

Preparatory Committee of the Third UN Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction

Informal Working Group on Targets and Indicators, Fifth Meeting Friday 5 December, 10.00-12.30

Facilitator's Report

1. Introduction

The Facilitator introduced the agenda of the meeting and shared his reflections on the work of the IWG so far, and its future direction.

The Facilitator recalled the discussions to date and urged Member States to work towards achieving consensus on the global targets. He called for Member States to consider the best approach to reach consensus in terms of subject, scope and for setting qualitative or quantitative metrics; to consider whether the proposed seven targets are fit for purpose; and recalled a suggestion to also include a positive focus, such as strengthening resilience or enabling continuous delivering of services in the aftermath of disasters, e.g. by schools and health care institutions.

The Facilitator also acknowledged the role of the Secretariat in providing technical guidance.

Decisions:

- The Agenda for the fifth meeting was approved.

2. Recapitulation of the IWG's report delivered to the Preparatory Committee in its second session.

The Facilitator acknowledged that the second session of the Preparatory Committee did not undertake detailed discussions on paragraph 13 of the zero-draft regarding global targets, and had requested the continuation of the Informal Working Group to advise on targets.

3. Further consideration of the scope and percentages of the proposed global targets for the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction.

The Facilitator called for general considerations on scope, timeframe and the baseline, and suggested:

- Move forward to reach consensus on the targets in areas where no disagreement is apparent;
- Recalled the Group's suggestion of a 15-year timeframe to align with the SDGs, although still bracketed and asked delegations to move towards convergence on this point;
- He noted that there was general agreement that Baselines should be set for at least 10 years preceding the start of any review process.

The Secretariat was invited to share views on general considerations in terms of scope, and noted:

- *Global targets* measure worldwide implementation, through targets and indicators, and should be *useful at the national level, and simple*.
- *Number of hazardous events* is difficult to use as a target due to the variation in figures captured in different databases, and in the methodologies used.
- Even if a common approach to define hazardous events can be agreed to, examples show that rates and trends of increase are similar, for both absolute mortality figures and mortality divided by hazardous events, so there is *no added value to relate mortality by hazard events*.

General Comments:

- General support was expressed to define global targets which encourage political action, are easy to measure and linked to national targets.
- There were differing opinions on the context, either to relate to hazardous events, or to omit it, and or make it relative to the number of inhabitants or increases in population which could be easier to correctly compute.
- Some Members indicated that global targets need to complement/be complemented by regional and national targets, or related to national indicators.
- The Facilitator summarized that we should have simple, aspirational, quantitative targets, yet contextualized in order to relate them to policy processes.
- Support for a timeframe of 2030 to align with the SDGs and a baseline of at least 10 years was underscored.

Regarding Target 1: “Reduce disaster mortality by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[30/35]”

The Secretariat presented statistics showing growing disaster mortality over the last twenty years.

On scope, several members suggested the contextualization of this indicator to per capita population instead of by hazardous events, and on target.

Many members reiterated their desire to include *missing persons* while others disagreed and there were different views on whether there should be *disaggregation by age, gender and persons living with disabilities in the targets themselves or in other areas such as in the Indicators for example*.

There were useful discussions whether and how contextualization can be captured in the indicators of the targets rather than in the targets themselves.

Recommendations:

- The Group reiterated the importance of a global target to reduce disaster mortality, and to consider how best to address disaggregation *by age, gender and persons living with disabilities*.
- Further consultation should be undertaken on the context in relation to population growth, per capita, or in function of the number of hazardous events. This could be revisited in the discussion on relevant indicators.
- A revised text was suggested: “Reduce disaster mortality by [a given percentage [in function of number of hazardous events /**per capita** /**population growth**]] by 20[30]”

Regarding Target 2: “Reduce the number of affected people by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events by 20[30/35]”

The Secretariat presented statistics showing an increase in the number of people affected by disaster over the last twenty years.

Several Members reiterated the need to consider *affected people* as a combination of five parameters: number of people *injured*, number of people *evacuated*, number of people *relocated*, and number of *houses damaged and house destroyed*.

One Member suggested considering the number of affected people per capita, within this context, while another Member suggested that this is useful only in the context of national indicators.

The Facilitator invited Members States to consider the implication of outcomes in this area for progress in others, for example how might the effect of an increase in evacuations on reduced mortality be treated.

Recommendations:

- The Group reiterated the importance of considering this target.
- Further consultation should be undertaken on the matter of reference to the number of hazardous events and the percentage for this target.
- A revised text was suggested: “Reduce the number of affected people by [a given percentage [in function of number of hazardous events /**per capita**]] by 20[30]”

Regarding Target 3: “Reduce direct disaster economic loss by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] in relation to the GDP by 20[30/35]”

The Secretariat presented statistics showing that direct and indirect economic loss has grown over the last twenty years.

There was general support for retaining the focus of this target on reduction of direct economic loss, as the data is more concrete, comparable, verifiable and easier to obtain, including livelihood loss.

A Member requested more reflection regarding the relation of this target to GDP.

Recommendation:

- The Group maintain support for linking this target to reduction of direct economic loss, with further reflection on its relation to 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[30/35]

A Member suggested simplifying this target to read ‘*reduce disaster damage in critical infrastructure...*’, understanding that ‘critical infrastructure’ needs to be defined.

Several Members called for rewording this target considering the *disruption* or *closure* of health and education facilities instead of damage, and looking at the continuity of services from critical infrastructure.

Other Members supported the inclusion of ‘critical infrastructure’ in addition to ‘health and educational facilities’.

Recommendation:

- A revised text was suggested: “Reduce disaster damage to health and educational facilities [, **and other critical infrastructure,**] by [a given percentage in function of number of hazardous events] by 20[30]”

Regarding Target 5: “Increase number of countries with national and local disaster risk management strategies by [a given percentage] by 20[20/30/35];

Members agreed that this target is useful to strengthen coherence with climate change adaptation and relevant sustainable development strategies within the post-2015 agendas.

A Member also suggested including climate change mitigation in this context. It was agreed that this would need further reflection bearing in mind the need for coherence while respecting the different processes and mandates.

Recommendation:

- The Facilitator invited Members to reflect further on this target taking into account the need to address/strengthen coherence with other agendas.

Regarding Proposed Target 6 on international cooperation and global partnership;

Some Members reiterated the importance of this target as means of implementation of the post-2015 framework.

Other Members recalled that the zero draft, section IV, is devoted to international cooperation and global partnership and suggested that this be taken into account in considering this proposed target.

The Facilitator noted that this target could be seen in relation to the level of ambition considered for 1, 2 and 3. He suggested that where the level of ambition desired would exceed some members ability to execute on their own, it seems logical that there would have to be some clarity on how this gap would be filled. This had clear implications for the approach to be taken to any complementary target on international cooperation and support for the goals and targets of the post-2015 framework. Note was also taken of the importance of national indicators to further the discussion on the scope of the targets.

Recommendation:

- The Facilitator requested donor delegations and proponents of this target to meet prior to the next meeting and consider how best to develop the language on this target.

Target 7: increase the number of people, including vulnerable people, with access to early warning and risk information by [given percentage] by 20[XX].”

Members raised questions on the means for implementation of early warning, as well as what is meant by ‘access’ to early warning and risk information. A discussion on the matter of availability of early warning information, means of delivery and access was undertaken and members agreed that this would require further reflection.

Recommendation:

- Further consideration should be given to the scope of this target and its relation to national indicators.

4. Other Business and next steps

The Facilitator noted that further consultation with experts and among Members would be necessary to define the language of the targets and then consider core indicators.

The Facilitator suggested meeting after the forthcoming consultation on the zero draft.

Meeting was adjourned on 5 December 2014 at 12:30pm