

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND DECISIONS ON THE ISTANBUL ROADMAP

Discussions 23.02.15

Background

The draft Roadmap builds on requests made by the 16 countries present in Istanbul, namely for the Istanbul Roadmap to:

- Be concise and short to guide the WISS implementation
- Be non-controversial hence allow for some flexibility for adaptation to national contexts
- Recognize and agree on the proposed three-pillar approach of WISS: (1) resilient education infrastructures, (2) school disaster management and (3) disaster risk reduction in school curriculum
- Be adopted at high level in Sendai

Constituted of 3 key parts

1. Preamble – Paras 1-6
 - ✓ Historical references and commitments to school safety in international disaster risk reduction meetings.
 - ✓ Text already set from Global Platforms outcomes – cannot be revised.
2. Content – Paras 7-11:
 - ✓ Build on country experiences and challenges shared in Istanbul
 - ✓ Require more detailed input from each Government related to:
 - Pillar 1: Promoting resilient education infrastructure, a multi-sectoral approach to safe school implementation, the use of locally available and low cost materials;
 - Pillar 2: School preparedness and school disaster management;
 - Pillar 3: Life skills integration of disaster risk reduction in school curricula
 - ✓ Promote cooperation and technical support / assistance among countries and sister cities.
3. Action - Paras 12-15:
 - ✓ Agree on core actions required to implement the WISS
 - ✓ Key elements:
 - Measures required to implement school safety at the national level
 - national / voluntary commitments
 - national targets / global common indicators
 - International cooperation and technical assistance:
(as an example, Turkey reconfirmed their plan / commitment to apply their expertise to neighbouring and South Eastern countries and to highlight / advocate for school safety / WISS in all key international meetings (forthcoming 8th ECO Conference + World Humanitarian Summit May 2016 hosted by Turkey with specific sessions on school safety).

Key decisions taken:

- All countries represented will send contributions on their respective achievements and good practices for paras 7-11 to the secretariat (rosec@un.org) by 27 February 2015
- Upon finalization will be uploaded on WCDRR's website to motivate further countries to join the initiative and discussions in Sendai.
- Contributions should be concise and illustrate concrete good practices
- Avoid repetition of same countries under each paragraph – Be selective based on countries' particular expertise.

- All contributions should not be referred to in the text of the roadmap so to keep it short and concise. Depending on the size of contributions received, they might be referred to as part of footnotes or an Annex to the Roadmap.
- Roadmap currently restricted to countries / partners who endorsed the WISS and committed to implement its three-pillar approach to school safety. To be gradually expanded after Sendai.
- Recommendations made to set more ambitious objectives for the group (references include objectives set as part of the WISS two-pager (eg. allocation of national budget, implementation plan for WISS etc.)
- The Roadmap should remain a generic and simple document to get the endorsement and political buy-in of as many as Governments and partners in Sendai.
- Point 13 on the hosting of annual meetings was endorsed by the group.
- Once the Roadmap is endorsed, governments shall develop the actual implementation plan of the WISS – possibly at the second Safe School Leaders meeting in Iran
- Targets should be formulated in a positive approach (“resilient schools” rather than “damaged schools”)
- Governments will confirm their intention of high-level representation in Sendai to the secretariat by end of the week.
- Proposal that one activity of this group could be the development of an annual activity report / progress report on WISS.

Pending final decisions – For discussion on 24.02.15

1. Terminology:

- **Safe / safer schools:** relative concept based on national context - guarantee schools to be actually “safe” ? Ambitious and positive common target as “safe” ? Should be clarified with Global Alliance’s presentation on targets and Indicators
- **Safe School Leaders / Safe School Leader Countries ?**
- **Leadership ? Paragraph 4 still require final endorsement.**
- **“Monitoring” (13 d) – even though not formal document, reporting modalities and mechanisms are required – link up to annual meeting of Safe School Leaders ?**

2. Placement of references to:

- Guidelines, database
- Should we already refer / integrate means of implementation, capacity-building, technology transfer in roadmap (or at later stage when developing full implementation plan)?
- Proposal by I.R of Iran for peer reviews of each Safe School Country

3. Developing national targets / global common indicators – contradictory ? Global Alliance to clarify and advise.

4. Complementarity / merging of paras 11 & 14 ?

5. Activities to be detailed activities under Paragraph 12 & 13 (including the kind of support expected from UNISDR, other partners, other countries to join ?)

6. Voluntary collective commitment to school safety ?

- **WISS could be logged in as a joint voluntary commitment for school safety immediate implementation ?**
- **Offer to formalize Safe School Leaders as a working group of Governments on school safety through WISS in Sendai ?**