

**Women's Major Group Intervention**  
**Discussion between Member States and Major Groups**  
**September 19, 2014**  
**(Added after the informal consultations were scheduled – general views)**  
**Delivered by Leah Kimber**

Good morning Co-Chairs and distinguished colleagues,

I'm here as a representative for the Women's Major Group. We are happy to have this opportunity to directly meet with you today, midway through the informal consultations. We are invested in this process and will be happy to continue the dialogues going forward, both formally and informally.

We would like to share several priorities highlighted by the Women's Major Group.

- (1) 1st priority are the **Goals/targets**: While we understand the benefits of a small number of targets, the final targets must provide sufficient depth to reflect all 3 dimensions of sustainable development and to facilitate actions that are effective and inclusive--promoting the rights of **all** persons. The proposed targets currently do not align to the wider aims of the goals.
- (2) 2nd priority is the **Gender equality / women's rights**: The Guiding Principles state that '**gender considerations** are to inform all policies and practices...' but this is not enough. For mainstreaming to succeed, there is a need to explicitly mention gender differentiation and women as a specific group in all appropriate instances. Women must be positioned as more than a human and economic resource for DRR but as active stakeholders and decision makers, with rights and knowledge. **Through Principles, targets and indicators, the HFA2 can guide Member States toward measures to ensure women's active role is encouraged valued and supported.**
- (3) 3rd priority are the **Stakeholders**: The power imbalances among stakeholder groups must be acknowledged and addressed and distinctions must be made between rights holders and duty bearers. Developing platforms where women, girls and young people's experiences and recommendations - and the situated knowledge of indigenous peoples – are respected and acted upon are key to redress the power gap.
- (4) Number 4 are the **Human rights**: A clearer rights based approach would help to ensure rights and responsibilities of all stakeholders are better articulated. Currently only one reference appears (in the Guiding Principles).
- (5) Number 5: Inclusive language in another priority. It should be improved by using the word "ALL".
- (6) Number 6: **Differences** between people, especially in terms of differential risk, exposure and vulnerability must be recognized in the document to insure a rights-based approach and inclusive actions that deliver for a larger group of people.

Overall, we feel it is important to ensure that the document is people centered as mentioned earlier. In such a people centered approach, gender should be more fully and explicitly discussed within all areas of policy. This includes the recognition of gender inequality as one of the root causes of vulnerability on the one hand, and the recognition of actions to achieve gender equality as key for building resilience and successful DRR implementation on the other hand. Women's policy making capability should be recognized and their active participation in policy formulation and implementation should be supported and ensured.

As I conclude, I'd like to focus on resilience. Addressing potential and known risks supports resiliency. For example, post-event risks for women and girls, including under displaced persons programs, may be more from persons than from exposure to natural hazards. This is particularly true of gender based violence, as well as social and economic exploitation of women and girls.

CSOs, and especially women and gender CSOs should be recognised for contributions to resilience - as an important source of local knowledge, as active contributors to sustainable management of eco systems (17i and k) and local capacity as well as policy inputs.

Thank you!

#### *Possible Questions*

- *Why is the rights-based frame missing from the pre-Zero Draft?*
- *How do Member States see the connection between the goals and targets? Can the targets (written so quantitatively) effectively assess progress toward the outcome and goals?*

## QUESTIONS:

- *Why is the rights-based frame missing from the pre-Zero Draft?*
- *How do Member States read the paragraphs that speak generically of stakeholders? To them, which groups does this encompass? (e.g. is private sector their first thought, or is it science, or what?)*
- *What is the reason for inconsistencies when talking about resilience - that sometimes it is only social or only economic, rarely environmental and rarely all 3?*
- *Why does the expected outcome ("In keeping with the HFA expected outcome, the present framework aims to achieve the substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries.") remain limited to reducing loss and not also consider improving well-being?*
- *How do Member States see the connection between the goals and targets? Can the targets (written so quantitatively) effectively assess progress toward the outcome and goals?*
- *Given the agreed lack of progress in implementation of the gender mandate from the HFA, how do MS view the current document? Would they agree that gender remains on the margins, with a focus on women as vulnerable, and not integrated into the Actions in terms of active roles in decision-making?*
- *There is no 'accountability' factor in the draft for post disaster relief or reconstruction. Should we question that too? (Kalyani)*