

Statement of Norway 10 October 2014

Open-ended consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction

Presented by Mr. Arne Follerås

Senior Advisor

Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Thank you Madam Chair,

I would like to start by thanking you and your co-chair for all the important work you have put into the process of drafting the HFA2 documents. I would like to extend the thanks to those by your sides Margareta and Marco, and others, who I know have been instrumental in getting this process to where it is today.

The pre-zero draft has incorporated the core considerations that are needed, and we appreciate the open process that has allowed a lot of special concerns to be included.

Norway has at the outset of the HFA2 process emphasized the need for a simple and operational framework, and we therefore welcome efforts to make the structure and content more focused on main goals, and how to achieve this. We are therefore happy to hear the co-chairs commitment to focus the draft, avoid duplications and cluster topics that are related together. In this context, we support the idea of amalgamating the global and national level separation under section D.

The very core of DRR is to allow decision-makers, at all levels, to make risk-informed choices. As stated under Guiding principles, and repeated by madam co-chair: Paragraph 12, bullet a), Each State has the primary responsibility to holistically manage disaster risk, including through cooperation. This is the core. Ultimately the efforts will have to trickle down to the local level, and our aim, as well as the aim of the HFA2, should be to find out how we best can support national and local level actors to achieve this. Regional and global cooperation are means to achieve these goals at the local level.

Going back to the overarching level, we want the new framework to be aligned with the SDGs and Climate Change processes. We therefore support the idea, voiced by the UK, to explore ways of having an overarching explanation of how the different frameworks interacts. The division of labour, if you like. In this context, the need for a coherent system for monitoring and evaluation is also relevant.

In the interest of getting a more tightly structured framework, we think it would be useful for the co-chairs to consider whether the fourth priority area: “Investing in social, economic and environmental resilience”, needs to be a separate priority-area, or if the elements here could be amalgamated with the topics in the first three priority-areas.

We welcome the inclusion of education in several of the points under section D. A culture of safety must be built in the society as a whole, and education is a key arena for ensuring integration of DRR in future decision-making.

Thank you.