of their communities. Figure 1 presents a summary of the main elements of inclusive DRM.

1 The three dimensions of social inclusion (opportunity, ability, and dignity) are explained in the Inclusion Matters framework (World Bank 2013a).
Mainstreaming climate and disaster risk management into development could reverse the trend of disaster losses. Social, economic, and political conditions mediate exposure and susceptibility to physical impacts of disasters. Marginalized groups tend to live in higher-risk areas, often have limited resources, and are often excluded from or underrepresented in decision-making bodies.

Inclusive DRM

The operationalization of inclusive DRM encapsulates various approaches that consider the heightened vulnerability of certain groups that are disadvantaged in the context of disasters.

Analysis of vulnerable groups and the diverse set of factors driving their vulnerability.

Addressing disaster risk vulnerabilities of marginalized and excluded groups should be a cornerstone of the commitment to fight poverty and advance the social inclusion agenda.

Recognition of social vulnerabilities can increase the cost-effectiveness of DRM measures.

Meaningful citizen engagement and broad community participation

In identifying and analyzing risks and vulnerabilities in planning, designing, implementing, and monitoring DRM interventions.

Source: Original figure for this publication.
II. Main Findings

Although this report focuses on the specific needs of women, men, and persons with disabilities, it also aims to explain inclusivity in DRM more broadly and as a holistic concept. Some of the lessons learned from gender- and disability-inclusive activities are relevant for identifying other vulnerable groups as well. Moreover, the concept of vulnerable groups does not imply that they are homogenous collectives with clearly defined boundaries. Rather, the premise is that group identities overlap and are inherently diverse and dynamic. Individuals and groups are excluded or included based on their identity (gender, race, caste, ethnicity, religion, age, and disability status), so certain socio-demographic characteristics may also lead to an accumulation, or even a multiplication of, disadvantages. This notion of intersectionality is crucial for the understanding of inclusive DRM. To identify vulnerable groups that may be at greater risk and have special needs during and after disasters occur, practitioners must understand the elements identified in Figure 2.

**Figure 2 Key Elements of Vulnerability**

- **The nature of potential impacts**
  - Disasters have a wide range of effects on natural and human systems, generally referred to as "effects on lives, livelihoods, health, ecosystems, economies, societies, cultures, services and infrastructure" (UNISDR 2018, 86).
  - The distinction between immediate, short-term effects (e.g., fatalities, injuries, displacement, destruction of homes, water shortages, disruption of essential services, infectious diseases) and more indirect, long-term effects (e.g., employment effects, market dynamics, social cohesion, public health impacts, nutrition, or migration) (EEA 2017).
  - The wide-ranging social and economic impacts are often subtle and not easily measurable. For instance, stress and anxiety have important mental health implications in the short and long term and affect peoples’ future lives, work, livelihoods, and social participation (EEA 2017).
  - Some social groups may be at greater risk from a disaster (because of greater exposure or greater vulnerability to a hazard), have different dimensions, and require different kinds of support.

- **The availability of tools, methods, and data**
  - Assessment methodologies to measure vulnerability. Given its multidimensional nature, there is no consensus on the definition, conceptualization, and measurement of vulnerability, but it is highly context specific, and to be relevant for policymakers, assessments must account for diverse socioeconomic, demographic, political, and cultural characteristics.
  - Quantitative approaches focused on indicator development, indices, and weighting make a valuable contribution to the research field (Arnold et al. 2014). Qualitative research provides detailed, place-specific, and hazard-specific information that can play a crucial role in understanding perceptions and experiences in the context of disaster risks.
  - The merits of qualitative and quantitative data should be considered for disaster risk assessments, although choice of methodology will depend on a research context (e.g., practical and political constraints) and level of analysis (geographic and temporal scales).

Effective mainstreaming of social inclusion in DRM requires thorough understanding of the various societal barriers marginalized groups face when interacting with their social and physical environments. The approach used in this report explored the factors or drivers of vulnerability by examining five distinct types of constraints: physical, financial, information, attitudinal, and institutional. These constraints may prevent people from accessing critical resources and services vital for their recovery and resilience.

---

2 Rufat et al. (2015) have reviewed case studies that assess social vulnerabilities to floods and found “a large gap between the contextual complexity revealed through qualitative studies and generalized, quantitative metrics produced by social vulnerability indices.”
markets, services, and spaces with dignity. By shifting attention to shortcomings in the social system rather than focusing on people’s abilities, this perspective acknowledges marginalized groups as agents of change, emphasizing that the adverse effects of disasters on these groups are avoidable. Understanding the underlying risk factors is a key element of DRM. Inclusive DRM approaches pay special attention to various factors related to vulnerability beyond the hazard itself or the likelihood of exposure. Hence, inclusive DRM is about understanding these factors or drivers of vulnerability in groups likely to disproportionately experience the direct and indirect consequences of disasters.

**Figure 3 Drivers of Vulnerability Associated with the Identified Types of Constraints**

The stocktaking exercise included an extensive review of relevant documentation, as well as consultations with regional task teams. To shape the engagement during the timeframe of strategy (FY22-FY25), the following operational gaps, key opportunities, and outcomes have been identified and will be addressed as a part of the annual workplans.

**Physical constraints**

- **Geography, location, and accessibility.** Marginalized groups often live in places that are inaccessible and susceptible to hazard risks, such as riverbanks and slopes. For instance, the floods that devastated India’s southern state of Kerala in 2018 disproportionately affected many remote and inaccessible tribal settlements in the state’s hilly districts (World Bank 2021a). Some groups in remote or physically isolated communities may face additional barriers, further elevating vulnerability to disaster. Persons with disabilities, for instance, may face additional mobility barriers because poor or inadequate infrastructure is a common characteristic of remote settlements. Moreover, they often depend on public services and assistive devices that may be inaccessible in the aftermath of a disaster.

- **Continuity of services and resilience of key public infrastructure.** Physical structures and spaces in communities often fail to reflect the unique and diverse social needs of the people who interact with them daily. Ensuring continuity of services and the resilience of key public infrastructure, such as roads, school buildings, and hospitals, is a core element of DRM, yet experience around the globe shows that few building codes comprehensively integrate safety and accessibility. Disasters often create physical barriers. Evacuees with disabilities may find shelters inaccessible. For women, gender-insensitive infrastructure design can present significant barriers throughout the DRM continuum. Examples from Europe, Central Asia, and South Asia underscore the importance of gender-appropriate spaces, such as safe bathrooms and sanitary facilities.
Financial constraints

- **Financial resource accessibility.** Poor households are unable to invest in risk-reducing measures and are often forced to live in areas susceptible to hazards. Lack of adequate insurance and social protection measures compounds precarious living conditions during shocks, driving people further into poverty. Moreover, complex livelihood strategies, often involving seasonal migration, are common among the poor, who are particularly vulnerable to disruption and restricted mobility during disasters.

- **Economic opportunities and financial independence.** Evidence clearly shows that women and persons with disabilities, among other groups, face disadvantages regarding economic opportunities and financial independence. For instance, women are more likely than men to lose employment after a disaster and carry most of the additional burden of domestic work during emergencies. The poorest households rely on unsustainable coping mechanisms, such as reducing food and health expenditures during disasters, withdrawing children from school to help at home, taking on debt, and/or selling productive assets.

Information constraints

- **Universal design and accessibility.** Information-sharing activities that do not accommodate the hearing, visual, physical, and intellectual needs of persons with disabilities exclude a part of the population from critical aspects of DRM. For instance, early warning systems that rely solely on audible methods (e.g., sirens, radios, and loudspeakers) are inaccessible to people with hearing disabilities and will fail to ensure that they can evacuate on time. The same applies to way-finding information, emergency numbers, evacuation directions, information on shelters and relief measures, and instructions to claim financial support. Likewise, public education campaigns that aim to raise awareness of existing risks and related DRM measures often rely on existing community institutions that are not universally accessible.

- **Access to information.** In addition to the points raised above, there may be several reasons why community members’ access to risk information and certain communication channels is limited. For instance, persons with low or no literacy or those who do not speak the official language (e.g., migrants and ethnic minorities) face challenges in accessing vital information via mass communication channels (e.g., radio, television, mobile phones, and newspapers) if their language barriers are not taken into account. Social norms and local power dynamics regulate access to information, especially in communities where many rely on word of mouth for DRM-related information. Interventions in South Asia illustrate how patriarchal norms exclude vulnerable community members, particularly women, from information sharing. Perceptions of and attitudes toward risks and related policies vary for social, cultural, and economic reasons, including, but not limited to, language barriers, education level, previous experience with disasters, and access to and use of information and communications technology and certain media channels.

Attitudinal constraints

- **Attitudes of people toward themselves and others.** Attitude is probably one of the most significant barriers to marginalized groups building disaster resilience. Regardless of context, social norms and belief systems usually underpin exclusion of certain groups from DRM-related interventions and in society more broadly (World Bank 2021a). For
instance, experience with pandemics (Ebola, HIV, COVID-19) shows that diseases are often stigmatized during a public health crisis or used to reinforce discrimination (UNDRR 2020). This is particularly true for groups that already face stigma on other grounds and can lead to overt and subtle forms of discrimination. The attitudes of others also have implications for how we perceive ourselves. For instance, a common stereotype experienced in the disability community (especially among persons with cognitive and psychosocial disabilities) is that they are passive beneficiaries who depend entirely on others. Given their social roles, women and girls are often limited in mobility and autonomy in disaster contexts, regardless of their physical and mental capabilities.

Community trust and cooperation. These two elements are fundamental pillars of cohesive, resilient communities. Communities work through “informal networks based on trust, reciprocity, and social norms” (World Bank 2013b, 23). This characteristic of communities, their social capital and cohesion level, helps its members manage risks effectively. For instance, evidence from Europe and Central Asia shows that people with strong social networks and high levels of trust are significantly less likely to resort to costly coping behavior after a shock, presumably because they have greater informal support. Labor migration and disrupted family structures may explain limited social assets in low-income urban settlements, decreasing the self-reliance and resilience of households and communities.

Institutional constraints

Legal documentation. In many cases, lack of government documentation, such as identification cards, disability certificates, and property titles, can impede access to relief measures and reinforce existing inequalities in access to social protection and public services. Informality and lack of legal documentation make it difficult to access social protection, credit, insurance, and certain public services, which are crucial to recovering from disasters.

Participatory processes. Participation in community affairs, including DRM processes, is widely seen as a fundamental element of disaster resilience (Arnold et al. 2014; Arnold and de Cosmo 2015; GFDRR 2020a; IIED 2020; World Bank 2020). Participation implies being able to speak out, be capable of and confident in advocating for oneself, and claim one’s rights and be heard, but longstanding, intricate patterns of exclusion undermine the voice and agency of certain marginalized groups for various reasons. For instance, evidence from Albania shows that during the floods of February 2015, women benefited less from public support measures, which was partially because they had less access to local representatives and decision makers (World Bank 2021b). Persons with disabilities are usually not consulted about their needs in disaster contexts, as the 2013 UN Survey on Living with Disabilities and Disasters (the first ever conducted) confirmed (UNISDR 2014).

Basic public services. Availability of and access to basic public services—most importantly health, education, and social services—is a fundamental building block of a well-functioning, resilient community. These services are particularly relevant for subsections of the population that are potentially vulnerable because of specific needs they have or barriers they face. For instance, having low-quality, inadequate, or inaccessible health care services during disasters increases the vulnerability of people with health risks or special health care needs, such as older people, those with underlying health conditions, pregnant women, and persons with disabilities.

II. Main Findings
III. Alignment with GFDRR’s Strategy 2021-2025
(Expanding and Mainstreaming Resilience in a World of Compound Risk)

- **Priority Area 1 (risk-informed decision making).** One of the key challenges encountered in the context of inclusion-sensitive DRM activities is the absence of data disaggregated according to sex, disability status, age, caste, and ethnicity, among other variables. Collection of disaggregated data on marginalized groups sheds light on the diversity and complexity of community needs and is often a precondition for developing effective, relevant DRM strategies. For instance, when post-disaster damage assessments fail to capture gender-differentiated losses and damages or neglect the distinct roles, responsibilities, and capacities of women and men, boys and girls, it is unlikely that policy decisions will achieve the desired outcomes. Although national-level data have improved significantly over the years, data resolution is often insufficient to assess group-specific vulnerabilities at subnational levels. Given existing data limitations, many DRM activities have relied on qualitative data to obtain a more-nuanced picture of potential inclusion barriers. Although qualitative and quantitative research each has its merits, they are not interchangeable.

- **Priority Area 2 (reducing risk and mainstreaming DRM).** GFDRR promotes integration of DRM principles, technologies, and expertise to ensure that critical infrastructure can withstand natural disasters and climate change. In doing so, task teams are encouraged to emphasise barriers to access for marginalized groups in the built environment and in relation to essential public and communal services, such as basic water and sanitation services. This involves, for instance, efforts to mainstream accessibility...
standards and universal design principles into infrastructure investments, making sure they are safe and inclusive. Empirical evidence shows that incorporating universal accessibility features into the design process is more cost-efficient than retrofitting existing buildings (GFDRR 2020b). Several activities in GFDRR’s portfolio support integrating and mainstreaming universal design standards into the design of buildings and risk-mitigation infrastructure. As in the case of in Indonesia, GFDRR supported the government to integrate universal design standards by developing a series of audit checklists that can be used to identify accessible solutions during the design and construction phases.

- **Priority Area 3 (financial preparedness to manage disaster and climate shocks).** Adaptive social protection (ASP) systems play a key role in financial preparedness for disasters. The social protection system can be more responsive to a disaster by expanding a preexisting safety net or creating a dedicated emergency program. Although the preferred design features of ASP are highly context dependent, a GFDRR guidance note on ASP highlights five core building blocks for investments in disaster responsiveness (GFDRR 2019b): government leadership, institutional arrangements, data and information, programs and delivery systems, and finance. To ensure that marginalized groups in need of assistance are included in the program, they must be identified and registered. If existing registries and information systems do not allow for accurate needs assessments, vulnerable groups may be excluded. Another key bottleneck for marginalized groups is that they often do not self-enroll, even when eligible, because of lack of awareness or other hurdles in the registration process. Japan’s example shows that citizen interfaces can clarify eligibility criteria and identify special needs, increasing inclusivity (GFDRR 2019a).

- **Priority Area 4 (disaster preparedness and resilient recovery).** GFDRR supports efforts to increase community and government preparedness by strengthening hydrometeorological services and early warning systems, increasing emergency response capacity, and supporting resilient recovery. Creating inclusive early-warning communication approaches requires having a good understanding of the target audience and mapping out the various aspects of vulnerability explored in this report. Application of accessibility standards and universal design ensures that preparedness information or early-warning alerts has a broader reach. Good practices in this area include using a wide range of communication formats and channels; selecting a messenger that the audience trusts; and designing simple, relevant messages.
IV. Lessons Learned

Although disasters tend to amplify existing barriers for marginalized groups, appropriate preparation can help make the needs of the most vulnerable more visible. For instance, disability-inclusive emergency preparedness and response requires contingency plans to stockpile locally appropriate assistive devices and power provision for persons with disabilities as part of relief activities. To ensure that persons with disabilities do not exclude themselves from mainstream relief, emergency settlements and shelters must be designed and located to maximize accessibility for all. Active involvement of women, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities, the elderly, and other potentially vulnerable groups in emergency preparedness and response activities is critical to inclusive resilience. An important element of inclusive DRM recognizes vulnerable groups for their ability to overcome stereotypes that portray them solely as victims. This includes promoting engagement of women in relief coordination, search and rescue, and other aspects of the humanitarian response cycle. To achieve this, gender-sensitive, disability-inclusive training and capacity building are instrumental.

During the recovery and reconstruction phase, efforts should focus on expanding and increasing, rather than simply restoring, access to services, infrastructure, and economic opportunities for marginalized groups. This could include increasing the physical accessibility of services, improving public transportation, or establishing community-based services that are more responsive to inclusion needs. Overcoming barriers to accessing services, infrastructure, and economic opportunities for marginalized groups usually requires targeted support, and promoting economic resilience during recovery requires diversified, sustainable livelihoods. For instance, this may require tailored financial services to help women restart livelihood activities after a disaster. Moreover, decision makers should prioritize protecting citizens, and marginalized groups, in particular, from physical and psychosocial harm. Additional actions to prevent
violence and conflict (including gender-based violence, human trafficking, and forced and early marriages) are needed to protect women, children, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups. Evidence has shown that early relief is tied to long-term recovery, and that failure to provide protection can have long-term repercussions that undermine social, economic, and psychological recovery. For instance, lack of psychosocial support for men can elevate the risk of violence against and abusive treatment of women. Formal justice systems and social support structures play a role in protecting vulnerable groups.

- Individuals and communities must own and drive the process of building community resilience, yet the findings of this report show that participation of marginalized groups is a challenge across GFDRR’s four priority areas and throughout the phases of the disaster cycle. Consequently, there is a clear imperative to explore and use opportunities to work closely with local stakeholders (government and nongovernment), particularly those who have traditionally been excluded from policy development and implementation. More must be done beyond just consultations to engage marginalized groups actively in DRM processes. There is a myriad of obstacles to putting the principles of community-based DRM and citizen engagement into practice. The findings presented here underline the importance of being sensitive to the peculiarities of a place and social setting when developing such approaches. It is critical to understand a context, especially for marginalized groups who may not benefit from the same access to services, resources, or information as most of the population. Hence, tailored approaches will be instrumental in boosting marginalized groups’ participation and making citizen engagement approaches more inclusive.

- Additional efforts are required to increase the availability of disaggregated data from public sources and to collect robust, relevant data on inclusion outcomes for marginalized groups. Gender-specific indicators are the most developed and are most consistently incorporated into the monitoring and evaluation framework in terms of socially differentiated risks and results. Other marginalized groups seem to be insufficiently captured, particularly in terms of outcomes. The GFDRR monitoring and evaluation framework mandates some level of disaggregation and identification of inclusion-sensitive activities, but task team leaders may not always provide accurate and sufficient information when reporting on these indicators. A key challenge that task teams have encountered has been a general lack of disaggregated data from public sources and practical challenges related to the collection of robust, relevant data on inclusion outcomes for marginalized groups.

- Despite ongoing efforts to promote gender- and disability-sensitive DRM, many gaps remain in recognizing and supporting the great diversity of people’s circumstances and needs. Through its grants, GFDRR has supported World Bank task teams and government counterparts in their efforts to develop and implement inclusive approaches to DRM. Although important results have been achieved, more work remains to be done to ensure that persons with disabilities, women and girls, and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups are genuinely empowered to participate in DRM processes and, as a result, increase their resilience. This stocktaking exercise identified several areas where continued, concerted efforts by governments and their international development partners are needed. Furthermore, the findings have implications for GFDRR, and are presented in the following section. These are broad recommendations for mainstreaming inclusive DRM, but they may be useful for developing more specific implications upon which to act.

IV. Lessons Learned
V. Recommendations

- **Recommendation 1:** Increase efforts to integrate various agendas and approaches to inclusive DRM. There is great potential to harmonize and integrate GFDRR’s frameworks and approaches subsumed under the umbrella of Inclusive DRM and Gender Equality. A key principle of this approach is that mainstreaming inclusion generates community benefits beyond the initial target group. The report identifies common patterns, gaps, and opportunities across the agendas of gender equality, disability inclusion, and citizen engagement in the context of DRM. The specific objective of these efforts is to develop and implement a more systematic and results-focused approach to the analysis, design, and monitoring and evaluation of inclusive DRM policies, programs, projects, analytics, and advisory services. This objective will be achieved through several targeted interventions focused on knowledge, learning, and innovation, and programming, analytics, and advisory services. Since at the country level, constraints affecting people’s ability to anticipate, cope with, respond to, and recover from disasters represent a unique combination of psychical, financial, information, attitudinal, and institutional constraints, a special focus will be made on tailoring inclusive DRM policies, programs, projects, and tools to the needs of diverse vulnerable groups in various country-specific contexts, cultural settings, and institutional environments. The results of these efforts will also be used to support policy dialogue about how effectively and efficiently tackle various constraints, including discriminatory social norms in patriarchal societies and institutional discrimination at the country and regional levels. This will help raise awareness about the importance of this topic among various stakeholders at different levels of the political and economic systems and society as a whole.

- **Recommendation 2:** Promote collaboration between DRM, social inclusion experts, and external stakeholders. Successful mainstreaming of inclusive DRM requires continued technical and financial support for DRM task teams, in engaging communities. A key challenge is to translate global knowledge into project-specific inputs. GFDRR may seek opportunities to promote collaboration between DRM and social inclusion experts to integrate both of their agendas and mobilize the required expertise in the context of DRM operations. Additional guidance and funding opportunities are needed to move from community engagement as a standard reporting requirement to real participatory approaches. Knowledge exchange and guidance for DRM task teams are also needed to leverage entry points and government buy-in. This includes diagnostics and specific tools to reiterate why inclusion matters in the DRM context. Furthermore, approaches to inclusive DRM need to consider the costs and consequences of both addressing and not addressing vulnerabilities of marginalized and disadvantaged groups and individuals. In addition to internal actors, GFDRR may support activities that enhance collaboration between DRM and social inclusion actors who represent nongovernmental entities, social society organizations, and other external stakeholders who could contribute to identifying country-specific recommendations, for example, organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), women’s associations, and indigenous peoples’ organizations, among many other actors.
Recommendation 3: Continue to support governments’ capacity to collect, analyze, and manage relevant data. Data collection and analysis are vital building blocks of inclusive DRM. The evidence base must be improved so that vulnerable groups can be identified, and the diversity of their needs and capabilities can be captured. One of the most cited obstacles to designing, implementing, and monitoring inclusive DRM is general lack of reliable, sufficiently disaggregated data. Qualitative diagnostics to provide the required nuance should be used to complement wider efforts to improve the collection of high-resolution quantitative geo-coded data. In addition to supporting efforts to address data gaps, GFDRR may also promote a wider, more strategic use of available data and diagnostics.

Recommendation 4: Improve the monitoring and evaluation framework, with a focus on results and operational leverage. There is an opportunity to revamp GFDRR’s monitoring and evaluation framework to better track inclusion outputs and outcomes in the new strategy. This consists of reviewing the indicators and reporting methodology to incorporate the inclusion angle better, but there also seems to be a need to support task teams in developing strong results frameworks with clear, measurable, realistic inclusion targets in World Bank–financed projects. Task teams would benefit from specific guidance on inclusion targets and outcome indicators to integrate approaches to inclusive DRM during the preparation phase. In addition, the indicators and reporting methodology need to reflect how the inclusion aspects of GFDRR-financed activities inform other operations.
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