

# **Preparatory Committee of the Third UN Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction**

## **Informal Working Group on Targets and Indicators, Seventh Meeting Friday 9 January 2015, 10h00-13h15**

### **Facilitator's Report**

#### **1. Introduction**

The Facilitator introduced the agenda of the meeting.

The Facilitator invited members to:

- finalise or substantively advance discussions on global targets to inform the Co-Chairs for consideration in paragraph 13 of draft-1 of the post 2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, which negotiations will resume on 12 January 2015.
- review proposed global targets with the view to report on scope and language of targets and indicators for consideration in the preparatory process of the post-2015 framework.

#### **2. Review of proposed global targets for the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction**

##### **General considerations**

The Facilitator recalled the desire to develop simple and clear global targets and indicators, and the general agreement reached on timeframe and baseline of targets, which unless stated otherwise will be:

- Time frame of 15-years (till 2030) for the global targets on disaster risk reduction except where specified.
- A baseline period of 10 years preceding the start of any review process.

The Facilitator suggested further that the discussions on each target take into consideration suggestions by experts and the secretariat, based on current trends, of possible quantifiable percentages considering ambitious, moderate and conservative scenarios. The Informal Working Group first focused on the four targets on which substantial progress has already been made.

Canada referred to a paper it has produced and shared with the Facilitator, which suggested that, rather than proposing quantitative global targets in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, the Group could also consider global qualitative goals, and, that quantitative targets would be called for at national levels.

Several members expressed willingness to set quantitative targets, some members also suggested that it might be useful to include “substantial” at the beginning of relevant targets to reflect a stronger qualitative option.

## Proposed Target 1 on disaster mortality

The secretariat presented current trends in disaster mortality. Between 1990 and 2014 mortality has increased by 50% and this trend is consistent across different databases of disaster losses. Therefore, a conservative scenario would be to stabilize this trend. An ambitious scenario would be to seek to decrease mortality by 50% by 2030. While a moderate scenario could be a reduction between 10 or 20%.

Members expressed views that quantifiable targets on mortality would need to be ambitious as well as realistic. It was also reiterated that any targets would be voluntary in nature. Members did not identify at this stage, specific figures or percentages.

The language proposed to be presented to the preparatory process is:

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

The measurement on indicator would be the level of reduction in mortality per capita against a baseline period of 10 years.

## Proposed Target 2 on number of affected people

The secretariat referred to trends in 86 countries that have national disaster loss databases. In these countries, the number of affected people since 1990, as reflected in damage housing, and or number of people injured, has increased 4 fold, and people displaced has increased 6 fold. Given this steeper increase (200-300% since 1990), the secretariat explained the reason for a possibly less ambitious scenarios for this target than those considered for mortality. For example, an ambitious scenario could be a reduction of number of affected people by 10 to 20%.

It was recalled that in previous meetings the reference “per capita” was suggested for global target 1 and 2. As well as to consider *affected people* as a combination of: number of people *injured*, number of people *relocated or displaced*, and number of *houses damaged and house destroyed*.

A member suggested that quantitative figure of 20% for this target would be appropriate.

The proposed text to be presented to the preparatory process is:

**“[Substantially] reduce the number of affected people<sup>1</sup> per capita [by 20%] by 2030”.**

The measurement on indicator would be the level of reduction of affected people per capita against a baseline period of 10 years.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Affected People” as defined for the purposes of the Declaration and along the lines presented in this report.

### **Proposed Target 3 on economic losses**

The secretariat presented current trends in terms of direct economic loss. These have approximately doubled since 1990. Global GDP has also doubled during this same period so the loss in relation to GDP has remained stable. A conservative scenario would be to further stabilize the trend as any progress would be expected to be slower, as economic losses depend on the adoption of longer term policies and plans. An ambitious target could be to reduce by 20% in relation to GDP.

Some members expressed concerns with regard to the formulation of this target. One member drew attention to the need to recognise the challenge that a commitment to reduce economic losses would pose for developing countries and reiterated the need to consider more positive targets for example to build resilience to disasters and address continuity of services in the face of disasters.

Members suggested to retain the notion of measuring “direct” economic losses in a global target, while recognizing that indirect losses are important information for countries and could be measured in a national context.

The proposed text to be presented to the preparatory process is:

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

The measurement on indicator would be the level of reduction of direct disaster economic loss by GDP against a baseline period of 10 years.

### **Proposed Target 4 on health, educational and other critical facilities**

The secretariat informed that, in effect, damage to health, educational and other critical infrastructure are accounted for in direct economic losses (proposed target 3). However, the damage to health, education and other critical infrastructure is fundamental and it would be important to focus on these, as well as to make a useful link to indirect losses. Current evidence suggests an increase of 300 to 400% in damage to health and education facilities since 1990.

On this target, more positive language to inform on continuity of services of education and health facilities in times of disasters could be explored. Some members felt that this target could potentially be merged with target 3 on economic losses.

The proposed text to be presented to the preparatory process is:

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

The measurement on indicator would be the level of reduction of damage to critical infrastructure, including health and educational facilities, against a baseline period of 10 years.

### **Proposed Target 5 on national and local strategies**

Members acknowledge the need to suggest a simple formulation in order to be consistent with other targets. Members noted the important link between this target and action in respect of targets 1- 4. It was further noted that the setting of an earlier timeline of 2020 for this target was done with this in mind.

The proposed text to be presented to the preparatory process is:

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

The measurement on indicator would be the number of countries with national and local strategies against a baseline period of 10 years.

### **Proposed Target 6: on international cooperation and global partnership**

Australia presented the outcome of informal discussions between a few members held since the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. The informal discussions suggested possible wording for a target on international cooperation, namely: *“All [100%] multilateral and bilateral development partnership frameworks take into consideration disaster [and climate risk] and accordingly support regional and domestic risk reduction by 2030.”*

Some member suggested that the proposal does not fully address international and global partnership. Therefore, preference was made to retain previous suggestions.

Facilitator asked for members to further consult to find consensus around this target. In the meantime, the existing suggested text will be transmitted to the Co-Chairs:

**“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].**

### **Proposed Target 7: on early warning and risk information**

In the previous meeting on 18 December 2014, a recommendation was made to continue discussing the language of this target for which the initially suggested text was:

*“ To increase the number of people with access to early warning and risk information by [given percentage] by 2030”*

A smaller group consisting of EU and WMO met and presented a revised proposal for target 7, namely:

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

Members requested clarification on the text. The proponent informed that the text seeks to further develop people-centered early warning systems. A member suggested to add the word “disaster”. With these clarifications, the following text will be transmitted to the Co-Chair for further consideration.

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

### **3. Consideration of approach to national targets and indicators and the linkage to global targets**

The Facilitator recalled previous discussions of the Informal Working Group addressing the need to set national targets and related indicators that would allow the collection of disaggregated data (e.g. by age, gender and people living with disabilities) and complement the proposed global targets.

He advised that the report to the Co-Chairs would encourage the establishment of national targets as means to support implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction reflecting also the perspective of the Informal Working Group that this would allow for more detailed and focused targets to be set in line with national commitments.

### **4. Further steps and other business**

As requested the secretariat will circulate, for information, to the Informal Working Group, a paper with additional information for relevant target. The paper should also present possible figures, as percentages, considering ambitious, moderate and conservative scenarios.

A note with the proposed text for the global targets, presented in this report, will be transmitted to the Co-Chairs for further consideration.

*The meeting was adjourned on 9 January 2015 at 13h15.*