

Literature review – summary of findings

Concepts and framings

- The disciplinary boundaries of ‘disaster risk science’ are hard to perceive and ever changing – informed by **diverse and inter-related disciplines**
- Definitions and framings of key concepts (e.g. risk, hazard, exposure, vulnerability, resilience, capacity) are **constantly evolving and often contested**
 - Risk and hazard, at the core of this review, are such examples, with **multiple and overlapping framings**: e.g. disaster, climate, environmental, natural, technological, biological, transboundary, cascading, compounding, Natech, Anthropocene, financial and systemic
 - **Ex ante vs. ex post** approaches to risk management
- Evolving **understanding of risk from ‘natural’ to ‘systemic’** is apparent – but blurred conceptual boundaries points to the importance of **risk science communication**
- The conceptual links between disaster risk, climate change and sustainable development are multiple and complex, with explorations of **synergies and trade-offs between domains** particularly prominent

Literature review – summary of findings

Gaps, challenges and emerging priorities

- The relationship between advances in disaster risk science and changes in policy/practice is unclear, but a **general trend is the growing disconnect between knowledge and action**, for example:
- There are a **plethora of approaches** to understanding risk, responses to risk and perception of risk
 - But, the integration of approaches for a holistic understanding of risk is lacking
- There are significant **regional and national differences and disparities** in disaster risk science production
- The systemic, cascading and transboundary nature of risk in a globalized and interconnected world needs to be reconciled with current systems of risk governance