

**THIRD UNITED NATIONS WORLD CONFERENCE ON
DISASTER RISK REDUCTION
Second Preparatory Committee Meeting
Geneva, 17 – 18 November 2014**

**Statement of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland**

**Delivered by
Ms Karen Pierce, Ambassador and Permanent
Representative,
UK Mission to the UN and Other International
Organisations, Geneva**

Thank you to the Co-Chairs, members of the Bureau and the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) for convening and facilitating this second Preparatory Committee Meeting and for their work in producing the zero-draft on which further negotiations are to be based.

The UK welcomes this opportunity to make this brief statement and we look forward, in common with others represented here today, to actively engaging with these

negotiations in order to contribute to the development of the post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

We support the earlier statement made by the European Union, welcoming the draft elements of the Sendai Declaration proposed by Japan – including the emphasis placed on the importance of mainstreaming disaster risk management in sustainable development policies and practice; coherence with other international frameworks; and processes and a focus on implementation to ensure the success of the new framework.

While reserving our more detailed observations on the zero-draft for the negotiation sessions to come, we would like to share some general observations at this stage.

The zero draft provides a good basis on which to begin to build an ambitious new framework, while maintaining its voluntary nature. It is clear that some of the gaps identified during recent informal consultations on the pre-zero draft have been better addressed; however there remain a number of areas in which the draft, in our view, could be improved and some omissions which must be urgently addressed.

We welcome the progression towards a **clearer and more concise** framework and support further moves in this direction as a vital element in successful implementation.

We wish to see a **stronger overarching narrative** in which the disaster risk reduction and broader resilience agenda is firmly established as both a development and humanitarian priority. It should explain not only context and history but also a 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, addressing climate change and encouraging sustainable development and fostering of economic growth.

We will not achieve a broader and more integrated approach to risk management unless we **ensure an effective level of coherence between the post 2015 DRR framework and other global frameworks and processes**. We join others in reiterating our call for the new post-2015 DRR framework to be aligned with the post 2015 sustainable development and climate change agendas as well as with the World Humanitarian Summit. It is not enough for this to be reflected as an aspiration or

guiding principle. Rather, it should be reflected consistently through in the frameworks, goals, outcome and action-oriented targets and indicators as well as the synchronicity between timeframes, reporting schedules and target dates.

We welcome the clear recognition of the prime responsibility of states to reduce disaster risk. Although action taken at the regional and global levels have an important role to play in supporting states, particularly through sharing good practice, we must keep in mind that there is rarely a one size fits all approach to risk management. The new framework should take account of the differences in risk profile between countries and the ability of states to reduce risk, particularly as it relates to the development of global targets.

We support the moves in the zero draft **towards recognising the important role of civil society, the private sector and science** in supporting national and local leadership by supporting countries to manage disasters by themselves.

It is important that the framework is pragmatic, workable, and focussed, and **does not place a disproportionate**

burden on states or create unnecessary bureaucracy.

For example, we recognise the value of understanding and accounting for the losses incurred through disasters, but experience in the UK has demonstrated that it is difficult to arrive at complete and accurate data that can be used on a comparable basis without an enormous investment in time and energy. While in some cases this effort may be warranted, in many cases it may be disproportionate.

The World Conference really is a unique opportunity to lead the way in setting out an ambitious road map for reducing disaster risk and building resilience over the coming decades. We must grasp this opportunity to fully integrate disaster risk management into the broader efforts to eradicate poverty and ensure sustainable development.

The UK looks forward to contributing to this process.

Thank you

END