



---

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**First session of the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom1) of the  
Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction**

**14-15 July 2014  
Geneva at the Palais de Nations**

Ladies and gentlemen,

### **What is your vision for the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction?**

It is encouraging to see proactive risk reduction identified as an approach to be incorporated into disaster risk reduction. Generating resilience, reducing existing risk exposures, and addressing anticipatory risks should be the three pillars or strategic goals to any such vision. It is important that each of these principles receive adequate attention, as all three are necessary to successfully reduce risk moving forward. As such, the first complementary guiding principle identified in point 32 of the Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction represents an important addition.

Moreover, there is general agreement that the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction should have a continuation similar to that of the Hyogo Framework for Action of at least ten years in order to ensure appropriate results-based monitoring mechanisms for the new framework.

There is also a need to re-acknowledge the role of agri-coop and farmers' organizations to contribute to recovery / restoration from disasters as well as food security in local communities. In terms of incidence of natural disasters, Asia Pacific region is four times as likely as Africa, and 25 times as likely as Europe or North America. Therefore, it is very important to maintain and develop agri-coops and farmers' organizations which play the important role in recovery and restoration from disasters.

The first priority must be to establish a clear set of metrics associated with the indicators that are decided upon. This should be followed by a set of targets and benchmarks for each indicator to be drafted immediately following. Any review process involved must incorporate public communications of the results to ensure there is accountability amongst States, Major Groups and others. Furthermore, priorities should be globally applicable and inclusive of the disaster risk reduction needs of all.

Any priorities that are agreed upon should be defined and supported in a manner that allows for concrete implementation that will have a lasting effect upon disaster risk reduction in a world that is expected to face increasing pressure from climate change and unforeseen political instability. The priorities and targets to be negotiated should fit within the post-2015 development framework so that disaster risk reduction is not side-lined by the Sustainable Development Goals. A robust monitoring regime will be able to assess progress in meeting the indicators and may be able to achieve synergies with data gathering needs that are part of other post-2015 frameworks.

Practical reference to follow, especially for Africa, could be The Statement on Africa's Contribution to the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and Stakeholder Voluntary Guidelines.

The whole process should anyway be supported by a coordinated and mutually reinforcing approach to the three international agreements in 2015 – the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, the sustainable development goals and the climate change.

### **Climate change adaptation;**

Climate change adaptation is sorely needed in many sectors to reduce the disaster risk that is posed by climate change. Events that have taken place over the past few years have highlighted the fact that people, infrastructure and food systems can all be at threat from multiple climate related factors. Farmland and agricultural producers are very familiar with the impact that the climate can have upon their crops and livestock and will have useful examples and experiences that they can share with other sectors.

For instance, the continued efforts of African countries, especially the contribution of Regional Economic Communities, local governments, community practitioners and civil society, on disaster risk reduction and its integration with climate change adaptation for sustainable development and enhanced resilience should be noted.

However, additional work needs to be done in order to build resiliency and adaptation to climate change that protects not only people's livelihoods but also the food systems that we are all dependent upon in the event of a disaster.

## **Standards and regulatory compliance;**

Building robust stakeholder engagement into regulatory/standards development processes not only increases awareness of risk and the need for proactive action, it also engenders buy-in and support for such standards. Particularly in instances of complex regulation or significant regulatory modernization, creating adequate venues for such engagement is essential to encourage compliance promotion. The primary benefits of this engagement are information sharing and a broader understanding of the policy outcomes and decisions that underpin regulations. In general, robust communications with regulated stakeholders and a focus on education rather than punitive compliance enforcement ultimately contributes to on-going regulatory compliance. It is necessary to build and strengthen this network which is utilized not only in times of disaster but also in normal time for cooperation in various fields. Cooperation with national/local government and policy support is needed.

## **Risks in conflict prevention, migration as an effect of disaster, and food security;**

There are many aspects that require significant consideration to protect food security in the event of a disaster. The agriculture sector plays a large role in supplying food in disaster situations as well as in reducing food insecurity. Any factors that inhibit the growing, processing and distribution of food are highly likely to negatively impact food security with potentially disastrous results for local populations.

## **Can regional strategies developed by intergovernmental organizations help to accelerate and promote implementation of national strategies?**

There are some regions that may benefit from such an approach, however it is important that in order to be truly resilient and adaptive that each approach be tailored to fit the needs of each State and regionally within the State. It should be left up to regions to identify whether this is an approach they would like to take rather than adopt it as a model for all States to follow.

For example In South Africa, the Disaster Management Act, 2002, places an obligation on all state organs to compile and implement strategies. Regional cooperation with various African states and international organizations allows South Africa to be amongst the leaders in the field of disaster risk management.

## **Are the proposed system and menu of targets and indicators sufficiently robust to ensure accountability in the reduction of risk?**

They are robust, but further definition of the metrics that will underpin the fourth and fifth family of indicators outlined in the Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction is necessary before the level of insight they provide for future risk reduction can be properly assessed. The intent of both indicator families is valuable, but the ability to craft clear, universal indicators to account for the breadth of activities involved in managing underlying risk drivers and approaches to prospective and anticipatory risk management will be essential to the success of these indicator groups. Reducing subjectivity through such metrics will be essential in establishing any real accountability.

Secondly, this process will need to be followed closely in the upcoming PrepComms and the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction to ensure that any changes that are negotiated do not result in a reduced effectiveness of the goals of disaster risk reduction and that the targets and indicators remain globally applicable and useful to all States.

## **How should we regularly review the implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction?**

Each State should be required to submit a country report that explicitly outlines progress on achieving the goals through the indicators and metrics. It would be expected that each State consult internally with their stakeholders in the development of the report. This is a model that can be combined with other data gathering exercises that take place at the international level to assess the overall effectiveness of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

For example in Japan, when the earthquake occurred, farmers' cooperatives made effort on supplying various goods such as foods, commodities, fuel, and played a role in recovery activities in local communities. Based on this experience, increasing number of Cooperatives conclude agreements with local governments for the purpose of mutual support in times of disasters. These kinds of agreements are

also concluded among cooperatives themselves. Thus, movements for preparation for disasters are now expanding both in local communities and among cooperatives in different prefectures.

It is important to realize that the reduction of risk has so many facets that one size does not fit all. Countries face different situations and the menus and indicators are useful guidelines. In the case of South Africa already has systems in place, but it remains work in progress. Organized agriculture is a full partner in the development and refining of the system. The Disaster Management Plan 2004, which is an extension of the Disaster Management Act, 2002, provides for the necessary targets and indicators which are sufficient to ensure accountability. These are continuously refined as time progresses. Therefore, in order to fulfill its function, cooperation with national/local government as well as budgetary and policy support from it are needed.