Global Alliance for
Disaster Risk Reduction & Resilience
in the Education Sector

CSS Targets and Indicators
and
Concept Note for Phase Two

GADRRR-ES and WISS Ad Hoc Committee on
Comprehensive School Safety Targets and Indicators, April 2015.

Summary

These *draft Targets and Indicators for Comprehensive School Safety (CSS)*, and *Concept Note for Phase Two* are the product of global consultative processes with subject matter experts in the various aspects of CSS. The Targets and Indicators are intended to guide policy and program development and stimulate monitoring and evaluation of progress towards risk reduction and resilience in the education secgtor.

The Concept Note is intended to guide the Worldwide Initiative for School Safety (WISS) and the Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector (GADRRRES) to plan for the iterative testing, validation and refinement for use at national and sub-national levels, with cascading, indicative, school-based indicators, by the end of 2016.

A template of targets and indicators is expected to support national and sub-national education authorities to incorporate risk reduction into education sector strategies and plans, and to achieve and measure progress towards these goals:

Goals of Comprehensive School Safety
- To protect learners and education workers from death, injury, and harm in schools
- To plan for educational continuity in the face of all expected hazards and threats
- To safeguard education sector investments
- To strengthen risk reduction and resilience through education

These are also intended to guide education authorities and schools in promoting participatory school-based disaster risk management, including risk assessment, risk reduction skills, provisions for response, and planning for educational continuity.

It is intended that national and sub-national level indicators will be able to be compared across countries in sub-regions, as well as across larger regions and globally, and that consistent school-level indicators also be developed for adaptation to country level contexts. A process may be developed for normalizing coutnry level indicators in order to adjust for variations in measurement across countries. Wherever possible targets will be based on quantifiable measures. Where necessary common criteria will be sought for qualitative measures. A process will need to be recommended to normalize country-level indicators, to allow countries to both use their existing metrics and to define new ones.

To achieve this a shared glossary of definitions, and well-defined measures will be developed. (A model for this exists in the Education for All The Year 2000 Assessment Technical Guideline) The early availability of this guidance, provided through the collaborative effort of UNESCO, UNDP, UNFPA, and UNICEF is credited as a significant reason for the substantials progress documented in achieving the Millennium Development Goal of *Education for All*.)

Regional consultation processes are encouraged to support the development of these global targets and indicators.

It is intended that GADRRRES and WISS seek donor support to provide the technical support and facilitation necessary to develop, test, and monitor this global guidance. It is also intended that WISS member countries identify resource persons from within their national education authorities both to support articulation of enabling policies, data gathering, analysis and reporting requirements, to contribute to reference groups of technical experts in each of the pillars of school safety, and to support linkages with education management information systems.

Global Alliance for
Disaster Risk Reduction & Resilience
in the Education Sector

Comprehensive School Safety Goals, and Draft Targets and Indicators

(April 30, 2015)

Goals of Comprehensive School Safety

- To protect learners and education workers from death, injury, and harm in schools
- To plan for educational continuity in the face of all expected hazards and threats
- To safeguard education sector investments
- To strengthen risk reduction and resilience through education

SUMMARY

OUTPUT TARGETS

OUTPUT TARGETS	MEASURES
#1. Minimization in number of deaths and injuries due to hazard impacts on schools	# deaths and severe injuries in schools disaggregated by type of hazard, students and staff, education level (early childhood, primary, secondary, post-secondary) males and females
#2. Educational continuity is maintained	# days of school closure due to hazard impacts # days of school closure made up through school calendar adjustments # students displaced from school for # days # hours reduction in school day for # days % Increase in average class size for # days # students relocation to temporary learning facilities School attendance sampled 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 school days after impact. and cohort at beginning of next school year. # students not returning to school
#3. Reduction in education sector investment losses to hazard impacts	**# schools, # classroom, estimated cost of repair or replacement of classrooms, and of materials disaggregated by specific intensive hazard impacts, non-specific extensive hazard impacts, and use of schools as temporary shelters**

Global Alliance for
Disaster Risk Reduction & Resilience
in the Education Sector

INPUT INDICATORS

INPUT INDICATORS	MEASURES
A: ENABLING ENVIRONMENT	
#A1. Legal Frameworks & Policies Enabling policies and legal frameworks are in place at national and/or sub-national levels to addresses key elements of comprehensive school safety.	Enabling policies and legal frameworks are in place at national and/or sub-national levels to addresses key elements of comprehensive school safety
#A2: Organizational arrangements, leadership, and coordination for risk reduction and resilience is established by senior management, and includes designated focal points responsible at all levels.	a) Education authority provides leadership in disaster risk reduction and management b) Risk Reduction and Resilience Focal Points are engaged at all levels in the education sector
#A3: A comprehensive approach to school safety, is the foundation for integrateing risk reduction and resilience into education sector strategies, policies and plans.	The framework or approach has been communicated and understood at all levels of education administration, and is publicly available.
#A4: Funding is in place to reduce education sector risks	a) National education sector budget includes allocation for risk reduction and resilience programming ($) b) Education in emergencies and/or other sufficient funding sources exist and can be drawn upon by the national education authority, in an emergency. ($)
#A5: Child-centered Risk Assessment is in place at all levels in the education sector	a) Hazard mapping and risk analysis information is available to the national education authority from national and sub-national authorities, is available at all levels for education sector planning b) National/sub-national/school-level staff have guidance to assess hazards and risks c) National/sub-national/school-lvel staff have the capacity to assess hazards and risks
#A6: Monitoring and Evaluation for CSS is underway	a) Data collection tools for Pillars 1, 2, and 3 are well-developed and used at the school and sub-national levels on an annual basis to monitor progress towards scaled, sustainable implementation.

	b) Output indicator data on impacts of hazards on deaths, injuries, damage to education sector infrastructure, and long-term educational outcomes is systematically collected at national and sub-national levels and reported

B: PILLAR 1: *SAFER LEARNING FACILITIES*	
Target: Every new school built is safe one.	
#B1: Guidance and regulations are in place from appropriate authorities for safe school construction. This includes a) safe school site selection b) safe design, and c) safe construction	Qualitative review
#B2: Safe school site selection, design and construction are monitored for compliance/enforcement by appropriate authorities	# and % of new school construction that is monitored for compliance with a) safe school site selection b) safe school design c) safe school construction
Target: Existing schools are being made safer, systematically	
#B.3. A systematic plan for assessment and prioritization for retrofit and replacement of unsafe schools has been developed, and is being implemented.	a) estimated % of school stock that has been inventoried b) estimated % of school stock covered by the risk assessment process. c) # and % of unsafe school buildings have been identified.
#B.4 The prioritization plan for upgrading of existing unsafe schools is being resourced and implmented.	a) construction capacity, systems for monitoring and quality assurance and financial resources are allocated for completion of needed upgrading within a 20-year time-period. b) # and % of unsafe school buildings upgraded each year.
#B5 Education authorities promote routine maintenance and non-structural mitigation for increased safety and protection of investments in public schools.	a) Education authorities provide guidance and skill-training for routine maintenance and for needed non-structural mitigation measures to reduce risks in all schools. b) Roles and responsibilities for maintenance and non-structural mitigation are defined, documented and assigned.

	c) Education authorities have identified budget for routine and deferred maintenance of school facilities for safety and to protect investments, with transparent monitoring oversight at the school level.
#B6: Planning is undertaken for limited use of schools as temporary shelters or collective centers, during the school year.	a) Disaster management and education authorities have identified those schools that are expected to be use as temporary evacuation centers for disasters with early warning, and as temporary collective centers or shelters in the event of major hazard impact. b) Planning, support and capacity development are being provided at sub-national level to meet these needs.

C: PILLAR 2: *SCHOOL DISASTER MANAGEMENT*	
#C1: Education authorities have national and sub-national plans for education sector risk reduction and management, with focus on safety and security, educational continuity, and protection of education sector investments	a) National and sub-national plans are publicly available and are reviewed annually. b) Plans include risk assessment, risk reduction, response preparedness, and educational continuity c) Planing processess include inputs from children and youth [ ] yes [ ] no
#C2: Schools annually review school disaster risk reduction and management measures (eg. as part of school-based management and/or school improvement).	a) Education authorities provide common approach and guidance policies and procedures for all key elements of risk reduction, response and recovery b) Total number and % of schools that have review school safety measures during the last academic year. c) Students participate in these reviews [ ] yes [ ] no
#C3: Education authority has established and guides a full simulation drill, held annually, at all levels, to practice response preparedness and to review rrm plans (based on expected scenarios),	a) % of schools participating b) % of admin levels participating c) Students participate in planning and review [ ] yes [ ] no
#C4: Education authority has needs assessment, strategy, and implementation plan to develop staff and	a) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in DRRM through pre-service training programs b) Number and percentage of new staff trained through c) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in

student capacity for participation in school based disaster risk reduction and management, at necessary scale.	DRRM through in-service training programs d) Number and percentage of individuals trained through on-site, and computer-aided instruction e) Students participate in needs assessment and planning

D: PILLAR 3: *RISK REDUCTION AND RESILIENCE EDUCATION*	
#D1: National Disaster Management Authority and Education authority have nationally adopted, consensus- and evidence based, action-oriented key messages as foundation for formal and non-formal education.	a) Set of consensus-based and evidence-based action-oriented key messages for personal, family, and household risk reduction has been adopted as foundation for public education
#D2: Education authority has infused climate-aware risk reduction and resilience education into regular curriculum.	a) Consensus based action-oriented key messages are used as a foundation for formal and non-formal education. b) A full set of skills and competencies for risk reduction and resilience have been adopted at national level. c) Number and % of schools that have included disaster risk reduction and management into formal and non-formal education in the last academic year. d) Skills and competencies of students are assessed through measurable learning and RR outcomes.
#D3: Schools convey risk reduction and resilience education through non-formal education through participation in school disaster management, and through afterschool clubs, assemblies and extra-curricular activities.	a) Student participatory activities for engagement in household, school, and community risk reduction are available, and assessed, at school level (including involvement in Pillar 1 and 2 activities). b) Student participatory activities for engagement in household, school, and community risk reduction are utilized, and assessed, at school level through formal and non-formal education (including in Pillar 1 and 2 activities).
#D4: Education authority has needs assessment, strategy, and implementation plan to develop teachers capacity for teaching risk reduction	a) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in RRR Ed through pre-service training programs b) Number and percentage of new staff trained through induction trainings c) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in

and resilience education	RRR Ed through in-service training programs d) Number and percentage of individuals trained through on-site, and computer-aided instruction e) Number of pre-service RRR Ed/CSS training programs developed at tertiary level.
#D5: Country has quality and quantity of RRR Education materials for implementation of risk reduction and resilience education at scale.	a) Quality criteria for development and review of RRR educational materials b) Inventory of number and grade levels of educational materials meeting criteria and demonstrate effectiveness in RR&R outcomes c) Quality educational materials are available and utilized at school level
#D6: Monitoring and Evaluation	a) Monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness is RRR educational programs is carried out in terms of student learning outcomes and RR&R outcomes. b) Monitoring and evaluation of implementation is carried out to assess scaled,sustainable implementation

Global Alliance for
Disaster Risk Reduction & Resilience
in the Education Sector

CSS Detailed Output Indicators – DRAFT

NB: Underlined terms will be defined

#1. Minimization in number of deaths and injuries due to hazard impacts on schools

Over succeeding decades, the number and rate of deaths and injuries due to hazard impacts on people in schools is reduced.
Number and percent of students, and staff who lost lives or were severely injured, and type of hazard (cause) is aggregated from school level data of all schools with any deaths or injuries.
Reported: annually, every 5-years, every 10 years (by hazard type or category)
Denominators: Total number of students and staff in schools with at least one injury or death. Total numbers of students and staff in affected geographic area. Calculate percentages of total affected.

for [type of hazard]				
Deaths and injuries at school	deaths		severe injuries	
	male	female	male	female
students				
teachers and staff				

#2. Educational continuity is maintained.

Disparities due to intensive and extensive hazard impacts are measured and reduced.
Number and percent of school days lost in calendar year due to intensive and extensive hazard impacts, reported by type of hazard. This is aggregated from school level data from sampled schools. Select sample schools from high, medium, and low hazard impact areas for extensive hazards, and following intensive hazard impacts.
Reported: annually, every 5-years, every 10 years.
Denominators: Normative number of school days per year. Normative number of teacher:student contact hours per years. Baseline school enrollment. Normative rate of student annual attendance per year.

days of school closure due to hazard impacts
days of school closure made up through school calendar adjustments
students displaced from school for # days
hours reduction in school day for # days
% Increase in average class size for # days
# students relocation to temporary learning facilities
School attendance sampled 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 90, 120, 150, 180 school days after impact. and cohort at beginning of next school year.
students not returning to school

#3. Reduction in education sector investment losses to hazard impacts

Financial impacts of hazard impacts on schools are reduced.
Number and percent of schools and classrooms destroyed and severally damaged due to intensive and extensive disaster impacts, and due to temporary use as shelters or collective centers, and cost of repairs or replacements are aggregated from school level data of all affected schools.
Reported: annually, every 5-years, every 10 years.
Denominators: Total number of schools and classrooms in affected schools and in affected geographic area.

	specific intensive hazard impacts	non-specific extensive hazard impacts	use of school as temporary shelter or collective center

	severely damaged	destroyed	severely damaged	destroyed	average # days	range of # days
# schools						
# classrooms						
estimated $ cost of repairs or replacement						
estimated $ cost of materials lost						

CSS Input Indicators

NB: Each indicator will include: Title. Purpose. Description. Linkages to relevant CSS Goal, CSS Pillar, HFA Indicators. Data level. Denominator(s). Data sources. Aggregation method. Calculation method. Rating method. Limitations. Comments. A full set of definitions will be included. In this draft there remains some duplication and overlap that can be cross-referenced and reduced.

A: ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

#A1. Legal Frameworks & Policies

Enabling policies and legal frameworks are in place at national and/or sub-national levels to address key elements of comprehensive school safety.

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4. *Pillars 1, 2, 3*

Definition: Key elements of CSS are:
- all-hazards risk assessment
- safe learning facilities
- school disaster management
- risk reduction and resilience education

Ratings:
1= Not at all achieved: No key elements addressed
2= Partially achieved: 1, 2, or 3 key elements addressed
3= Fully achieved: 4 key elements addressed, including financing
4 =Exceeds expectations: Exemplary, including financing and capacity-building

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#A2: Organizational arrangements, leadership, and coordination for risk reduction and resilience is established by senior management, and includes designated focal points responsible at all levels.

a) Education authority provides leadership in disaster risk reduction and management through
- leadership from a unit with senior staff supervision (including full-time staff as appropriate)
- representation in the national platform for risk reduction
- coordination with National Disaster Management Organization structures at national, sub-national and local levels
- active coordination of broad national/sub-national multi-stakeholder engagement in a single structure to support risk reduction and resilience and educational continuity planning.
- regular communication

b) Risk Reduction and Resilience (RRR) Focal Points are engaged at all levels in the education sector with
- clear roles and responsibilities
- regular communication
- peer networking and support
- training programs for capacity development

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4 *Pillars 1, 2, 3*

Definitions:
Broad range of stakeholders includes:
- across divisions within the education sector, esp. school facilities, education sector management, strategic planning, finance, curriculum, and non-formal education.
- external stakeholders eg. local emergency managers, public safety officers, community disaster management committee, health care providers,
- includes education sector development actors, and humanitarian (education in emergencies) responders.

Ratings**:**
1= Not at all achieved:
2= One or both partially achieved:
3=Both Achieved:

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#A3: A comprehensive approach to school safety is the foundation for integrating risk reduction and resilience into education sector strategies, policies and plans.
The framework or approach has been communicated and understood at all levels of education administration, and is publicly available.

Definitions:
Comprehensive national framework refers to all hazards risk assessment, safe learning facilities, school disaster risk reduction and management, and risk reduction and resilience education.
All levels refers to national, sub-national, school levels
Publicly available, eg. easily found on MoE website

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4 *Pillars 1, 2, 3*

Rating:
1= Not at all achieved: present in neither
2= Partially achieved: present in policies or plans
3= Achieved: present in both
4= Exemplary

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#A4: Funding is in place to reduce education sector risks
a) National education sector budget includes allocation for risk reduction and resilience programming
b) Education in emergencies and/or other sufficient funding sources exist and can be drawn upon by the MoE in an emergency.

Relevant to Goal #s: 2 *Pillars 1, 2, 3*

Rating:
1= Not at all achieved
2= a) and/or b) partially achieved
3= a) or b) achieved
4= a) and b) achieved

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=10% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#A5: Child-centered Risk Assessment is in place at all levels in the education sector
a) Hazard mapping and risk analysis framework exists within the MoE, and education sector has access to hazard and vulnerability information at sub-national and school levels
b) National/sub-national/school-level staff have guidance to assess hazards and risks
c) National/sub-national/school-lvel staff have the capacity to assess hazards and risks

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4. *Pillars 1, 2, 3*

Rating
1= Not at all achieved
a) no national/sub-national hazard mapping and risk analysis framework exists
b) no guidance to assess hazards and risks and no provision for capacity development
c) no national capacity to assess hazards and risks and no provision for capacity development
2= Partially achieved
a) frameworks for both hazard mapping and risk analysis exist
b) guidance DRR and social cohesion assessments exists in the education sector
c) limited capacity and no provision for capacity development for DRR and social cohesion assessments exists in the education sector

3=Achieved
a) hazard mapping and risk analysis results inform the education sector diagnosis
b) guidance for school-based assessment of hazards and vulnerabilities is provided to schools
c) sub-national authorities and schools regularly and accurately asses their hazards and risks

4= Exemplary

Global targets:
Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#A6: Monitoring and Evaluation for CSS is underway
a) Data collection tools for Pillars 1, 2, and 3 are well-developed and used at the school and sub-national levels on an annual basis that monitor effectiveness in producing risk reduction and resiliency outcomes and monitor progress towards scaled, sustainable implementation, andt
b) Output indicator data on impacts of hazards on deaths, injuries, damage to education sector infrastructure, and long-term educational outcomes and progress towards scaled and sustainable implementation is systematically collected at national and sub-national levels and reported.

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4. *Pillars 1, 2, 3*

Rating
1= Not at all achieved
a) No data collection tools for DRR and social cohesion exist or are in use.
b) No data is collected
2= Partially achieved
a) Data collection tools exist but are not accessible to MoE, or not widely used
b) Partial data is collected and partially utilized
3=Achieved
a) Data collection tools exist and used at school and sub-national levels
b) Data is systematically collected from impacted schools
4=Exceeds expectations
CSS data is collection systematically, integrated with the MoE's EMIS, and used for decision-making

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=5% 2021=25% 2026=50% 2030=100%

B: PILLAR 1: *SAFER LEARNING FACILITIES*

Target: Every new school built is a safe one.

#B1: Guidance and regulations are in place from appropriate authorities for safe school construction. This includes
a) safe school site selection
b) safe design, and
c) safe construction

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4 *Pillars 1*

Ratings:
1= Not at all achieved: none or one out of three are regulated in accordance with the definitions provided.
2= Partially achieved: two out of three are regulated in accordance with the definitions provided
3= Achieved: all three areas are regulated in accordance with the definitions provided

B.1a) Safe site selection and use is regulated and guided.
Guidelines and regulations are in place for safe site selection and use.
B.1b) Safe design is regulated and guided
Guidelines and regulations are in place for school design.
B.1c) Safe school construction is regulated, supervised, and monitored for quality assurance

Definitions:
Safe school site selection regulation and guidance should include these considerations:
a) land use plans that incorporate information about known hazards (maps)
b) planning guidelines include physical planning (safe building arrangement on site), infrastructure availability, safe access and egress, and mitigation of residual site hazards.
c) procedures for approval of school site selection
d) when and how to engage in site investigation.

Safe school design regulation and guidance should include all of these considerations
a) Hazard maps are accessible and utilized
b) Guidelines/code provisions are published, accessible, applicable to wide range of contexts, and updated at least once every 5 years.

c) Code requirements for schools are higher than residential standards for load requirements, and safety factors (normally 1.5x)
d) Guidelines/code provisions include: ventilation, disability access, egress, fire safety, water and sanitation, and known hazards
e) Schools are required to be designed according to code/guidelines
f) School designs are provided by trained/certified/registered engineers and architects.
g) School designs are approved by technically qualified specialists prior to construction.

Safe school construction practice regulation and guidance should include all of these elements:
a) policy and process for inspection and quality assurance at key points during construction and prior to occupancy.
b) supervision by qualified/certified site supervisor
c) construction records (as-built drawings and photos) are maintained in education sector records

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=20% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#B2: Safe school site selection, design and construction are monitored for compliance/enforcement by appropriate authorities

and % of new school construction that is monitored for compliance with
a) safe site selection
b) safe school design
c) safe school construction

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4 Pillar 1

Definitions

Measure: Number and Percentage of new schools built with a disaster resilient location, design, and construction
Denominators: Number of new schools / classrooms built

Targets: % of new schools have mechanisms in place for safety compliance
Rating:
1= Not at all achieved: unknown or <50%
2= Partially achieved: 50-90%
3=Achieved: 90% +
4=Exceeds expectations 100%

Global targets: Percentage of countries achieving standard:
2016=baseline 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

Target: Existing schools are being systematically made safer

#B.3. A systematic plan for assessment and prioritization for retrofit and replacement of unsafe schools has been developed, and is being implemented.
a) estimated % of school stock that has been inventoried
b) estimated % of school stock covered by the risk assessment process.
c) # and % of unsafe school buildings have been identified.

Definitions:
A systematic plan for assessment and prioritization for retrofit and replacement involves:

a) education sector maintains a digital (ideally geo-spatial) inventory of all public and private learning facilities containing basic information about location, building typologies, # students, year of construction
b) national and sub-national hazard maps are used to identify exposure to specific hazards, based on location
c) basic information about inventory and hazard information is used for desk review for first stage in triage system
d) school-based self-assessment using standard tools provides hazard, risk and capacity information at the school site level, to triage for referral for technical assessment
e) site based light technical assessments are conducted to determine recommendation for retrofit, replacement, or repair, and/or referral for in-depth technical validation.

A prioritization plan involves:
a) Decisions are made regarding the appropriate intervention for safety for each unsafe school:
- Replace (new construction in same location)
- Relocate (new construction in new location)
- Retrofit
- Rehabilitation and/or Repair

Inventoried means that all public and private learning facilities have provided basic information about school location, number of functional buildings and classrooms, maximum student capacity, and for each building: year of construction, building typology, number of stories.

Denominators: Total number of public and private schools at pre-school, primary school, and secondary school levels. Total number of schools inventoried. Total number of schools whose risks have been assessed with reference to national or sub-national risk maps. Total number of schools whose risks have been assessed using school-based assessment, and number referred for light technical assessment. Total number of schools assessed by light technical assessment.

#B.4 The prioritization plan for upgrading of existing unsafe schools is being resourced and implmented.

a) construction capacity, systems for monitoring and quality assurance and financial resources are allocated for completion of needed upgrading within a 20-year time-period.
b) # and % of unsafe school buildings upgraded each year.

Relevant to Goal #s: 1 Pillar 1

Definitions:
Upgrading includes replacement, retrofit, rehabilitation, or repair to improve safety, and safeguard education sector investments.
Construction capacity includes skills and competencies in the construction trades for understanding and applying safe design and detailing practices required, and supervising and guiding safe construction.
Systems for monitoring and quality assurance include both process and outcomes.
Financial resources allocated involves estimation of budget and identification of funding sources and commitment of government and/or donor funds to implement replacement, retrofit rehabilitation and repair activities.

Denominators: All existing schools. All existing schools identified as potentially unsafe and in need of

Rating:
1= Not at all achieved: No systematic school safety assessment, retrofit or replacement is underway.
2= Partially achieved: Plan is in underway for safety assessment of schools.
3=Achieved: All schools have been assessed and plan has been financed and is being implemented to retrofit or replace unsafe schools.
4=Exceeds expectations: Plan has been implemented and all unsafe schools have been retrofitted or replaced.

Global Targets: % countries achieving goal:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#B5 Education authorities promote routine maintenance and non-structural mitigation for increased safety and protection of investments in public schools.
a) Education authorities provide guidance and skill-training for routine maintenance and for needed non-structural mitigation measures to reduce risks in all schools.
b) Roles and responsibilities for maintenance and non-structural mitigation are defined, documented and assigned.
c) Education authorities have identified budget for routine and deferred maintenance of school facilities for safety and to protect investments, with transparent monitoring oversight at the school level.

Relevant to Goal #s: 1, 2, 3, 4 Pillar 1

Definitions
Guidance for daily, weekly, monthly, seasonal, and annual maintenance is provided appropriate to new school construction, existing school construction. Processes or mechanisms are provided to cover these costs with local budget, deferred maintenance budget, and/or requests to access support for larger projects.

Rating:
1= Not at all achieved
2= Partially achieved
3=Achieved
4=Exceeds expectations

Global Targets: % countries achieving goal:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#B6: Planning is undertaken for limited use of schools as temporary shelters or collective centers.
a) Disaster management and education authorities have identified those schools that are expected to be use as temporary evacuation centers for disasters with early warning, and as temporary collective centers or shelters in the event of major hazard impact.
b) Planning, support and capacity development are being provided at sub-national level to meet these needs.

Relevant to Goal #s: 2, 3, 4 Pillars 1, 2

Definitions

Rating:
1= Not at all achieved: Neither measure has been achieved
2= Partially achieved: One measure has been achieved, but not the other
3=Achieved: Both measures have been implemented
4=Exceeds expectations: School losses from use as shelters has been measured and minimized.

Global Targets: % countries achieving goal:
2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

C: PILLAR 2: *SCHOOL DISASTER MANAGEMENT*

(aggregated from school level data)

#C1: Education authorities have national and sub-national plans for education sector risk reduction and management, with focus on safety and security, educational continuity, and protection of education sector investments
a) National and sub-national plans are publicly available and are reviewed annually.
b) Plans include risk assessment, risk reduction, response preparedness, and educational continuity
c) Planing processess include inputs from children and youth [ ] yes [ ] no

Goals: 1, 2, 3, 4 Pillar 2 Definition Global Targets: 2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#C2: Schools annually review school disaster risk reduction and management measures (eg. as part of school-based management and/or school improvement).
a) Education authorities provide common approach and guidance policies and procedures for all key elements of risk reduction, response and recovery
b) Total number and % of schools that have review school safety measures during the last academic year.
c) Students participate in these reviews [ ] yes [ ] no

Goal: 1 & 2 Pillar 2 Definitions: Key elements includes risk assessment, risk reduction, early warning, response preparedness (including skills and competencies for standard operating procedures (list) for rapid onset events and post-disaster division of labor and educational continuity planning. Global Targets: 2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#C3: Education authority has established and guides a full simulation drill, held annually, at all levels, to practice response preparedness and to review rrm plans.
a) % of schools participating
b) % of admin levels participating
c) Students participate in planning and review [ ] yes [ ] no

Goal: 1 & 2 Pillar 2 Definitions: Drills should include public and private schools, pre-school through secondary education. Outreach to include parents, after-school programs. Full simulation drill refers to a drill for specific hazards faced. Simulation refers to.... Practice includes standard operating procedures building evacuation, safe school assembly .... It includes practicing post-disaster functional division of labor appropriate to school implementation, including eg. ... Where possible school-based drills are linked to national, sub-national and community based drills.

All levels = national, sub-national, school levels

#C4: Education authority has needs assessment, strategy, and implementation plan to develop staff capacity for participation in school based disaster risk reduction and management, at necessary scale.
a) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in DRRM through pre-service training programs
b) Number and percentage of new staff trained through induction training programs
c) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in DRRM through in-service training programs.
d) Number and percentage of individuals trained through on-site, and computer-aided instruction
e) Students participate in needs assessment and planning

Goal: 1, 2, 4 Pillar 2, 3

Definitions

Denominators:
Number of individuals graduating from pre-service education traning programs
Number of new staff.
Number of teachers, staff, administrators

D: PILLAR 3: *RISK REDUCTION AND RESILIENCE EDUCATION*

#D1: National Disaster Management Authority and Education authority have nationally adopted, consensus- and evidence based, action-oriented key messages for risk reduction and resilience as foundation for formal and non-formal education.
a) Set of consensus-based and evidence-based action-oriented key messages for household risk reduction has been adopted as foundation for public education

Goals: 1,2,3, 4 Pillar 3

Measure: Yes/No

Global Targets 2016=25% 2021=75% 2026=100%

#D2: Education authority has infused climate-aware risk reduction and resilience education into regular curriculum.
a) Consensus based action-oriented key messages are used as a foundation for formal and non-formal education.
b) A full set of skills and competencies for risk reduction and resilience have been adopted at national level.

c) Number and % of schools that have included disaster risk reduction and management into formal and non-formal education in the last academic year.
d) Skills and competencies of students are assessed through measurable learning and RR outcomes

Goals: 3 Pillar 3 Global Targets: 2021=25% 2026=75% 2030=100% Definitions: DRRM learning objectives (See http://www.tge.ca/DRR/ lists learning outcomes classified by knowledge , skills competencies and dispositions) Denominators: Total number of schools.

#D3: Schools convey risk reduction and resilience education through non-formal education through participation in school disaster management, and through afterschool clubs, assemblies and extra-curricular activities.
a) Student participatory activities for engagement in household, school, and community risk reduction are available at school level
b) Student participatory activities for engagement in household, school, and community risk reduction are utilized at school level through formal and non-formal education.

Goals: 4 Pillar 3 Measure the availability, use, and quality of guidance materials and activities for non-formal education. Measure students knowledge, skills and competencies in disaster risk reduction. Yes/No % of schools Global Targets: 2016=25% 2021=50% 2026=75% 2030=100%

#D4: Education authority has needs assessment, strategy, and implementation plan to develop teachers capacity for teaching risk reduction and resilience education
a) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in RRR Ed through pre-service training programs
b) Number and percentage of new staff trained through induction training programs
c) Number and percentage of individuals accredited in RRR Ed through in-service training programs
d) Number and percentage of individuals trained through on-site, and computer-aided instruction
e) Number of pre-service RRR Ed/CSS training programs developed at tertiary level.

Goal: 1, 2, 4 Pillar 2, 3 Definitions Denominators: Number of individuals graduating from pre-service education traning programs Number of new staff.

Number of teachers, staff, administrators

#D5: Country has quality and quantity of RRR Education materials for implementation of risk reduction and resilience education at scale.

a) Quality criteria for development and review of RRR educational materials
b) Inventory of number and grade levels of educational materials meeting criteria and demonsrate effectiveness in RR&R outcomes
c) Quality educational materials are available and utilized at school level.

Goal: 2, 4 Pillar 2, 3 Definitions Denominators: Range of educational materials available at all grade levels in carrier subject areas.

#D6: Monitoring and Evaluation

a) Monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness is RRR educational programs is carried out in terms of student learning outcomes and RR&R outcomes.
b) Monitoring and evaluation of implementation is carried out to assess scaled,sustainable implementation

Goal: 2, 4 Pillar 3 Definitions: Measures of learning outcomes Denominators:

Global Alliance for
Disaster Risk Reduction & Resilience
in the Education Sector

CSS Targets and Indicators Development – Concept Note for Phase Two

Background

The Comprehensive School Safety Framework was developed consistent with the global consensus around the Hyogo Framework for Action, millennium development goals, and education for sustainable development and children's rights. Comprehensive school safety is addressed by education policy and practices aligned with disaster management national, regional, district, and local school site levels. Multi-hazard child-centered risk assessment is considered the foundation for planning for Comprehensive School Safety. Ideally, this information should be part of Educational Management Information Systems at national, subnational, and local levels to provide the evidence base for planning and action.

The CSS Framework focuses on three intersecting pillars of activity:
1. Safe Learning Facilities (This involves education authorities, planners, architects, engineers, builders, and school community members in safe site selection, design, construction and maintenance (including safe and continuous access to the facility).
2. School Disaster Management (This is established via national and sub-national education authorities and local school communities (including children and parents/guardians), working in collaboration with their disaster management counterparts at each jurisdiction, in order to maintain safe learning environments and plan for educational continuity, conforming to international standards).
3. Risk Reduction and Resilience Education (This includes formal and non-formal education designed to develop a culture of safety, and resilient communities).

The Comprehensive School Safety Framework was proposed by the Asian Coalition for School Safety to the 5th Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR) in October 2012, as the common foundation for its disaster risk reduction work in the education sector. The Framework was endorsed by Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) in November 2012. In May 2013 the Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector adopted the Comprehensive School Safety Framework as the foundation for joint work in promoting school safety as a priority area of post-2015 frameworks for sustainable development, risk reduction and resilience.

In October 2014 at the founding meeting of the Worldwide Initiative for Safe Schools (W.I.S.S.) the CSS framework was recognized as providing a common approachfor the purposes of developing a set of global targets and indicators for school safety. The World Bank Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) Global Program for Safer Schools has expressed its commitment to establishing an open source collaboration platform to share monitoring information on the three pillars of school safety, globally.

The Purpose and Needs for Targets and Indicators

The GADRRRES, SEAMEO, GFDRR and WISS have all expressed the need for CSS Targets and Indicators in order to challenge, monitor, and evaluate country progress towards school safety, and to incorporate risk reduction planning into education sector strategies and plans.

The purpose of such indicators are to:

- Strengthen implementation of CSS Framework with observable targets
- Measure progress towards goals.
- Support National/Sub-national policy and capacity-building
- Support School-based operationalization

The CSS Framework Hierarchy of Targets and Indicators has as its foundation universal child rights to safety and survival, a free quality basic education, and child participation.

The primary goals of the CSS Framework Hierarchy of Targets and Indicators is to:

- Prevent deaths and injuries in schools
- Ensure educational continuity

The secondary goals of the CSS Framework Hierarchy of Targets and Indicators is to:

- Safeguard education sector investments
- Build a culture of safety and resilience

Approach and Progress

The GADRRRES established an Ad Hoc Working Group on Targets and Indicators in March, 2014, comprised of representatives of UNESCO, UNICEF, Save the Children, Plan International, World Vision, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), and the Interagency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE).

A list of experts was invited to be involved in the development of preliminary targets and indicators. Desk review of previous work on CSS Targets and Indicators (See Addendum: References) was compiled. UNESCO UIS has provided guidance and expertise in the development of education sector targets and indicators. With access to these resources, the reference group provided inputs via two workshops (See Addendum: CSS Targets & Indicators Preliminary Reference Group).

GADRRRES has drafted the attached preliminary set of Targets and Indicators in preparation for the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. It is recommended that a gap analysis be undertaken to check whether there are any areas that have been overlooked in developing this initial set of indicators.

It is intended that these serve as a starting point for consultations regionally and globally, to engage W.I.S.S. members and other national education authorities colleagues in this process.

The current shared approach and understanding are that:
• Global targets and indicators should be established in order for countries to be able to measure a baseline and monitor subsequent progress towards school safety and to allow for comparability across countries.
• There should be no more than 20 national-level indicators, covering enabling policy, and each of the three pillars. This is based on previous experience of promoting Education for

All, and the practical limits of what can be understood and incorporated by national education authorities.
• Each national level indicator should be supported by guidance as to purpose, data sources, computation and analysis, and discussion of limitations.
• The structure of the indicators should be cascading in order to link national level targets with sub-national and school-based targets. The specific indicators to be gathered at national, sub-national and local level will be quite different, However many can be aggregated from school to sub-national, and from sub-national to national level.
• Implementation targets should be aggregated and reported at sub-national level
• Indicators should be evidence-based, rather than subjectively self-assessed.
• There is need for data collection tools for school-based self-assessment for all three pillars, and there is also need for targeted expert assessment of selected schools.
• School-based data collection tools, need to be adapted and localized at the national level. For example, specific measures of structural safety will depend on construction type, specific measures of school disaster management will depend on integration with existing school-based management and community-based disaster risk reduction and management mechanisms, and specific measures of risk reduction knowledge and action will depend on specific risk profiles, early warning systems, curriculum adoption cycles, pre-service and in-service training mechanisms, and partnerships in non-formal education).
• Pre-disaster facilities assessment should serve as baseline, so that same or slightly adapted tools can be used for post-disaster damage assessment

Recommendations:
The following recommendations are proposed:

1. To Produce and Validate, and implement Comprehensive School Safety Assessment Technical Guidelines by December 2016.

Global activities: In order to produce and validate CSS Assessment Technical Guidelines, the first step, drawing upon an initial reference group assembled by the GADRRRES, has been the development of preliminary draft of targets and indicators.

The next step will be to identify the widest reference group of national DRRM focal points from education authorities. In addition WISS countries will be asked to provide experts with bilingual English or Spanish language skills from planning and finance departments, EMIS, statistical analysis, school inspection, and a number of education sector administrators who are champions of risk reduction.

Using the *Education for All the Year 2000 Assessment Technical Guidelines* as a model, guidelines should include national/sub-national and top-line school-based indicators and should elaborate guidance for each, including:

- Definition and Purpose
- Data Sources, Quality Standards and Calculations Methods
- Interpretation
- Limitations
- Illustrative data sheets, questions and prompts

A Glossary and User Guide with excel worksheets, templates and examples for submission of data should also be included.

It is recommended that a draft document providing Technical Guidance for CSS Assessment should be developed by the end of 2015, through global and regional consultative processes and validated and revised over the course of 2016.

The recent experience of UNESCO in implementing a pilot of Self-Monitoring and Reporting on Education Policies and Plans for Conflict and Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development in nine Asian countries, demonstrates that whilst subjective self-assessment at the national level is no substitute for quantitative data collection at the school level, the consultative process itself is extremely important for motivating and engaging national level education sector actors. Pilot data collection is recommended to be able to understand the availability of data, variation in metrics in order to decide whether normalization is required, and whether the results will be aggreated to make it more accessible to a wider audience.

It is therefore of utmost importance that the development of this guidance be informed through the engagement of experts from within national education authorities, designated by WISS member countries. Linkages are also recommended with World Education Forum and Global Partnership for Education.

Sub-regional activities: It is recommended that sub-regional education sector organizations be approached or activated to bring together representatives of education authorities in the region. Organizing a one or two-day consultation, or shorter sessions in association with other planned meetings of education sector experts would be an efficient way to engage these organizations. This can include organizations such as the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Association, UNESCO regional offices. It may also extend to other organizations such as UNESCO Associated Schools.

National/sub-national level activities: It is also suggested that education authorities in W.I.S.S. member host a country level consultation, bringing together relevant representatives including risk reduction and resilience focal point, planning and finance departments, EMIS, statistical analysis, school inspection, and heads of major divisions including pre-school, primary school, and secondary education, facilities and maintenance, administration, and curriculum, along with representatives of international and national civil society organizations advocating for school safety, for discussions and feedback on CSS indicators.

2. To Develop, Link, and Test School-Level Assessment Tools
Establishing the empirical basis for evaluation of school safety requires tools for assessment of indicators, at the school level. Development of *CSS School-based Assessment Suite,* based on standard and adaptable electronic templates, is being undertaken through collaboration of GADRRRES partners. This is planned to include three mobile application modules that education authorities and their partners may use to collect and analyze data for planning and decision-making. These tools are being designed for measurement across key areas identified by CSS Targets and Indicators. They will be used to generate analytic reports to support prioritization of recommended actions at school level,

as well as retrofit and replacement. As such they will contribute to monitoring, evaluation and learning, as well as to awareness and empowerment.

The *suite* in development includes:
i) *School Safety: First Step,* is a social app that will permit collection of crowd-sourced observations from students and adults in the school community. It can both raise awareness, and suggest and stimulate next steps.
ii) *CSS School Self-Assessment Survey*, a tablet-based app to collect school-base self-assessment data by school-based management groups, school heads, and visiting education sector assessors, including photos of structural conditions. This tool will generate a report for use by schools themselves, as well as data for analysis and planning by education authorities. The risk and facilities data will be used to triage and select those schools that should be prioritized for VISUS CSS assessment, to their location, hazard profile and structural vulnerabilities.
iii) *VISUS CSS (Visual Inventory for Surveying and Upgrading Safety)* is a technical tool for multi-hazard safety assessment of school facilities (Pillar 1), to be used at higher-risk schools, by trained engineering and construction professionals. This tool is linked with available risk maps and risk information associated with various school construction types.

The testing of this 'bottom-up' approach at the school level in the course of 2015 and 2016 will help to link and ground-truth objective measures to reach national targets. In the future this data can feed directly into national Education Management Information Systems.

Later technical tools are also envisioned for sampling of school-based implementation of disaster risk reduction and management (Pillar 2), and risk reduction and resilience skills and competencies (Pillar 3).

Next Steps:
The following next steps are proposed:

1. Expand the expert reference group to include staff and other experts recommended by WISS founding members.

2. Request donor support and IGO and INGO commitments to engage consultant(s) to coordinate and support global and sub-regional consultations, and to lead the development of the CSS Indicators Technical Guidance Document.

3. Coordinate inputs from sub-regional consultations for input and feedback to develop, refine and complete the CSS Indicators Technical Guidance Document by December, 2015.

4. Engage and support W.I.S.S. member countries in validating and completing the CSS Indicators baseline assessment, and completing a final revision of CSS Indicators Technical Guidance Document by December, 2016.

Work Plan - 2015:
The following are recommended activities and time frames:

	Notes	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	2016
Presentation of preliminary draft at WISS launch	UNISDR / WISS											
Reference group reviews of indicators (pillar-wise)	WISS / GADRRRES GFDRR											
ASEAN, SARCC, and Pacific Consultations	APCSS partners											
Other sub-regional consultations	TBD Jul-Sept:											
Draft *Technical Guidelines for CSS T&I produced*	WISS / GADRRRES / GFDRR											
ASSI VISUS CSS+ Review	UNESCO / ASSI / SC											
Harmonization of VISUS CSS+ Tools	UNESCO / GFDRR / SC											
Integration into GFDRR SS Portal	WISS / GADRRRES / Crowd											
Baseline assessment and reporting	WISS											
Feedback and finalization of Technical Guidelines	WISS / GADRRRES / GFDRR											

Addendum: References

	Enabling Policy	Pillar 1	Pillar 2	Pillar 3	Other
ASSI (2014). Comprehensive School Safety in ASEAN Region: Current Status and Road Ahead, Technical Report.	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Children in a Changing Climate Coalition (2014). Targets	✔				General: schools should be safe and continuous
GADRRRES (2014). Comprehensive School Safety Framework, HFA Indicators adapted for the Education Sector	✔	✔	✔	✔	HFA - 5 Priorities
Arup for GFDRR (2013). Assessment & Delivery of Safe Schools		✔			location, construction, operation
Grimaz et. al. (2014). VISUS Tool		✔			
Risk RED (2012). School Disaster Readiness and Resilience Checklist		✔	✔		School level non-technical
Save the Children (2013). Quality Learning Environment - Basic Education Indicators (SCI/UNICEF)	✔	✔	✔	✔	Most are in "exceeds expectations" category
Save the Children (2014). School-based Quick Self-Assessment Tools		✔	✔	✔	School level non-technical
UNESCO et. al. (2015). VISUS CSS+ Tools		✔	✔	✔	School level only
UNESCO (2014). Self-Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on Education Policies and Plans for Conflict and Disaster Risk Reduction for Sustainable Development	✔	✔	✔	✔	Subjective self-assessment at national level
UNESCO IS (2009). Education Indicators Technical Guidelines	✔				
UNICEF (2010). Asia-Pacific Capacity Development Strategy for the Education Cluster/Sector for Emergency Preparedness and Response			✔		Capacity-indicators and mapping approach and tools
UNICEF (2011). DRR in EiE: A guidance note for education clusters and sector coordination groups					Guidance is for IGOs and INGOs advocacy
UNICEF/CADRI (2014) Education module capacity assessment questions	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Save the Children (2014). CSS Indicators at National/Subnational/Local levels (unpub.)		✔	✔	✔	
UNISDR (2012). Assessing School Safety from Disasters – A Global Baseline Report	✔	✔	✔	✔	
UNISDR (2014). HFA2 Indicator Families and Priorities	✔				

Addendum: CSS Targets & Indicators Reference Group

Reference Group includes representatives from:
IGOs, INGOs, Government, Academic/Research, Private Sector & Others
Those listed have been part of consultations conducted through April, 2015.
Those highlighted have been suggested but have not yet been engaged in this review.

IGOs			Areas of Expertise							
Name	**Title**	**Organization**	**Targets & Indicators**	**Enabling Policy Environment**	**EMIS & geo-Informatics**	**Risk Assessment**	**Child Participation**	**Pillar 1 Safe School Facilities and Access**	**Pillar 2 School Disaster Management**	**Pillar 3 Risk Reduction and Resilience Education**
Alexandros Magarikakis	Program Specialist	UNESCO - ESGRR		✓						
Jair Torres	Consultant	UNESCO - ESGRR						✓		
Julia Heiss		UNESCO		✓						✓
Danny Padilla	ESD Progr Coordinator and Liaison Officer	UNESCO - Bangkok		✓						
Roshan Bajracharya	Programme Specialist	UNESCO UIS	✓							
Jayakumar Ramasamy	Programme Specialist & Chief – Nat Sciences	UNESCO - Bangkok		✓				✓		
Nyi Nyi Thaung		UNESCO	✓							
Lindsay Bird		UNESCO IIEP		✓						
Leonora MacEwen	Programme Specialist	UNESCO IIEP	✓	✓						
Antony Spalton		UNICEF								
Teji Vallindingham	Regional Ed Specialist, Emerg & Peacebuilding	UNICEF Bangkok EAPRO		✓		✓			✓	✓
Christel Rose		UNISDR		✓						
	(indicators expert)	UNISDR	✓							
Sanjaya Bhatia	Head of Office	UNISDR GETI		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Vica Bogaerts	Disaster Risk Management Specialist	WB-GFDRR				✓		✓		
John Crowley		WB-GFDRR			✓					
Iwan Gunawan	Sr. Disaster Risk Management Specialist	WB-Jakarta				✓		✓		

INGOs			Areas of Expertise							
Name	Title	Organization	Targets & Indicators	Enabling Policy Environment	EMIS & geo-Informatics	Risk Assessment	Child Participation	Pillar 1 Safe School Facilities and Access	Pillar 2 School Disaster Management	Pillar 3 Risk Reduction and Resilience Education
Nick Ireland	DRR/CCA Manager	Save the Children		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Marla Petal	Senior Advisor for Education and DRR	Save the Children		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lydia Baker		Save the Children		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Danielle Wade	DRR Senior Advisor	Save the Children		✓			✓		✓	✓
Nitika Tolani-Brown		Save the Children	✓							
Lydia Baker		Save the Children	✓	✓						
Michelle Young		Save the Children						✓		
Jeanne-Aimée DeMarais		Save the Children	✓	✓			✓		✓	
Marjorie Sotofranco		IFRC				✓				✓
Indira Kulenovic	Regional RR&R Coordinator	IFRC				✓				✓
Sanjeev Kafley	Regional DRR Advisor	IFRC				✓			✓	✓
Jacobo Ocharan		Plan International					✓			
Peuchenda Bun	Regional Safe Schools Program Coordinator	Plan International		✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Amit Kumar	Senior Programme Manager	AKDN						✓		
Ronilda Co		World Vision		✓						
Hadi Husani		AKDN								
Claudio Osorio	INEE Spanish Language Community Facilitator	INEE		✓					✓	
Manu Gupta	Executive Director	SEEDS of India		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Amod Dixit	Executive Director	NSET		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Surya Prasad Acharya	Director	NSET								
Surya Narayan Shrestha		NSET						✓		

Education Authorities & NDMOs			Areas of Expertise							
Name	Title	Organization	Targets & Indicators	Enabling Policy Environment	EMIS & geo-Informatics	Risk Assessment	Child Participation	Pillar 1 Safe School Facilities and Access	Pillar 2 School Disaster Management	Pillar 3 Risk Reduction and Resilience Education
Mariban Constantino Ariban		PHL DepEd		✓						
Dexter Pante	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, School Effectiveness Division	PHL DepEd	✓	✓			✓		✓	
ASec Ray Laguda		PHL DepEd		✓						
Daravonne Kitipanth	Head of Research and Executive Briefing Division	LAO MoES		✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Sithat Outhaithany	Head of Primary Education Division	LAO MoES		✓		✓	✓			
Jennifer Flores	Senior Associate, Instructional Design and Materials Development	SEAMEO-Innotech								
Madelein Sullivan		U.S. Department of Education								
Robert Spears	Office of Emergency Services (retired)	LAUSD USA FEMA		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jill Barnes	Office of Emergency Services	USA LAUSD		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Director	U.S. Department of Education, REMS TA Center						✓	✓	✓
WISS Focal Points									✓	
Planning & Analysis			✓							
Senior Mngmt FP				✓						
EMIS FP					✓					
NDMO						✓				
Afterschool and youth movements							✓			
School facilities experts								✓		
School-based management									✓	
Curriculum										✓

Academic/ Researchers / Consultants			Areas of Expertise							
Name	**Title**	**Organization**	**Targets & Indicators**	**Enabling Policy Environment**	**EMIS & geo-Informatics**	**Risk Assessment**	**Child Participation**	**Pillar 1 Safe School Facilities and Access**	**Pillar 2 School Disaster Management**	**Pillar 3 Risk Reduction and Resilience Education**
Rebekah Green	Assistant Professor	WWU (Risk RED)		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bishnu Pandey	Faculty	UBC (Risk RED)		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Stephano Grimaz	Director, Sprint Lab	University of Udine			✓	✓		✓		
Prof Edgar Armando Pena Figueroa	Director School of Engineering	University of El Salvador						✓		
Nadia Pulmano	DRR Mainstreaming Specialist	ADPC	✓	✓		✓				
Ilan Kelman	Reader	University College London (Risk RED)		✓		✓				
David Alexander		University College London								
Paul Myers		Independent					✓		✓	✓
David Selby		Sustainability Frontiers					✓			✓
Fumiyo Kagawa		Sustainability Frontiers					✓			✓
Suha Ulgen	Geo-informatics Specialist	Risk RED			✓	✓			✓	
Prof. Kevin Ronan	Professor in Psychology	Central Queensland University	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Briony Towers, Ph.D.		RMIT					✓			✓
Prof. Rajib Shaw	Associate Professor	Kyoto University, Graduate school of Global Environmental Studies	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Prof. Ben Wisner		UCL, Oberlin				✓	✓			✓
Dr. Bijan Khazai	Senior Research Scientist	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology				✓		✓		

Private Sector & Others				Areas of Expertise						
Name	Title	Organization	Targets & Indicators	Enabling Policy Environment	EMIS & geo-Informatics	Risk Assessment	Child Participation	Pillar 1 Safe School Facilities and Access	Pillar 2 School Disaster Management	Pillar 3 Risk Reduction and Resilience Education
Jo Da Silva	Director	Arup International Development	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	
Haley Gryc	Associate	Arup International Development	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	
Anup Karanth	Associate Director	Taru Leading Edge Pvt Ltd		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓