17 December 2013

UNISDR
The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

by

The UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction

1. Introduction

1. The United Nations General Assembly by Resolution A/RES/66/199 of 22 December 2011 requested the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) to facilitate the development of a "post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction". Consultations of all stakeholders started in early 2012 and included online and local, national, regional and global events, including eight Regional Platforms and the 4th Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.

2. The consultations together with countries' reports through the UNISDR HFA Monitor, the findings of the biennial UN Global Assessment Reports on Disaster Risk Reduction of 2009, 2011 and 2013, and the relevant deliberations of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as a growing literature and practice on disaster risk and resilience, provide a wealth of knowledge and guidance for the further development of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

3. The Proposed Elements draw on the consultations to date. They aim to provide guidance and support for the preparation and deliberations of the upcoming Regional Platforms and meetings for disaster risk reduction[1] upon which the future framework will be built through the formal preparatory process of the 3rd World Conference for Disaster Risk Reduction (Sendai, Japan, 14-18 March 2015).

4. UNISDR was requested by the United Nations General Assembly through Resolution A/RES/67/209 to serve as the secretariat of the World Conference and coordinate the preparatory activities in consultation with all relevant stakeholders. It will submit a synthesis report with the recommendations of the Regional Platforms on the content of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction for consideration by the first preparatory committee meeting of the World Conference, scheduled to take place in Geneva, Switzerland, on 14-15 July 2014.

[1] Regional Platforms: Africa (Abuja, Nigeria) 5-8 May 2014; Americas (Guayaquil, Ecuador) 27-29 May 2014; Asia (Bangkok, Thailand) 23-26 June 2014; Pacific (Suva, Fiji) 2-4 June 2014; Arab States (Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt) 10-12 June 2014 and Europe (Brussels, Belgium) : dates still to be confirmed.

5. The formulation of the Proposed Elements also benefited from the counsel provided to the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction by her Science and Technology Advisory Group, Global Assessment Report Advisory Board, Private Sector Advisory Group, Parliamentarians Advisory Group, and the Hyogo Framework for Action Advisory Group. These encompass over 60 senior government officials, Members of Parliament, scientists, business executives, lawyers, practitioners, and civil society representatives – all serving pro bono in their personal capacity.

2. Overall Considerations

Context

6. As the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) draws to a close, and in developing the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, it is important to recall progress towards its achievement to date. On the one hand, many countries have made some progress across all HFA Priority Areas[2]. In particular, economic growth and an improvement in development conditions in many low and middle-income countries, including an enhancement of capacities in early warning, disaster preparedness and response, have contributed to a downward trend in mortality risk, at least for those weather-related hazards where early warning is possible.

7. However, disaster-related economic loss and damage continues to increase. Economic globalization has spurred growth but has also led to a massive increase in hazard exposure, as new private and public investment have been concentrated in hazardous areas, such as cyclone and tsunami prone coastlines, flood prone river basins and in earthquake prone cities. Intensive[3] risk has accumulated in hazard-exposed areas and is now transmitted around the world through global supply chains, representing a systemic global economic risk for business, governments and society at large.

8. Moreover, poorly planned and managed urban development, environmental degradation, poverty and inequality and weak governance mechanisms continue to drive rapidly-increasing loss and damage associated with extensive[4] risk. This has devastating impact on exposed and vulnerable low-income households, on the small and informal enterprises that provide the vast majority of employment in many countries, and on the public infrastructure and services on which these households and enterprises depend. Extensive risk is increasing even in countries and areas that are not exposed to major hazards, which highlights how both development and disaster risk reduction have not been sustainable and effective; this is particularly detrimental to low-income communities. The achievement of key sustainable development objectives, such as the end of extreme poverty, as highlighted by the 2012 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20),

---

[2] See *Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action – Summary Reports 2007-2013*, UNISDR, 2013.

[3] "Intensive risk" is used to describe the risk of high-severity, mid to low-frequency disasters, mainly associated with major hazards. Glossary, 2013 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction, UNISDR.

[4] "Extensive risk" is used to describe the risk of low-severity, high-frequency disasters, mainly but not exclusively associated with highly localized hazards. Ibidem.

cannot be achieved without effective management of risk, or else the ongoing increase of development-induced risks, which keep large numbers of people in poverty, will be difficult to halt and reverse.

9. In the HFA and the ensuing policy and practice, disasters generally continue to be conceptualized as external shocks to normally functioning economies, rather than as manifestations of underlying risk drivers inherent to development policies and practices which generate and accumulate disaster risks. Dangerous and irreversible climate change is generated by the same economic processes associated with increasing hydrometerological disaster risk, and will often magnify the effects of these underlying risk drivers, many of which are trans-boundary in nature. Unless these drivers are addressed, in coming decades climate-related and other physical and economic losses will dramatically increase, gains in reducing mortality may stall or be reversed, and impacts on social welfare, economic growth, food security and environmental health will threaten the viability and sustainability of nations, enterprises and communities.

10. Sustainable development goals cannot be achieved without managing disaster risk. The overall focus of disaster risk management, therefore, has to shift from shielding social and economic development against what are seen as external events and shocks, to one of transforming development to manage risks, sustainably seize opportunities, strengthen resilience, thereby ensuring a sustainable development.

11. In addition, given that most investment is made by the private sector, whether or not this investment is risk sensitive will have a critical influence on future levels of disaster risk. Therefore, the post-2015 framework should explicitly include public policies that provide incentives and opportunities for risk sensitive private investment, including from business, households and communities, as well as allow for voluntary commitments by these sectors.

12. The creation of a more resilient humanity and environment requires strong international and local commitment, and goodwill to engineer the necessary changes to current development practices, processes and patterns. Policy and action need to go beyond the reduction of existing risk and prioritize the prevention of new risk accumulation. Risk management must be part of sustainable development policies and practices in order to tackle existing challenges and seize potential opportunities.

The Opportunity at Hand

13. The elaboration and adoption of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction comes at a critical time, when two other major instruments that are relevant to the increase and management of risk are under discussion, namely climate change and the post-2015 sustainable development agenda and goals.

14. This synchronicity is a major opportunity to define and agree upon an overall cohesive, coherent, and as much as possible harmonised post-2015 paradigm. This should enable the management of the risks inherent to development and that manifest through disasters, climate change and variability, financial and economic crises, and other consequences for the economy, society and the environment. From that perspective, climate change mitigation and adaptation need to be seen as part of broader risk management strategy, which embraces

natural and technological hazards and is instrumental to the achievement of sustainable development goals.

15. The knowledge and experience acquired in disaster risk management to date need to inform the development of the above-mentioned international instruments and frameworks. These need to converge if the world-wide shared aspiration of sustainability in development and resilience is to be achieved.

16. If risk management is addressed in an incoherent and incompatible manner by each the three instruments there will be little possibility of success to achieve sustainable development. While each instrument may need to guide and regulate, as appropriate, specific questions, managing risk and opportunities in a coherent manner needs to remain a common feature.

17. Challenges in managing risk have been well tested in practice at local, national and regional scales through the experience of HFA implementation. The post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction is hence, in a strong position to introduce the necessary changes to enhance current risk management practices in development planning and investment. It therefore needs to be conceived and recognised as a guiding tool for supporting the successful implementation of the future sustainable development goals and the climate change agreement. Taken from this perspective, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction cannot be considered as a stand-alone, technical and sector specific agreement. Provisions need to be made to secure an interlinked and mutually supportive implementation.

18. The HFA Monitor – a voluntary self-reporting mechanism for governments managed by UNISDR – has shown the importance and usefulness of a properly defined monitoring system of targets, indicators and means of verification to measure effective impact. Therefore, an enhanced HFA Monitor will need to accompany the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, and could be potentially instrumental to monitor the broader sustainability of development.

19. Moreover, to date, the periodic review of the Hyogo Framework for Action has been carried out through a process separated from the Millennium Development Goals and the Climate Change Convention, thus preventing countries from having a holistic review and appreciation of progress, assessing coherence and convergence in implementation, and introducing useful adjustments. In this connection, the periodic review of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction should be carried out at least in connection with, and through the same process and UN governance bodies as, the post-2015 development agenda and goals; and also, possibly, with future arrangements for mitigating and adapting to climate change.

20. Finally, effective risk management requires action from a variety of actors of local, national, regional, and global as well of a public and private nature. Given the varied nature and scale of action, legally binding instruments and policy instruments, while necessary, are per se, neither sufficient nor suitable to provide detailed regulation and guidance. Indeed they need to be complemented and articulated by voluntary and explicit commitments and actions by stakeholder groups – such as communities, civil society organisations, local

governments, parliamentarians, business, and science – which want to assume the leadership and responsibility and thus contribute positively to managing the risk inherent to development. These commitments, often discrete and unnoticed, are emerging and deserve full appreciation and recognition as a significant contribution to the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

21. Against this background, a number of interlinked and mutually reinforcing elements and questions emerge as instrumental to effectively manage risk, and need to be captured in the overall outcome of the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. Some of these issues and questions may be best addressed in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, while others, such as commitments, in other documents, and further others in a political declaration. From this perspective, the outcome can be imagined as a three-fold package composed of: A) the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and its monitoring system and period review process, B) the voluntary commitments of stakeholders, as leading examples of assumption of responsibility, vision and readiness to act, and C) the political declaration.

22. To ensure continuity and coherence between regional and global level, it is important that the preparation for, and deliberations of, the upcoming Regional Platforms and meetings on disaster risk reduction focus, and elaborate further, on the questions and issues addressed in this document.

3 Proposed World Conference Outcome Components

23. This section proposes an articulation of the aforementioned three components of the overall outcome of the World Conference: A) the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and its monitoring system and period review process, B) the voluntary commitments of stakeholders, as leading examples of assumption of responsibility, vision and readiness to act, and C) the political declaration.

A) The post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, its enhanced monitoring system and period review process

24. In the consultations, countries and stakeholders have indicated that the post 2015-framework for disaster risk reduction needs to: build on the experience from Hyogo Framework for Action, be practical and action oriented, strengthen accountability, be relatively short, and capable of addressing future natural and technological risk scenarios, hence far reaching.

25. The post 2015-framework for disaster risk reduction should also build on the experience and the principles enshrined in the preceding frameworks, namely the International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World, and the Strategy "A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction" (ISDR). As such it may not be necessary to repeat their content, but rather simply refer to and recall the past instruments.

26. The enhancement of clarity in responsibility, accountability and monitoring of implementation may benefit from moving from a framework based on concepts and activities, as the current HFA, to one structured around specific and strategic public policies, which can be complemented by stakeholders' commitments.

27. Overall, the identification of the substantive elements of the post 2015-framework for disaster risk reduction may be guided by a question: **considering that managing risk may require a variety of instruments and initiatives at local, national, regional and global level - what is it that is currently missing or unclear, but which, if agreed upon by the specific means of an global non-legally binding framework, would enable more effective risk management?**

28. This approach helps focus the quest for the elements of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, towards the core elements of HFA, namely the "expected outcome", the three "strategic goals" and the five "priorities for action 2005-2015", and assists in assessing whether or not such an outcome, goals and priorities for action are still valid, need reconfiguration, and determine if some elements are missing.

29. In this section A, the proposed substantive elements of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, its monitoring system, and its periodic review process, will be presented in three sub-sections, namely "i", "ii", and "iii".

i. <u>The Substantive Elements of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction</u>

30. Overall, the consultations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and experience in HFA implementation have pointed toward the need for a redefinition and reorganisation of the HFA elements in order to place greater emphasis on achieving safer, more secure and resilient communities and nations. Contextually, a number of questions have emerged as pivotal, and may merit consideration in the form of principles which guide future action.

31. The proposed substantive elements of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction include a set of guiding principles and a redefinition of the expected outcome, strategic goals and priorities for action.

<u>Guiding principles</u>

32. The principles enshrined in previous and existing frameworks remain, and may be complemented by the following:

- The sustainability of development and resilience of people, nations and the environment depend on sound risk management, which needs to guide private and public planning and investments. It goes beyond the reduction of existing risk and includes the prevention of new risk accumulation.
- Natural and technological hazards are within the scope of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.
- Prevention and reduction of disaster risk - are an international legal obligation and constitute a safeguard for the enjoyment of human rights.

- The increasingly trans-boundary and global characteristics of risk drivers require further cooperative efforts in their assessment and management.
- The availability of open source and open access science-based risk information and knowledge is instrumental to cost-benefit analysis, transparent transactions, accountability, and the development of partnerships across public, private and other stakeholders.

Expected Outcome, Strategic Goals, Priorities for Action, Foundational Questions

33. The reduction of disaster loss and damage per se, as an outcome of the existing HFA, reflects a vision of disasters as external events and disaster risk reduction as a sector that protects development. The expected outcome of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, therefore, should not be described only in terms of reduced loss but rather in positive and aspirational terms such as secure, healthy, wealthy and resilient nations and communities. This would create a direct and mutually reinforcing link to the SDGs and specific targets. At the same time, it would increase the political and economic imperative for managing disaster risks, changing the perception of investment in risk management as an additional cost to one of an opportunity to create shared value.

34. To achieve this outcome, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction needs to embrace three complementary and strategic goals, namely: 1) risk prevention and the pursuit of development pathways that minimise disaster risk generation; 2) risk reduction, i.e. actions to address existing accumulations of disaster risk; and 3) strengthened resilience, i.e. actions that enable nations and communities to absorb loss and damage, minimise impacts and bounce forward.

35. Accordingly, the priority areas of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction needs to be defined in terms of critical public policies that address disaster risk in publically owned, managed or regulated services and infrastructures, and in the environment, but also that regulate or provide incentives for actions by households, communities, businesses and individuals. In these different domains, the priority areas should include public policies in prospective and anticipatory risk management (risk prevention), corrective risk management (risk reduction) and actions to strengthen resilience. This refocusing of the HFA Priority Areas on public policy will serve to sharpen the instrument, define responsibilities, strengthen accountability and facilitate monitoring.

36. In order to make progress towards the expected outcome and strategic goals, public policies on risk management need to be underpinned by appropriate governance frameworks that incorporate actions not only by national and local governments but also by civil society, the private sector, the science and academic sector and others. Such a governance approach would reflect the increasing prevalence of innovative and networked partnerships and alliances between different sectors, as effective means to address development challenges. Similarly, the public policies will need to be underpinned by mechanisms for information and knowledge generation and management in order to ensure that relevant information and knowledge on risk and on risk management alternatives is available to policy and decision makers at different levels, from individuals and households to international organisations.

37. Against this background and building on the consultations, a possible name for the post 2015-framework for disaster risk reduction could be: "HFA[2][Plus] – Managing Risk to Achieve Resilience."

ii. The Enhanced Monitoring System

38. To date, the achievement of the HFA has been monitored against a set of 22 core indicators across the five Priority Areas. Through the on-line HFA Monitor progress is benchmarked by countries on a scale of 1 to 5, complemented by means of verification and a qualitative description. While this has generated the most significant global repository of information available on the progress reported by governments in reducing disaster risk, the experience of three biennial review cycles in 2009, 2011 and 2013 has highlighted weaknesses, including: subjectivity; the fact that individual indicators respond to multiple public policies and the fact that most indicators are input rather than output related. In addition, most indicators refer to corrective risk management or disaster management rather than to prospective and anticipatory risk management. Therefore, the current HFA Monitor is partially helpful in assessing whether countries are addressing the underlying risk drivers and avoiding the accumulation of new risks. In addition, there is no explicit link between the HFA Monitor and the mechanisms to monitor progress on the MDGs and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

39. Recognising these weaknesses, a new system of indicators for risk management, comprising five different indicator families, could be adopted that measures how public policy in disaster risk management is addressing the underlying risk drivers to prevent risk creation (prospective risk management), reducing existing levels of risk (corrective risk management) and strengthening resilience (the capacity to absorb loss and bounce forward) when disasters occur. The success of these policies will determine the level of disaster loss and damage a country faces and the longer term impacts on the economy, the environment and social welfare.

40. The level of disaster loss is the ultimate indicator of success of risk management. Fundamentally if losses are increasing, risk management is not being effective and vice versa. Therefore, the first family of indicators will need to include a set of disaster loss and damage metrics, expressed in both absolute and relative (to population, GDP etc) terms. They will include both human loss (mortality, people injured or affected); physical damage (houses and local infrastructure damaged and destroyed) and economic loss (replacement costs of damaged and destroyed assets).

41. The second family of indicators would refer to countries' risk profile, including both intensive and extensive risk. This family would be built on metrics such as Annual Average Loss (AAL) and Probable Maximum Loss (PML) in order to highlight the likely future losses that a country could experience in the future. It is important to understand the difference between observed historical losses and risks. Given that some intensive disasters only occur infrequently (for example every 500 or 1000 years), thirty or forty years of historical data does not, in itself, express the level of risk a country may face.

42. A third family of indicators would explore the resilience of a country's economy to probable losses. This will be done by identifying indicators that compare risk to the size of a country's economy, its capital stock, investment and savings levels, trade flows, insurance penetration, the fiscal health of government, the degree of social protection and other metrics. This family will also measure fiscal resilience by comparing the risk that governments are responsible for with fiscal capacity and the availability of risk financing, including but not restricted to insurance.

43. The fourth family of indicators will measure how a country is managing its underlying risk drivers, also providing links from disaster risk management to the SDGs and to the climate change convention. Indicators will be developed in some categories, including: economic and fiscal structure; poverty and social vulnerability; environmental and ecosystem services degradation and climate change; urbanization; coping capacity.

44. The fifth family of indicators would measure how countries are adopting effective public policies in favour of prospective and anticipatory risk management, corrective risk management and the strengthening of resilience by both the public and private sectors. Indicators will also be developed to measure the effectiveness of the governance and arrangements for information and knowledge generation and management that need to underpin public policy in disaster risk management. Whereas the HFA Monitor provided indicators for specific areas of concern, such as early warning systems, these correspond to multiple policies and commitments, making monitoring vague and opaque. This indicator family based on public policies will provide more explicit and easy to verify indicators.

45. Data required for the first indicator family would be derived from national disaster loss databases, for the second family from the results of global risk assessments, and for the third and fourth families from internationally available and comparable statistics and databases. Data for the fifth family of indicators would be generated by governments, using a modified and enhanced HFA Monitor.

46. In order to facilitate a link between the monitoring of post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and that of the SDGs and a new climate change agreement, the design of the new HFA Monitor system would need to include indicators that are compatible with the objectives of those instruments. Making this link explicit at the indicator level will make it possible to monitor concurrently progress across all three frameworks.

iii. <u>The Periodic Review Process</u>

47. The 1989 International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction was within the purview of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. However, the HFA did not provide for a formal periodic review by relevant UN governance bodies. This was instead carried out through the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. The effect is that monitoring has been very removed from the mechanisms used for the MDGs, resulting in extremely limited cross-fertilisation.

48. The High Level Political Forum (HLPF) has been established by the United Nations General Assembly as a mechanism to "provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development, follow up and review progress in the

implementation of sustainable development commitments, enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in a holistic and cross-sectoral manner at all levels and have a focused, dynamic and action-oriented agenda, ensuring the appropriate consideration of new and emerging sustainable development challenges". As such, the establishment of the HLFP represents a critical instrument which could also serve for the review of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction in order to ensure a synchronised and harmonised review process and deliberations, as well as cross-fertilisation and learning from the implementation of the future sustainable development agenda and goals and the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Therefore, the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction may provide for its formal review by the HLPF through the periodic meetings held under the auspices of the UN General Assembly and the ECOSOC.

B) The voluntary commitments of stakeholders

49. The consultations have called for a strong participation by civil society, science, local authorities, local communities, media, business, and others in the development and implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Moreover, the implementation of the HFA has been enriched, enhanced and accelerated by the development of voluntary commitments, plans, actions, and monitoring tools by key stakeholders such as the private sector's "Five Essentials for Business in Disaster Risk Reduction"[5], and the local governments' "ten essentials" and "self assessment tool" to make cities resilient[6].

50. The formulation of more voluntary commitments at the regional and global levels by all stakeholders through the Regional Platforms, and their integration into the Conference's overall outcome will constitute an enriching and powerful drive for the implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

51. In particular, the voluntary commitments would represent the proposal by stakeholder groups for concrete actions to implement the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction at regional and/or global levels. They would constitute an expression of leadership, provide a very solid basis for the implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, and indicate how all stakeholders could work together and generate the necessary shift "from shared risk to shared value", captured in the 2013 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. The value of the voluntary commitments will also be to catalyse and inspire further action by other individuals, groups, organizations, and networks etc., not present at the World Conference.

52. Although formally not part of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, the voluntary commitments should be compiled and recognised as part of the overall outcome of the Conference, and in particular in the political declaration of the World Conference, due to their value in guiding implementation and cooperation. To be practical and actionable, voluntary commitments should provide targets, indicators and means of verification and commit to periodic self-assessment of progress. The voluntary commitments could be compiled by country, region and sector to facilitate visualisation and monitoring.

[5] See UNISDR: www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/networks/public/psp/essentials/

[6] See UNISDR: www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/toolkit/essentials

C) The Political Declaration

53. The political declaration of the World Conference is indispensable to give guidance on a number of crucial points, in particular on how the overall outcome of the Conference needs to be interpreted, and how its components are connected. It is important that the Political Declaration build on the deliberations of the Regional Platforms, in order to ensure harmony between global and regional levels and specificities. Proposed substantive elements for consideration in the political declaration include:

- An appreciation of the anthropogenic nature of risk; changing characteristics of risk; the need to focus on risk drivers, including climate change and variability, which are inherent to development practices; need to address exposure together with vulnerability; need to address extensive risk due to its relevance for vulnerable people and poverty; and a recognition of the need to focus explicitly on risk management, encompassing the reduction of existing risk and the avoidance of new risk accumulation, to achieve resilience of people, nations and environment.
- An appreciation of the progress made through the HFA to address human vulnerability to some hazards, and recognition of the redefinition of HFA elements as a necessary innovation to effectively manage risk for resilience.
- Naming the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction (possibly as "HFA [2] or [Plus] – Managing Risk to Achieve Resilience"), and defining the latter as an evolution of HFA, that builds on the past frameworks, namely the International Framework of Action for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World, and the Strategy "A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction" (ISDR); and proposing that the General Assembly change the name of its relevant agenda sub-item from "International Strategy for Disaster Reduction" to "International Strategy for Risk Management and Resilience" in order to better reflect the focus of the work.
- Welcoming the updating of the HFA Monitor into a HFA [2] [Plus] Monitor, based on a new core system of targets, indicators and means of verification.
- Welcoming and appreciating the significance of the stakeholders "commitments", as an essential sign of leadership, goodwill, needed cooperation and concrete action to articulate and implement the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.
- Stressing the importance of enhancing accountability at local, national and international levels, and welcoming the progressive development and codification of international law concerning the "Protection of persons in the event of disasters" by the UN International Law Commission.
- Calling for an integrated implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction and the post-2015 development agenda/goals and climate change agreement.
- Requesting the periodic review of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction by the HLPF through the periodic meetings under the auspices of the UN General Assembly and the ECOSOC.
- Recognizing the significance of regional strategies to manage risk and suggesting their review in line with the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

- Calling on the United Nations system to support countries and stakeholders with the implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction through the UN Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience.
- Calling on countries and stakeholders to join forces under the safe schools initiative launched at the World Conference.