Introductory Remarks on e-Consultation & Status of Disaster-Related Statisics Framework (DRSF)

Inception Meeting for Pilot-testing
DRSF
15-17 December, 2015

United Nations Conference Centre, ESCAP, Bangkok

Daniel Clarke,
(UN ESCAP Statistics Division)

Outline

1. DRSF e-Consultation
2. Status of DRSF
3. Pilot testing Work planning

Outline of Provisional Draft DRSF

- **Chapter 1: Scope and Rationale for Framework**
- **Chapter 2: Definitions of Disasters & Impacts**
- **Chapter 3: Disaster Risk Reduction Expenditures**
- **Chapter 4: Classifications**
- **Chapter 5: Measurement & Compilation**
- **Chapter 6: Indicators** *(new)*
- **Chapter 7: Descriptions of tables**
- **Chapter 8: Integration with other frameworks**

E-Consultation Overview

- Conducted during 13 Nov. – 27 Nov., 2015
- Draft sent to Asia-Pacific Disaster-related Statistics Expert Group Members only
- Presented as draft for pilot-testing purposes
- Feedback from: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Fiji, Indonesia, New Zealand
- General feedback
  - Some editorial fixes needed
  - Suggestion to utilize roman numerals for classifications
  - Further work on classifications emphasized

E-Consultation feedback by Section

- 1.1 Description of rationale
  - Most respondents made no comment or confirmed appropriate scope & rationale for DRSF
  - "Efforts should be made to compile these statistics in one place, so that it can readily available to assist government policies on disasters. More efforts should also be made to collect more statistics related to disasters, particularly conditions shortly after a disaster struck, such as losses of lives and livelihood."

E-Consultation feedback by Section (1)

- 1.2 Core Set and relationship to Enlarged Framework
  - Confirmed agreement with Core Set
  - There should also be base statistics in relation to population, area and infrastructure at risk of disasters.

- 2.1 Definition for disaster, including proposed criteria
  - Confirmed agreement
  - Consideration should be taken for local definition of disaster in each country, however, one definition and concept should be used across all countries so that disaster indicators produced are comparable across countries.

E-Consultation feedback by Section (2)

- 2.2 Definition for direct impacts, including distinction from indirect
  - Agreement or no comment in all cases
- 2.3 Recommendations for recording reference period (beginning and end to disaster
  - Set up break-down criterion (Statistical Scorecards) to define to what extent the disaster impacts on
    - I - Direct human impacts, affected population
    - II - Direct economic material impacts
    - III - Direct impact on cultural heritage
    - IV - Direct environmental impact
  - In the case of a volcanic eruption, if the mountain continuously erupt for more than a year with several temporary stoppages, is the beginning of the disaster the first eruption and the end is the last, or the beginning is start of the eruption and the end is when refugees have returned to their homes after the eruption.

E-Consultation feedback by Section (3)

- 3.1 Description of satellite account for disaster management
  - Most respondents agreed to concept
  - Comment on challenge of measurement and poor availability of statistics, currently
- 3.2 Summary of Disaster Risk Reduction Characteristic Activities, including annotation to classification
  - Agreement or no comment
  - Example of dams appears both under prevention and mitigation, should choose one?

E-Consultation feedback by Section (4)

- 4.1 Disasters/Hazards classification: use of IRDR 2015 with addition for multi-hazards

  – Agreement or no comment

  – There is "everyday disasters where no government institutions and development partners do not have any contributions but the losses and damages from disaster sometimes higher than a big disaster. We would suggest to accommodate "everyday disasters" in the Hazards Matrix

- **4.3 Classification of DRRCA characteristic activities and transfers**
  - Agreement or no comment

- **5.1 Measurement Units**
  - beneficial to segregate data into age groups and gender in the dissemination of data to identify vulnerable groups, such as women-headed households, children and the elderly, who are more at risk when disaster occurs.

- **5.2 Valuation, reparations cost**
  - Valuation and reparations cost should use dollar and local currency as well as PPP (purchasing power parity) to make the valuations comparable across countries.

E-Consultation feedback by Section (6)

- 5.3: Need for geographic information and GIS Agreement or no comment
  - Agreed/no comment
  - New sophisticated tools are needed to estimate areas affected by disasters, such as areas affected by wildfires, not just the hotspots caused by the fire. Satellite imaging can also be used to estimate hotspots as well as areas affected by wildfires.
- Chapter 6: Descriptions of tables
  - Agreed/no comment
  - Should also be basic data available such as population in the disaster area, migration data for population who displaced by a disaster. Other basic data should also include population at risk in terms of age group, gender and location. There should also be basic data on infrastructure which would otherwise be affected if a disaster occur.
- Chapter 7: Integration with other frameworks
  - Agreed/no comment
  - There should be coordination and synergy between various relevant and related government agencies in relation to disasters. However, useful to have one agency in charge in coordinating.
  - The National Statistics Agency does not have the capacity to conduct survey immediately after a disaster. However, the agency can provide technical assistance, in the form of training to do a survey.

Status of DRSF

- Updated draft (Dec. 8 Version) based on E-Consultation
- Draft is still provisional, designed for pilot testing
- Not yet done the comprehensive editorial changes; can be done as part of revisions following the pilot tests
- Key point for discussion during this week: Is the current provisional draft, including the tables (Draft_TablesV1.xls) sufficient for the pilot testing phase?
  - Need for addl' tools/templates, instructions?

DRSF Pilot testing Work Planning

- Need to determine:
  - TIMELINE: Can we develop priorities (e.g. prioritizing tables) and thus develop a sequential time line?
    - Criteria for prioritization:
    - Next Commission Session: May, 2016 – will review progress and mandate of Expert Group
  - Reporting of results of testing to the Secretariat
    - Addl' reporting tools/templates, instructions, glossary, standard for metadata, footnotes?
  - Specify technical assistance needs, if any, for conducting pilot testing and reporting results to Secretariat.