

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

### **Informal Working Group on Targets and Indicators, Fourth Meeting Wednesday 12 November, 14.00-17.00**

#### **Facilitator's Report**

##### **1. Introduction**

The Facilitator introduced the agenda of the meeting.

##### Decisions:

- The Agenda for the first meeting was approved.

##### **2. Report of the joint meeting with Major Groups**

The Facilitator referred to the report of the meeting held with Major Groups on 10 November 2014 and invited members to consider these comments when discussing each of the targets in the next agenda item.

##### **3. Further consideration of global targets for a post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction**

The Facilitator referred to some of the general considerations that have been emerging from the discussions so far, both with regard to the proposed five targets indicated in paragraph 13 of the zero-draft as well as two new suggested targets.

Regarding the timeframe and the baseline, the Facilitator reminded members of the decision to refer back to the Co-Chairs the recommendation to align the timeframe of targets in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction with other global goals and targets such as Sustainable Development Goals. The Facilitator suggested that the proposed 2030 timeframe for the targets to be presented in brackets pending a decision by the Preparatory Committee. The baseline figures for each target, suggested in expert inputs, should cover the last 10 years preceding the start of any monitoring process.

The Facilitator also mentioned that members might wish to consider opportunities to merge some targets and indicators, as well as address the pending need to advise the Co-Chairs on some figures/benchmarks for each of the targets.

##### **GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

- General support was expressed for applying a 2030 timeframe, where possible, to be coherent and mutually re-enforcing to other post-2015 agendas.
- UNDESA referred to the Open Working Group discussions in relation to the timeframe of the Sustainable Development Goals and supported the move to facilitate coherence with the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction by aligning most of the targets to 2030.

- UNFCCC referred to the potential new agreement under the UNFCCC to be adopted in December 2015 and that is expected to come into force in 2020. The timeframe to review progress against the new agreement thereafter could be either every 5 or 10 years. If agreed it would align with a 2030 timeframe.
- It was suggested that the working group explore “positive targets” which were more optimistic and resilience oriented. It was agreed that this should be given further consideration bearing also in mind similar observations expressed in the meeting with major groups.
- The Facilitator urged Member States to consult with their experts and capitals on the scope of the targets as well as possible percentages.

**Regarding Target 1: “Reduce disaster mortality by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[xx]”**

The Facilitator recalled the suggestions made by the Major Groups on target 1 to disaggregate the data of mortality by age, gender and people with disability.

One delegation suggested removing the words “in function of hazardous events”, and to consider rather absolute mortality figures per year so that a specific indicator (for example: average mortality per million) can be constructed. Other members expressed the view that the context would need to be retained and, in particular, the reference to measuring mortality in relation to hazardous events.

Recommendations:

- The target on reducing mortality is relevant and should be included in the list of proposed targets to be presented to the Co-Chairs .
- The context for measuring a target on mortality, in particular, for example referring mortality rates to hazardous events, should be retained while exploring how best to establish a metric that would be practical and avoid the skewing of outcomes.

**Regarding Target 2: “Reduce the number of affected people by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[xx]”**

The Facilitator recalled recommendations made previously by experts to consider affected people using five specific parameters, namely the number of injured people, the number of people evacuated, the number of people relocated, and houses damaged and houses destroyed as proxy indicators for the number of homeless people. Data for these are available in the majority of current disaster loss databases.

In addition, the Facilitator referred to a suggestion by Major Groups and the UN to consider diseases related to disasters, loss of livelihood and commercial losses. Additional parameters proposed include livestock loss and crop loss. In the latter cases emphasis was placed on their relationship to slow onset disasters.

#### Recommendations:

- The target on reducing the number of affected people is relevant and should be included in the list of proposed targets to be presented to the Co-Chairs.
- Further discussion is required on the categories that are to be applied for more precise definition of “affected people”, as well as the scope of the target.

#### **Regarding Target 3: “Reduce disaster economic loss by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[xx]”**

The Facilitator reminded members of the suggestions by experts to consider *direct economic losses*, as the data is more concrete, comparable, verifiable and easier to obtain. It was also clarified previously that loss of livelihood can be covered within the scope of direct losses. A suggestion was also made to relate economic loss as a *percentage of the GDP*.

It was suggested that, in addition to the option of measuring economic loss against GDP, other metrics against which economic losses could be measure are *exposed GDP* or *annual expected losses*.

#### Recommendations:

- The target on economic losses is relevant and should be included in the list of proposed targets to be presented to the co-Chairs .
- Members generally support the approach of measuring economic losses against GDP.

#### **Regarding Target 4: “Reduce disaster damage to health and educational facilities by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[xx]”**

The Facilitator reminded of the experts recommendations that data on *damage to Education and Health facilities* is commonly available, concrete and verifiable. Some members further suggested that the reduction in the *number of closures of health and education facilities* to be considered as a factor in this regard bearing in mind the information of addressing access to education and health services in this target.

A suggestion was made to use the term *disruption* rather than *damage* in the wording of the target in order to focus more on function than facility.

It was also suggested to broaden the scope of the target to address more broadly, critical infrastructure and facilities. The categories of critical infrastructure that would be included should be further explored , guided by input from relevant national authorities in member states.

#### Recommendations:

- Further consultations are required to define the scope of target 4, either maintaining the emphasis on schools and hospitals or broadening to critical infrastructure, and to consider more positive intention of the target.

## **Regarding Target 5: “Increase number of countries with national and local strategies by [a given percentage] by 20[xx]”**

The Facilitator referred to previous suggestions to strengthen this target, including, the proposal to take account of climate change adaptation strategies to promote coherence between agendas; the need to make this target more relevant to national processes, policies and programmes on disaster risk management; the suggestion to refer to the % of population covered by national plans, and; measuring the availability of risk assessment, and capacity assessment to drive national strategies.

One suggestion by a member is to align the wording for target 5 with the current terms used in the equivalent SDG target, namely *cities and human settlements strategies and plans*. Other members stated preference for the current wording, noting that their strategies developed and applied through national and local structures.

UNFCCC referred to ongoing discussion under the climate change convention to adopt a global adaptation goal. Parties to the Convention still need to define whether the goal would be qualitative or quantitative. Parties are also working on a related set of metrics that could be adopted at the Conference of the Parties in December 2015, Paris, France.

One member suggested that target 5 should focus more on national strategies leaving the option to countries to report on strategies at local level. Another was questioning the need to highlight climate change when there were also other drivers of risk (urbanisation for example). Facilitator recommended that the interested members to work together on the language of target 5.

Members suggested strengthening the target by including the number of countries with national and local disaster risk management strategies as well as integrated multi-hazard risk assessment and assessment of their capabilities to manage the identified risks.

Target 5 could also include a marker which refers to the minimum required capacities in key sectors. For example, WHO could assist in defining the minimum capacity required in the health sector.

### **Proposed additional Targets**

Bangladesh, jointly with Bolivia and Egypt tabled the following suggested wording for a sixth target: *“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].”*

The rationale for this suggested target is to include a global target geared to support international cooperation goals.

The Facilitator also recalled the proposal from Panama: *“International cooperation to stimulate the creation and strengthening of national capacities and technology transfer at the regional and sub-regional levels”*.

One member suggested that the intent of the target maybe more applicable in the means for implementation rather than a global target. A member stated that they are generally not in favour of having financial obligations reflected in the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

The EU delegation suggested a seventh target: *“to increase the number of people, including vulnerable people, with access to early warning and risk information by [a given percentage] by 20[xx].”*

Many delegations welcomed the emphasis on early warning systems, given their life-saving function. It was pointed out by some members that early warning systems are part of national strategies and therefore a rationale needs to be given as to why they are singled out. Reference was made to the access and cost of early warning systems and therefore international support and means of implementation would be required.

It was recalled that Major Groups suggested to change “vulnerable people” to “people at risk”. Further consultation on this reference is required.

#### Recommendation:

- The two additional targets are to be included as proposals for further consideration as targets and indicators.

### **3. Other Business and next steps**

The Facilitator will produce, with the support of the Secretariat, a report from the Informal Working Group to the Co-Chairs, including recommendations and an Annex with the proposed targets bracketed.

The Co-Chairs will determine how they will reference the report at the Preparatory Committee. The deliberations of the Informal Working Groups were meant to help Member States in the negotiations on the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

The Facilitator reminded members that the second session of the Preparatory Committee includes a Technical Workshop on “Indicators, monitoring and the review process for the post-2015 framework” scheduled for 17 November.

The delegation of India, in comments at the end of the session, noted that all States undertake policies and measures to reduce disaster losses according to their national circumstances. Nevertheless, considering that the nature and timing of disasters differ from place to place and so too the vulnerability and losses, no sufficient data is available to make a scientific assessment of timing and extent of impact and damage from various kind of disasters. Many of these disasters do not give lead time to react for rescue and response, in such a situation putting targets of disaster risk reduction in terms of % and timeline may be artificial and difficult to implement.

*Meeting was adjourned on 12 November 2014 at 5:00pm*