Report Back Presentation

Breakout Group - Session 3

4th May 2023
Guiding Questions

- Which taxonomies should be fixed/standard, and which should allow the addition of items at the country level? How helpful and how difficult would it be to map national classifications to global ones to allow comparisons and aggregation?
- Do you see a way in which the proposed data model could be used to track cascading relationships between events, e.g., where a cyclone causes landslides? What are the challenges and suggestions to track such cascading events?
- Which primary data collections tools are being used and will need to integrate with the disaster losses and damages tracking system)? Which ones will be needed to build-in?

Additional Questions

- What type of review, update, and validation institutional workflow you will need the platform to support in your context/country?
- Does the data model incorporate all core elements that you expect to have on a disaster losses and damages tracking system?
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Key feedback points – Session 3

Main questions or concerns

▪ Strict definitions of terminology are challenging but needed for comparability purposes. There is no common understanding on larger concepts like losses and damages, but also on more detailed ones like major or minor losses.
▪ Hazard classification is not only an issue of terminology, the understanding of hazard definition also differ in regions. E.g. Tsunami-earthquake is a common classification in Indonesia.
▪ Data collection by governmental organizations is biased by government interests and scopes. Impacts outside of, e.g. low income groups, will therefore not be reflected in the data bases.
▪ Exclusionary criteria in the forms are a delicate subject. They are needed to reduce double counting but can limit accuracy in reporting. Wider classifications, like number of people in destroyed households, cause confusion on how to differentiate them from evacuated.
▪ Flexibility in the database increases the chances for “trash data”. Taxonomies and standards should be used when possible.

Strengths and popular features

▪ UNDRR has considered different scenarios and existing database structures from different countries and is targeting flexibility that allows for multiple entry points for national systems on the new LnD one.

To revise, correct or add

▪ Attribution of impacts for compound events can be very challenging. E.g. A TS can cause floods, allocating impacts to the source hazards and some to the resulting one may not be feasible for the user. The recommendation is that the database allow for one impact to be linked to more than one hazard.
▪ The interphase of the database is still intimidating for non-data specialist who often document impacts, e.g. emergency responders.
▪ Some data fields depend on advanced knowledge and capacity. If very few data is documented in some fields, it should be considered to take them away at a certain point.
▪ Input systems like slide bars for reporting timeframes, can be confusing for some people, and allowing for manual inputs (e.g. dates) can be helpful.
▪ Glossaries for terminology that allows for suggested edits from users, would be useful.

Other suggestions

▪ A clear overview on data classification is recommended as criteria can be interpreted differently and if local agencies do not document impacts with compatible structures, connecting local and UNDRR databases will be challenging. E.g. the Sendai classification of partial and total losses was incorporated on the Costa Rican system, specifically for reporting purposes.
▪ Workflows for the input of data should be discussed – the status of the reporting (draft, in-revision, rejected, public)
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Points principaux

- **Taxonomies**
  - Aléas,
    - doit être standard (flexibilité d'ajouts justifie – importance des traductions)
  - Géographie;
    - idem
    - P code – standard données géographiques (OCHA?) / GAUL de FAO
  - En général,
    - chercher à standardiser en gardant flexibilité
    - L’absence de standard est un gros souci pour l'utilisation de l'outil (notamment pour catastrophes)
  - Idée: identifier quels pays utilisent quels standards

- **Effets en cascade**
  - Aggrégation d'événements, possibilité d'agréger plusieurs événements
  - Relation cause à effet
    - Permettre rapport sur les relations entre événements pour permettre analyse par expert
    - Relation peut devoir être décrite par autre chose que causalité
    - Échelle temporelle, surtout pour événements sur long terme (sécheresse etc.)

- **Outils de collecte existants**
  - Maroc – site de registre existant
  - Tunisie – depend du but de la collecte

- **Flux de revision / validation**
  - Permettre de gerer les flux et les etats (exemple: etat "soumis", "valide" mais aussi "officiel")
Key feedback points: Group C – Breakout Group Discussion 3

Main questions or concerns

- Legislative basis for the systems – from intergovernmental bodies to policy makers to local municipalities
- Flexibility – optional fields – national offices take the driver’s seat – as little as needed, as much as possible
- Data quality – validation process
- Taxonomies
- Connected to SFM indicators

Strengths and popular features

- Rich format of data intake (e.g. images)
- Use-case to promote uptake
- Inform situation awareness
- Hazard Information Profile dynamics
- Countries efforts and best practices could be duplicated

To revise, correct or add

- Coding for regions
- Ability to enter customizable indicators by the countries, e.g., risk assessment indicators
- Prompt new fields for indicators (public health, etc.)
- Privacy issues
- Data refresh mechanism
- Output templates to meet data needs

Other suggestions

- Data strengthening, connect with research institutes and academia, local community data
- KOBO templates – offline data collection
- Digital health applications – grassroots/community data – mobile coverage
- Data methodological/collection integration
- Incorporate geo-coded NSO data to setup baseline information and vulnerability profiles
Key feedback points – Session 3

Main questions or concerns
- Option for live entry vs retrospective entry of data
- Revisiting entries into the system to update data
- Ability to select the appropriate hazards within context of cascading hazards including cross-boundary linkages

To revise, correct or add
- Start and end date (date type) vs just duration
- Use of ‘ongoing’ vs ‘draft’ for status
- Feature to have ‘mouse over’ and hyperlink to standard definitions of hazards

Strengths and popular features
- Customizable and modular options
- Allowing national language contextualization

Other suggestions
- Option for multiple effects
- Option for countries to share use data on configuration for improvements
- Use of hazard cluster (e.g., hydro-met.) mandatory, and specific hazard optional
- Commonly occurring list (incl. eliminating hazards not experienced in locales)
Key feedback points – Session 3

- **Main questions or concerns**
  - Data Gaps on the older system that don’t match the current Model. How will the system account for these discontinuities?
  - There’s a need to develop custom indicators, necessitating a need for an adaptable data model.
  - API’s are necessary to import data from other systems such as Kobo/ODK

- **To revise, correct or add**
  - Enable upload of GeoJSON as part of record data input (for effects/reports)
  - Generate weightings based on specific hazards and their locations to drive resource allocation
  - ODK integration.
    - Having the possibility to export data inputs as XLSForm.
    - Having direct integration with tools such as KoboCollect/ODK Collect for input

- **Strengths and popular features**
  - Data is richer since it captures detailed information
  - The effects being linked to the event and multiple hazards

- **Other suggestions**
  - Allow customization of basemaps