
Management and Advocacy, Kobe, (b) Training and Capacity Building, Turin, and (c) Enhancing Recovery Operations, Geneva.

As described in the Terms of Reference, the IRP Kobe functions as the IRP secretariat and is responsible for convening IRP steering committee meetings and disseminating information on IRP activities and outcomes.

- * IRP members: Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC), Hyogo Prefectural Government, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), International Labour Organization (ILO), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Cabinet Office of Japan, Swiss Agency for Development and Coordination (SDC), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), United Nations Secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN/OCHA), and the World Bank.

6-3. IRP Activities in FY 2009

6-3-1. International Recovery Forum 2010

On occasion of the 15th year commemoration of the Great Hanshin Awaji Earthquake, IRP organized the International Recovery Forum 2010, “From Resilient Recovery to Sustainable Development”, to revisit the progress of linking recovery operations with long-term community development. The presentations and discussions focused on the issue of recovery and sustainable development.



International Recovery Forum 2010

[Opening]

In the opening session, the Chair of the IRP Steering Committee, Mr. Saroj Kumar Jha of the World Bank and the Governor of Hyogo Prefecture Mr. Toshizo Ido emphasized importance of putting in place mechanisms for recovery and reconstruction as well as translating lessons on recovery into policies, tools, guidance, and programs. The recent earthquake that hit Haiti on 12th January was mentioned as a strong reminder of the need to learn from past lessons and experiences. In that context, the “building back better” approach and fostering international cooperation and partnership have been advocated as highly significant tasks for national governments and stakeholders.

[Recovery Status Reports]

The recovery status reports and video presentations shown at the Forum highlighted several challenges and lessons that are likely encountered at three different phases of recovery process.

As shown in the Special Report on L'Aquila Earthquake of 2009 in Italy and the Current Recovery Status Report from Sichuan Earthquake of 2008 in China, challenges in the early phase of recovery process often include reconstruction of buildings such as houses, cultural heritage structures, and public service institutions.



Mr. Guido Bertolaso, Head of Civil Protection, Italy

The recovery status report from Yogyakarta Earthquake of 2006 in Indonesia showed cases of challenges and lessons in the mid-term phase of the recovery process. While there was a challenge of effectively managing recovery operations, the role played by universities in facilitating community-based approaches has greatly contributed to better recovery.

The report of Bam Earthquake of 2003 in Iran showed that livelihood and governance are among the common underlying issues in the long-term phase of recovery process. Some of these issues were addressed through the reconstruction policies. Strong collaboration between government and people created synergies that facilitated long-term recovery.

Together with recovery lessons from the Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake of 1995, which has entered into the sustainable recovery phase, the discussions point to the need to synthesize the lessons and challenges from different phases of recovery to attain a holistic perspective of recovery. Lessons from each recovery phase are deemed invaluable to inform the development of “Guidelines for Recovery” that IRP has been initiating and will be used by national governments to ensure a “build back better” approach.

[Panel Discussion]

During the panel discussion, the representatives from ADRC, the Government of Pakistan, and IFRC provided substantive insights into the recovery processes from different perspectives. The following conclusions came from the discussion:

Firstly, access to basic needs has to be integrated and addressed in the recovery process. Secondly, lessons from disaster recovery can be utilized in other contexts, such as the case of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Pakistan. Thirdly, there are issues and gaps in funding, knowledge, and organizational coordination in recovery operations. These issues constitute both a challenge as well as opportunities for better recovery.

[Conclusion]

On the basis of these insights, the following key messages emerged -

IRP Secretariat shall synthesize lessons from different phases of recovery processes to gain better understanding on how to attain holistic and sustainable recovery. IRP shall further strengthen the dissemination of lessons and good practices as well as capacity building for better recovery.

National governments should document recovery operations, identify what processes worked and did not work, and determine the conditions that facilitate the recovery process to work. These documentations shall be shared with other governments as well as among stakeholders, through IRP and other platforms.

IRP Community of Practice shall continue bridging the link between recovery processes and sustainable development. This includes consideration of access to housing and livelihood to meet basic needs.

These recommendations from participants of the Forum are expected to enhance the partnership and ownership of the IRP, encouraging more active involvement of developing countries and other partners in recovery. At the same time, IRP is expected to become more responsive to the needs of the national governments, by offering more services through knowledge sharing for build back better.

6-3-2. IRP special event in The Second Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction

The Second Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction was held in Geneva, Switzerland on 15-19 June 2009.

The IRP special event, whose theme was “Integrating Social, Economic, and Environmental Concerns in Post-Disaster Recovery,” took place on 17 June. More than 70 delegates attended the event, where they heard discussions of effective mechanisms for more coherent and holistic approaches to recovery. H.E. Mr. Masayoshi Namiki, Vice Minister for Disaster Management, Cabinet Office of Japan, together with Mr. Alfred Lazarte-Hoyle, Chair of the IRP Steering Committee, led the opening session. Two special reports on recent disasters were presented. Mr. Bertolaso, Head of Civil Protection for the Italian government discussed “Recovery Status Report on the Italian Earthquake of April 2009.” Prof. Kenji Okazaki of the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies of Japan discussed “Current Knowledge and Practices for Disaster Reduction and Recovery.” After these special reports, a technical forum on Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) was held. The forum featured presentations on the concept and practical aspects of PDNA. To highlight environmentally sound recovery, Dr. Nizar Mohamed, UNEP Consultant, presented “Environmental Perspective in Recovery: Experience from Cyclone Nargis.” Mr. Alfredo Lazarte-Hoyle presented “Recommendations from the International Recovery Forum 2009” whose theme was “building back better and greener.” Mr. Praveen Pardeshi of UN/ISDR, who facilitated this special event, presented two major points during his wrap up.

First, he identified the need to make recovery tools more adaptive, thereby suggesting that PDNA has to integrate other important elements to make it more holistic. Second, he identified the need to utilize and improve existing mechanisms to address some of the known gaps. For example, stakeholders can access standby funds (e.g. GFDRR of the World Bank) to support recovery processes and initiatives whose goal is to link recovery tools to disaster risk reduction efforts. The event was formally closed by Mr. Naoto Tajiri, Director of the Cabinet Office of Japan and Vice-Chairman of the IRP Steering Committee.

6-3-3. IRP Regional Workshop in Yogyakarta

IRP, ADRC, and the Department of Architecture and Planning of Gadjah Mada University

(DAP/UGM) organized the IRP Regional Workshop “Action by Stakeholders for Effective Management of Post-Disaster Recovery” from 3-5 November 2009 at Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

The Workshop was aimed at disseminating recovery lessons drawn from the Yogyakarta 2006 earthquake to help enhance recovery operations across Southeast Asia. Around 200 participants comprising policymakers, practitioners, and academics from ASEAN region and Japan attended the workshop. The workshop facilitated the identification of constraints and gaps in recovery operations and explored specific measures to address them in a more collaborative approach.

[Day 1]

The first day of the workshop was held on 4th November. Technical presentations concerning disaster reduction and recovery were presented by Dr. German Velasquez (UNISDR) and Mr. Ahmad Zaki Fahmi (WB). The session was followed by Ms. Adelina Kamal, who presented the vision of the ASEAN Post-Disaster Recovery. The afternoon sessions highlighted the *collaborative study* conducted by IRP Secretariat, ADRC, and Gadjah Mada University. In the succeeding session, country presentations from the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam provided the opportunity to compare recovery lessons and experiences.



IRP Regional Workshop in Yogyakarta

[Day 2]

On the second day of the workshop, parallel thematic sessions on shelter, livelihood, environment, governance, and gender were held. In the presentation of thematic outputs, the actions for “Effective Management of Post-Disaster Recovery” were suggested. A panel discussion dealing with the gaps in recovery operations in ASEAN countries took place in the afternoon. It was chaired by Dr. Iwan Gunawan (WB) with all thematic session chairs acting as panelists.

[Conclusion]

The Workshop concluded with a clear and simple message. Recovery phase may offer an opportunity to further reduce risk and make communities more resilient to future disasters if necessary measures are incorporated into post-recovery operations. In Southeast Asia, solutions exist. The challenge is to put these solutions into action through collaborative working.

6-3-4. Developing Guidance Notes on Recovery

IRP is developing Guidance Notes on a variety of areas of Recovery, to be used by national governments to ensure building back better. There is a gap in knowledge on recovery. There is an abundance of documents, plans and policies addressing the preparedness phase of disasters. However, no significant systematic post disasters study has been undertaken with a focus on

the long-term, sustainable community recovery and rebuilding needs of the thematic areas such as shelter, environment, livelihoods and so forth. Deficiency in material available on recovery is felt. Guidelines currently available focus on mitigation and DRR. Guidance notes focused on recovery are not available. While it is conceded that preventive measures are vital, in the ex post situation availability of knowledge products reflecting best practices and lessons learned is critical for effective and sustainable recovery. Such knowledge products are currently unavailable.

IRP is developing the sector specific recovery tools and guidance notes, drawing upon substantial experience of IRP partners and the recovery community. The guidance notes have an emphasis on lessons learned and good practices from global recovery operations. The development of guidance notes will be for the following sectors:

- Shelter • Livelihood • Environment • Gender • Public infrastructure
- Governance • Health • Psycho-social aspects • Climate Change Adaptation