

Nauru submission for the Sections E and F of the pre-zero draft post-2015
framework for disaster risk reduction
2 October 2014

Co-Chairs,

Thank you for organizing this meeting and let me commend you for the work that has been done thus and for this opportunity to highlight key elements on sections E and F of the pre-zero draft for disaster risk.

Let me begin with general comments for Section E: International partnership in the implementation and follow-up process with proposed text and amendments then continue to Section F: Transition Phase in one intervention.

General comments on Section E

My delegation find the current section E provides a good basis for our discussion and suggest that there is room for further improvements on the structure of the section as well as the substance. In this regard, we take note of the structure of HFA 1 and believe that it provides a good starting point and perhaps one worth considering. On substance, Section E is a very important section and we believe that this section should closely correspond to the Section on Priorities for Action. Perhaps looking at these two sections together could prove beneficial for all.

We have reiterated this point in earlier consultations that while some countries have made significant progress in the implementation of HFA 1, progress has been slow and have regressed in some countries in particular SIDS. We would have yet to see successful implementation of this work in SIDS. This is important for SIDS.

There is value in drawing on some of the elements identified under HFA 1 that are yet to be fully implemented as part of HFA 1.

For Small Island Developing States, international cooperation and global partnerships are very important as they are key enablers in providing financial, technology development and transfer, and capacity building support for SIDS.

Specific Comments

We would like to support the comments made by delegations that Implementation and follow up are overarching issues in which international cooperation and global partnerships are key component of this framework. Our suggestion for the title:

E. International cooperation and global partnerships in the implementation and follow-up process

26. While it is a primary responsibility of States to manage disaster risk, there is a

strong expectation on the further strengthening of international cooperation and the forging of an international partnership for disaster risk reduction. Managing disaster risk requires an all- states and all-stakeholder effort, given the complexity of the task at hand and the relevance for humanity as a whole. In this connection:

- a) Developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States, and landlocked developing countries, and Africa remain most vulnerable to disasters and the impact of climate change and thus require adequate international assistance, through bilateral and multilateral channels, for the development and strengthening of their capacities in the areas of disaster prevention and building resilience, including through financial and technical assistance, and technology transfer on mutually agreed terms.

We welcome this paragraph and the reference to SIDS and other groupings. While we have no objection to the reference to other groupings, we want to reiterate that there are vast differences in terms of priorities, experiences and vulnerabilities amongst these different groupings.

As reflected in the SAMOA Pathway, SIDS continue to grapple with the effects of disasters, some with increased intensity and some that are exacerbated by climate change, which impedes progress by SIDS towards sustainable development. The Samoa pathway further recognizes that disasters can disproportionately affect SIDS, and there is a critical need to build resilience, strengthen monitoring and prevention, reduce vulnerability, raise awareness and increased preparedness to respond to and recover from disasters.

In consideration of the special case and unique vulnerabilities of SIDS, the international community made commitments to SIDS through a list of actions highlighted under the SAMOA Pathway. In our view, these should form the basis of a separate paragraph on SIDS to highlight its special case and particular vulnerability that remains to date. In the same spirit we are proposing, we are not departing too much from previous practice used in HFA 1.

- b) International cooperation efforts should continue giving priority to strengthening countries' capacity and modalities to manage transboundary disaster risk, including potential disaster-related displacement, through the further development of early- warning systems and sharing of knowledge, including making and the available ility of climate services information and data and other relevant earth observation systems.

For now we are fine with this paragraph with some minor amendments to make it more clear according to how we read and put meaning to the intention of this paragraph.

- c) Intergovernmental organizations of global and regional nature, including

international financial institutions, such as the World Bank Group, the International Monetary Fund, and the Regional Development Banks, and the United Nations system's entities, including funds, programs, and specialized agencies, through its United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience, as well as the Red Cross and the Red Crescent Movement should be called upon to support countries and other stakeholders in the implementation of this framework, including the development of relevant sector policies and standards, monitoring mechanisms and the strengthening of capacities, through clear and focused programs that support in a balanced and sustainable manner countries' priorities.

This paragraph contains different types of organizations that have different mandates and functions. They are being called on in this paragraph to support countries with yet an attempt to list a few tasks only. Countries have different expectations of these different organizations whether they are UN organizations, financial organizations or humanitarian organizations. We believe this paragraph could be improved. It would be helpful however to know if this is agreed text and where it came from or whether it was an attempt to put together different ideas from the First Prep-Com. Perhaps some explanation also on the intention of this paragraph if it did not come from previously agreed text as it would help us understanding it better.

We have proposed two additional paragraphs based on agreed language from Rio+20 for delegations consideration below:

cbis

Recognize the need for significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources and the effective use of financing, in order to give strong support to developing countries [Based on para 254 RIO].

cbis bis

We underscore the continued need for an enabling environment at the national level particularly for vulnerable developing countries such as SIDS, as well as continued and strengthened international cooperation, particularly in the areas of finance, technology development and transfer, and capacity-building [Based on 19 of RIO with tweaking for SIDS]

- d) Adequate voluntary financial contributions should be provided to the United Nations Trust Fund for Disaster Reduction, in the effort to ensure adequate support for the follow-up activities to this framework. The current usage and feasibility for the expansion of this fund, should be reviewed, inter alia, to assist disaster-prone developing countries to set up national strategies for disaster risk reduction.

On face value, we are ok with this paragraph except the last part. I know there is inter alia there but why highlight only setting up of national strategies for disaster risk reduction. Yes its good but we would like this fund to do more than setting national strategies. It should focus more on supporting vulnerable countries such as SIDS to implement some of the actions agreed to in this framework in which SIDS do not have the capacity and capability to do so on its own.

- e) The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and other relevant regional bodies and mechanisms for parliamentarians, are encouraged to support the implementation of the deliberations adopted thus far and advocate for disaster risk management.
- f) The United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) and other relevant bodies of local governments are encouraged to carry forward the implementation of the deliberations adopted thus far, and support cooperation and mutual learning among local governments.

For e) and f) we take note of the comments by delegations and the clarification by co-chairs that member states have asked that IPU be identified to play an advocacy role in DRR and also mentioned in HFA 1.

We would support delegations' request for the Secretariat to clarify if the role and responsibilities of IPU and UCLG are additional or the same in HFA1.

- g) The UNISDR in particular is requested to support the implementation, monitoring and review of this framework through: preparing periodic reports on progress in the implementation; generating evidence-based guidance; supporting countries, including through the national platforms or their equivalent, in monitoring trends and patterns in disaster risk, disaster loss and impacts; convening the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and supporting the organization of regional platforms for disaster risk reduction; and reinforcing a culture of prevention through advocacy initiatives and dissemination of risk information, policies and practices.
- h) International, regional institutions and organizations should be encouraged to enhance cooperation and mutual reinforcement in policies, strategies, instruments and programs *where appropriate* for the coherent implementation of this framework, the post-2015 sustainable development agenda and goals, and the climate change agreement *where appropriate*, especially in support of developing countries *at the national level*.

International regional institutions? Is it missing a comma or is international regional a new concept? It doesn't make sense, perhaps missing a comma after international. Thank you for the clarification that a comma is missing.

Additionally this paragraph speaks to issues we have discussed in previous sessions pertaining to the linkages between this framework and other processes, the implementation of this framework and those of post 2015 sustainable

development goals and the climate change agreement. We have made some comments including a proposal on how this should be reflected. We would propose working on this paragraph closer to what has been proposed earlier and taking into account our amendments in previous statements.

- i) This framework is open-ended and will be periodically reviewed by the United Nations General Assembly and the ECOSOC every [X] years, through existing review processes, to allow for stocktaking, formulating recommendations for further action, and introducing possible corrective measures.

What does the periodic review mean? Co-chairs this is a very important issue to know what periodic review means? Timeline? From experience in other processes we do not want the extra burden on our countries in doing reviews every year or two years given our capacities in particular SIDS. It makes sense to consider having a mid-term review. I note that delegations have clearly made suggestions for the timing for the review and we will take them into consideration.

- j) Periodic report on progress will be provided by UNISDR for the considerations [by whom?], and to support the deliberations, of the High Level Political Forum for Sustainable Development at its sessions under the auspices of the ECOSOC and General Assembly.

We also need further clarification how UNISDR plan to prepare a periodic review report to be sent to HLPF. For SIDS we can consider a periodic review to be discussed as part of SIDS Day under ECOSOC and HLPF. There should be a link between these UN bodies and organs including the processes and there should be further discussions on how this link is made.

My delegation may come back with proposed paragraph or language on this issue.

F. Transition phase

General comments:

As we have referred to in earlier sessions, HFA 2 should build on the achievements and gaps in the implementation of HFA 1. We believe this should be clearly reflected in the transition phase.

Specific comments:

28. UNISDR will continue to lead technical consultations on this framework with countries and experts from international organizations, including the relevant United Nations system, and other stakeholders to complete the ongoing work to review and strengthen the current HFA (which one HFA 1 or HFA 2, not clear) Monitor, including its indicators, while ensuring continuity with, and use of, data collected thus far. In particular, focus will be on its system of indicators,

periodicity and modalities of reporting, and the synergy between the global, regional and national monitoring and reporting, as well as its potential synergies with other relevant monitoring and reporting systems, including for the sustainable development agenda and goals and climate change, [at the national level and where appropriate](#). It will also lead technical consultations in order to update the 2009 Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction; lead the revision of the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience; and facilitate the revitalization and transformation of, and providing support to, the Scientific and Technical Committee.

This paragraph is not clear and needs further work. It almost seems like a set of expectation/actions of UNISDR muddled with expectations of other processes. The paragraph is also quite loaded as it is talking about different issues, which makes it quite difficult to follow the sequencing of issues.

29. Existing regional strategies, plans and programs may be adjusted [where appropriate, to take](#) ~~taking~~ into account this framework.