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Storm Daniel

A multi-sectoral rapid needs assessment showed that health, including Mental and Psychological Support (MHPSS), WASH and access to safe drinking water, and shelter are the main priorities of affected communities. There are heightened protection risks for people affected, in particular for unaccompanied and separated children, newly widowed women, those displaced, and those who lost homes, livelihoods or their civil documentation. As the emergency response continues, recovery and restoration have already started.
Problem in a nutshell

Climate-related disasters rising and likely to rise

Vastly different situations projected around the world

How to allocate unearmarked global envelope equitably?
Research design – Delphi and funding simulation

• The literature
  • Better to ask than to assume. (Rising et al., 2022, Lentz & Maxwell, 2022)
  • Weaknesses in damage estimation are a key research area. (IPCC WG2, 2022)
  • Decision maker can be a flawed human with limited cognitive capacity. (Thaler, 1980)

• 2-round Delphi method with funding priority simulation on a 4-point scale
  • Q1: What are the priority criteria in allocating humanitarian or disaster aid funding per future forecasts in view of climate change response or adaptation?
  • Q2: What are the priority options for which to allocate humanitarian or disaster aid funding regarding adaptation to representative key risks of climate change?

• Global frameworks, INFORM suite (Q1) and IPCC RKRs (Q2), as a baseline

• Panel (N=36) composition
  • 50/50 gender, 19 countries, IOs (e.g., UN, EU, World Bank, Red Cross Red Crescent), the research sector, the public sector, and civil society (e.g., Save the Children, World Vision). Preference on near-future forecasting, primarily month(s) forward and up to year(s).
### Results – Summary of panel priority preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority –</th>
<th>Q1: Criteria in allocating humanitarian or disaster aid funding per future forecasts in view of climate change response or adaptation</th>
<th>Q2: Options for which to allocate humanitarian or disaster aid funding regarding adaptation to representative key risks of climate change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH PRIORITY</td>
<td>• PEOPLE IN NEED (PIN) PER SEVERITY LEVEL OF THEIR HUMANITARIAN CONDITIONS (INCL. AFFECTED AND DISPLACED)</td>
<td>• RISK TO FOOD SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RISK OF HAZARD AND EXPOSURE TO DISASTERS</td>
<td>• RISK TO HUMAN HEALTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• RISK TO WATER SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW PRIORITY (in between)</td>
<td>• CAPACITY OF LOCAL ACTORS AND ON-GOING PROGRAMMING TO RESPOND/ADAPT INDICATORS ON VULNERABLE GROUPS OR DIVERSITY OF GROUPS AFFECTED</td>
<td>• RISKS TO PEACE AND TO HUMAN MOBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HUMANITARIAN ACCESS INDICATORS • LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURAL COPING CAPACITY</td>
<td>• RISK TO LIVING STANDARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH CRITICAL PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, NETWORKS AND SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT LOW PRIORITY</td>
<td>• RULE OF LAW INDICATORS AND LACK OF INSTITUTIONAL COPING CAPACITY • SOCIAL COHESION INDICATORS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC VULNERABILITY</td>
<td>• RISK TO LOW-LYING COASTAL SOCIOECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• RISK TO TERRESTRIAL AND OCEAN ECOSYSTEMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High priority is much more relevant than somewhat low priority during real-life funding allocation processes.*
Discussion

• Even a small Delphi size is reliable if they have a similar experience level.
  • Strong consensus based on parametric measures (e.g., SDs < 1)
  • The next phase will be to augment the results with stochastic measures

• Suggests that the results are an emergent preference (covariant)?
  • The diverse panel answered similarly in front of an ensemble of composite criteria or complexly interlinked risks that often overlap.

• Results had nuances
  • **Q1:** Preference for the crisis'/disaster’s severity of magnitude and risk, but also, there is a complex interplay between vulnerability, context, practical issues, and resilience.
  • **Q2:** Timewise priority on cascading risks – so panellists focused on the most pressing ones (e.g., food security is pertinent now, but what if the socioecological system falls?).
Thank you!
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