



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
8 August 2014

English only

---

## Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction

### Preparatory Committee

First session

Geneva, 14-15 July 2014

Agenda item 6

Considerations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

## Substantive Summary<sup>1</sup>

### Note by the secretariat

#### I. Introduction

##### Opening session

1. The first session of the Preparatory Committee for the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction was opened on 14 July 2014 by Margareta Wahlström, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction. The Committee elected two co-chairs, Päivi Kairamo, Permanent Representative of Finland to the United Nations Office at Geneva, and Thani Thongphakdi, Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations Office at Geneva, the rapporteur and Vice-Chair, Andrey A. Nikiforov, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office at Geneva, and Md. Abdul Hannan of Bangladesh, Katerina Seunenová of the Czech Republic, María del Pilar Cornejo of Ecuador, Walid Abdelnasser of Egypt, Wayne McCook of Jamaica, Riek Puok Riek of South Sudan, Toni Frisch of Switzerland as Vice-Chairs. Takashi Okada of Japan was elected as an ex-officio Member of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee.

2. Speaking at the opening session, Päivi Kairamo (co-chair), noted that the meeting marked the start of an important journey for the international community, and constituted an opportunity for discussing a new framework for addressing disasters. All countries were at risk of disaster. It was an issue that required the exercise of shared responsibility and had already benefited from cooperation among many countries. This meeting would provide an opportunity to exchange views with each other on what was necessary for this framework.

---

<sup>1</sup> This note includes a summary of the deliberations on agenda item 6 “Considerations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction”, as well as summaries of the three technical workshops and the three Chair’s dialogues with major groups.



3. Thani Thongphakdi (co-chair), reiterated the importance of regional responsibilities and highlighted regional meetings that had taken place in the lead up to this preparatory committee meeting. The meeting of the Preparatory Committee would consider the outcomes of the regional meetings, alongside the outcomes of all consultations that have taken place since March 2012. He stated the importance of striving to maintain the energy and drive shown by the participants at the regional platforms, and aim for the same standard of quality and integrity, using a whole-of-society approach as we work towards the development of the Post 2015 Framework.

4. Acting Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, Michael Møller, highlighted the importance of the work of the Preparatory Committee, as it focused on how to create a safer, prosperous and resilient world. Disaster affected everyone. It was imperative to take action to limit the human impact and cost of disasters.

5. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction, Margareta Wahlström, reflected on the past decade since the Hyogo Framework for Action was adopted. While highlighting the significant progress made, in particular in relation to the reduction in disaster mortality, the promotion of disaster risk reduction across international, regional, national and local agendas and the strengthening of international cooperation efforts, the increasing challenge of disaster risk and economic, social, environmental, and cultural losses was underscored. In building a new framework, the importance of drawing on the extensive knowledge and understanding of preventing, managing and reducing risk was emphasized.

6. Noting the consultations held over the past two years, including global and regional platforms, meetings of intergovernmental organizations, national dialogues, stakeholder forums and social networks, clear support had converged around 12 issues: build on the Hyogo Framework for Action; focus on preventing the creation of new risk and continue steady action to reduce existing risk; focus on reducing vulnerability and exposure; engage all of society and promote equality, inclusion and non-discriminatory participation, a responsibility of all stakeholders; develop more effective financing mechanisms in both public and private sectors for managing risk; contribute to create synergies across the three key post-2015 frameworks (the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction, the sustainable development goals and a renewed agreement on climate change); strengthen national governance and coordination to manage disaster risk; engage all State institutions; empower local communities and authorities in managing disaster risk and contributing to the definition of national policies and plans; clearly define responsibilities across public and private sector actors; strengthen regional cooperation and address trans-boundary risk; and monitor progress more carefully in order to allow for necessary corrective actions and continue strengthening of what we already know that works.

## **II. Considerations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction**

7. In total, 106 statements<sup>2</sup> were made under agenda item 6 “considerations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction”, by representatives of political groups (6), Governments (82), observers (15) and major groups (9).

---

<sup>2</sup> Myanmar on behalf of the Association of South East Asian Nations, European Union, Costa Rica on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, Egypt on behalf of the African Group, Ecuador, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland, Mexico, Philippines, Turkey, India, Russia, Brazil, Mozambique, China, Colombia, Senegal, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Thailand, Republic of Korea, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nauru, Côte d’Ivoire, Austria, Egypt, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Dominican Republic, Cambodia, New Zealand, Fiji, Bahamas, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Niger, Jamaica, Sri Lanka, Palestine, France, Gabon, Armenia, Norway, Singapore, Samoa on behalf of Pacific Island Countries, Cuba, Chad on behalf of the Group of 77 and China,

### **Reflection on the Hyogo Framework for Action**

8. Many speakers provided the Committee with an overview of the successes and challenges faced in implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action. Of the speakers that addressed this issue, there was universal agreement that the Hyogo Framework had been instrumental in advancing global, regional and national efforts in disaster risk reduction in a number of areas. A large number of countries reported on their achievements and good practices in areas such as, elaborating and strengthening national plans, policies and programmes, strengthening national institutions, enhanced early warning systems and community preparedness, as well as in updating and developing normative frameworks for disaster risk reduction legislation at national and local levels. Some countries noted that the Hyogo Framework for Action had greatly contributed to promoting culture of prevention, increased public awareness and disaster risk reduction education. Several speakers referred to the importance of decentralising disaster risk reduction into relevant sectors and they underscored the importance of multi-stakeholder approach.

9. Many delegations recognized that while the Hyogo Framework for Action had allowed many advances, several challenges still remained. Reflecting on the Hyogo Framework's implementation, many speakers highlighted that progress had been uneven and that this was a reflection of broad economic and institutional differences among countries and geographical regions. A number of speakers underscored the challenges faced in addressing the underlying risk factors, and in preventing risk accumulation. Several countries highlighted the special situation of Small Island Developing States as well as increasing challenges posed by climate change and rapid unplanned urban growth.

10. Speakers also noted that many priority areas of the Hyogo Framework were still "work in progress", and that the successor framework should support the continuation of this work. A large number of delegations were of the view that the Hyogo Framework for Action provided a strong basis for developing the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, recognizing that the new framework must address new challenges and trends, such as climate change, the escalation of economic cost of disasters, as well as the increasing exposure to disaster risk. Some countries expressed their desire to maintain the basic structure and key activities of the Hyogo Framework for Action, and avoid introducing new concepts and terms in the new framework.

### **Considerations on the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

11. Several speakers highlighted that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction must complement and build upon the Hyogo Framework for Action and efforts underway at regional, subregional and national levels. Many speakers stressed that the World Conference should deliver a strong outcome document, on the basis of a transparent and inclusive process that enhanced global partnerships to tackle the myriad of risks to which countries were exposed. One country suggested that the name of the new framework be revised as "International Strategy for Disaster Risk and Resilience Management".

---

Morocco, Canada, Argentina, Trinidad and Tobago, Cook Islands, Uganda, Zambia, United Kingdom, Burundi, Algeria, Tonga, Australia, Sudan, Bolivia, Peru, Angola, Tuvalu, Georgia and Yemen addressed the plenary. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Economic Community of West African States, Economic Community of Central African States, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Arab League, Centre for Natural Disaster Prevention in Central America, Indian Ocean Commission, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Inter-Governmental Authority on Development, International Hydrographic Organization, Caribbean Community, African Union and the Group on Earth Observations also took the floor. In addition the World Health Organization delivered a joint statement on behalf of the United Nations system. The nine major groups also addressed the plenary.

12. There were a number of proposals for priority issues that should be covered or highlighted in the new framework. These included, inter alia, the promotion of coherence in the 2015 global agendas, legal and institutional frameworks, climate and disaster risk information and land use planning.

13. A large majority of speakers welcomed a new global post-2015 paradigm, in which disaster risk reduction, sustainable development goals and climate change frameworks are recognized as mutually reinforcing and are tackled in an integrated manner. Many speakers noted that making the link between disaster risk reduction and climate change implications was crucial even for the sustainability and survival of the Small Island Developing States.

14. At the national level, there were also a number of calls for the promotion of coherence in the post-2015 global agendas, in particular sustainable development goals, climate change and disaster risk reduction. This was supported by a number of observers and major groups. However, some countries urged caution against intrusion into areas exclusive to national domain, and stated the need to clearly define the inter-linkages of disaster risk reduction, climate adaptation and sustainable development goals more deeply, and find ways to overcome differences that already impede international consensus.

15. Several speakers called for improved legal and policy frameworks for disaster risk management. Some countries stated the need to include legal elements for disaster risk reduction with the aim at strengthening States efforts and commitments, facilitate definition of clear competencies for concerned actors and define clear responsibilities for the formulation and implementation of public policies. Some countries called for support to the efforts of States in drawing up the normative and legal frameworks at the national level.

16. A number of speakers called for a strengthened evidence base to inform decision making, including the establishment of reliable disaster statistics under the leadership of each country, and for the development plans and policies to be based on reliable disaster statistics. In this context, some speakers proposed improved synergies with the Global Framework for Climate Services. In addition, there were calls for the promotion of global information sharing, and the improvement of instruments for disaster and climate risk monitoring, assessment and forecasting.

17. There were also calls for enhanced land use management and strengthening of urban development and planning, including transportation. Several speakers promoted prospective disaster risk management in territorial development with the aim at safeguarding its optimal use, occupation and sustainable transformation. Many speakers also spoke on behalf of the importance of healthy and sustainable ecosystem and environmental management in creating buffers against hazard impacts.

### **Guiding principles**

18. A number of speakers addressed the issue of guiding principles that should be considered in the new framework. While many speakers reiterated that the principles contained in the Hyogo Framework for Action remained relevant, they offered additional elements to complement them. For example, it was noted that the new framework should address rights of women, children, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples and older persons. Several speakers stated that post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction must adopt a “whole of society” approach, including local governments, communities and private sector. Some speakers stated the need for improving accountability and transparency as a key principle of the new framework, as well as the need to ensure that it will reflect the common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) approach. One delegation suggested that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction be a legally binding instrument.

### **Implementation**

19. There were a number of proposals on the means of implementation for the new framework. For example, there was a proposal that post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should clarify the provision of resources, development and transfer of technologies and international commitment to support developing countries to address climate change impacts. There were also calls for the new framework to provide adequate and predictable financial resources, review existing financial and fiscal instruments, promote public-private sector partnerships, south-south cooperation, capacity building and green technology development and transfer to address climate adaptation and mitigation.

20. A large number of speakers emphasized disaster risk reduction as a shared responsibility which requires the involvement of all relevant stakeholders. They stated that therefore, post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should be inclusive and encourage active participation of a broad range of actors, including, local governments, affected communities, private sector and academia. In this context, some delegations reminded that while they recognized the important role of all stakeholders, the State had a central role as the governing and coordinating body for the formulation of disaster risk reduction policies. A few countries acknowledged the limits of engaging with private sector and one speaker said that disaster risk reduction should not be used as a tool to obtain private monetary gains in sectors such as the financial markets.

21. The importance of strengthening the role of women, children and youth, people with disabilities, older persons and indigenous people, as agents of change was also highlighted by many speakers.

#### **International cooperation, monitoring, reporting and review**

22. A large number of speakers made proposals regarding the international cooperation, monitoring, reporting and review of the new framework. Many speakers expressed their support to a monitoring framework that is ambitious and aspirational while also remaining realistic about what can be achieved and when. Several speakers called on using a strengthened monitoring system to improve accountability in disaster risk reduction. There was a clear call for post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to provide measurable outcomes as well as clarity with regard to responsibility and accountability, and the establishment of clear linkages between the regional Hyogo Framework for Action monitor and national Hyogo Framework for Action monitor. In addition, there were calls for regional commitments to be reflected in the new framework. There were also calls for the development of action-oriented targets, supported by indicators, and the inclusion of voluntary peer reviews. There were also calls to align the global monitoring framework with regional monitoring frameworks, in particular with the Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient development in the Pacific, national development systems, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change loss and damage monitoring system.

23. To support the monitoring, there were calls to develop reliable statistics based on local knowledge and research, and data that are sex-disaggregated, age-disaggregated and gender specific. Several delegations promoted peer reviewing of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, but one country noted that not all the countries are currently in the same condition to tackle an international review exercise.

24. With regard to proposed global targets and indicators, while all speakers expressed their general support on this issue, a number of speakers offered specific comments. Several countries supported the transition from input to outcome and output indicators. Some speakers welcomed the proposed suggested families of indicators. Most speakers called for targets and indicators of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to be simple, practical, clear-cut, action-oriented and easy-to-understand. Some speakers called for targets to take into account crosscutting themes, and to be framed on accurate baselines to ensure that targets are realistic. Some countries stated that targets and indicators should not

be prescriptive and some said that a selection of indicators to assess compliance should be voluntary.

25. Some speakers suggested the inclusion of issues such as agriculture, infrastructure, displacement of population, fragility and conflict to be part of the targets. The use of existing indicators, such as the Busan Global Partnerships indicators was also proposed by one delegation.

26. On the issue of periodicity of the review, one country proposed every three years, instead of the suggested four years. A number of countries supported the idea to have a transitional phase between the current and the new framework to adapt indicators, knowledge, understanding and implementation. One country noted that since the High Level Political Forum is a newly created body, which has not shown yet its viability for reviewing progress on the Plan of Action and that therefore it would be premature to establish joint monitoring and integrated review of disaster risk reduction, climate change and sustainable development strategies. One observer group suggested to use political leadership at highest level to monitor the implementation of post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, including at regional summit meetings at the international and regional levels.

27. The majority of speakers reiterated the importance and relevance of global and regional platforms for disaster risk reduction to remain as important multistakeholder mechanisms to forge partnerships, assess progress on implementation and share practice and knowledge on risk-informed policies, programmes and investments. The role of national platform was also highlighted and some countries called for their strengthening to support community resilience. Some countries called for national platforms to become more operational through financing.

28. Finally, there were a number of calls for specific action for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction secretariat and the United Nations system, in areas such as furthering the cooperation and coordination with countries and other stakeholders, to implement and periodically review the progress of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Several countries also called for the strengthening of the role of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction secretariat and its role and mandate to better support countries in reducing risks and achieving sustainable and safe development. There was also a call for a permanent United Nations-led process, involving all international organizations, partners and global stakeholders to support countries efforts in disaster risk reduction. Speakers also noted their support to the United Nations Plan of Action for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience.

### **III. Chair's Dialogues with Major Groups**

29. Recognizing the importance of all contributions in formulating the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, the co-chairs held three dialogues with the major groups to solicit views on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction under three themes: (1) progress, good practices, innovations and lessons learned in implementing Hyogo Framework for Action that have worked and could be worth replicating and scaling up in the context of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction; (2) reflections on the "Proposed Elements for Consideration in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction" and building coherence and mutual reinforcement between disaster risk reduction, sustainable development goals and climate change agreements; and (3) identifying commitments for the Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and define relevant mechanisms for implementation.

30. During the first dialogue, disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction and accessibility issues, concrete examples of collaborative initiatives and consortia for science and technology, ways of ensuring more systematic integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, indigenous women leaders' empowerment, safe schools initiative, children and youth mobilization in disaster risk reduction and the development of resilience metrics that engage the private sector and inform local investment decisions were discussed.

31. Several speakers highlighted the necessity to ensure civil society and community participation within a successor framework. In addition, speakers noted the opportunity for the framework to move beyond recognition and to support tangible action. Proposals included the integration of 'universal design principles' as mentioned in the Sendai declaration on persons with disabilities, the involvement of women in disaster risk management strategies, and the development of risk metrics that can be utilized by both business and science.

32. The challenges of capturing commitments and responsibilities in the design of the new framework dominated the second dialogue. Several speakers highlighted the importance of ensuring an inclusive and transparent process in the drafting of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction to enhance stakeholder's ownership. Related to this, was a call for better descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in the implementation of the new framework.

33. A stronger people-centred approach to the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction was highlighted throughout the discussion, recognising the imperatives of poverty eradication. The need to focus on risk prevention resonated, as did the need to ensure coherence between the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, the sustainable development goals, a new climate change agreement and the World Humanitarian Summit. A number of speakers called for the synchronisation of indicators across these frameworks, the use of proxy targets (e.g. safe schools) in a monitoring system, and the need for disaggregated data.

34. Speakers also highlighted the importance of gender equality and women's leadership. Recognising the need for devolved and local action, as communities and local governments are first responders, was underscored, as was the need for greater emphasis on capacity-building for effective local risk management. In this regard, the role of national platform, or other national mechanism, was recommended. On private sector engagement, speakers noted the need to go beyond building codes, to ensure that future public and private infrastructure is disaster-resilient, and to promote more public-private partnerships. The lack of progress on Priority Area 4 of the Hyogo Framework for Action (addressing underlying causes of risks) was highlighted, in particular the insufficient attention given to transformative land use and planning processes and unsustainable development pathways.

35. Speakers throughout the third dialogue underscored that the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should be locally adapted and action-oriented. Voluntary commitments must underline the interconnectedness of stakeholders, based on substance and building on existing and new partnerships. Several speakers noted the importance of accountability and continued dialogue.

#### **Technical Workshops**

36. The Conference secretariat convened three technical workshops to provide a space for substantive discussions between experts and stakeholders on (1) indicators, monitoring and review process for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction; (2) investing in disaster risk reduction; and (3) mutual reinforcement of disaster risk reduction, sustainable development goals and climate change.

37. During the first workshop, speakers agreed on the importance of having an indicator system that allows progress on disaster risk reduction to be reported, compared and analysed. While recognising the limitation of the current Hyogo Framework for Action monitor, with its focus on inputs rather than output or outcome, many speakers highlighted the opportunity for a new system to support the identification of policy gaps and to support decision-makers. To achieve this, many speakers called for the new system to be more objective and quantitative in its approach.

38. In regards to global targets, a range of views were expressed including the need for a clear relationship between global targets and national targets. Some speakers raised concern that a global indicators system might conceal regional and national indicators in the absence of national benchmark data. A number of speakers highlighted the need for national targets to be flexible and nationally determined.

39. Several speakers stressed the need for the system to be simple and clear, raising concern over the high number of proposed indicators, while others highlighted the need for a more comprehensive approach. A number of speakers emphasised the need to focus on monitoring action at the local level. Similarly, diverging views were expressed on the periodicity of monitoring, with some speakers supporting a four year or longer cycle and others preferring to maintain a biannual reporting cycle. The opportunity to align the reporting with other processes, such as the sustainable development goals and climate change, was noted. In reference to peer reviews, several speakers noted the benefits of utilizing this as a voluntary tool. Several speakers emphasized the importance of terminology and relevance of concepts. The lack of disaster loss data and baseline data was noted, as was the lack of national capacity and need for technical support.

40. Speakers exchanged experiences in managing disaster risk in public and private investment and discussed innovations and pathways to promote disaster risk-sensitive public and private investment in post-2015 societies during the second workshop. Speakers examined how investment decisions adopted by both the public and private sectors can prevent future risk construction and accumulation, reduce existing levels of risk, and strengthen resilience to absorb loss and advance. Speakers highlighted formal mechanisms of coordination between the public and private sector and explored how the costs and benefits of disaster risk reduction can be subsumed into economic valuations, public finance, competitiveness strategies and investment decisions. Issues around strengthening accountability and enhancing monitoring, as well as disclosure and reporting of risk, were also raised.

41. Risk identification, new data and models, and how making these accessible to decision makers in both the public and private realm, at all levels, was identified as critical to assist prioritization. In examining risk management strategies, capacities and incentives, several speakers identified risk prevention and reduction as fundamental. All speakers recognized the central role that the private sector has to play in managing current and future risk; observing that options for concrete collaboration were not well known.

42. A number of speakers called for the issues of accountability and risk accounting to be addressed in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, noting that failure to accurately account for disaster risk impedes the representation of potential disaster impacts in cost-benefit analysis, without which decision-makers will not have the right incentives to reduce risk. The concept of a chief risk officer was raised several times as a way of ensuring that disaster risk is considered at a strategic level and alongside other risks, in public investment planning. Speakers noted the potential for integrating disaster risk metrics into country and business ratings of credit rating agencies.

43. At the outset of the third workshop, speakers recognised that political consensus and a policy foundation for coherence and mutual reinforcement exists. Therefore, the key issue is how this can be effectively transformed in practice. A number of speakers spoke on the



importance for transparency and emphasised a variety of approaches, including aligning timeframes, sharing or aligning targets and indicators, synchronizing periodicity of monitoring and reporting, using common language and concepts across frameworks, explicitly referencing the need for coherent implementation in each framework's chapeau and horizontal integration of climate and disaster risk management in the sustainable development goals.

44. Speakers also highlighted national and regional efforts to promote coherence between disaster risk reduction and climate change as good practices can be scaled or adapted. The challenge of coherent implementation at the global level was noted, while at the national level there was a call for local governments and actors to be utilized. Regional level resilience initiatives were also highlighted as an important vehicle to bring together development, disaster risk and climate change issues together. The need to improve connectivity between United Nations entities was raised, as was the need for policy makers and technical experts to work together.

---