

Technical non-paper on indicators for Target F

1. Overview

This non-paper is produced at the request of Members in the Second informal consultation of the Chair of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology Related to Disaster Risk Reduction (OIEWG) by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) (hereafter referred to as the Secretariat). The document is informed by the Working Text on Indicators¹, the deliberations of Members in the Second Session of the OIEWG and intersessional consultations of the Chair, the Concept Note on Indicators for Global Target F of 10 December 2015, the deliberations of Members of the group of 10 + 10 facilitated by the Friends of the Chair, and technical inputs provided by the Secretariat at the request of the Chair and the Members of the OIEWG.

The purpose of this non-paper is to support the deliberations of Member States in the selection and design of indicators to monitor progress and achievement of global Target F of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (hereafter referred to as the SFDRR).

Target F: *Substantially enhance international cooperation to developing countries through adequate and sustainable support to complement their national actions for implementation of this framework by 2030*

The document makes proposals for the re-organization, rationalisation and reformulation of the proposed indicators of the Working Text, taking into consideration any redundancies, omissions, as well as technical and computational issues that may exist.

2. Summary

The non-paper draws from the relevant paragraphs of the Sendai Framework, and takes particular note of Section VI. and the Guiding Principles. It is also informed by the deliberations of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), the Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators - Note by the Secretary-General², and Member States' deliberations at the 47th Meeting of the UN Statistical Commission (8-11 March 2016) on issues related to international cooperation and the means of implementation.

The commitment to provide support to developing countries' national disaster risk reduction (DRR) actions was made in Sendai; the recommendations of the OIEWG will define the metrics of measurement of that support and thereby measure incremental progress in meeting Target F by 2030.

¹ based on negotiations during the Second Session of the Open-ended Inter-Governmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology relating to Disaster Risk Reduction held in Geneva, Switzerland from 10-11 February 2016. Issued on 3 March 2016. Reissued with factual corrections on 24 March 2016.

² E/CN.3/2016/2/Rev.1* (published on 19 February 2016)

This non-paper organises the proposed indicators using the three categories (or clusters) that were used in the Working Text, and which are consistent with the acknowledged principles of global cooperation, the categorization used in the SDGs, and the Sendai Framework: (a) Financial Resources, (b) Technology Development and Transfer, and (c) Capacity Building³.

Of the additional three categories proposed in the Second Session of the OIEWG, those of Adequacy and Sustainability of cooperation present methodological challenges in terms of data availability, computation and consistency for global comparison. However, in that they represent important qualitative aspects of international cooperation as well as elements of predictability of support to developing countries, these elements are to the degree possible represented within the proposed indicators. Given that the role, as well as the means to capture key characteristics⁴, of ODA in international cooperation is evolving, it is possible that these indicators will evolve and be further qualified during the SFDRR and SDG period. As for the third category – Enhancement – the proposed indicators will capture increasing or decreasing trends in international cooperation; at the heart of the purpose of measuring Target F.

It is important to emphasize that no indicator will provide an absolutely precise, accurate and exhaustive measure of this ‘degree of enhancement’, given the complexity of national DRR actions, and relatively under-developed mechanisms for measuring international support to national DRR actions. In this sense, the proposed indicators seek to capture approximate values of support, so as to allow an appraisal of changing trends in international cooperation over time to 2030.

3. Critical issues

Methodology and / or data unavailable:

Measurement presents particular methodological challenges. The majority of the indicators proposed in the Working Text lack the minimum standards applied to indicator selection by the IAEG-SDGs, i.e. conceptually clear, established methodologies and standards, and / or the data required for the measurement of the proposed indicator do not exist. It is unlikely that the methodologies and standards and / or the data required to measure many of the proposed indicators will be developed in the short term.

Furthermore, existing methodologies capturing the quantitative aspects of international cooperation in support of the national DRR actions of developing countries, are largely limited to quantifying stand-alone or incremental budgets, investment and expenditure for DRR. These methodologies fail to capture integrated DRR and the wider co-benefits of risk-sensitive (sectoral) investment. This issue is discussed in greater detail in Annex I. of the Concept Note, as well as analysis carried out for the UN Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR) 2013⁵. This is still more complex when seeking to capture the qualitative aspects of support.

Given the absence of established methodologies and the lack of standardised data, special consideration should be given to indicators that can take advantage of mechanisms and data that already exist, and that are consistent, commensurable, and can be reported by all countries.

³ The language currently used in the Working Text on Indicators

⁴ Potentially e.g. multi-annual financing [see the deliberations of the Working Party on Development Finance Statistics of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)]

⁵ See Global Assessment Report 2013. Geneva, Switzerland: UNISDR

Quantitative and qualitative aspects.

The elements to be addressed in the design and selection of the indicators to measure progress in achieving Target F are similar, if not identical, to those addressed by the proposed indicators to measure the strengthening of the means of implementation of the SDGs; this document is duly informed by the approach adopted by the IAEG-SDGs. Recognising the complexity of measurement, the challenges of data capture, and applying the principle of simplicity, the IAEG-SDGs favours quantitative rather than qualitative measurements (see Annex A).

Globally comparable datasets that would allow consistent and objective measurement of qualitative aspects of international support for national DRR actions are currently unavailable. Informed by the recommendations of the IAEG-SDGs, qualitative elements are included if the following exist⁶: i) a conceptually sound methodology that allows objective measurement, and ii) data that are regularly reported by all countries.

Comparators and alignment.

Simply measuring the volume of support provided will not appropriately measure the progress in achieving the target – a comparator is required to qualify changing trends in support. As the target measures ‘support to complement national actions’, the proposed headline indicator will capture the alignment of international cooperation with recipient country policy and investment priorities (thereby reinforcing recipient country policy leadership). Comparing international DRR support provided against developing country DRR expenditure is one way of addressing this.

Binary measurement:

Indicators that measure the existence or not of an aspect of international cooperation – for example, an initiative, programme, institution or partnership – do not assess the degree to which international cooperation has been enhanced. If such elements are to be captured in global reporting in the future, additional work is required to determine if the development of data and quantitative indicators to allow a qualitative assessment of progress is feasible.

Statistical processing and baselines.

Work will need to be undertaken to establish baselines to measure progress in achieving Target F, and should be considered when selecting the indicators. In respect of the recommended headline indicator, constructing preliminary baselines may be possible for instance, by analysing existing statistics for Official Development Assistance (hereafter referred to as ODA) of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). These data may be supplemented by existing research⁷.

The measurement of all financial flows within international cooperation, including those from private sources (mobilized through official interventions), remains a challenge both for the IAEG-SDGs and this Working Group. However, the complex financing packages that will be required to support the implementation of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA), the 2030 Agenda for

⁶ or are expected to be developed further in the short to medium term

⁷ See for example: Financing Disaster Risk Reduction - A 20 year story of international aid. UK. ODI and the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery at the World Bank. 2013. Disaster risk reduction: Spending where it should count. Somerset, UK. Global Humanitarian Assistance / Development Initiatives. 2012

Sustainable Development and the SFDRR, require tracking and measurement mechanisms within the international statistical system that are inclusive of the totality, and direction, of flows.

Work developing a new measurement framework to capture total official support for sustainable development (TOSSD)⁸ is ongoing. Until such time as this, or other internationally agreed data and methodologies, are developed, the measurement of financial flows in respect of SDGs targets, and thus SFDRR targets, is restricted to ODA. Methodologies and datasets for measuring international support to national DRR actions are expected to evolve, and with it, improvements to baseline data may be possible in the medium term (for example, to include other financial flows beyond ODA).

Multi-annual support and double counting.

While representing the sustainability of support to national DRR actions in developing countries in annual reporting is desirable, Members recognized the technical challenges inherent to reporting of multi-annual contributions, while simultaneously eliminating double counting.

4. Recommended indicators

This document introduces the approach employed by the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) to analyse the proposed indicators by a) the level of methodological development, and b) overall data availability. The proposed indicators are grouped into three categories:

Category I	Indicators for which a methodology exists, or has been proposed, and for which data are already widely available in a significant number of countries
Category II	Indicators for which a methodology exists, or has been proposed, but for which data are not easily available
Category III	Indicators for which a methodology has not yet been developed nor is data easily available

The following table summarises the recommendations of the Secretariat with regard to the re-organization, rationalisation and reformulation of the proposed indicators of the Working Text on Indicators, taking into consideration redundancies, omissions, as well as technical and computational issues that may exist.

The table is grouped by:

- Recommended – for measurement at the global level;
- Not Recommended – for reasons of feasibility, duplication, lack of a globally applicable methodology, lack of data, inter alia.

⁸ Annex I. of the Concept Note on Indicators for Global Target F

No.	Indicator	Methodology	Data
Recommended - for measurement of the global target			
F-6 alt*	Total official international support (ODA plus other official flows) for national DRR actions that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan.	Y	Y
F-6a	<i>Total official international support (ODA plus other official flows) for national DRR actions provided by multilateral institutions.</i>	N	N
F-6b	<i>Total official international support (ODA plus other official flows) for the exchange of science, knowledge, technology and innovation (STI) in disaster risk reduction.</i>	N	N
F-6c	<i>Total official international support (ODA plus other official flows) to strengthen the disaster-related statistical capacity of developing countries.</i>	N	N
F-12*	Number of countries engaging in a voluntary and mutual review of progress in the implementation of national DRR strategies.	Y	Y
Not recommended			
Chapeau	[This indicator directly supports the developing countries' implementation of the Sendai Framework and the fulfilment of the global goals.]	N	N
F-1	[[Level of / Percentage of gross national product that represents the] non-earmarked [adequate] support provided by developed countries and reported by developing countries.]	N	N
F-1 alt.	[Percentage of earmarked ODA provided by developed countries and reported by developing countries.]	N	N
F-2	[Number of developed countries having a policy marker as part of the legislation on provisions for support to developing countries to enhance the implementation of the Sendai Framework and the fulfilment of the global goals.]	N	N
F-3	[Progress on the implementation of paragraph 47 of the Sendai Framework, in particular subparagraphs 47(a) and 47 (b).]	N	N
F-4	[Progress in using the regional platforms for [exchanging experiences and / exchange of best practices, technology and capacity building in] enhancing South-South cooperation for the implementation of the Sendai Framework.]	N	N
F-5	[[Level of support provided / Number of projects and programmes funded] by international organizations in line with paragraph 48 of the Sendai Framework.]	N	N
F-7	[Number of countries supported in implementing national DRR strategies by aligned programmes of entities of the UN System.]	N	N
F-7 alt.	[Amount of resources given to support developing countries' implementation of national DRR strategies by programmes of entities of the UN system and other relevant stakeholders.]	N	N
F-8	[Number of international (multilateral/bilateral) financial institutions that systematically integrate climate [change adaptation] and disaster risk [reduction] into [the design, implementation and evaluation of Official Development Finance / urban planning etc.]]	N	Y

No.	Indicator	Methodology	Data
Not recommended			
F-9	[Number of countries with international and regional initiatives for the exchange of science, technology and innovation in disaster risk reduction.]	N	N
F-9 alt.	[Number of developed countries supporting developing countries' regional initiatives for the exchange of science, knowledge, technology and innovation in DRR.]	N	N
F-10	[Total amount of funding within ODA to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of DRR-related science, technology and innovation (STI).]	N	N
F-11	[Number of international and regional multi-stakeholder partnerships established to build [individual, institutional and societal capacity for disaster risk reduction. / DRR capacity in developing countries and the economic value of such partnerships.]	N	N
F-11 alt.	[Number of countries that have regional cooperation to support DRR.]	N	N
F-13	[Financial and other resources made available to strengthen the statistical capacity of developing countries in collection, analysis, management and use of disaster risk information.]	N	N
F-14	[Number of voluntary commitments by international and regional organizations / initiatives related to DRR capacity building of developing countries.]	N	N
F-15	Annual percentage of cooperation financing for DRR provided by developed countries and received by developing countries compared with the economic losses registered in developing countries.	N	N
F-16	[Total amount of funds provided by developed countries to developing countries to promote development and transfer of ecologically adequate, appropriate and modern technology for DRR.]	N	N
F17	Proportion of cooperation funds for DRR provided by developing countries and registered in the annual budgets of developing countries.	N	N
F-18	[Estimated proportion of cooperation for DRR covered by indicative expenditure and/or implementation plans from developed countries for 1, 2, 3 years in advance.]	N	N
F-19	[Financial or other resources provided for capacity building to developing countries to strengthen the implementation of their national strategies for DRR.]	N	N
F-20	[Number of [developing / developed] countries fostering an enabling environment domestically, [to reduce the barriers for technology transfer to developing countries], including through the implementation of national disaster risk reduction strategies and enhanced mobilization of domestic resources.]	N	N

* Suggested reformulation of the Working Text on Indicators.

5. Technical considerations on specific indicators from the Working Text:

Chapeau	It is not clear from the language proposed, to which indicator the 'Chapeau' refers, or if in fact, this should read 'These indicators directly support....' - referring to all subsequent proposed indicators. The Chapeau is not an indicator, rather can be included in the guidance and protocols on reporting for Target F.
F-1	An internationally agreed methodology for computation, and relevant data for non-earmarked support are not currently available to measure this indicator, instead F-6alt* is recommended. Given that ODA allows for the capture of data at the activity level, this indicator may respond to the call of some Members' to quantify earmarked and unearmarked support. This may be further reinforced if the proposal for a DRR policy marker is adopted.
F-1 alt.	The same consideration as F-1 applies with regard to the distinction between earmarked and unearmarked support. Likewise, F-6alt* is recommended instead, which also will enable the capture of data from both providers, and from recipient countries.
F-2	If the proposal for the inclusion of a DRR policy marker is adopted by the OECD DAC Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT), the marker can be used as one of the means of measurement of proposed indicator F-6alt* - providing sectoral specificity to support to national DRR actions, as well as providing an indication of the policy commitment of providers. In this case, it is not recommended that this be retained as an indicator.
F-3	This indicator presents challenges both in definition of scope and subsequent measurement, and is not recommended to be retained. As with the Chapeau, the essence of this indicator can be included in the guidance and protocols on reporting for Target F.
F-4	As with F-11alt., neither methodology nor data are currently available to report against the proposed indicator. An objective, globally comparable measure of the degree to which regional platforms enhance South-South cooperation (SSC) does not exist. Furthermore, there is no common definition, nor are there standards or an understanding of what constitutes SSC among Southern partners. Measuring SSC is difficult, and is made more so by inconsistent recording across countries ⁹ . Until such time as more inclusive methodologies and data capturing the totality of flows are developed, this indicator is not recommended to be retained.
F-5	This indicator presents challenges both in definition of scope and subsequent measurement, and is not recommended to be retained.

⁹ The Network of Southern Think Tanks (NeST) / UNCTAD. 2015.

F-6	<p>Recommended to be retained, with the reformulation – F-6alt*, which is consistent with a number of the indicators proposed by the IAEG-SDGs to measure the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda (see Annex).</p> <p>F-6a, F-6b and F-6c are not sub-indicators of F-6alt* per se, rather they are indicative of anticipated disaggregation options that may become available with evolving datasets and computation methodologies, as measurement systems develop further to capture the totality of flows beyond ODA (see relevant sections of this document).</p>
F-7 + F-7 alt.	<p>An internationally agreed methodology for computation, and relevant data are not currently available to measure these indicators. However, as ODA captures “flows to multilateral institutions” in addition to flows to developing countries¹⁰, and provides country specificity, it is expected that some elements of F-7 and F-7alt. may be captured in analysing data reported against F-6alt*. This is consistent with the approach adopted by the IAEG-SDGs to measure the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which does not propose specific metrics to measure support provided by the multilateral institutions.</p>
F-8	<p>Some Members observed that as access to, and application of, international financing mechanisms were not uniform, this indicator was less relevant. Furthermore, an agreed methodology to measure the integration of DRR within the decision-making and investment behaviour of the multilateral development banks (MDB)¹¹ is lacking. This indicator is therefore not recommended to be retained, rather to the degree possible captured in F-6alt*. This is consistent with the approach adopted by the IAEG-SDGs to measure the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which does not propose specific metrics to measure support provided by the multilateral institutions. As the definition of total official support for sustainable development evolves, it is anticipated that data generation and capture will improve.</p>
F-9 + F-9 alt.	<p>Despite the existence of the STI-related facilities identified in the Concept Note, as evidenced by the lack of metadata for the equivalent SDG indicators 17.6.1 and 17.7.1, a mechanism that will enable the tracking and assessment of international and regional initiatives supporting the exchange of STI has yet to be developed. Globally comparable data are therefore not currently available to measure this indicator. The Regional and Global Platforms on DRR could be considered one source of information, but remaining data gaps are considered too great and so it is not recommended to retain these indicators.</p> <p>If F-9alt. were to be reformulated as in F-6b (similar to SDG indicator 17.7.1), it may in time be possible to extract information on support to international, regional and bilateral initiatives on the exchange of STI for DRR from ODA, and, as methodologies and data evolve, potentially other sources.</p>

¹⁰ on the DAC List of ODA Recipients

¹¹ including the regional and sub-regional development banks, and the bilateral development banks

F-10	<p>Similarly, an internationally agreed methodology for computation, and relevant data are not currently available to measure this indicator. As above, if F-10 were to be reformulated as in F-6b (similar to SDG indicator 17.7.1), it may in time be possible to extract information on support to international, regional and bilateral initiatives on the exchange of STI for DRR from ODA, and, as methodologies and data evolve, potentially other sources.</p>
F-11 + F-11alt.	<p>There are significant technical challenges related to the measurement of these proposed indicators. The equivalent metric proposed by the IAEG-SDGs is indicator 17.9.1 which seeks to measure international support to capacity building in developing countries (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation). It proposes a methodology that uses data reported against specific subsectors¹² identified in the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS). These broadly correspond to the coverage of the SDGs and focus on capacity building and national planning opposed to the implementation of specific projects and programmes.</p> <p>These codes do not exist for DRR. Moreover, as the data only address concessional flows for development and welfare purposes provided by governments, further work would be required to arrive at an agreed measure of non-ODA official and private flows. TOSSD may make data available in the medium term, but until such time as more inclusive methodologies and data capturing the totality of flows are developed, the amount of ODA related to support for national DRR actions, F-6alt*, is considered to encompass support for DRR capacity building. These indicators are therefore not recommended to be retained.</p>
F-12	<p>Voluntary, on-demand and self-determined reviews by peers are seen by many Members as one of the most effective mechanisms of international cooperation for mutual learning, exchange of good practices and capacity building. With a straightforward methodology and data available, it is recommended that this indicator be retained. Members have proposed a slight reformulation, F-12* above.</p>
F-13	<p>An internationally agreed methodology for computation, and relevant data are not currently available to measure this indicator, and it is not recommended to be retained. However, the inclusion of key indicators from the SFDRR within the global monitoring framework of the SDGs by the IAEG-SDGs – endorsed at the 47th Session of the UN Statistical Commission (UNSC) – will have important ramifications for the development of disaster-related statistics, and DRR-related statistical capacities of countries. The SDG equivalent is indicator 17.19.1; the responsibility for the development of methodology and data lies principally with PARIS21¹³, as well as the UN Statistical Division, UN Regional Commissions and the World Bank. Additionally the High Level Group for Partnership,</p>

¹² inter alia: 14010 Water sector policy and administrative management / 15110 Public sector policy and administrative management / 16030 Housing policy and administrative management

¹³ which seeks to encourage a better use of statistics in developing countries, by providing support and strengthening their National Statistical Systems.

	<p>Coordination and Capacity-Building for post 2015 monitoring also addresses the issue of financing for statistical capacity building¹⁴; this is also of relevance.</p> <p>As ODA data can be generated at the activity level, with additional work with the aforementioned entities and the OECD, it may be possible in the medium term to capture international financial and technical support to strengthening national statistical capacities related to DRR. If F-13 were to be reformulated as in F-6c (similar to SDG indicator 17.19.1), it may in time be possible to extract information on support to statistical capacity building related to DRR (potentially supplemented by relevant data from the aforementioned stakeholders).</p>
F-14	Neither methodology nor relevant data are currently available to report against the proposed indicator, and as such it is recommended that it should not be retained.
F-15	This indicator is captured within F-6alt*, and therefore is not recommended to be retained. The element of qualifying support to developing countries against economic losses can be further developed in the global analysis when comparing against reporting on Targets A – D.
F-16	Neither methodology nor relevant data are currently available to report against the proposed indicator. The equivalent SDGs indicator, 17.7.1, seeks to measure funding to developing countries, but this does not currently have an established methodology and standards. As above, if F-16 were to be reformulated as in F-6b (similar to SDG indicator 17.7.1), as methodologies and data evolve, and potentially use other sources, an estimate of international cooperation in support of applicable and relevant technology for DRR may ultimately be possible.
F-17	This indicator is captured within F-6alt*, and therefore is not recommended to be retained.
F-18	Neither methodology nor relevant data are currently available to report against the proposed indicator. Elements of this indicator are captured within F-6alt*; it is consequently not recommended to be retained.
F-19	As with F-11, neither methodology nor relevant data are currently available to report against the proposed indicator, and the same technical considerations apply. Until such time as more inclusive methodologies and data capturing the totality of flows are developed, the amount of ODA related to support for national DRR actions, F-6alt*, is considered to encompass support for DRR capacity building. This indicator is therefore not recommended to be retained.

¹⁴ See the report E/CN.3/2016/3

F-20	An internationally agreed methodology for computation, and relevant data are not currently available to measure this indicator; it is not recommended to be retained.
------	---

Legend

F-###	<p>Indicator can be captured or potentially could be captured, in part or in its entirety, within F-6alt*.</p> <p>Given the expected evolution of methodologies and data for indicators throughout the period of SFDRR and SDG implementation, it is possible that some of the elements of these indicators will be represented in global reporting on progress in achieving Target F.</p>
-------	--

6. Computation methodology:

In light of the technical considerations elaborated in this non-paper and the Concept Note – and which were discussed during the intersessional deliberations – and observing the principles and approaches adopted by the IAEG-SDGs which have underpinned the design and development of the relevant indicators of the SDGs (see Annex below), the Secretariat recommends the use of one headline indicator measuring flows in support of national DRR actions, and another measuring exchange, capacity building and learning between peers.

F-6alt*: Total official international support for national DRR actions (ODA plus other official flows) that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan.

The indicator presents the total value of resources in support of national DRR actions that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan. It is comprised of total official international support for national DRR actions, and total government expenditure on national DRR actions. The indicator allows the estimation of the proportion of total expenditure on national DRR actions that is accounted for by official international support. Reporting is to be conducted by both the *provider*, in the short term using ODA data, and by the *recipient* country, using data from national accounts.

The method of computation is a simple summation:

$$F_1 = F_2 + F_3$$

Where:

- F_1 : Total value of official resources in support of national DRR actions in country n
- F_2 : Total official international support to national DRR actions in country n (provided / received)
- F_3 : Total government expenditure in country n on national DRR actions (from domestic resources)

An estimation of the proportion of the total amount available to country n for national DRR actions, that is made up of official international support, can be useful not least in estimating the degree of reliance of the country on external support and how this is changing over time:

$$F_4 = \frac{F_2}{F_1} * 100$$

Where:

- F_4 : Total official international support to national DRR actions as a percentage of total value of official resources in support of national DRR actions in country n

6.1.1. Disaggregation.

ODA data are generally obtained on an activity level, and include numerous parameters. They can thus be disaggregated by:

- provider and recipient,
- groups of countries (*global, regional / sub-regional*)
- type of finance (for instance *grants and loans*)
- type of resources provided
- multilateral institutions (*including multilateral agencies, international NGOs, public-private partnerships and networks*¹⁵)

Recognising that the role of ODA in international cooperation is evolving and that the range of stakeholders involved in international cooperation is ever broader, it is envisaged that this indicator will evolve and will be further qualified during the SFDRR period¹⁶.

The headline indicator uses the term **Total official international support** to allow additional financial and technical flows to be incorporated, as the means to capture the totality of international cooperation (beyond ODA) develop. In this way, it is expected that the indicator will be able to capture in whole or in part, the elements of a number of the proposed indicators of the Working Text on Indicators as methodologies and data evolve.

Data capture may be enhanced in the near term if the proposal for a **DRR policy marker** is approved by the DAC Working Party on Development Finance Statistics in December 2016. If approved, a DRR policy marker would enable the tracking of DRR integrated in individual sectors of development assistance and also encourage the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into development planning. The disaster risk reduction marker would assess the donors' "policy objectives" (or investment intent) in relation to disaster risk reduction in each aid activity. The reporting agency would be requested to indicate for each aid activity whether or not it includes disaster risk reduction activities / considerations as a principal or significant objective.

The proposed policy marker provides a methodology that offers the possibility for greater sectoral and sub-sectoral specificity for both providers and recipients. The marker methodology was originally developed¹⁷ to assist the definition of ODA in respect of DRR, but it can also be applied to non-DAC donors¹⁸ as well as national expenditure (of recipient countries). As detailed in Annex I. of the Concept Note, the DRR policy marker has been tested in developing countries as part of a **risk-sensitive budget review (RSBR)**¹⁹.

¹⁵ These include inter alia the regional development banks, the World Bank Group, the IMF, and United Nations agencies, funds and commissions

¹⁶ the IAEG-SDGs will review the indicators measuring the targets of the SDGs in 2020 and 2025.

¹⁷ by the UNISDR and the World Bank, together with OECD DAC Members

¹⁸ it is recommended that the guidelines and reporting directives developed for such a marker may also guide similar tracking and reporting of DRR-related initiatives / programming of non-DAC donors

¹⁹ <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=43523>

A **RSBR** is a simple, systematic, quantitative analysis of a budget (or series of budgets) that enables countries to estimate and take credit for investment in DRR (the budget review methodology is described in Annex A of each National Report²⁰). If the RSBR is conducted by a national government, the findings typically track public investment and can include inward financial flows. An RSBR conducted on a series of annual budgets allows for the identification and tracking of temporal trends. An RSBR that also categorizes components of risk management, can point to trends in focus (i.e. increasing investment in prevention / risk reduction, as opposed to repeated response to disasters).

If the proposal for the DRR policy marker is adopted and the methodology applied by providers and recipients alike, further options for (sectoral and sub-sectoral) disaggregation may be possible. This is consistent with the approach proposed for Targets A to D, wherein disaggregated data can be collected at the national level.

6.1.2. Applicable working definitions.

Official development assistance (ODA): ODA is defined as flows of official financing (essentially grants or concessional loans) administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 per cent (using a fixed 10 per cent rate of discount).

In addition to financial flows, technical co-operation is included in aid. Grants, loans and credits for military purposes are excluded. Transfer payments to private individuals (e.g. pensions or insurance payouts) are in general not counted. By convention, ODA flows comprise contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries (“bilateral ODA”) and to multilateral institutions. ODA receipts comprise disbursements by bilateral donors and multilateral institutions. Lending by export credit agencies — sole purpose of export promotion — is excluded (OECD source IMF 2003).

Government coordinated spending plan: is defined as a financing plan / budget for national DRR actions, clearly assessing the available sources of finance and strategies for financing future needs.

International cooperation: principally concerns aid (some of it quantifiable) in the form of grants or loans by external support agencies. Thus in the context of this indicator, and until such time as more inclusive methodologies capturing the totality of flows are developed, the amount of ODA related to support for national DRR actions can be used as a proxy for this.

Developing countries: A clear universally agreed concept of developing country is yet to be agreed. Analysis by the World Bank identified that the term is used in a number of different ways depending on the purpose²¹. Current practice is largely a mix of the (adapted) M49 statistical classification and the definition inherent in ODA. To facilitate the monitoring of the SDGs, work will be undertaken under the auspices of the IAEG, to develop a coherent approach to regional groupings.

It is recommended that until such time as this is finalised, that the DAC list of ODA Recipients (developing countries) be used for this indicator. This list includes developing countries and territories eligible for receiving ODA; consists of all low and middle income countries based on gross

²⁰ UNISDR working papers on public investment planning and financing strategy for disaster risk reduction: review of Mauritius. <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/43525>

²¹ *analytical* – e.g. the UN Statistical Division M49: 179 countries in ‘developing regions’; *political* – e.g. UN G77 with 134 members; *resource monitoring and allocation* – e.g. OECD DAC list of ODA Recipients with 142 potential aid recipients.

national income (GNI) per capita as published by the World Bank, with the exception of G8 members, EU members, and countries with a firm date for entry into the EU. The list also includes all of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

6.1.3. Rationale and interpretation.

Provider: ODA is the accepted measure of development co-operation, including both grants and soft loans, and covers the value of both financial and technical assistance for development purposes. UN Member States have agreed a total net ODA target for economically advanced countries of 0.7% of GNI, and a target of 0.15-0.20% for ODA to LDCs. The Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction 2009 invited the establishment of clear national and international financial commitments to DRR, including an allocation to DRR of at least 1% of development funding, a minimum of 30% of climate change adaptation funding, and at least 10% of all humanitarian and reconstruction funding.

Although ODA does not capture the totality of flows, as both methodology and data are readily available from the CRS of the OECD, the amount of ODA related to DRR can be used as a proxy for international cooperation for support to national DRR actions.

Recipient: Providing the recipient perspective allows a more complete tracking of international financial support in support of national DRR actions of developing countries. This measure can complement official statistics on ODA, and in some cases may provide additional specificity to the definition of support; detail that may not be available via current ODA measurement methodologies.

Providing the data on total government expenditure (from domestic resources) in addition to international official support, allows the calculation of:

- i) the total value of official resources available in support of national DRR actions,
- ii) an estimate of the degree to which that country is dependent upon official international support to implement the SFDRR, and
- iii) an indication of the degree of alignment of ODA with national priorities.

6.1.4. Sources and data collection.

Provider:

Net official development assistance (ODA) to all countries on the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) List of ODA Recipients pertaining to disaster risk reduction²², using the following subsectors as explained in the list of Creditor Reporting System (CRS) purpose codes:

- 74010 Disaster prevention and preparedness²³
- 41010 Environmental policy and planning
- 41050 flood prevention/control

Data are usually reported annually and expressed in US dollars at the average annual exchange rate.

If adopted by the OECD WP-STAT, the proposed DRR policy marker will provide details of DRR investment for a wider range of sectors in ODA (see above).

As measurement frameworks, able to capture data that are more representative of the totality of international flows and providers, become operational – for example TOSSD, the Technology Facilitation Mechanism, the Technology Bank for LDCs²⁴, or reports of UN entities or National Progress Reports of the Sendai Framework Monitor – then the indicator may evolve over time so as to exploit new data from emerging sources.

Recipient:

Total government expenditure on national DRR actions (from domestic resources) as part of a government coordinated spending plan, as recorded in national accounts.

and

Disbursements by bilateral donor governments and multilateral institutions in support of DRR, as recorded in national accounts or balance of payments statistics.

Data are usually reported annually and expressed in US dollars at the average annual exchange rate.

If adopted by the OECD WP-STAT, the proposed DRR policy marker methodology can provide greater sectoral specificity to government expenditure on national DRR actions in a wider range of sectors.

National accounts, administrative records and official estimates can provide the information to assess whether there is a financing plan or budget for national DRR actions, the extent of their implementation, and potentially whether it includes all key areas of intervention. In some countries there may be several plans each covering a specific area, e.g. separate plans for disaster risk assessment, or for urban and rural areas. Plans and budgets may exist in countries and present different figures / estimates, nevertheless the aim of this information is to identify if there is an agreed allocation for DRR.

²² Data are compiled by the OECD DAC from returns submitted by its member countries and other aid providers

²³ CRS Code 74010 covers “Disaster risk reduction activities (e.g. developing knowledge, natural risks cartography, legal norms for construction); early warning systems; emergency contingency stocks and contingency planning including preparations for forced displacement).

²⁴ See Annex I. of the Concept Note for Target F

6.1.5. Comments and limitations.

There are limitations to using ODA as the principal data for measuring international cooperation for support to national DRR actions. In its current configuration, the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD DAC does not currently provide a complete record of DRR-related support to developing countries. Purpose code 74010, for example, is classified under Humanitarian Aid (700) which, by its definition, does not cover the wide spectrum of disaster risk management (DRM) activities and considerations integrated into sectoral development aid, nor can it capture the wider co-benefits of integrated DRR to other economic sectors. Although this results in an **under-reporting** of actual investments in DRR, in recognition of which the proposal for a policy marker was in part developed, there is currently no more widely used methodology, nor a better source of data to measure international cooperation in support of national DRR actions, than ODA statistics.

Work is ongoing to develop measurement capabilities that provide a more comprehensive representation of flows and providers. For example, scientific and technological co-operation activities that focus on the needs of, and the achievement of the SDGs, in developing countries are included in the **new measurement framework, TOSSD**. Indeed, TOSSD proposes to measure various forms of international cooperation not currently captured in ODA, including **south-south and triangular co-operation** or indeed public-private and multi-stakeholder partnerships. As data tracking improves and statistical capacity deepens, there will be greater scope through the TOSSD framework for capturing multiple components of complex financing arrangements.

Other official flows: The OECD collects data on development cooperation from the 29 DAC members, an additional 21 countries beyond the DAC, and 36 multilateral institutions and one foundation. Some of these also provide information on other official flows and data on amounts mobilised from the private sector. This does not include all provider countries – including South-South providers, such as Brazil and China – although estimates of the development cooperation programmes of emerging providers are available, data specific to disaster risk reduction is not.

The OECD and other organisations collect data on broader financial flows to developing countries, including non-concessional official flows, foreign direct investment (FDI), bank lending, export credits and other flows. The World Bank makes estimates of remittance flows, and the IMF compiles balance-of-payments data. The sustainable development focus and concordance of these other categories of flows with national development plans is less clear, and substantial further work would be required to arrive at an agreed measure of non-ODA official and private flows. Nevertheless, in the medium term, data will also be available through TOSSD.

F-12*: Number of countries engaging in a voluntary and mutual review of progress in the implementation of national DRR strategies.

Computation methodology.

Summation of the reports of Sendai Framework Peer Reviews, and/or data contained in the National Progress Reports of the Sendai Framework Monitor, and/or the Proceedings of Regional and Global Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction.

6.2.1. Disaggregation.

This indicator should be disaggregated by:

- Country.

6.2.2. Applicable working definitions.

Voluntary and mutual review: an on-demand, self-determined exercise of appraisal and exchange to promote mutual learning and sharing of information and good practices through, inter alia, voluntary and self-initiated peer reviews among interested States.

National DRR Strategy: national disaster risk reduction strategies and plans, across different timescales with targets, indicators and time frames, aimed at preventing the creation of risk, the reduction of existing risk and the strengthening of economic, social, health and environmental resilience (Sendai Framework, Paragraph27(b)). In the Sendai Framework, link with DRR and climate change adaptation is strongly advocated.

Note: DRR strategies need to be based on risk information and assessments.

6.2.3. Rationale and interpretation.

The transparent sharing and exchange of policy and practice, institutional and governance arrangements, knowledge and technology, through mutual learning, assessment and review can build sustained opportunities for solution-oriented international collaboration and cooperation.

6.2.4. Sources and data collection.

Reports of Sendai Framework Peer Reviews.

National Progress Reports of the Sendai Framework Monitor, reported to UNISDR.

Proceedings of Regional and Global Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction.

6.2.5. Comments and limitations.

As reviews are entirely voluntary, self-determined exercises in mutual learning and exchange, they can be as light or as in-depth, as targeted or comprehensive, as the country that initiates the process requires.

ANNEX.

A. Indicators developed by the IAEG-SDGs related to the Means of Implementation.

Indicators are classified by the IAEG-SDGs according to the following Tier system.

Tier 1: Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available and data regularly produced by countries.

Tier 2: Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available but data are not regularly produced by countries.

Tier 3: Indicator for which there are no established methodology and standards or methodology/standards are being developed/tested

The following shows the updated tier classification (as of 26 September 2016). It is expected that the tier classification of many indicators will change in the coming years, as methodologies are developed and data availability increases.

		Tier
2.a.2	Total official flows (official development assistance plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector	Tier I
3.b.2	Total net official development assistance to medical research and basic health sectors	Tier I
4.b.1	Volume of official development assistance flows for scholarships by sector and type of study	Tier I
6.a.1	Amount of water-and sanitation-related official development assistance that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan	Tier I
9.5.1	Research and development expenditure as a proportion of GDP	Tier I
9.a.1	Total official international support (official development assistance plus other official flows) to infrastructure	Tier I
10.b.1	Total resource flows for development, by recipient and donor countries and type of flow (e.g. official development assistance, foreign direct investment and other flows)	Tier I (ODA) Tier II (FDI)
11.c.1	Proportion of financial support to the least developed countries that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings utilizing local materials	Tier III
12.a.1	Amount of support to developing countries on research and development for sustainable consumption and production and environmentally sound technologies	Tier III
13.a.1	Mobilized amount of United States dollars per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the \$100 billion commitment	Tier III
13.b.1	Number of least developed countries and small island developing States that are receiving specialized support, and amount of support, including	Tier III

	finance, technology and capacity-building, for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change-related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities	
15.a.1 + 15.b.1	Official development assistance and public expenditure on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems	Tier III + Tier I
17.2.1	Net official development assistance, total and to least developed countries, as a proportion of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee donors' gross national income (GNI)	Tier I
17.3.1	Foreign direct investments (FDI), official development assistance and South-South Cooperation as a proportion of total domestic budget	Tier I <i>No metadata received on current indicator formulation</i>
17.6.1	Number of science and/or technology cooperation agreements and programmes between countries, by type of cooperation	Tier III <i>No metadata received on current indicator formulation</i>
17.7.1	Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies	Tier III <i>No metadata received on current indicator formulation</i>
17.9.1	Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries	Tier I
17.17.1	Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships	Tier III <i>No metadata received on current indicator formulation</i>
17.19.1	Dollar value of all resources made available to strengthen statistical capacity in developing countries	Tier I <i>No metadata received on current indicator formulation</i>