

Note from the Secretariat
to the Informal Working Group on Targets and Indicators (DRR)
(Geneva, January 2015)

Introduction

The Secretariat (UNISDR) would like to provide additional information on possible scenarios of percentages for proposed global targets as requested by the Informal Working Group on Targets and Indicators of the preparatory process to the Third UN Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in its meeting held on 9 January 2015.

This paper compiles information from experts and the UNISDR experience and data used for the biennial publications of the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR).

The global targets intend to measure the *worldwide* implementation of the post-2015 framework. Applicable, verifiable, comparable and measurable targets would contribute to determine the advance or guide adjustments needed to reduce the impact of disasters. These targets, and the indicators they are based on, should also be useful at *national* level to understand the progress of each individual country.

Target 1: “[Substantially] reduce disaster mortality per capita [by a given percentage] by 2030”.

Suggestion:

Ambitious scenario:	Absolute reduction in global disaster mortality by 50% compared to 2005-2015.
Moderate scenario:	Absolute reduction in global disaster mortality by 10%-20%
Conservative Scenario:	Global disaster mortality does not increase (i.e. Trend of absolute mortality is not an increasing one).

Justification: Since 1990 global disaster mortality¹ has increased in absolute terms by approximately 50%. A reduction of 50% over the next 15 years would therefore be an ambitious target as it would signify not only slowing down but actually reversing the upward trend to-date - while ambitious it is not impossible. A moderate scenario would be to reverse this trend and still reduce it by 10%-20%. A very conservative scenario is to stabilize the increasing trend. However, anything less than reversing the trend (i.e. moderate) would lack ambition and may not motivate. Mortality is susceptible to improvements in early warning, disaster preparedness and response, risk reduction efforts and improved development conditions.

Measurement: Achievement of the target can be monitored from national disaster databases adopting an appropriate procedure to filter out low-frequency high-impact losses. This indicator has been tested with data since 1990 and demonstrates a robust and statistically significant trend. A relative metric (disaster mortality per 100,000 people) could also be used.

¹ EM DAT taking into account all events with 100 killed or less

Target 2: “[Substantially] reduce the number of affected people² per capita [by 20%] by 2030”.

Ambitious scenario:	An absolute reduction by 20% compared to 2015.
Moderate scenario:	A moderate decrease of 5% in the number of people affected.
Conservative Scenario:	A minimally acceptable scenario would be to stabilize the number of affected (despite increases in population, exposure and vulnerability)

Suggestion: it has been suggested that the attribute *affected* is measured as the combination of robust indicators, such as people injured, evacuated, relocated, houses damaged and destroyed. Several countries has suggested not to include evacuated in order to consider the possible side of evacuation in saving lives.

Justification: Housing damage³ and injuries have increased approximately four-fold since 1990, the number of people evacuated ten-fold and the number relocated six- fold in nationally reported disasters. Given the strength of this increase we believe that any reduction of more than 20% by 2030 would be hard to achieve. Given increases in risk due to urbanization, environmental degradation, inequality and poverty and climate change, achieving a 5% would be progress in reverting the increasing trend. A 20% reduction in itself would be ambitious progress. Anything less than stabilizing the number of people affected would not be motivational.

Measurement: it is recommended that a compound indicator be used combining people injured, evacuated and relocated and housing damaged and destroyed. This compound indicator has been tested with data since 1990 and demonstrates a robust and statistically significant trend.

Target 3: “[Substantially] reduce direct disaster economic loss [by a given percentage] in relation to GDP by 2030”.

Ambitious scenario:	Reduce direct economic loss by 20% relative to global GDP.
Moderate scenario:	A moderate decrease of 5% relative to global GDP.
Conservative Scenario:	A minimal scenario would be to stabilize the loss relative to GDP (thus neutralizing increases in exposed assets and other factors)

Justification: Absolute global direct economic loss has approximately doubled since 1990. However, this reflects the increase in hazard-exposed assets due to economic development. Relative to global GDP direct economic loss has been constant. An ambitious scenario can be set at a reduction of 20% given that, unlike mortality or other human related losses, reducing economic loss implies reductions in the hazard exposure and vulnerability of economic assets, including in the built

² “Affected People” as defined for the purposes of this paper.

³ From national disaster databases for X countries. Disasters associated with extensive risk killing 30 people or less or destroying 600 houses or less

environment. This is a slower process given that most infrastructures etc. are built with a design life of 50 years or more. Any target of more than 20% would be unrealistic. A decrease of 5% relative to global GDP would be a moderate scenario. Any target below the stabilization of economic loss damage would not be motivational.

Measurement: Achievement of the target can be monitored by combining modelled economic losses for smaller disasters from national disaster databases with assessed losses from large disasters captured from international disaster databases.

Target 4: “[Substantially] reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure, including health and educational facilities [by a given percentage] by 2030”.

Ambitious scenario:	Reduce disaster damage to health and educational facilities [and other critical infrastructure] by 30%
Moderate scenario:	A moderate decrease of 10% of damages to health and educational facilities [and other critical infrastructure]
Conservative Scenario:	A minimal scenario would be to stabilize the damage to this type of facilities (i.e. to neutralize increases in exposed infrastructure and other factors)

Justification: Given the critical importance of health and education facilities as a factor of resilience that avoids the translation of disaster losses into wider social impacts there is scope for an ambitious target of 30% or a moderate target of 10%. A minimal target would be to neutralize the increasing trend observed in the past decades.

Measurement: Achievement of the target can be monitored from national disaster databases, taking into account that most damage to local health and educational facilities occurs in smaller disasters not reported internationally.

Target 5: “[substantially] increase the number of countries with national and local strategies by 2020”.

Ambitious scenario:	100 % Coverage
Moderate scenario:	95% Coverage
Conservative Scenario:	90% Coverage

Justification: This is an *input* target. In other words, achieving Target 5 will contribute to the Outcome Targets (Targets 1 – 4). Anything less than complete (or almost complete) coverage would not make sense as a target.

Measurement: national progress reporting.

Proposed Target 6:

“Increase flow of additional, sustained and predictable means of implementation, in particular, provisions of financial resources for disaster risk reduction including public investments, technology transfers, capacity building etc.; from developed countries to developing countries by [x percentage of gross national income] per year up to 20[xx].

Suggestion: To be measurable would need to be expressed in quantitative terms.

Justification: This is an *input* target. In other words, achieving Target 6 will contribute to the Outcome Targets (Targets 1 – 4).

Measurement: Recommend that this is consistent with reporting of global ODA.

Proposed target 7:

“Ensure access to impact based early warning and disaster risk information [to 90% of the people] by 2030”.

Ambitious scenario:	100 % Coverage
Moderate scenario:	85% Coverage
Conservative Scenario:	75% Coverage

Justification: This is an *output* target that would build on *inputs* (Targets 5 and 6) and contribute to outcomes (Targets 1 – 4). Anything less than complete coverage would not make sense as a target. Conservative target would be that ¾ of population has access to this type of information.

Measurement: national progress reporting.