

Local Governments Major Group

Open-Ended Informal Consultations

Feedback to Section “D” of the Co-Chairs Pre Zero Draft

Oral Statement 18 September 2014

I Marcelo Sabanes from the Canary Islands, Spain will be representing the Local Governments Major Group and the UNISDR Making Cities Resilient Campaign during the course of consultations today and tomorrow.

Following the release of the Co-Chairs Pre Zero draft, we have reached out to all members of these groups through the Making Cities Resilient Campaign, its Steering Committee including other channels such as UCLG and ICLEI to seek input of local and regional governments regarding Section D.

While we have received feedback for each paragraph and article under the proposed Priorities for Action, I would here only raise the most critical aspects that need to be addressed.

1. Inclusion of local issues in the pre zero draft signifies that international community and member states now understand the variable needs and last mile service delivery which local governments are capable of and were missing in the current Hyogo Framework for Action. However, it does not refer to the urbanization issue that most of the countries are facing and will be of major concern in near future. Urbanization is one of the four megatrends determining the future of the world, alongside economic and cultural globalization, demographic change and climate change. With regards, we recommend further inclusion of urban issues with a stronger focus on critical infrastructure, informal settlements and interconnectedness of urban systems.
2. We strongly request to strengthen the language by asking "local municipalities to develop, and implementation, culturally competent community resilience action plans that encapsulate mitigation, preparedness, response, restoration and recovery and are reflective of their unique geographical and socio-economic condition."
3. As suggested under Goal 11 of the Outcome Document of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals and to Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable the Post 2015 Disaster

Risk Reduction Framework needs to articulate and explicitly clarify the role of Local and City governments, which in the current version falls short.

4. The new framework should build on existing efforts and avoid duplication. Existing tools and resources developed in the past decade under HFA, such as the Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient, LGSAT and City Resilience Scorecard should be mentioned in the section on national and local level
5. We have noted that private sector is mentioned mainly for resilient investment. We recommend, to recognize and articulate incorporation of private sector in decision making at local level, especially for urban resilience. This is very much lacking till date. Without being part of the decision making system, only resilient investment does not work for practical reason.
6. With rapidly growing cities led by heavy migration and urbanisation, there is a need for the HFA2 to articulate and promote the important role of urban planning in local risk reduction. Urban planning policy and implementation should include land-use planning in urban areas, with particular attention to informal settlements.

I wish to reiterate that the Mayors, Local Government leaders are committed to, and already discussing practical next steps towards implementation of the Post 2015 Disaster Risk Reduction Framework. Engagement of Cities and Local Governments in the Making Cities Resilient Campaign should be seen as our commitment towards risk reduction and resilience.

Lastly, we would like to emphasize that, in many cases, cities lack both trained personnel to cope with the multitude of interests and objectives and the financial means for a city's development options, such

as compiling and implementing existing construction guidelines, promoting the construction of social housing and local public transport or establishing and maintaining green areas. Thus actions prescribed to local governments and cities through the Post 2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction should be holistic in nature and help them in addressing the larger goal of "Total Resilience".

Thank You !

19 September 2014

During the second round hosted on 19th September direct inputs were delivered to the co-chairs with reference to SECTION D :

1. Paragraph 14 - QUESTION was raised on article “e”: Who is going to provide capacity building support to Local Authorities? The Co-Chairs (Finland and Thailand) replied that the National Governments are the ones in charge of this task, however, we understand the complexities and necessities at local level and it is recommended that all stakeholder and major groups support local authorities in addressing this concern.

2. Paragraph 14 - Local Governments Major Group suggested a ‘new article’: Encourage and promote systematic dialogue between Local Authorities and other levels of the government including relevant stakeholders to generate political commitment and effective actions.

3. Paragraph 15 – Local Governments Major Group suggested a ‘new article’ that will call for integration of DRR in existing and new social cohesion and education programmes which will have a huge impact on the outcome of any given disaster. Such Integration would also address the lack of attention in some of the risk factors currently mentioned pre zero draft.

4. Paragraph 15 - To complement article “b” Local Governments recommend inclusion of Making Cities Resilient Campaign and its associated tools as tangible commitment from Local Authorities for post 2015 HFA. In that context, the campaign and other instruments can support effective monitoring, regular assessment and reporting.

5. Paragraph 17 – Local Governments strongly advised for inclusion of climate change adaptation and resilience measurers into cities planning process and master plans.

6. Section III: Considering that Section D provides substantial actions and deliverables for the Local Authorities, a clarification of roles and responsibilities for local authorities is needed. This could be included in Section III.

ANNEXE 1

Local and Regional Government Input on Pre-Zero Draft, Open-Ended Informal Consultations, Sessions 2 to 4

Section D. Priorities for Action

Section	Articles (a-z)	Ideas and suggestions	Rationale	References
Introduction				
Par. 13				
I. National and local context				
Par. 14, Understanding disaster risk	a	<p>It is not only gender/age/sex/disability, the minority or the vulnerable populations also include different ethnicities or displaced populations. The Roma population is one vulnerable population and hard to account for.</p> <p>One major question/problem is how to account for informal economic loss, which is a large portion in most developing countries. I'd suggest to include a sentence that acknowledges the significance of "informal economic loss."</p>		
	b	<p>To define disaster risks by "persons, economic and fiscal assets" is very narrow. It should also include essential infrastructure and facilities, cultural heritage, and ecosystem services to name a few other important risk areas.</p>		

	c	<p>Open access to disaster risk data might be problematic at some nations, where such data may lead to civil disturbances. This issue may be brought up by some delegations.</p>		
	e,f,g, h, i, j, k	<p>Some of these articles are related to capacity building and interlinks with Par.15 strengthening governance. Furthermore, there are some articles in Par. 15, such as article d, which are overlapping. Should not they be combined for simplicity?</p> <p>Perhaps, one way to deal with this is to rephrase “understanding risk” to “understanding risk and capacity building” although I understand it has to be consistent throughout the whole Pre-Zero draft and the same titles are used in other sections.</p> <p>e.f.g. Education and training on DRR and Resilience should be improved at all the levels of the civil society: the needs are more skills for the local key-actors of the land-use planning and government policies and more education for the communities.</p> <p>More emphasis has to be put to the socio-cultural aspect while working on resilience in urban planning policies: the raise of awareness of the communities.</p> <p>g.j. One possible vehicle for enhancing community engagement could be founded also on the school education and on the involvement of voluntary citizens associations, under the public coordination and guidance.</p>	<p>COMMENT/RATIONALE : Civil society is composed by a variety of communities: each of them will suffer injury form disaster and, for this reason, could reverberate on the others affecting the response (and the resilience) of the entire social system. These communities should be aware of their role and involvement in DRR so they could become a pro-active part in the process. The rise of the risk awareness will result in the increase of the demand of more qualitative interventions on the territory, in the enhancement of the scientific research for the experimentation of new techniques and in the demand for better skills and capacities.</p>	

	j	Suggest to add “continuing education by professional associations,” which would cover issues such as building technology, construction services as well land-use planning.		
Par. 15, Strengthening governance to manage disaster risk	a	Suggest to add “social resilience” in addition to economic.		
	c	Suggest to add “implementation” before “local and national plans” because it is not only whether the plans exist, but whether they are implemented or not which is important.		
	d	In view of the evidence that community cohesion and mutual support can have such a huge impact on the outcome of any given disaster, I think the draft should make more reference to these. It's not just about training people and having volunteers - it's about promoting social cohesion (ie "citizen-to-citizen") as a whole.		
	F, g	Article f, and the second part of article g are overlapping. Also the group of local authorities, communities and indigeneous people are somewhat problematic. What about writing instead “individuals including indigenou people.” The term “community” might be found problematic to shape and to get a hold of. In local authorities, it is usually neighborhoods which		

		are defined by area and are at some countries led by an elected authority. So, it is easier to define communities through neighborhood.		
	i	This again relates to my previous comments on Par.14. Perhaps, should be combined as part of capacity development		
	h	Link this to financial capacity as well. Something like integration of DRM into development policies would also facilitate the implementation of DRM or DRR actions through cost-sharing. In addition to this, I could not see the mention of financial capacity development of local authorities which is crucial.		
		Add about the importance of coordination, not only of local and national authorities as has been discussed, but also of departments within local authorities for “understanding of risk” which should probably go to article 14. Specifically, coordination and collaboration between emergency sectors of the local authorities and the land-use planning departments should be encouraged.		
Par. 16, Preparedness for response, recovery and reconstruction- ‘Build Back Better’		Suggest to include something about the potential involvement of private sector and businesses for post-disaster recovery; such as the use of construction equipment as well the use of hotels etc. for sheltering. Local authorities can make relevant prior agreements. I observed good cases from some of the cities, where I worked as part of the Western Balkans project.		
Par. 17, Investing	c	Rephrase to read – “and culturally significant sites and structures through proper planning, design,....		

in social, economic and environmental resilience		Include - Recognize and build upon the role of cultural and natural heritage for building resilient communities		
	i	This sentence seems a bit problematic as land-use should be part of urban planning not the other way around. In addition, urban planning should have a much more important role overall in local risk reduction and it is mentioned only at a very stage. I would rephrase this as something like “urban planning policy and implementation including land-use planning in urban areas, with particular attention to informal settlements..”		
	j	suggest something like promoting mutual policies taking into consideration urban-rural linkages – For instance the significance of rural food production for urban areas – food safety – perhaps this relates to article k		
	m	What does the word “appropriate” stand for? This is a too long and complicated sentence. Would it be possible to rephrase as two sentences instead? The first one being the design of building codes and the second, their implementation and monitoring mechanism. Add something like “participatory slum-upgrading” but I am not sure whether it would be more relevant to this article or to article I.		
	n	Implement climate change adaptation/resilience	Anna: Important to get this into city	

		measurers into cities planning process and master plans.	planning	
II. Global and regional context				
Par. 18, Understanding disaster risk		International collaboration is vital to enable the understanding of disaster risk drivers and trends, and the evolution of future risk scenarios		Piyush
Par. 19, Strengthening governance to manage disaster risk	d, e	Although such reviews are useful, there is always a question as to how objective they are. At the same time, I think they are useful for displaying good practices as well as challenges encountered. No suggestion here – just a comment. To reference - and keep your draft consistent, the scorecard and LG SAT should be mentioned as self-assessment and monitoring tools		
Par. 20, Preparedness for response, recovery and reconstruction		Any one city government may have neighboring city governments as stakeholders - for example where they share infrastructure or where one controls an ecosystem service such as a wetland on which the other one depends. A similar point applies with state and national governments which may also be stakeholders at the local level.		
Par. 21, Investing in social, economic and environmental resilience				
III. Role of stakeholders				
Par. 22				

Par. 23	3	<p>Add the term “responsible” here. It is essential that media acts in a responsible manner in raising public awareness without scaring the public.</p> <p>The media needs to act in a responsible way by informing citizens and educate them in these matters even if is not a subject that sells.</p> <p>enhancing communities risk awareness, that could also result in a stronger demand for more territorial/urban safety, so influencing the political will.</p>	<p>RATIONALE:The increase of communities’ risk awareness and related political will are fundamental for shifting the attention from the response phase to DRR and resilience implementation (it means, increase of public support, of more incisive urban planning policies and of search and allocation of financial investment in the pre-disaster actions) and for enhancing the policy dialogue at and among all the institutional and community levels.</p>	
Par. 24				
Par. 25				