

THE RIGHT TO SAFETY: SOME CONCEPTUAL AND PRACTICAL ISSUES

John Twigg
Benfield Hazard Research Centre
Disaster Studies Working Paper 9
December 2003

Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Definition of the 'right to safety'
 3. Human rights and development
 4. Rights and disaster reduction
 - 4.1 Global level
 - 4.2 Regional and national levels
 5. Defining 'safety'
 - 5.1 Adequate safety
 - 5.2 Highest attainable standard of safety
 - 5.3 Choice of definition
 6. Responsibility for safety
 - 6.1 The state
 - 6.2 Non-state actors
 - 6.3 Enforcing rights
 7. Measuring progress towards the right to safety
 - 7.1 Economic, social and cultural rights
 - 7.2 The right to safety
- Appendix: Aspects of the right to safety in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

This paper is a product of work carried out for CARE International UK's project 'Mainstreaming Mitigation to reduce Urban Poverty', 2001-2003. It is published as a Benfield Hazard Centre Disaster Studies Working Paper with permission from CARE International UK but the views expressed are those of the author alone. The 'Mainstreaming Mitigation' project was funded by the Department for International Development (research award no. R7935).

1. Introduction

Increased vulnerability to environmental hazards is one among many problems generated by urbanisation in developing countries. There is plenty of experience of effective risk reduction in towns exposed to natural hazards. However, the scale of urban vulnerability and the speed of its growth have outstripped efforts to reduce risk. Complex socio-economic and institutional contexts are also a major obstacle.¹

Scaling up is a particular challenge: to date, many urban risk reduction initiatives have been small-scale, one-off activities, often focusing on a single hazard or aspect of risk. New approaches are needed to stimulate broad-based, multi-disciplinary disaster risk reduction and to mainstream mitigation into development planning.

The concept of a ‘right to safety’ may assist in mainstreaming, in both urban and rural contexts. The idea has been discussed in general terms, but there are problems associated with its application. For this reason it has not made much headway outside academic circles. This paper describes how the right to safety may be defined and discusses issues in its application. It aims to stimulate further debate, in the hope that this will lead one day to the right to safety’s adoption internationally.

2. Definition of the ‘right to safety’

The right to safety can be defined, quite simply, as follows:

Everyone has the right to the highest attainable standard of protection against natural and man-made hazards.

This definition is supported by other economic, social and cultural rights agreed in international human rights instruments. Like other rights, the right to safety carries obligations – primarily on governments, but also on other stakeholders – to take steps to realise it.

3. Human rights and development

There are two main types of human right:

- *civil and political rights* (e.g. the right to a trial, to freedom of association, not to be tortured)
- *economic, social and cultural rights* (e.g. the right to food, housing, or employment)²

¹ Twigg J 2004 in press, *Disaster Risk Reduction: mitigation and preparedness in development and emergency programming* (London: Overseas Development Institute), chapter 14.

² Some people maintain that there is a third category of ‘collective rights’ deriving from principles of international solidarity and co-operation – e.g. a right to development, and to peace.

Both kinds are found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), which is the cornerstone of internationally accepted rights. The Universal Declaration and the two International Covenants of 1966 (the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) are commonly regarded as constituting an international bill of rights, although many other instruments have been adopted at global and regional levels (e.g. European Convention on Human Rights, 1950; Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989).³

Human rights belong to individuals although in some contexts they are associated with groups. Technically speaking, human rights are rights that apply to all people, anywhere – i.e. rights recognised only in one country cannot be viewed as human rights (Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’). Rights that small groups of people believe ought to be recognised as human rights are sometimes referred to as ‘moral rights’. They become recognised as human rights when there is a widespread consensus that they should be applied globally. International treaties and conventions are the expression of such consensus. However, rights only become enforceable legal rights when they are set out in widely ratified international law.

Many organisations working in international aid and development are now committing themselves to a ‘rights-based’ approach. This tends to encompass both human rights (i.e. those that are internationally accepted) and other rights that the agency believes should be accepted as human rights. In such contexts, the language of rights may be used vaguely, with a risk of causing confusion. Those advocating rights-based approaches to development tend to steer clear of definitions and instead focus on frameworks for analysis, discussion and action.

Terms such as ‘basic rights’ and ‘equal rights’ are often used in the development context to cover issues of access to aid and participation in decision making. The Declaration on the Right to Development adopted by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly in 1986 suggested drawing up a ‘right to development’, which was defined as ‘an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in and contribute to and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realised’. This was subsequently explained to include the right to effective participation in all decision making, the right to equal opportunities and access to resources, to fair distribution of the benefits of development, to respect for civil, political, social and cultural rights, and to an international environment in which these rights can be fully realised. Similarly, the Department for International Development (DFID) takes a ‘human rights approach to development’ that ‘focusses on empowering all people to claim their rights to the opportunities made available through pro-poor development’.⁴

³ All international human rights agreements and associated United Nations (UN) declarations and interpretations can be read on the website of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (<http://www.unhchr.ch>). All references here to such documents are taken from this source.

⁴ Eade D, Williams S 1995, *The Oxfam Handbook of Development and Relief* (Oxford; Oxfam) I: 24-5; DFID 2000, *Realising human rights for poor people* (London: Department for International Development) http://www.dfid.gov.uk/public/what/pdf/tsp_human.pdf pp.10, 17.

4. Rights and disaster reduction

4.1 Global level

The right to safety is not an *explicit* right in international human rights instruments but some address it, implicitly or otherwise. Certain aspects are covered by the three major instruments of human rights: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR). These aspects can be grouped into six main kinds.⁵

(i) Right to security in general

The right to life is the supreme right, and is basic to all human rights. Some codes begin with a general statement on the right to life, liberty and security of person. These are intended to maintain the rule of law against assaults on personal liberty and security by other people. They do not really imply a right to protection against a wider range of hazards, although it could be argued that they do so in some cases – for example, where human negligence or malice allows hazards to cause death or injury.

(ii) Right to economic, social and cultural development

This is the right to freedom of choice in the economic, social and cultural spheres (as well as to self-determination and freedom of political choice). External shocks, such as hazards, can obstruct individual freedoms in these areas. Therefore, one could argue that failure to ensure adequate protection against hazards is a failure to protect rights, but the argument is tenuous.

(iii) Right to an adequate standard of living (including right to housing)

Human rights agreements identify several components of this, including adequate food, clothing, housing, medical care, social services, and social security.

Of these components, housing is of particular significance to safety. The notion of ‘adequate’ housing features in some human rights instruments. Fact Sheet No. 21 on ‘the right to housing’ published by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, drawing on various instruments, sets out the main elements of ‘adequate’ housing: legal security of tenure, availability of services, materials and infrastructure, affordability, accessibility and location, and cultural relevance. Housing must also be *habitable* (i.e. ‘it must provide the inhabitants with adequate space and protect them from cold, damp, heat, rain, wind or other threats to health, structural hazards and disease vectors. The physical safety of occupants must also be guaranteed.’).⁶ This is explicit enough, but the interpretation currently lacks the authority of either an explicit statement in an international

⁵ See Appendix for full citations.

⁶ Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Fact Sheet No.21, *The Human Right to Adequate Housing* (n.d).

human rights instrument or a General Comment by the UN's monitoring Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.⁷

(iv) Freedom from hunger

Adequate food is another component of the right to an adequate standard of living. The 1966 Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is a landmark in commitment, asserting the right of everyone to be free from hunger and sketching out specific measures to improve production and distribution of food in order to achieve this.

(v) Right to health and safety at work

Safety in the workplace is generally regarded as a right and moreover as a right that can be enforced, because employers are clearly responsible – both morally and legally – for guaranteeing it.

(vi) Right to health

The commitment to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health in the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provides a substantial support to the right to safety. Hazards are clearly a major cause of death and ill health. States must take steps to prevent diseases and to improve environmental and industrial hygiene. From this it is only a short step to requiring measures to deal with hazards.

The UN's monitoring Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural rights explains aspects of this in greater detail. It interprets the right to health as 'an inclusive right extending not only to timely and appropriate health care but also to the underlying determinants of health, such as access to safe and potable water and adequate sanitation, an adequate supply of safe food, nutrition and housing, healthy occupational and environmental conditions, and access to health-related education and information, including on sexual and reproductive health'.⁸ The emphasis on the *underlying determinants* of health is significant, and clearly applicable to the idea of a right to safety.

4.2 Regional and national levels

Little research has been done on regionally- or state-defined rights relating to disasters, and there is probably a wide variation in the concepts and approaches used. Some echo the international conventions: for example, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000) covers general liberty and security, health and safety at work, health care and protection, and environmental quality.⁹

⁷ The UN has six treaty monitoring committees covering the main rights instruments (civil and political, economic-social-cultural, torture, race, women and children). They receive reports from countries and issue 'General Comments' or interpretations of these instruments that have authority equivalent to that of the original agreements.

⁸ The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C. 12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraph 11 (see also paragraph 15).

⁹ *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union 2000* (Brussels: European Commission).

Several national constitutions contain provisions that support the right to safety. The right to an environment that is healthy, wholesome, free from contamination, clean or ecologically balanced is recognised in the constitutions of Argentina, Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, Korea, Portugal and Turkey. The South African constitution recognises the right to an environment that is not detrimental to health or well-being. The constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic states that its citizens shall have the right to a healthy safe environment, and that of Moldova that every human being has the right to live in an environment that is ecologically safe for life and health.¹⁰

The Humanitarian Charter that forms the preamble to the Sphere Project's minimum standards in humanitarian assistance (1998) sets out a number of fundamental principles, including 'The right to life with dignity' that echoes major international agreements on human rights (the right to life, to an adequate standard of living and to freedom from cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment). It also states that: 'We understand an individual's right to life to entail the right to have steps taken to preserve life where it is threatened, and a corresponding duty on others to take such steps. Implicit in this is the duty not to withhold or frustrate the provision of life-saving assistance.'¹¹

5. Defining 'safety'

Absolute safety is unattainable. In addition, safety is difficult to define, since views of acceptable risk and security levels are relative and often subjective. Decisions about risk and safety may have to be taken where the precise nature, magnitude and extent of a hazard are unclear or disputed.

Two potentially useful ways of addressing these problems are through the notions of 'adequacy' and the 'highest attainable standard'.

5.1 Adequate safety

As we have seen, the right to 'adequate' food and housing is generally accepted. Can this be defined in a meaningful way – i.e. one that sets some basic standards whilst allowing for diversity in people's needs and expectations? The history of the right to food suggests that this is possible and provides a possible parallel for the interpretation of the right to safety. In its General Comment on the right to adequate food (1999) the UN's Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights explained what the right to adequate food consists of:

The right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement. The right to adequate food shall

¹⁰ Boyce JK 2000, 'Let Them Eat Risk? Wealth, Rights and Disaster Vulnerability'. *Disasters* 24(3): 254-261.

¹¹ Sphere Project 1998, *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response* (Geneva: Sphere Project) <http://www.sphereproject.org>

therefore not be interpreted in a narrow or restrictive sense which equates it with a minimum package of calories, proteins and other specific nutrients.

Here the term ‘adequate’ is not defined rigidly: ‘The precise meaning of “adequacy” is to a large extent determined by the prevailing social, economic, cultural, climatic, ecological and other conditions.’ However, there is a ‘core content’ of the right to adequate food, which implies: ‘The availability of food in a quantity and quality sufficient to satisfy the dietary needs of individuals, free from adverse substances, and acceptable within a given culture’ and ‘The accessibility of such food in ways that are sustainable and that do not interfere with the enjoyment of other human rights.’

The General Comment goes on to explain what it means by such terms as ‘dietary needs’, ‘free from adverse substances’, and ‘acceptability’. It therefore sets out some indicators against which progress towards achievement of the right to adequate food can be assessed.¹²

5.2 Highest attainable standard of safety

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights also offers the idea of the ‘highest attainable standard’. In its General Comment on the right to health (2000) it states that everyone has the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health – which means that states have, among other actions, to take steps necessary for ‘The prevention, treatment and control of epidemic, endemic, occupational and other diseases’.¹³

Significantly, the General Comment states that perfect health cannot be guaranteed. Health is not seen as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being. ‘The right to health is not to be understood as a right to be *healthy*’, but must be understood as ‘a right to the enjoyment of a variety of facilities, goods, services and conditions necessary for the realization of the highest attainable standard of health’. The notion of the highest attainable standard of health has to take an individual’s biological and socio-economic preconditions into account (i.e. genetic factors, individual susceptibility to ill health, and the adoption of unhealthy or risky lifestyles), as well as the state’s available resources. This emphasis on the provision of facilities, goods, services and conditions, has obvious implications for the idea of a right to safety.

The General Comment goes on to explain the ‘interrelated and essential elements’ of the right to health in some detail, covering the availability of health care, its accessibility, acceptability and quality. It also explains what is required to ensure other subsidiary rights contained in the right to health: to material, child and reproductive health, to healthy natural and workplace environments, to prevention, treatment, control and disease, to facilities, goods and services.¹⁴

¹² The right to adequate food. E/C.12/1999/5, CESCR General Comment 12’, paragraphs 6-13.

¹³ The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C.12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraphs 4, 8-11.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, paragraphs 13-29.

5.3 Choice of definition

This paper defines the right to safety in terms of the ‘highest attainable standard of protection’ against natural and man-made hazards rather than ‘adequate protection’. Although both variations have a basis in international human rights, the former is preferable because it aims higher: ‘the highest attainable standard of protection’ is clearly a more advanced state than ‘adequate protection’. The challenge of finding appropriate indicators of progress towards this standard is discussed in Section 7.

6. Responsibility for safety

Who is ultimately responsible for ensuring the safety of the public and mitigating hazards (natural or man-made)? There is no simple answer to this. In the built environment, for instance, individuals expect government to ensure the safety of their homes and the buildings in which they work by issuing and enforcing standards and regulations; but society as a whole also places much of the responsibility on builders, architects and the consumer public.

6.1 The state

International human rights codes are directed at the state, which should be the guarantor of such rights. It is states that sign up to such documents and undertake to fulfil their obligations.

In the case of political and civil rights, this responsibility is clear enough. Every state signing the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ‘undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognised in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind’ (Article 2.1).

However, it is harder to assign responsibility for economic, social and cultural rights. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone is entitled to realisation ‘of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality’, but ‘in accordance with the organisation and resources of each state’ (Article 22). Each state signing the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights undertakes ‘to take steps, individually and through international assistance and co-operation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant’ (Article 2.1).

This idea of *progressive realisation* has been criticised as vague, letting states off the hook and turning rights into aspirations,¹⁵ but it can also be argued that it simply reflects the fact that such rights cannot be achieved in a short time. Governments are committed to ‘full realization of the rights’, and are required to take concrete action to achieve this using ‘all appropriate means’ and as quickly as possible.¹⁶

¹⁵ Overseas Development Institute 1999, *What can we do with a rights-based approach to development?* Briefing Paper 1999(3).

¹⁶ The nature of States parties obligations. 14/12/90. CESCR General Comment 3.

In recent years, the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has been increasingly active in defining states' obligations. Its 1999 General Comment on the right to adequate food acknowledges that the right will have to be realised progressively, and allows each state 'a margin of discretion in choosing its own approaches' but charges states with a 'core obligation to take the necessary action to mitigate and alleviate hunger'. States are said to have three types or levels of obligation: to *respect*, to *protect* and to *fulfil* the right to adequate food. What this means is:

1. The obligation to *respect* existing access to adequate food requires states not to take any measures that result in preventing such access.
2. The obligation to *protect* requires states to ensure that other enterprises or individuals do not deprive individuals of their access.
3. The obligation to *fulfil* incorporates an obligation to *facilitate* and an obligation to *provide*. The obligation to *facilitate* means engaging in activities to strengthen people's access and utilization of resources and means to ensure their livelihood, including food security. When an individual or group is unable, for reasons beyond their control, to enjoy the right to adequate food by the means at their disposal, the state is obliged to *provide* that right directly (this also applies to victims of natural or other disasters).¹⁷

This three-fold typology of obligations has become standard in the Committee's general comments since 1999. In the General Comment on the right to health they are spelt out in some detail.¹⁸

6.2 Non-state actors

Everyone has some responsibility for ensuring that rights are upheld. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights maintains that 'Everyone has duties to the community' (article 29.1). The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union insists that 'Enjoyment of these rights entails responsibilities and duties with regard to other persons, to the human community and to future generations' (preamble).

The position of non-state actors is complex and contested. All members of society – individuals, families, communities, civil society organisations and the private business sector – are said to have responsibilities for ensuring that rights are upheld or realised,¹⁹ but they stand outside the international system of legal ratification of rights and cannot therefore be held accountable internationally in the same way as states. There is no legally defined obligation on any of these organisations to help poor countries to fulfil their rights obligations, nor to meet particular standards of care in emergencies. In practice, self regulation is preferred, especially among NGOs. For example, agencies working in humanitarian relief have in the 1990s launched their own programmes to promote accountability and improve standards: the Red Cross Code of Conduct, the Sphere project, and the Ombudsman project.

¹⁷ The right to adequate food. E/C.12/1999/5, CESCR General Comment 12, paragraphs 2, 6, 15, 21.

¹⁸ The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C. 12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraphs 33-45.

¹⁹ e.g. The right to adequate food. E/C.12/1999/5, CESCR General Comment 12, paragraph 20.

The concept of a right to safety is likely to be challenged by those who fear it will increase their own liability (e.g. government and the private sector).

6.3 Enforcing rights

The distinctive feature of a human rights-based approach is its legal foundation – internationally, regionally and nationally. However, rights are notoriously difficult to enforce. International conventions that have UN bodies associated with monitoring them have the greatest status and binding authority, but these bodies do not enforce rights – this can only be done where they have been incorporated within international law. Although many national governments sign international agreements, they fail to ratify them, and even where they do they may not make adequate provision in domestic law or may lack effective mechanisms for enforcement. States signing up to UN covenants are expected to report on progress towards them, but their reports may not give much information on what has been achieved – a problem noted, for example, with regard to realizing the right to adequate food.²⁰ There is a complaints procedure attached to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights but not for the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The international community sometimes prefers to steer away from rights. For example, the Habitat Agenda agreed by the UN Conference on Human Settlements at Istanbul in 1996 contains a commitment to tackle urban vulnerability to disasters, but this does not mention rights and is not binding in the way that a right to safe housing would be.²¹ At international level, recent discussions concerning social policy have focused on principles rather than rights.

Because of such problems, some people have argued against over-reliance on the law and for alternative approaches. Codes of conduct and quality standards may be seen as more flexible, attainable alternatives. Discussion of ‘entitlements’ rather than rights avoids the legalism associated with rights thinking, too. Entitlements may be legal rights, and the term entitlement tends to assume some prior rights, but the term has wider usage and application and comes closer to the idea of moral rights than that of human rights.

Despite these legal weaknesses, the international apparatus can promote a culture of compliance, for instance through UN monitoring bodies. Its different conventions and treaties also provide a generally accepted benchmark of good practice against which governments can be measured and challenged.

7. Measuring progress towards the right to safety

7.1 Economic, social and cultural rights

Human rights instruments are primarily about principles and fundamental obligations. It is not their business to advise on methods of implementation. Nevertheless, as we have

²⁰ The right to adequate food. E/C.12/1999/5, CESCR General Comment 12, paragraph 2.

²¹ Habitat Agenda (1996) section 172 (Nairobi: United Nations Centre for Human Settlements)
<http://www.unchsc.org/unchsc/english/hagenda/>

seen above, some of the recent General Comments of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have set down benchmarks for measuring progress towards achievements of rights. They have also been specific about the actions required to realise rights.

The 1999 General Comment on the right to adequate food broke new ground in this area. It expects states to:

- adopt a national strategy to ensure food and nutrition security, ideally through a framework law
- formulate policies and corresponding benchmarks
- identify the resources available to meet the objectives and the most cost-effective way of using them

It also makes several more specific recommendations pertaining to food security in particular.²²

Similarly, the 2000 General Comment on the right to health expects states to adopt a national strategy, formulate policies, set indicators and benchmarks, and identify resources. It also requires them to involve communities in setting priorities, making decisions, planning, implementing and evaluating strategies. A framework law should establish national mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of national health strategies and plans of action.²³

On the basis of this, the Commonwealth Medical Trust has developed a resource manual (now in press) for NGOs to use in monitoring and promoting the right to health. This explains the right to health in the context of human rights generally, sets out the obligations of states and non-governmental bodies, provides tools for monitoring compliance and violations, advises on activities to promote the right to health, and explains to NGOs and health professionals how they can become involved. Some of the detailed methodological guidance in this innovative resource is applicable to monitoring fulfilment of other human rights.²⁴

7.2 The right to safety

These recent developments in measuring attainment of economic, social and cultural rights provide signposts indicating how one might assess progress towards the right to safety.

Following the interpretation of the 2000 General Comment on the right to health, we can state that the right to safety is not the right to be safe, but ‘a right to the enjoyment of a variety of facilities, goods, services and conditions necessary for the realization of the highest attainable standard of safety’.

²² The right to adequate food. E/C.12/1999/5, CESCR General Comment 12, paragraph 21.

²³ The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C.12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraphs 53-62.

²⁴ Asher J in press, *Monitoring and Promoting the Right to Health: a resource manual for NGOs* (London: Commonwealth Medical Trust). I am grateful to Dr Judith Asher for details of this publication.

The task, then, is to identify these facilities, goods, services and conditions and provide indicators for achievement or improvement. This will be far from straightforward because disaster risk reduction is complex: it comprises many different activities, structural and non-structural, at policy and practical levels, implemented by a range of stakeholders, to address both the immediate and root causes of vulnerability to hazards. To be useful, an assessment method would have to cover this variety. A further problem is that the monitoring and evaluation of disaster mitigation initiatives tend to be weak. Much more work is needed to develop impact indicators for different kinds of intervention, and tools for evaluation.²⁵

The UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction's Draft Framework to Guide and Monitor Disaster Risk Reduction and Mitchell's Operational Framework for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction are two recent designs for assessing progress towards disaster risk reduction by governments and other actors at national level, and to help set goals and targets.²⁶ Although both are still at the conceptual stage, these frameworks could provide benchmarks for progress towards the right to safety, but would need to be linked to that right more firmly – they currently sidestep the problem of defining disaster risk reduction precisely, preferring to work with key elements that characterise it. To be consistent with international human rights instruments, they could also be adapted to provide indicators of the three types or levels of state obligation set down in other comments by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: to *respect*, to *protect* and to *fulfil* the right (see section 6.1).

An alternative or perhaps complementary approach would be to identify a set of component rights, which might include the right to be informed about the location and nature of hazards, and the right to live in housing governed by adequate regulations for safe construction. Identification and justification of these rights would be a complex task but any linkages to the existing agreements would strengthen the case for a right to safety.

International agreement on the relevant benchmarks is necessary for the right to safety to be accepted globally as a human right. This can take place only through the UN system and would require the commitment of relevant UN agencies, those best placed being the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. However, separate agreements on benchmarks or indicators could be negotiated at national or local levels, with stakeholders defining their common and separate targets and obligations. Such 'codes of conduct' might vary widely according to contexts, but all would lie within the common definition of the right to safety.

²⁵ Twigg J 2004 in press, *Disaster Risk Reduction: mitigation and preparedness in development and emergency programming* (London: Overseas Development Institute), chapter 18.

²⁶ ISDR 2003, 'Rationale paper on the Framework for Guidance and Monitoring of Disaster Risk Reduction' (Geneva: ISDR, background paper for Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction); Mitchell T 2003, *An Operational Framework for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction* (London: Benfield Hazard Research Centre, Disaster Studies Working Paper 8)
http://www.benfieldhrc.org/SiteRoot/disaster_studies/working_papers/workingpaper8.pdf

Appendix: Aspects of the right to safety in the UDHR, CCPR and CESC

(i) Right to security in general

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.	Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, Article 3
Every human being has the inherent right to life.	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966, Article 6.1

(ii) Right to economic, social and cultural development

Everyone ... is entitled to realisation ... of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.	Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, Article 22
All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966, Article 1.1 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 1.1

(iii) Right to an adequate standard of living (including right to housing)

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.	Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, Article 25.1
The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions.	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 11.1
The Committee interprets the right to health, as defined in article 12.1 [of the CESC], as an inclusive right extending not only to timely and appropriate health care but also to the underlying determinants of health, such as access to safe and potable water and adequate sanitation, an adequate supply of safe food, nutrition and housing, healthy occupational and environmental conditions, and access to health-related education and information, including on sexual and reproductive health.'	The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C. 12/2000/4, CESC General Comment 14, paragraph 11

Article 12.2(b) [of the CESCR, on the right to health] also embraces adequate housing and safe and hygienic working conditions ...	The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C. 12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraph 15
--	--

(iv) Right to food (freedom from hunger)

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.	Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, Article 25.1
The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions.	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 11.1
The States Parties to the present Covenant, recognizing the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger, shall take, individually and through international co-operation, the measures, including specific programmes, which are needed: (a) To improve methods of production, conservation and distribution of food by making full use of technical and scientific knowledge, by disseminating knowledge of the principles of nutrition and by developing or reforming agrarian systems in such a way as to achieve the most efficient development and utilization of natural resources; (b) Taking into account the problems of both food-importing and food-exporting countries, to ensure an equitable distribution of world food supplies in relation to need.	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 11.2

(v) Right to health and safety at work

The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work which ensure ... safe and healthy working conditions	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 7
--	--

(vi) Right to health

<p>The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.</p>	<p>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 12.1</p>
<p>The steps to be taken by the States Parties to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right [to health] shall include those necessary for ... (b) The improvement of all aspects of environmental and industrial hygiene; (c) The prevention, treatment and control of epidemic, endemic, occupational and other diseases.</p>	<p>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966, Article 12.2</p>
<p>The Committee interprets the right to health, as defined in article 12.1 [of the CESCR], as an inclusive right extending not only to timely and appropriate health care but also to the underlying determinants of health, such as access to safe and potable water and adequate sanitation, an adequate supply of safe food, nutrition and housing, healthy occupational and environmental conditions, and access to health-related education and information, including on sexual and reproductive health.’</p>	<p>The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C. 12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraph 11</p>
<p>‘The improvement of all aspects of environmental and industrial hygiene’ (art. 12.2(b)) comprises, <i>inter alia</i>, preventive measures in respect of occupational accidents and diseases; the requirement to ensure an adequate supply of safe and potable water and basic sanitation; the prevention and reduction of the population’s exposure to harmful substances such as radiation and harmful chemicals or other detrimental environmental conditions that directly or indirectly impact upon human health ... Article 12.2(b) also embraces adequate housing and safe and hygienic working conditions ...</p>	<p>The right to the highest attainable standard of health. E/C. 12/2000/4, CESCR General Comment 14, paragraph 15</p>