

Co-Chairs open-ended informal consultative meetings on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction pre-zero draft

September 5th – October 13th 2014

UK INITIAL VIEWS AND COMMENTS

General Comments

The United Kingdom would like to express our thanks to the Co-Chairs, members of the Bureau and the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) for convening and facilitating these informal consultative meetings. They are a welcome response to Member States calls to ensure that the process for drafting the new framework is informed by as wide a consultation as possible. We call on you to ensure that the process is genuinely inclusive and transparent.

We are grateful for the work that has been done to prepare the pre-zero draft published on 8 August 2014. Overall, the pre-zero draft gives us a reasonable basis on which to seek to build further consensus as well as prioritise specific requirements. Indeed, we are encouraged by the evident desire to incorporate the wide-ranging set of issues, principles and priorities for action which have taken some account of the priority issues that we proposed during the first Preparatory committee Meeting in July. The increased emphasis on tackling the root causes of vulnerability and promotion of a greater focus on the most vulnerable is especially welcome.

However, with great appreciation for the work done so far, we are of the view that there remains significant scope to improve the present draft – in particular:

- i. a more **coherent, concise, and better structured** text that provides clarity on the relationship between the purpose, scope and strategic goals and between the guiding principles and priorities for action. Indeed, we would welcome a diagrammatic representation of the relationships, much like the diagram seen in HFA1, and called for by the Netherlands and others during the consultative meetings;
- ii. a **clear, forward looking narrative throughout** – one which builds on the Hyogo Framework for Action while also setting out a compelling vision for disaster risk reduction (DRR) with more positive language on the role of DRM in contributing to transformational change in terms of sustainable development and economic growth;
- iii. recognition of the need for **alignment with other relevant international processes** (including the post-2015 development agenda and where appropriate, on climate change and the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016);
- iv. a **focus on the local/community level** that strikes the right balance with the national level, ensuring local government is the centre of DRR policy making and implementation by building capacity at the lowest appropriate level, and encouraging support for community-based DRR initiatives, while ensuring that any monitoring activities offer opportunities rather than create additional burdens;
- v. a **focus on the most vulnerable** to tackle the **root causes of their vulnerability**;
- vi. inclusion of **action-oriented targets and ensuring the new framework is based on a credible evidence base**;
- vii. Rationalisation and Prioritisation – i.e. fewer, better crafted **guiding principles and Priorities for Action** set out in order of importance;
- viii. Acknowledgement at national level, of the **importance of good governance** to address the multi-purpose nature of implementing DRM strategies - including an emphasis placed on

adopting a whole-of government approach to reflect the role of multiple Ministries in implementation of DRM strategies; and

- ix. Supports **improved transparency and accountability, including through peer review.**

Section A – Preamble

The Preamble should be shorter. It should seek to provide a strong overarching narrative that sets out the context, history, vision and strategy that we wish to adopt – one which sets out how it will build on the Hyogo Framework to build the resilience of communities and nations while also contributing to broader policy agendas such as eradication of extreme poverty, encouraging sustainable development and fostering of economic growth. More should also be made at this point of the links to other global policy processes. The present text is overlong and the UK proposes that close consideration is given to the need to substantially edit **paragraph 5**.

Section B – Purpose, Scope, Outcomes and Goals

This section would benefit from clearer definitions and clarity around the relationships between the purpose, scope, outcomes and goals.

While we welcome, in general, the proposed scope of the framework, it needs to be better defined. For example, the lack of clarity regarding what is meant by *‘environmental and technical hazards and risks’* should be addressed. A more thorough review of the terminology employed here (as with the rest of the draft) including to resolve issues of consistency should be undertaken and reflected in the next iteration of the draft framework – particular as it relates to the term *‘resilience’*. The draft’s omission of any reference to disasters in fragile and conflict affected states is disappointing.

We support the inclusion of global goals and targets but these should be specific, measurable, time-bound and be aligned with the post-2015 development goals.

Section C – Guiding Principles

There should be fewer, more focused guiding principles and strong consideration should be given to our proposal to list them in order of priority as far as possible. The aim should be to ensure clear direction to aid implementation. Too many guiding principles that are also ill defined undermine this aim.

Section D – Priority Actions

The UK considers this section as one of the most crucial of the draft framework.

It will be important to ensure that new framework makes the link with SDGs and climate adaptation at operational level to ensure coherence – the priorities for action need to make clear references emphasising the need for alignment and coordinated implementation.

We would support the merging of the current sections on *‘local/national’* activity, and *‘global/regional’* activity in this section and further clarity on the interdependencies between levels would improve the draft.

We have set out a number of our priority issues at the start of this document. We believe in addition the priorities for action also need to address other areas – e.g. engagement with the private sector, insurance, the role of science in supporting policy development, innovation and technology, and conflict (as an underlying risk factor).

Section E – International Partnerships

The open-ended nature of the proposed framework should be set aside and a defined timeframe agreed that allows a clear link to other post-2015 frameworks.

Section F – Transition Phase

In the absence of a defined timeline, we are not clear as to the purpose of the proposed transition phase. It is our view that the new framework, while building upon HFA, should be a standalone

agreement and therefore consider that there should be no requirement for a transition period of the kind proposed.

Conclusion

We intend to submit proposals for more significant text changes during the second Preparatory Committee meeting in November but we wish to propose the co-chairs give consideration to the following more minor suggestions:

*12 (d) 'are', 'is to' and 'are to' should be replaced by 'should' to make clear this hasn't yet been achieved.

*14 (b) 'regularly' rather than 'periodically'.

*14 (d) not sure why 'community centres' is included here - 'local platforms' is sufficient.

*15 (g) – 'regulate and provide' should be replaced with 'encourage incentives for action...'

END