

## Science and Technology Major Group - Summary of comments on the pre-zero draft

General Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft document is sound and comprehensive, and <b>acknowledges the importance of science and evidence-based risk information for HFA-2</b> in order to drive disaster risk reduction activities as well as to provide a base of support for the proposed monitoring system. Given that many member states, stakeholders and UN agencies have emphasised the need to <b>strengthen the access to and use of scientific data and information but also better connect science to decision-making</b>, it is important that the references to science remains in the subsequent versions of the outcome document (post-2015 framework for DRR)</li> </ul>
Section A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The preamble should <b>lay out more explicitly the new challenges for DRR</b> - including emerging risks and the rapidity and scale of changes occurring across highly interconnected social and environmental systems - and the opportunities to bring DRR and development together to identify sustainable and safe development pathways. This calls upon a <b>mainstreaming of the DRR across the development agenda</b>.</li> <li>A stronger recognition of the importance to include health in the post-2015 framework for DRR is needed as a key outcome. Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity (WHO, 1948) and the right to life, liberty and security of person is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As such, <b>disaster risk reduction and resilience building, and the promotion of healthy communities have clear synergies</b>: the prevention of illness and provision of healthcare services can increase community resilience in preparing for and responding to disasters, while disaster risk reduction should minimise the risk of death, illness and injury and the burden of disease.</li> </ul>
Section B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The text at present talks mainly speaks to the core dimensions of existing ISDR/HFA I activity and fails at reaching out to provide a bridge into development. The <b>lack of a bridge between DRR/M and development</b> has long been recognised as a core barrier to risk reduction and HFA II is an opportunity to send a clear signal of intent and ambition by governments to address this concern.</li> <li><b>Raise the ambition of strategic goals 2 and 3 currently limited to returning to pre-disaster conditions</b></li> <li>Making some <b>clear connection between the global targets for DRR and those used in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)</b> will be useful to connect agendas and may allow scope for cross analysis of progress, for example on underlying development indicators and disaster loss or risk management capacity. This is especially important given the timing of the HFA II (March 2015) and SDG (September 2015). If potential targets and indicators in the SDGs are not supported in HFA II this may undermine representation of DRR/M in the SDGs (in addition to overlaps, gaps and incoherence). Building a clear connection between the HFA II and SDG processes and expected administrative architectures may also help to institutionalise data collection alongside that required for the SDGs</li> <li>Move section 11 (3 strategic goals) before the global targets to <b>clarify the structure of the document around strategic goals, targets, and then priorities for action</b></li> </ul>
Section C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The priorities for action need to be supported by a clear set of indicators</li> </ul>

## Science and Technology Major Group - Summary of comments on the pre-zero draft

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for decision-making to be underpinned by scientific evidence needs to be embedded as a guiding principle. This also calls for highlighting more strongly that the effective use, accessibility and sharing of risk information including disaggregated and location-specific data and information is to enhance DRR</li> </ul>
Section D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of understanding disaster risk, the following point could be added: Develop systematic approaches to better <b>understand the root causes of disaster risk production and accumulation in development pathways</b> in order to promote development along more disaster resilient pathways. This will require close collaboration between science, policy and practitioners communities. <i>(paragraph 14)</i></li> <li>The <i>sub-section 'building back better'</i> signals an insufficient level of ambition and do not reflect the pre- and post-disaster opportunities, and the need for resilient and sustainable development choices in the first place and <b>prevent the creation of risks and exposure</b>, and the opportunities in post-disaster to enhance resilience but also sustainable development</li> <li><b>Supporting research and innovation</b> in disaster risk management should also be highlighted as a priority <i>(paragraph 17)</i></li> <li>Further strengthen the need to <b>invest in capacity building</b> including for using early-warning systems, scientific and technical capacity for risk and vulnerability assessments, and for monitoring <i>(paragraph 18)</i></li> <li><b>Revise section 18d</b> as follows : The <b>functions</b> of Scientific and Technical Committee, established by the General Assembly in its resolution 44/236 of 22 December 1989, should be <b>realized by reactivating and realigning as needed existing international organizations, networks and research programmes revitalized as an international science advisory mechanism, built on networks of national and regional institutions, using a Science and Technology Engagement Partnership for DRR (STEP 4 DRR)</b> in order to strengthen the evidence base in support of the implementation and monitoring of this framework; promote scientific research into risk patterns and trends and the causes and effects of disaster risk in society; to promote and support the availability and application of science to decision-making; and to use post-disaster reviews as opportunities to learn and enhance public policy</li> <li>An additional <b>role of academia and research communities</b> would be to assess scientific evidence, <b>assess scientific evidence, synthesize and promote access to the policy-relevant results</b> of peer-reviewed published research on disaster risks and preparedness; in addition to the important points about increasing research for local application and supporting a more effective science-policy interface <i>(paragraph 23)</i></li> </ul>
Section E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for an <b>enhanced partnership between scientists, policy-makers and practitioners</b> to support risk-informed decision-making at all levels should be highlighted as a key enabler / means of implementation.</li> <li>The following paragraph could be added: The international scientific community including donors should be called upon to support the strengthening of integrated research into disaster risk, resilience and transformation towards sustainable development, to focus on the evolving nature of risk and scenarios in the medium and long terms; to increase research and its sharing for local application and support to local communities and authorities' action; to promote the involvement of young scientists in capacity building and science dissemination. Governments should provide support and also encourage science to partner with civil society, public bodies, those at risk and the private sector research and practice communities.</li> </ul>

**Science and Technology Major Group - Summary of comments on the pre-zero draft**