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Welcome!

Who we are (tour de table)

Why we are here

What we will do

How we will go about it
Who we are

Andrew Bower
Programme Management Officer – Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia, Brussels

Ritsuko Yamazaki-Honda
Programme Management Officer – Bonn Office (In charge of Sendai Framework Monitor)
Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
2015 - 2030
Reducing disaster risks

23 May 2014: Serbia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia – Sava river floods

- **SITUATION**
  - **SERBIA**: As floodwaters are slowly receding in the affected areas and displaced people start returning to their homes, the Serbian Government lifted the country-wide Emergency Situation on 22 May. It was left in effect, however, in the cities of Sabac and Sremska Mitrovica as well as in 16 municipalities, mostly along the Sava and Morava rivers. The number of people killed by the floods has reached 32.
  - **BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA**: The water levels in Broklo, Brčko and Sarajevo are stagnant according to local media reports, while in the rest of the affected area levels are decreasing, road access is still restricted in some areas, however, and power outages are still extensive. According to a UN report, there have been 24 (unconfirmed officially) deaths in the country (as of 20 May), and 46 municipalities have been affected by the floods. It is mentioned that the most pressing concerns are landslides and animal carcasses and debris that pose a health risk. According to local media, a total of 900,000 people were displaced by the floods.
  - **CROATIA**: On 22 May the Croatian Government declared Vukovar-Srijem as a disaster area as of that day. 11,000 people had been evaluated in the region of Zupanja. Also affected was the neighboring country of Slavonija Brod-Panorama. The death toll in Croatia remains at two people killed.

Copyright: European Union, 2014. Map created by EC-JRC. The boundaries and names shown on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the European Union.
Training objectives

✓ Understanding of the Sendai Framework Monitoring process;
✓ Familiarity with the main concepts, methodologies and tools;
✓ Awareness to link SFM with other initiatives and processes;
✓ Capacity to use to SFM online system, and help colleagues back home.
✓ Peer learning!
Programme

Day 1 – Contexts, Synergies and Potential
➢ Latest updates
➢ National experiences
➢ National Strategies and Platforms
➢ Coherence with International Processes

Day 2 – Processes, methods and tools
➢ Data collection
➢ Custom Indicators
➢ Hands on session
➢ Support tools
If you need to contact us over the next two days:

Andrew Bower – andrew.bower@un.org
Ritsuko Yamazaki-Honda – honda@un.org
Day 1 / Session 2: Sendai Framework Monitor and Latest Updates

UNISDR/DPPI SEE SFM Training, 5-6 March 2019
Impact of Disasters 2017

"Disasters have often hindered economic and social development and aggravated the depth and breadth of poverty. Despite efforts in improving measures for disaster risk reduction, in 2017, economic losses attributed to disasters were estimated at over $300 billion, among the highest losses in recent years, owing to three major hurricanes affecting the United States of America and the Caribbean."

Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals - Report of the Secretary-General - (2018 UN EcoSoC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>in %</th>
<th>Insured losses</th>
<th>Economic losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in USD bn</td>
<td>in %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2919</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5546</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania/Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seas / Space</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>11404</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: some percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.
Source: Swiss Re Institute
25 years of International Commitment to Disaster Risk Reduction

- 1989: International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR)
- 1994: Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action
- 1999: International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
- 2015: UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 Sendai Japan

SDGs

2015
Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 - 2030

• Shift from disaster management to disaster risk management;
• **People-centred** preventive approach to DRR;
• **Primary** responsibility of States for DRR;
• **Shared** responsibility for DRR with stakeholders;
• **Scope** includes slow-onset, man-made and bio-hazards;
The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

1 OUTCOME

The substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries

1 GOAL

Prevent new and reduce existing disaster risk through the implementation of integrated and inclusive economic, structural, legal, social, health, cultural, educational, environmental, technological, political and institutional measures that prevent and reduce hazard exposure and vulnerability to disaster, increase preparedness for response and recovery, and thus strengthen resilience

4 PRIORITIES

Understanding disaster risk
Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience

Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk
Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response, and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

7 TARGETS

- DISASTER MORTALITY BY 2030
- # of AFFECTED PEOPLE BY 2030
- ECONOMIC LOSS BY 2030
- INFRASTRUCTURE DAMAGE BY 2030
- DRR NATIONAL/LOCAL STRATEGIES BY 2020
- INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION BY 2030
- EWS AND DR INFORMATION BY 2030

Source: Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030
Implementing Sendai Framework
Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk

- National Strategies for DRR
- National Platforms for DRR
- Multi Hazards probabilistic Risk Profiles
- Economic cost-benefit analyses
- Systematic Disaster Loss accountability

Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk

- Investing in resilience:
  - Infrastructural & non infrastructural mitigation measures and Early warning Systems
  - Risk Awareness
  - Preparedness
  - Response capacity
  - Contingency fund
  - Risk transfer
  - Residual risk

Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience

Priority 4: Building back better
Advocating for DRR

- Organization of Global Platform for DRR (Geneva May 2019)

- Organization of Regional Platforms (5 regions every 2 years) e.g. European Forum for DRR (EFDRR: Rome, November 2018)

- Knowledge and resource online platforms (preventionweb.net)

- Campaigns (Cities resilience, IDDR, World Tsunami Awareness Day, etc)
Supporting Member States

- Development of national & local DRR strategies
- Establishment of DRR governance mechanisms
- Improvement of disaster loss data collection
- Improvement of DRR investments
- Development of DRR efforts at regional level
Supporting Member States in Monitoring

- Development of online Sendai Framework Monitoring system (SFM)
- Retrofit and update disaster loss data base (DesInventar- Sendai)

• **Technical Guidance Notes**
  [http://www.preventionweb.net/publications/view/54970](http://www.preventionweb.net/publications/view/54970)

• **Training online** SFM site
  [https://sendaimonitortraining.unisdr.org/login](https://sendaimonitortraining.unisdr.org/login)

• **Training online** DesInventar site
  [http://training.desinventar.net/](http://training.desinventar.net/)

• **E-learning** materials of SFM (Under ADPC E-learning portal)
  [https://courses.adpc.net/courses/course-v1:UNISDR+SFM001+2019Y1/about](https://courses.adpc.net/courses/course-v1:UNISDR+SFM001+2019Y1/about)

• (Co-)Organizing Technical **Workshops**
• Training modules (PPT presentation)
• Frequently asked Questions (FAQ)
• User manual on DesInventar Sendai (to be available soon) etc.
Overview of Reporting Status via SFM

88 countries have reported at least one target in at least one year 2015-2017 by the end of 2018.

As of 1 March 2019 (2017)
Overview of Reporting Status via SFM

As of 1 March 2019

2017 data
Overview of Reporting Status via SFM

As of 1 March 2019

2018 data

195 countries total
156 Not started
36 In progress
1 ready for validation
2 validated

TARGET REPORTING OVERVIEW

A: Mortality
B: People affected
C: Economic loss
D: Critical infrastructure & services
E: Disaster risk reduction strategies
F: International cooperation
G: Early warning and risk information

169 Not started
9 in progress
10 ready for validation
7 validated

173 Not started
7 in progress
9 ready for validation
6 validated

173 Not started
13 in progress
6 ready for validation
3 validated

183 Not started
6 in progress
9 ready for validation
4 validated

173 Not started
9 in progress
11 ready for validation
4 validated

186 Not started
4 in progress
7 ready for validation
2 validated

185 Not started
6 in progress
4 ready for validation
2 validated

No Data
All targets validated
Sendai Framework Monitoring
A Regional Perspective
Sendai Reporting: 2017

Reporting across Europe and Central Asia

- In progress: 37 (66%)
- Not Started: 19 (34%)

Number of targets reported

- Number of countries: 40
- Number of targets: 8 to 1

Targets reported

- Number of countries: 35
- Sendai Framework Targets: A to G
Progress in DPPI Member States

Metadata

Target A

Target B

Target C
Progress in DPPI Member States

Target D

Target E

Target F

Target G

Legend:
- Validated
- Ready
- In progress
- Not started
Reporting progress: 2018

Reporting across Europe and Central Asia

- In progress: 10 (18%)
- Not Started: 46 (82%)

Ratio of DPPI countries reporting

- In progress: 1 (10%)
- Not started: 9 (90%)

Targets reported

- Sendai Framework Targets: A, B, C, D, E, F, G
- Number of countries:
  - Meta: 8
  - A: 5
  - B: 6
  - C: 5
  - D: 8
  - E: 5
  - F: 5
  - G: 5

- Number of countries: 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1
Observed tendencies

- SFM effective with a clear attribution of roles
- Importance of coordination and cross-sectoral approach
- Data collection: an imperfect exercise
- Value of reporting for decision-making
- Linking reporting with other implementation initiatives
- Linking reporting with other instruments and programmes (EU)
Observed gaps

- 2018 data
- Targets C and D – access to data
- Target E – deadline 2020
- Local level reporting
- Custom indicators
- Validation
To keep in mind

Reporting: a continuous exercise - reporting milestones
- **31 March 2019** – 2018 data for Sendai implementation report
- **30 April 2019** – 2005-2014 baseline data

Linking monitoring and implementation – value of data

Value of the Analytics Module: public information

Opportunities at regional level
Day 1 / Session 3: National Experiences in Monitoring Sendai

UNISDR/DPPI SEE SFM Training, 5-6 March 2019
National experiences

Presentations: 5-7min each + questions

- Albania
- Bosnia & Herzegovina
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- North Macedonia
- Montenegro
- Romania
- Serbia
- Slovenia
- Turkey

Interactive discussion (30min)
Day 1 / Session 4: Target E – National Strategies and Platforms

UNISDR/DPPI SEE SFM Training, 5-6 March 2019
Why a National Strategy?

- Reduce Mortality
- Reduce number of affected people
- Reduce Economic Loss
- Reduce damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services
- Increase national & local DRR strategies
- Enhance international cooperation
- Increase availability & access: early warning & risk information

2020
Why a National Strategy?

• Key instrument in mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction in policies, programmes, across all sectors.

• It is a whole-of-country process representing all sectors of government and society: government, civil society, private sector and communities.

• Potential to align existing plans with the Sendai Framework and review the contents for updating.
National Strategies and Sendai Monitoring

Benefits of a DRR Strategy:
• Review national DRR and CCA needs;
• Promote coherence and interlinkages with other priorities and programmes;
• Raise awareness of DRR and CCA issues;
• Strengthen partnerships;
• Set achievable targets and propose realistic activities;
• Generate commitment to risk-informed action;

Contribution of Sendai Monitoring:
• Coordination and Partnership: gathering data across sectors;
• Data collection and recording: quantifying disaster risks;
• Awareness raising and understanding of risks and impacts: developing evidence for decision making;
National Platforms and Sendai Monitoring

- Increase understanding of risks;
- Convene and convince sectors on risk data needs;
- Develop disaster loss databases;
- Ensure strategic angles to the monitoring process;

As a locally or municipally owned coordination mechanism or committee, the local platforms promote the understanding of risk drivers at the local level and mainstreams DRR into local policies and planning.
Governance & Coordination
National level

• Most countries have a national coordination mechanism (National Platform; Council; Committee, Commission, etc.);

• Policy level and/or operational level; Emergency management taskforces;

• Main areas of multi-stakeholder cooperation: civil protection; education; health; environment; economy & public finance; land use planning;

• Limited coordination -> Limiting coherence
Governance & Coordination

Local level

• National plans and strategies of several countries have provisions for local platforms
  ➢ Very few countries have established provincial and local DRR coordination mechanisms;

• Local platforms help in reporting and providing information (and data) to the national level;

• Local platform can support the systematic monitoring of local progress against Sendai targets: Reporting in SFM / Undertaking Scorecard self-assessments.
Supporting Member States

- Countries are encouraged to self-assess their DRR Strategy as part of their reporting on Sendai Framework Global Targets (target E-1);

- Self-scoring of strategies through the Sendai Framework Monitoring tool;

- Self-assessment process is meant to support identification of strengths, gaps and opportunities;

- To note: UNISDR will not be ranking the countries on their level of Sendai alignment;
10 Key Elements of a DRR Strategy

✓ Different timescales, with targets, indicators and time frames
✓ Aims at preventing the creation of risk
✓ Aims at reducing existing risk
✓ Aims at strengthening economic, social, health and environmental resilience
✓ Address recommendations of Priority 1, Understanding disaster risk
✓ Address recommendations of Priority 2, Strengthening disaster risk governance
✓ Address recommendations of Priority 3, Investing in disaster risk reduction
✓ Address recommendations of Priority 4, Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better”
✓ Promote policy coherence relevant to disaster risk reduction
✓ Have mechanisms to follow-up, periodically assess and publicly report on progress.
The ten key elements are weighted equally by assigning 10% to each element.

Countries self-score according to the following rating:

- Comprehensive implementation (full score) : 1.0
- Substantial implementation, additional progress required : 0.75
- Moderate implementation, neither comprehensive nor substantial: 0.50
- Limited implementation : 0.25
- No implementation or not existent, it will be 0.0
Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities

Self-assessment to measure leave of resilience at local level;

Informs decision-making and increases awareness of risks at local level;

Relies on robust understanding risks, impacts, capacities at local level;

Coordination to collect necessary data and evidence: value of local platforms

47 indicators – can be embedded in the Sendai Framework Monitor

[Link to the scorecard here]
Key messages

• Good progress in strengthening DRR policy landscape – But needs further strengthening

• Evidence-based disaster risk reduction relies on data: Sendai Framework Monitoring is key

• Data collection strengthens needs for coordination and partnerships: a critical element of DRR mainstreaming

• Need for understanding of local DRR actions / data collection
Guidance / Words into Action

• Guidance on National and Local Platforms

• Guidance on Local DRR Strategies

• Technical guidance on Sendai Framework Monitoring

• Guidance on National DRR Strategies (coming soon)
Day 1 / Session 5: Coherence with International Processes
Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OIEWG) met in 3 Sessions in 2015-2016.

UN General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the OIEWG contained in its report A/71/644, February 2017.

IAEG-SDGs recognized the OIEWG, and identified UNISDR as custodian agency of DRR related Indicators, December 2015.

UN Statistical Commission, 48th Session, March 2017: endorsed Report of the IAEG-SDGs | Note by the Secretary-General - E/CN.3/2017/2* proposing the recommended indicators of the OIEWG.

11 SDGs indicators = 5 indicators from the Sendai Framework (Target A-E).
Disaster risk reduction indicators in measuring the 2030 Agenda

11 SDGs indicators = 5 indicators from the Sendai Framework (Target A-E)
**MILESTONES**

2015 – 2016 OEIWG

DesInventar
SF Monitor
March Snapshot
Custom Indicators
October Snapshot
Analytics

2016

A/RES/71/276
Data Readiness Review
System Prototype
Technical Guidance
Launch SFM Process

2017

Regional Strategies
March Snapshot
April Baseline
October Snapshot

2019

=> inform the deliberations of HLPF
Disaster risk reduction measures are urgently needed to strengthen the resilience of the world's cities

Reported damage to housing attributed to disasters shows a statistically significant rise from 1990 onwards (even when taking into account the observed high degree of year-to-year variance). Meanwhile, the number of deaths from small- to medium-scale disasters has also demonstrated an upward trend over the same period. Low-income households and small businesses are affected more frequently than middle- and high-income households. This is a result of high exposure to hazards, vulnerable conditions and lower coping capacity. To save lives, prevent and reduce losses, and strengthen the resilience of cities, it is essential to promote public and private investments that take disaster risk reduction into consideration. Many countries have developed measures to reduce disaster risk in vulnerable urban areas, including investments in drainage infrastructure in flood-prone areas, risk-informed urban and land use planning, and appropriate building codes and other regulations.

“Unplanned and rapid urbanization and poor land management, together with non-risk informed policies and investments are major underlying risk drivers of disaster mortality. From 1990 to 2013, almost 90 per cent of mortality attributed to internationally reported disasters occurred in low and middle-income countries, many of which have seen rapid urban expansion in recent years.

“Countries continue to make efforts to adopt and implement national and local disaster risk reduction strategies that are in line with the Sendai… In 2017, among the 87 Member States that responded to the questionnaire, 50 reported that they have national disaster risk reduction strategies and 34 countries reported they have local strategies. Moreover, in 2015, out of 95 countries, 84 reported investing in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas… .

“Disasters have often hindered economic and social development and aggravated the depth and breadth of poverty. Despite efforts in improving measures for disaster risk reduction, in 2017, economic losses attributed to disasters were estimated at over $300 billion, among the highest losses in past years owning to three major hurricanes affecting the US and the Caribbean. “
GLOBAL TARGETS: Reporting

Target A  
STATUS: Not started

Substantially reduce global disaster mortality by 2030, aiming to lower average per 100,000 global mortality between 2015-30 compared to 2005-2015.

### A-1
Number of deaths and missing persons attributed to disasters, per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALCULATE COMPOUND INDICATOR A-1**

To be imported from National Disaster Loss Database

[Yes] [No]

### A-2
Number of deaths attributed to disasters, per 100,000 population

**Number of deaths per 100 000 (calculated indicator)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A-2a
Number of deaths attributed to disasters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible DRR information/data flows within a country

Disaster-related Statistics is not limited to [standardized and integrated] loss data: socio-economic data including demographics, geography, risk, exposure, vulnerability, hazard, etc.
Institutional Arrangement at National Level

1. Nomination of **National Sendai Framework Focal Point**

2.  
   - **Coordinator**
     - Sets up the national monitor: adds users, institutions, configures metadata, creates national custom reporting
   - **Contributors**
     - Enter data for their assigned indicators
   - **Validator**
     - Validates report once data entry is complete
   - **Observers**
     - Have read-only access and are optional

28 countries have included NSOs in SFM
Climate Change Adaptation milestones under the Convention

COP 2 (1996)
National communications to include vulnerability and adaptation assessments

COP 7 (2001)
Establishment of the national adaptation programmes of action for LDCs, the LDC Expert Group, and 3 funds for adaptation (LDCF, SCCF and AF)

COP 11 (2005)
Nairobi work programme to facilitate and catalyse the development and dissemination of adaptation information and knowledge

COP 13 (2007)
Bali Action Plan

COP 16 (2010)
Establishment of the Adaptation Committee, national adaptation plans, a mechanism to address loss and damage, and the Green Climate Fund

COP 21 (2015)
Paris Agreement

Adapting in the future
Enhancing support and processes
Scaling up implementation

Sharing knowledge and lessons learned
Moving to planning and pilot implementation
Observing impacts, assessing risks and vulnerabilities
Adaptation under the Paris Agreement (Article 7)

Global goal on adaptation
- Enhancing adaptive capacity
- Strengthening resilience
- Reducing vulnerability to climate change
- Sustainable development
- Global average temperature to well below 2°C

Recognition of adaptation efforts of developing country Parties
- To also be considered under the global stocktake

Adaptation communications
To include
- Priorities
- Implementation and support needs
- Plans and actions

Link to disaster risk reduction
- Parties recognize that pursuing efforts towards 1.5°C would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change

Global stocktake
- To recognize adaptation efforts
- Enhance implementation of adaptation
- Review adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support
- Review progress in achieving the global goal on adaptation
Objectives of NAPs and the PA global goal on adaptation

- Objectives of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process (decision 5/CP.17) are:
  a) To reduce vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, by building adaptive capacity and resilience;
  b) To facilitate the integration of climate change adaptation, in a coherent manner, into relevant new and existing policies, programmes and activities, in particular development planning processes and strategies, within all relevant sectors and at different levels, as appropriate.

- Global goal on adaptation (Article 7 of the Paris Agreement)

  Enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development and ensuring an adequate adaptation response in the context of the global temperature limit of less than 2°C.
Current Challenge

• Differences in mandates of lead agencies (sometime conflicting policies)
• Mechanism of Coordination with different actor
• Lack of consistent definitions for relevant terminology
• Different methodologies to collect data
• Data availability
• Gaps in monitoring and reporting processes
• Lack of technical capacity; constraint of human/financial resources.
Current Challenges (cont.)

- **Specialized surveys needed**
  
  - Lack of resources, Low response rates, Data quality.
- **Some NSOs are highly involved in indicator compilation; Others not**
- **Submissions under Nairobi Agreement (Adaptation) by countries illustrate similar challenges:**
  - **Indicator design**: Purpose and scope, there is no-one-size-fits-all indicator
  - **User capacity**: Capacity required for data assessment and ICT literacy
  - **Data constraints**: Lack of baseline, basic statistic data and financial and institutional capacity