

Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology relating to Disaster Risk Reduction

Report of the Second Session (Informal and Formal)

Palais des Nations, Room XVIII, Geneva

9-11 February 2016

Issued on 3 March 2016

Reissued with factual corrections on 24 March 2016

UNISDR

I. Introduction

1. The present report provides an account of the key deliberations and outcomes as regards the way forward of the second session of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OIEWG) on Indicators and Terminology relating to Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) held in Room XVIII of the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland. The second session constituted of a formal session from 10-11 February 2016, preceded by an informal session on 9 February 2016.
2. The Working Group derives its mandate from General Assembly resolution 69/284 adopted on 3 June 2015 which decided “*to establish an open-ended intergovernmental expert working group comprising experts nominated by States and supported by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, for the development of a set of possible indicators to measure global progress in the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, coherent with the work of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Indicators.*”
3. A total of 107 Member States as well as the State of Palestine and the European Union nominated 255 experts for the Working Group. The experts emanated from a variety of national ministries and departments reflecting the cross-cutting nature of Disaster Risk Reduction including: emergency and disaster management and relief; civil defense/protection; ecology, environment and natural resources; national statistical institutes; energy; humanitarian affairs; foreign affairs and international/regional cooperation; interior/home affairs; land, infrastructure, transport and tourism; public health; disease control and prevention; economy and development; and universities.
4. In addition, there were 90 registered participants from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), the private sector, scientific, technical and academic institutions. Inter-Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and UN system entities including the FAO, WHO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNEP, UN Women, UN University, UN-DESA, UNECE, OECD, World Bank and IFRC, among others, also participated. The February meeting was the second of three formal sessions envisaged by the abovementioned resolution which has further mandated that the group complete its work by December 2016 and submit a report to the General Assembly for its consideration. The third session will be held in November 2016.
5. The informal session of the Working Group included informational briefings by the Secretariat on technical papers that it had prepared in relation to the proposed indicators for the seven global targets for the Sendai Framework. Each briefing was followed by interactive discussions to allow the participants time for questions, clarifications and comments on the substance of the technical papers.
6. The formal session of the Working Group undertook negotiations on the indicators and related terminology pertaining to the seven global targets of the Sendai Framework. Live on-screen compilation was undertaken to arrive at a first draft derived from a second reading of the working background text on indicators and terminology that was fully owned by the Member States. Two informal informals on missing persons (Target A), Target B and international cooperation (Target F) were also held during the second session.

II. Informal Session

7. The purpose of the informal session was to allow for the Working Group to arrive at a common understanding on the technical issues pertaining to the proposed indicators for the seven global targets for the Sendai Framework and how each indicator is to be computed. The technical papers were prepared following requests made by the experts during the first session for further clarity and information on the proposed indicators, as contained in the background paper on indicators discussed during the first session. The Secretariat prepared the technical papers during the inter-sessional period and posted them on the webpage of the Working Group.

8. The briefings on the technical papers during the informal session included elaborations of the rationale behind the Secretariat's technical considerations regarding the preparation of these documents and how they may be utilized by the experts during the formal negotiations. The informal meeting was for information purposes only and there were no negotiations on the indicators and terminology during the meetings.

9. The Secretariat provided eight technical briefings on the following topics:

- (a) An overall overview of all the indicators and related critical issues;
- (b) Suggested List of Hazards for the Purpose of Measuring Global Targets;
- (c) Methodology to Estimate Direct Economic Losses from Hazardous Events (Target C);
- (d) Basic set of requirements to monitor Targets (A) through (D);
- (e) Methodology to Estimate Damages to Infrastructure and Interruptions to basic services (Target D);
- (f) Indicators for national and local disaster risk reduction strategies (Target E);
- (g) Indicators to measure international cooperation (Target F);
- (h) Methodology to Estimate the number of affected persons (Target B).

10. Each briefing was followed by discussions in which participants provided constructive comments for consideration on indicator development. Key issues raised include:

- Defining the scope of hazards;
- Defining threshold for data recording;
- Disaggregation and its practicality including gender, age, disability;
- Coherence among measurement systems for the SDGs, FFD, climate change and Sendai;
- Ensuring that indicators developed are fit for purpose and measure progress;
- Taking account of mechanisms for monitoring and tracking data while recognizing the fundamental role of national reporting;
- Ensuring relevance, feasibility, measurability and practicality;
- Considering whether proposed indicators are mandatory or not;
- Defining what is "local" based on national system of governance;
- What can be understood from data as regards the effectiveness of international cooperation;
- How to address the question of double counting in the context of affected persons;
- Linking statistical information to geographical information.

III. Formal Session

11. The second formal session was dedicated to the continuation of consideration of Agenda Item 3 (Indicators to measure global progress in the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030). The starting point for negotiations was the working background texts on indicators and terminology which included all proposals received during the first session.

12. The experts proceeded with a second reading of the texts, from proposed indicators for Target A through Target G and completed a full reading by the end of the second session. While the terminology related to each indicator was also deliberated upon to ensure consistency in the definition of terms with the operationalization of indicators, a dedicated discussion on Agenda Item 4 (DRR Terminology) was postponed to the Third Session due to time constraints.

13. Deliberations continued on the basis of the working principles on which consensus was attained during the first session namely:

- (a) Paragraph 50 of the Sendai Framework will be interpreted to mean that the Working Group will produce indicators for the seven global targets of the Sendai Framework and that the definition of terms will be in relation to the indicators for the seven targets first and then for the Framework more broadly;
- (b) Only the experts from Member States can introduce terms and indicators into the working texts and draft documents on indicators and terminology;

- (c) Interventions should be of a scientific and technical nature and serve to operationalize the targets;
- (d) Challenges posed by the technical review will be identified and solutions proposed;
- (e) Experts will supply missing definitions and indicators where needed; and
- (f) Any term or indicator that risks undermining the Sendai Framework should be avoided.

14. In undertaking the negotiations, the experts also took into account the DRR related indicators contained among the 229 proposed global SDG indicators in the report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group (IAEG) on SDG indicators. Experts were requested to ensure consistency and coherence among the indicators across the 2030 Agenda and the Sendai Framework and to closely engage with colleagues in capitals on further work concerning the DRR-related indicators.

15. Taking the floor were the representatives of: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Philippines, Russian Federation, Samoa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the European Union. Representatives of civil society and the scientific community also spoke. Also taking the floor were representatives of UN Women, FAO, WHO, OECD and the World Bank.

16. Key emerging issues on Target A include: non-collection or difficulty in collection of data on missing persons (e.g. recording undocumented migrants), subjectivity in the use of the term and its particular importance in certain country contexts (e.g. coastal countries); accounting for particular legal implications of “missing” and “presumed dead” in each country; establishing core composite indicators for the global level and sub-indicators for the national level; issue of varying criteria for data disaggregation by country (e.g. some collect by gender, others by disability etc.); issue of establishing a clearly defined time-frame for missing when a person moves from presumed missing to presumed dead and the potential impact on double-counting.

17. Key emerging issues on Target B include: appropriately defining terms necessary to operationalize the indicators: evacuated, affected, relocated, protected, ill, livelihood, displaced, productive assets; issue of evacuation as a global indicator when some countries do not undertake it as a policy; question of scope of protection; question of reactive versus proactive indicators (e.g. distinguishing between pre and post-facto evacuation); challenges of distinguishing between directly and indirectly affected; distinguishing evacuated from relocated; issue of access to data which affects decision to evacuate; challenges in measuring disruptions to livelihoods and numbers receiving food relief aid; and whether to treat sub-indicators as an indicative or absolute list.

18. Key emerging issues on Target C include: clearly distinguishing economic losses from social losses; defining direct economic loss; adding losses to trade, services and tourism sector as components of economic loss; delinking economic loss calculations from GDP; measuring damage to cultural heritage and ecosystems; inclusion of fisheries, aquaculture and poultry as components of livestock loss; including oil, gas and mining sectors as part of industrial facilities; including shelters and informal settlements in housing damage/destruction calculations; and reporting losses utilizing a common currency.

19. Key emerging issues on Target D include: clearly defining basic infrastructure and disaster management; establishing an indicative list of what constitutes critical infrastructure and basic services; distinguishing critical from non-critical (e.g. primary versus secondary roads); assessing whether certain economic sectors constitute core and critical services; measuring long-term disruptions versus interruptions; measuring the time period of interruptions as a means to assess the impact of disruptions; establishing units of analysis for indicators; establishing minimum thresholds

for reporting; sensitivity of reporting on damages to security services structures; expanding the scope of transport units (roads, bridges); and including agricultural infrastructure, ports, airports, energy, water, sanitation and communication services/facilities as components basic or critical infrastructure.

20. Key emerging issues on Target E include: need for indicators to reflect evolution of policies and practices; assessing the mainstreaming of DRR into national development plans; linking local/municipal and national DRR strategies; open versus closed indicators; measuring percentage of local governments committed to resilient cities campaign; establishing guidelines on what is to be included in national and local DRR strategies; and assessing whether strategies are designed and implemented in an inclusive manner to allow for the participation and decision-making of all stakeholder groups.

21. Key emerging issues on Target F include: furthering precision on adequacy and sustainability of support; measuring both earmarked and un-earmarked contributions; inclusion of private flows as component of ODA; monitoring implementation of multi-stakeholder partnerships; disaggregation of data to assess support to SIDS, LDCs, low and middle income countries; distinguishing core and sub-indicators; avoiding duplication with the SDG indicators; assessing cooperation in all its forms (e.g. triangular, South-South, regional development banks); clustering indicators into the three categories proposed in UNISDR's concept note on Target F; measuring the quantity and amount given per country; measuring numbers of projects and programmes funded by international organizations; assessing capacity building aimed at risk reduction; and the question of the complementarity of national action.

22. Key emerging issues on Target G include: ensuring that early warning systems include monitoring and forecasting; measuring access of people to early warning and assessment; assessing whether information is available in a usable and accessible format (publications, TV, radio etc.); incorporating climate resilience into indicators in the face of climate variability; ensuring that accessibility and availability is commensurate with national practices and policies; and ensuring consistency in the use of numbers and percentages for indicators.

IV. Way Forward

23. The deliberations and negotiations in the second session trended towards convergence, resulting in the identification of clear landing zones on core and critical indicators for most targets. The Working Group agreed on the need for further work during the inter-sessional period to ensure that maximum progress can be attained on pending issues prior to the third session.

24. Concrete proposals made by experts during the second formal session on indicators and related terms were captured in an on-screen compilation document, on the basis of which the working texts emanating from the second session on indicators and terminology was prepared. The working text was sent to the experts for factual corrections only (e.g. correcting sentences mismatched, phrases omitted) on 1 March 2016 with a deadline for response of 8 March 2016. It was clarified that beyond the factual corrections, no changes to what has already been proposed in the working text would be accommodated after the second session. The working text will form the basis for the Working Group's discussions in the third session.

25. The Working Group identified a number of questions on which more in-depth work will have to be undertaken in the inter-sessional period, through the preparation of concept notes and methodologies for the following indicators by UNISDR (in collaboration with partners):

- (a) Indicator A-1 and relevant sub-indicators - Technical Note on mortality / missing / presumed dead, including computation methodology;
- (b) Indicators for Targets A, B and G - Concept / Information Notes;
- (c) Indicators for Targets A and G – Presentation;
- (d) Target E - Technical Note on the elements / minimum requirements for a national DRR strategy (standards);
- (e) Target F – Document clustering 20 proposed indicators for Target F by theme;

- (f) “Technical Annex” to the working text encompassing concept notes / technical papers for all seven Targets (including critical issues, areas for further work, guidance on data, etc.).

26. The abovementioned products, once prepared, will be circulated to the experts for comments and posted on the webpage of the Working Group. Experts will have the opportunity to submit written comments on indicator and terminology related issues emanating from the concept papers via email. The Chair will additionally convene informal consultations with Geneva based delegates (with remote participation of non-Geneva based experts via WebEx as needed) during the inter-sessional period to undertake an exchange of views on the issues emanating from the concept papers. No decisions will be taken during these exercises and the intent will be to attain the reactions and build understanding on the positions of the delegates on the issues to be discussed.

27. During the third and final session (informal and formal) presently scheduled for mid-November 2016, sufficient allocations will be made for the full engagement of members formally and informally. The Working Group agreed on the need to deliver a worthy product at the end of the process and to create the necessary circumstances for that to happen. In this context, it is the intent of the Chair to extend the informal session to three days during the final session to allow for adequate time for effective and sustainable informal consultations to arrive at conclusions.