
UNDP also has the overall lead agency co-ordination responsibility for the IRP. This will involve co-ordination of relevant agencies in the production of outputs of the workplans.

IRP Kobe bears the IRP Secretariat function, located on the 5th floor of the Disaster Reduction and Human Renovation Institution (DRI) Building. It has a Programme Advisor from UNDP, a Programme Analyst from UNDP/ISDR, a Recovery Expert from ADRC, a researcher and assistant staff from ADRC. IRP Kobe is responsible for the secretariat of the IRP Steering Committee, which was held twice in 2006 in Tokyo and Turin. The Chairperson of the IRP SC is from UNDP (Mr. Andrew Maskrey) and the Vice Chairperson is from the Cabinet Office of Japan (Mr. Satoru Nishikawa) with the duration of 1 year.

6-3. Activities of IRP in 2006

6-3-1. The 3rd Public Symposium on Post Disaster Recovery - Progress towards Hyogo Framework for Action -

On the occasion of the 1st anniversary of its establishment, a Public Symposium on Post Disaster Recovery will be held. The Symposium introduced the IRP activities carried out, and discuss the IRP towards the implementation of HFA.

- O Date: May 30, 2006, 13:30 - 16:30
- O Venue: Lasse Hall (4-10-8 Nakayamate-dori Chuo-ku, Kobe, Japan)
- O Organizers: IRP Secretariat, Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC),
Cabinet Office of Japan, Hyogo Prefectural Government
- O In cooperation with: Disaster Reduction Alliance (DRA)

Programme and Summary:

- (1) **Opening** Mr. Tomio Saito, Vice Governor, Hyogo Prefectural Government, Japan
Mr. Fumio Takeda, Deputy Director General for Disaster Management, Cabinet Office of Japan

Mr. Salvano Briceno, Director, United Nations Inter-Agency Secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN/ISDR)

- (2) **Keynote** Speech Mr. Andrew Maskrey, Chief, Disaster Reduction Unit, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) , UNDP

Mr. Andrew Maskrey highlighted the existence of Risk accumulation in disaster-prone countries, through building techniques, building areas, inappropriate agriculture practice, etc. He stated that facing the reality of risk, there is a need to transform the way to do Development. In his opinion, in case disaster strikes, if people are not prepared to conduct Development that targets the reduction of risk, the same risk accumulation before disaster will be reproduced.

Mr. Andrew Maskrey reminded that to understand IRP, there is a need to understand Recovery which has to be the process of transformation of risk and not simply a physical rebuilding or simply humanitarian assistance. He suggested that IRP's role is to find and generate the imperative to transform risks and recovery.

Finally, Mr. Andrew Maskrey reminded the keys and interconnected tasks to achieve, including the need to spread knowledge on the standing of what recovery is, the need to teach recovery to all levels, and finally the transformation itself based on a coherent set of global international tool.

(3) Presentations

- 1) Book Project for Recovery Support: Mr. Soheli Khan, Programme Analyst, IRP Kobe
- 2) Early Recovery Activities in the Philippines and Pakistan:

Mr. Puji Pujiono, Regional Disaster Response Advisor, UN/OCHA Kobe
<pre-recorded video>

Mr. Masahiko Murata, Recovery Expert, IRP Kobe

- 3) Capacity Building and Training:

Mr. Alfredo Lazarte Hoyle, Director, InFocus Programme on Crisis Response and Reconstruction, International Labour Organization (ILO)

<pre-recorded video>

4) Needs Assessment Methodology:

Mr. Praveen Pardeshi, Senior Adviser, UN/ISDR

(4) Panel Discussion

Coordinator: Mr. Anil K. Sinha, Programme Advisor, IRP Kobe

Panellist: Mr. Salvano Briceno, Director, UN/ISDR

Mr. Andrew Maskrey, Chief, BCPR/UNDP

Mr. Satoru Nishikawa, Director for Disaster Preparedness, Public Relations and International Cooperation, Cabinet Office of Japan

Concluding remarks by the Coordinator

The coordinator concluded that there has been better clarity about the “clientele”, with the questions: “what are we doing for, whom are we doing for?” He listed the national government, local players, key organizations at the local and international levels, and the public as the first respondents. He also mentioned that the community is the first and the last respondents in case of disasters.

The coordinator reminded how difficult the recovery process can be; and he illustrated this with the statement of the Governor of Hyogo Prefecture in previous Symposium wondering whether the recovery after the Great Hanshin Earthquake is still complete. Mr. Sinha continued his statement by showing that recovery is a big challenge; and perhaps the biggest challenge in the whole story of disaster management; explaining the importance to understand “who is the clientele? Whom we are working for?”. According to the coordinator, these questions will help each actor to become sharper in terms of definitions of its roles. He also mentioned the contributions to help politicians, at all levels, for a better result.

The coordination role of the Secretariat has been mentioned, whether to go in front or stay behind. For this, the coordinator stated that one way to look at it is to go and get to the operations to raise the awareness of the recovery. Another way is to go there right from the beginning and seek from the local government their need in terms of recovery and not in terms of humanitarian actions.

The major advocacy efforts about political visibility have been reminded. This constitutes an important mandate to make recovery and IRP the main ambassador of the World Conference, HFA, ISDR System to make it a household name.

Finally, the coordinator explained briefly the importance of the suggestions from the panel members, listing the networking and the need to work together guaranteed by trust, the capacity building for 15 to 20 countries, the concept of “rebuilding for the better” and finally the “best-fit” scenario.

The coordinator ended his concluding remarks by thanking the panel members as well as the audience.

(5) Closing Mr. Koji Suzuki, Executive Director, ADRC

6-3-2. The International Forum on Tsunami and Earthquake <January 15-16, 2007>

6-3-2-1. International Symposium <January 15, 2007>

Welcome Remarks

- Mr. Kensei Mizote, Minister of State, Disaster Management, Japan
- Mr. Takeshi Iwaya, Senior Vice-Minister, Foreign Affairs, Japan
- Mr. Toshizo Ido, Governor, Hyogo Prefecture
- Dr. John Ohiorhenuan, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Senior Deputy Director, BCPR, UNDP
- Dr. Salvano Briceno, Director, UN/ISDR

Video Message

- President William J. Clinton, Former President of the United States and UN Special Envoy for Tsunami Recovery

Keynote Speech:

- Dr. Maryvonne Plessis-Fraissard, Senior Advisor, Vice President Office of Sustainable Development Network, the World Bank Group

Tsunami Recovery Status Reports

- Indonesia : His Excellency Dr. Kusmayanto Kadiman, Minister, Research and Technology, Republic of Indonesia

- Sri Lanka : His Excellency Mr. Mahinda Samarasinghe, Minister, Disaster Management and Human Rights, Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka

- Maldives : His Excellency Mr. Mohamed Mauroof Jameel, Minister, Construction and Public Infrastructure, Republic of Maldives

- India : Prof. N. Vinod Chandra Menon, Member, National Disaster Management Authority, India

Progress of the Indian Ocean Tsunami Early Warning and Mitigation System

- Dr. Patricio Bernal, Executive Secretary of IOC, Assistant Director General of UNESCO

Panel Discussion

Facilitator: Dr. Salvano Briceno, Director, UN/ISDR

Special Speech: Dr. Marco Ferrari, Deputy Head, Department of Humanitarian Aid, Swiss Agency for Development and Coordination (SDC)

Panelists: Mr. Andrew Maskrey, Chief, Disaster Reduction Unit, UNDP/BCPR

Mr. Alfredo Lazarte-Hoyle, Director, InFocus Programme on Crisis Response and Reconstruction Programme, ILO

Mr. Satoru Nishikawa, Director for Disaster Preparedness, Public Relations & International Cooperation, Cabinet Office, Japan

Mr. Koji Suzuki, Executive Director, Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC)

Special Commentator: Prof. Ian Davis, Visiting Professor, Cranfield University, UK

Commentator: Country Representatives, WB, UNESCO/IOC

Closing of the Symposium

Recovery Status Reports of Countries

His Excellency Minister Kusmayanto Kadiman, Ministry for Research and Technology, Indonesia

Citing government efforts following the Indian Ocean Tsunami and the Pangandaran Tsunami (July 17, 2006), Minister Kadiman explained the need to address cultural issues in implementing disaster reduction at the community level. He reported the establishment of the Tsunami Early Warning Systems in Indonesia (through the international support and cooperation of Japan, Singapore, Germany, China, France, Malaysia, USA and inter-agency coordination by Ministry of Research and Technology) as a major development in the country. He also reported the establishment of the Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (BRR) in Aceh and Nias, and the continuing government efforts on managing risks and establishment of infrastructures. He considered rebuilding the economy and shifting of approach from disaster response orientation to disaster risk management orientation as a major recovery challenge, while the lack of local capacity and community risk awareness remains a major concern.

His Excellency Minister Mahinda Samarasingha, Ministry of Disaster Management and Human Rights, Sri Lanka

Minister Samarasingha reported that, in the aftermath of the Indian Ocean Tsunami, the Government of Sri Lanka constituted the Parliamentary Select Committee which investigated on the disaster preparedness of the country. Among the major action and accomplishments in the country have been: (i) enactment of

the Disaster Management Act, which took a holistic, integrated and coordinated approach to disaster management, (ii) establishment of the National Council for Disaster Management, headed by the President; and (iii) the Disaster Management Center; (iv) adoption of National Policy for Disaster Management based on consultations and dialogues with various stakeholders including civil societies; (v) formulation of National Emergency Response Plan through consultation; and (vi) establishment of 24x7 EOC (24 hours- 7 days a week emergency operations center).

He explained that instituting legal and institutional mechanisms allows the country to be stronger and more capable to deal with natural hazards and disaster risks. He also reported on current initiatives on enhancing early warning systems with the designation of focal points and responsible authorities for warning and risk information dissemination and the creation of data collection, analysis and research center. He explained that in the country disaster management must be a decentralized function that enjoins the responsibility of all and the building of capacity at in all levels, especially in the communities.

His Excellency Minister Mauroof Jameel, Ministry of Construction and Public Infrastructure, Maldives

Minister Jameel presented the Recovery Status Report of Maldives. He stated the vulnerability indicators of the country and recounted the impact of the Indian Ocean Tsunami on Maldives which called for immediate relief, reconstruction and risk mitigation. He reported that reconstruction has been pursued through the Safer Islands Programme. This involved consolidation of population, development of larger islands with better economic opportunities, redesigning the physical features of islands to ensure public safety and protection of environment, and preparation of island development plans. He mentioned that Maldives has adopted the principles of build back better in its repair and reconstruction of houses and harbors and in livelihood recovery.

He reported on key achievements of the country, that include the drafting of the National Disaster Management Act, the completion and publishing of the Disaster Risk Profile of Maldives, installation of early warning system, setting up of national and regional emergency operations centers, development of community disaster management plans in 13 islands, and awareness raising and skills training at all levels. As the way forward, the Maldives shall develop its long-term adaptation and mitigation plan and multi-hazard early warning system, continue awareness-raising, training and education activities, and advocate for disaster risk reduction at all levels.

Professor N. V. C. Menon, Member, National Disaster Management Authority, India

In presenting the Indian Experience on Recovery from the Indian Ocean Tsunami, Prof. Menon emphasized the importance of governance in reconstructing social infrastructures and building disaster resilience. He discussed the emerging issues, good practices and challenges in recovery in the country. He stated the need to address the lack of accurate data, the stress on social structures and increase in school drop outs, the delay in identifying local implementing agencies, the lack of local capacity for recovery, and the predominance of government in rebuilding and reconstruction, among others. Considered as lesson learned was the need for risk assessment and vulnerability analysis, hazard-resilient construction, proper maintenance of housing and infrastructures, ownership and accountability of stakeholders, good media management and communication of right messages, preparedness, coordination, and networking.

Prof. Menon highlighted the significance of the paradigm shift from reactive, post disaster relief-centric regime to proactive approach of strengthening disaster preparedness and mitigation measures. In this regard, he informed about the passage of the Disaster Management Act of 2005 and the establishment of the National Disaster

Management Authority, headed by the prime minister, and the state and district disaster management authorities. Moreover, he reported the development of institutional mechanisms such as the drafting of the National Disaster Management Plan, creation of the National Disaster Response Force, and the establishment of the National Institute of Disaster Management. He mentioned the current emphasis on risk assessment and vulnerability analysis, formulation of guidelines for multi-hazard management, insurance and micro financing, and development of national database for emergency management, among others.

Closing Remarks of the Symposium

Dr. Salvano Briceno, Director, UN/ISDR

Dr. Briceno stated that achieving long-term reduction of risks requires engaging ourselves collectively on a common process. Since HFA provides for such common process, he encouraged all to keep track of its implementation. Moreover, he mentioned the important negotiations on climate change, a most pressing current global concern. In this regard, he stated that HFA could serve as an important negotiation tool for the adaptation of climate change

6-3-2-2. Experts' Meeting <January 16, 2007>

Opening Remarks

Dr. Salvano Briceno, Director, UN/ISDR

Recovery Reports

Brig. General Sher Afgan Khan Niazi

Director General, Monitor and Evaluation Wing, Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority, Pakistan

Mr. Suporn Ratananakin

Director, Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, Thailand

Keynote Speech: "Learning from Recovery"

Prof. Ian Davis, Visiting Professor of Cranfield University, UK

Thematic Session: Group Discussion

Group A: Recovery issues in relation to Housing and UN-HABITAT led the discussion.

Hon. Mohamed Mauroof Jameel, Minister for Construction and Public Infrastructure, Government of Maldives, chaired this Group discussion session. This session aimed the key objectives of reviewing housing and land policies, strategies and approaches adopted by the governments, NGOs and communities under the topic of "who is participating in whose process?". It also discussed the issues of key lessons learnt from shelter recovery and reconstruction to build back better. Interventions from India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Maldives were discussed.

Group B: Recovery issues in relation to Livelihood and ILO led the discussion.

Hon. Mahinda Samarasinghe, Minister for Disaster management and Human Rights, Government of Sri Lanka chaired this group discussion. This session discussed the issues pertinent to post disaster livelihood recovery planning, rehabilitation and reconstruction of infrastructure to support the economic revival, back to business in the aftermath of a disaster, and post-disaster local economy recovery. Also the experiences in relation to these points from Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Indonesia (Aceh) were also discussed.

Group C: Recovery issues in relation to Organizational and Institutional Arrangements and UNDP led the discussion.

Dr. Marco Ferrari from Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC/HA) chaired this

session. This session discussed major issues in relation to Institutional arrangements for recovery at national level, UN institutional and regulatory mechanism for post disaster recovery and international assistance for recovery. Environment and gender issues in recovery were also discussed as crosscutting issues in the session.

Plenary Presentations on Thematic Issues

Mr. Andrew Maskrey, Chief, Disaster Reduction Unit, UNDP/BCPR, facilitated the plenary presentations from three Groups and discussions.

Output of Group A:

Rapporteur of the Group A Ms. Mariko Sato (UN-HABITAT) summarized the Group A's Discussion and the important points emerged out of this discussion are as follows under the title of "who is participating in whose process?".

Under the housing and land policy, strategy, and approach following issues were identified.

- Clarity on policy where people can return or cannot return is needed.
- Imposition of buffer zones delays the recovery process.
- Clear approach on land titling, security of tenure and building on customary land registration system is the must.
- There should not be any forced evictions and people's wishes to go back to their place should be recognized.
- A clear identification of process from temporary shelter to permanent fixtures is needed. Whether transitional arrangements between temporary and permanent fixtures are needed or not is the critical issue.
- How to shift the "provision" of housing to "enabling" housing is also discussed.
- Guidelines for shelter design are required for choice.
- The providers and governments must trust the people, and let the people take the lead in decision-making and actions. It is identified that cash injections for construction or community construction better supports the sustainable recovery rather than outside contractors.
- These procedures bring out better results in terms of community empowerment and skill development, generation of employment and economic opportunity, confidence building among local partners and creation of community institutions.

Under the lessons learnt section, following important points were identified.

- Shelter is the priority and crucial for recovery in terms of community solidarity, psychosocial recovery, skill development, income generation and investment.
- Communities including women should design the houses with proper guidance and they must be the part of damage assessments. Further locally available resources and skills including recycled post-disaster materials should be used as much as possible.

These are due to the following facts.

- Community construction was better in quality and speed with greater satisfaction.
- It also institutionalizes the community based recovery process for sustainability.
- Community based re-building facilitates not only structural recovery but also helps to develop the community, system and resilience.

Output of Group B:

Rapporteur of the Group B Mr. Alfredo Lazarte (ILO) summarized the Group B's Discussion and the important points emerged out of this discussion are as follows.

Discussion Points in this Group were as follows.

- Post-disaster livelihood recovery planning;
- Rehabilitation and reconstruction of infrastructure to support economical recovery;
- Back to business in the aftermath of a disaster;
- Food security and livelihood recovery;
- Post-disaster local economic recovery.

Chairman Hon. Mahinda Samarasinghe, Minister for Disaster Management and Human Rights, government of Sri Lanka made following observations and started the discussion.

- Dramatic situations create opportunity for unity and solidarity, citing the example of Indonesia.
- Governance is crucial and transparency, accountability and cooperation should be emphasized in recovery.
- Post-disaster recovery presents opportunity for equality and inclusiveness.

Under the various discussion points, following points emerged.

1. Post Disaster livelihood recovery planning
 - This must be based on a phased livelihood approach that covers relief, recovery and development.
 - Creation of local planning framework that promotes dialogue between communities, governments, private sector and development agencies, and enhances coordination and minimizes duplication of works.
 - Post disaster livelihood recovery planning facilitates the disaster preparedness.
2. Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Infrastructure to support the Economical Recovery
 - Standardized building material should be produced.
 - Insurance could function as a buffer in construction phase of infrastructure in order to enhance mitigation measures.
3. Post Disaster Local Economic Recovery
 - It is critical to shift coordination of activities to coordinating the vision when there is a shift from disasters to sustainable development.
 - Development potential of a country, especially in the case of aftermath of disaster should be seriously considered.
 - Harmonization among various organizations in terms of skills is very crucial in the post rehabilitation disaster situations. Working together is the key element here.
4. Back to Business
 - Multi-phased and situation responsive approach is needed.
 - There should be a Multi-sector, multi-level and multi-stakeholder approach.
 - Gender sensitive participation is crucial and the habit of learning from the past experience should be promoted.

Output of Group C:

Rapporteur of the Group C Mr. Hossein Kalali (UNDP) summarized the Group C's Discussion and the important points emerged out of this discussion are as follows.

Here the discussion points were as follows.

- Institutional arrangements for recovery at National level
- UN Institutional and regulatory mechanism for post disaster recovery, especially International assistance for recovery
- Environment in recovery
- Gender based discriminations in recovery

The following points emerged under these discussion points.

1. Institutional arrangements for recovery at National level

- This section highlighted variety of institutional arrangement options in recovery operation ranging from ad-hoc system to permanent structure.
- Country level presentations elaborated the existing Institutional arrangements and how they functioned in the event of disaster and the in the post-disaster situations.
- Examples of Pakistan earthquake and creation of ERRA (Earthquake Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Authority), which is the ad-hoc mechanism, and how the Pakistan Government handled the post disaster relief and recovery issues in the absence of a institutional arrangement were discussed.
- Then the Indian experience of Orissa super cyclone, which created the ad-hoc institutional arrangement of OSDMA (Orissa State Disaster Management Authority) Gujarat Earthquake and creation of GSDMA (Gujarat State Disaster Management Authority), which is the permanent mechanism, and the functional aspects of these two structures were discussed in detail.
- The new disaster management law and the permanent institutional arrangement of National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) were also discussed.
- Finally creation of Indonesia's BRR and the challenges faced by the BRR were also discussed. Indonesia highlighted the need for flexibility in recovery planning and operation and balance between the supply and demand driven approaches.

2. UN Institutional and regulatory mechanism for post disaster recovery, especially International assistance for recovery

- This section identified the procedures and the regulatory system in the International assistance after a disaster, especially how UN system on international assistance for recovery works.
- Report on the tsunami Recovery by a member of UN inspection team was presented and it identified the existing Gaps and it recommended that more streamlined and strengthened assistance scheme is needed since recovery is a dynamic process.
- It is stressed that better understanding between UN and national Governments is needed with Bottom-Up approach.
- Proper Resource Mobilization is the key aspect to regulate the recovery assistance.
- It also discussed the International early Warning Systems and the ownership issue. This discussion led to the important point of creation of agreements and institutional mechanism to implement these agreements at regional and national level. Data and information sharing was also identified as an important issue here.

3. Environment in recovery

- This is discussed as one of the crosscutting issues in the post-disaster recovery and UNEP identified following salient points of environment in recovery.
- Rehabilitation of the lost and degraded eco system due to disaster and some examples of success with mangrove planting. It was said that degraded environment worsens the disaster damage and vice versa.
- Mechanism to repair the damaged environmental infrastructure and the need of proper environment-friendly waste management system.
- Necessity to carry out detailed environmental assessment as suggested by UNEP.
- Stressed the importance of reducing vulnerability and environmental stress through proper land use planning.
- It is identified that environmental considerations must be streamlined in the pre-disaster mitigation planning and post-disaster recovery planning.

4. Gender based discriminations in recovery

Discussion under this section was focused on the impact of the gender relation on recovery and explored the ways to address the issue of how pre existing gender imbalances and women's vulnerabilities are further exacerbated by disasters. This section touched the following important points.

- Women's right in recovery process and equal access to resources.
- How to protect the women against violence and harassments in the post-disaster situation.
- Importance of consultative process of women and their participation in post-disaster recovery process.
- Counseling and assistance for livelihood and economic recovery of single mother families.

These Group presentations were followed by the closing remarks.

Closing Remarks

In closing the session, Mr. Maskrey expressed pleasure in having chaired the IRP and enjoined the community of practitioners of disaster risk reduction to pursue the goals of HFA and the mission of IRP. He shared an anecdote that conveyed the message that planning for disaster risk reduction needs to be straightforward and that related efforts, to be effective, need to be strongly linked as in a chain. He also emphasized the importance of strengthening and empowering local governments, local institutions, and local organizations. He further explained that in strengthening them, the national government is strengthened as well.

This was followed by the release of Kobe Communiqué as Forum Outcome.

Kobe Communiqué ~ For Further Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action ~

The International Forum on Tsunami and Earthquake "Progress of the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action and Recovery from Tsunami and Earthquake" took place in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan on January 15-16, 2007. The Forum was hosted by the Government of Japan, International Recovery Platform (IRP) Kobe, Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC) and Hyogo Prefectural Government in partnership with Governments of Switzerland and Italy, UN/ISDR, UNDP, UN/OCHA, ILO, The World Bank, IFRC and UN-HABITAT.

About 300 participants from 34 countries and 20 international organizations comprised of dignitaries, national and local officials, experts on disaster reduction and recovery, and representatives of various stakeholders, attended the Forum.

The Forum aimed to contribute to achieving the goals of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) to reduce risks and vulnerabilities of countries and communities.

The concrete objectives of the Forum were to:

- a) Present important perspectives of post disaster recovery;
- b) Facilitate and promote exchange of lessons and experiences on post disaster recovery, particularly the on-going recovery efforts; and
- c) Provide feedback from countries on their respective implementation of the HFA priorities of action.

His Excellency Mr. Kensei Mizote, Minister of State for Disaster

Management, Japan, opened the Forum and conveyed its commitment to promote international cooperation in building the disaster resilience of nations.

The Forum facilitated constructive and dedicated discussions among the participants on the key issues on recovery and resulted in the following outcomes:

1. The Forum highlighted the importance of advancing international cooperation in disaster risk reduction, promoting build back better principles, and addressing issues on governance, institutional arrangements, education, and local culture in recovery processes.
2. The Forum brought about a better understanding among the participants regarding the appropriate and sustainable recovery practices deployed in disaster affected countries in different country contexts. The disaster recovery experiences of Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Maldives, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Japan and other countries underscored the necessity of the incorporation of risk reduction elements in every aspect of recovery process.
3. The Forum discussed the following critical aspects of post disaster recovery from the tsunami and earthquake: a) Housing, b) Livelihood, c) Governance and Institutional Arrangements for Recovery, and d) crosscutting issues, among others, Environment, Gender and Information Dissemination (Early Warning). The following issues were recommended as requirements to support better recovery;
 - Need for an integrated recovery planning considering the socio-economic, cultural and environmental context,
 - Use of appropriate recovery guidelines and standard for sectoral recovery initiatives,
 - Sustainable institutional arrangement for effective post disaster recovery, and
 - Equity issues in all aspects of recovery.
4. The participants emphasized the need for expansion of networks and partnerships through the International Recovery Platform (IRP) activities of recovery stakeholders, among others, UN agencies, international/ regional institutions, countries, local governments, NGOs, IFIs and communities for promoting effective experience sharing and pragmatic initiatives on disaster risk reduction and recovery practices. Further enhancement of global disaster recovery network was proposed to ensure better recovery. The importance of facilitating South-South cooperation was stressed.
5. Participants emphasized the need to strengthen the capacity of countries and communities by enhancing knowledge networking and recovery preparedness, providing human resource development training as well as damage and needs assessment tools, recovery monitoring tools, developing user-friendly recovery databases, and organising constant on-line dialogues and forums.
6. The Forum recognized risk reduction as an integral component of recovery to achieve sustainable development. Further efforts are required to mainstream risk reduction and to address appropriate policy development and reform in high risk countries. For this purpose, strengthening of the ISDR system is crucial for effectiveness of the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), IRP and other relevant platforms, networks and initiatives.

-
7. Overall, the Forum has called for collective action for the pursuit of the goals of the HFA, in particular development and strengthening of national platforms, including enhanced mechanisms for multi-stakeholder coordination and collaboration and for increased involvement of national policy makers, national and local government officials, and community leaders in disaster risk reduction and post disaster recovery efforts.

Closing of Forum

Mr. Koji Suzuki, Executive Director, Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC)

ADRC Executive Director Mr. Koji Suzuki delivered the closing remark of the forum. He highlighted the importance of this forum and he expressed his satisfaction that this forum generated much brain storming discussions, and constructive information exchange. He also pointed out that the country recovery status reports highlighted the current status of the recovery aftermath of disaster in these countries and it is an eye opener to everyone here. He hoped that these reports would help the international agencies to coordinate and design their recovery strategies in the affected countries with the goal of build back better. He also expressed hope that the Kobe Communique would facilitate the future recovery procedures and help to achieve the goals of implementation of HFA. He thanked the participants, and supporting partner organizations for their active participation and continuous support.

6-3-3. Development of a Database on Good Practices & Lessons on Recovery and its Utilization

(1) Background:

Various booklets, research reports on good practices, lessons learned, and case studies of major disasters on recovery already exist. They are mostly summarized and analyzed by each major disaster except for some examples. However, when experts on recovery visit disaster affected countries, they are frequently asked to provide them with so to say “cross-disaster” knowledge support on topical thematic lines* which are urgently necessary and crucial for recovery planners/ decision makers of national and local level for post disaster recovery to realize safer and more secure society.

(2) Project Objectives

This project will be led by the IRP Kobe-Hyogo in collaboration of ISDR Secretariat, using the world-wide network of the IRP. It aims to quickly & effectively provide the key persons in charge of planning and implementing the recovery activities of disaster affected countries and local governments with useful, important and on-target knowledge for post disaster recovery through cross-disaster analysis of lessons learned from the recovery experiences from recent major disasters, which are accumulated and stored in a new database by IRP.

(3) Methodologies

1) Collect “Good practices” and “Lessons learned” of post-disaster recovery

- Developed a preliminary database linking to around 80 data sources on good practices, lessons, case studies mainly on post disaster recovery using the IRP network.
- Other examples such as presented at the WCDR / IRP related seminars and governmental documents will also be used as the data resource.
- Above data resources will be stored in a list and publish on the IRP web with hyper-link to each data owner for easy access.

2) Development of a database by filling the templates along the thematic lines

- Select target major disasters (total 34) from disasters occurred from 1984 to 2004 world-wide
- Develop a template <Annex 4>to summarize recovery experiences and lessons will including the topical thematic lines and key-codes <Annex 3>
- Fill the template by each selected major disaster <Annex 5>
- Develop a database using the File Maker with search engine, so that this database will be published on the IRP revised Web in near future

3) Compile a Comprehensive Recovery Knowledge Book to support better recovery for policy makers and planners

- Using the above database, cross-disaster review and analysis will be carried out based on each thematic lines*, and the Comprehensive Recovery Knowledge Book with effective and efficient cross-disaster analysis by each thematic lines* will be edited.
- The Comprehensive Recovery Knowledge Book will be published

4) Value of the Outputs and Suggestions for Future Disaster Recovery

This project fills a major gap in international knowledge through the careful analysis of recovery operations following a diverse range of natural disasters that have occurred during the past twenty years. The intention is to learn vital lessons by understanding what constitutes an effective recovery operation and what can impede the process.

The broader and more substantive aim of the project is to assist decision makers in their efforts to create more resilient societies through well-designed recovery operations. This complex and all-embracing task is fundamental to the whole disaster recovery process. It includes strengthening the ability of societies to resist the impact of natural hazards, to bounce back rapidly following impact and to adapt and change during the recovery process in such a way as to 'build back better'. It is anticipated that the study will result in significant progress in the following areas:

- *Improved global recovery management following major disasters.*
- *Better value for the money invested in recovery through the adoption of an 'evidence based approach' focusing on what works and what is likely to fail.*
- *Improvements in the assessment of damage, needs, and capacities.*
- *Better integration of psycho-social, economic, physical, environmental, and administrative recovery into holistic policies and programmes.*
- *Advice on ways to incorporate risk reduction into recovery.*
- *Guidance to officials managing recovery programmes on how to cope with multiple strategic and tactical dilemmas.*
- *The development of a framework for future reporting on disaster recovery.*

<Annex> Topical Thematic Lines and Database Items

Thematic Topics	
1)	Organizational/ Institutional Development for Recovery
2)	Risk Reduction in Recovery
3)	Damage, Needs, and Capacity Assessment
4)	Dilemmas in the Recovery Process
5)	The Continuum from Emergency to Long-term Recovery
6)	Recovery Sectors and Linkages
7)	Housing and Property Rights
8)	Resources for Recovery

Item	Sub Topics
1.1	Development of Recovery Policy, Plan and Programs
1.2	Recovery Program Implementation
1.3	Knowledge Management for Recovery
2.1	Organizational/Institutional Development for Recovery
2.2	Integration of Disaster Risk Reduction
3.1	Damage and Needs Assessment methodologies
4.1	Key dilemmas in recovery management such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • political pressure for speed of recovery vs. safety • to relocate unsafe communities or not? • speed of recovery vs. the full participation of the affected community in decision making or actual involvement in the building process. • balancing essential reform with essential continuity
5.1	Long term consequences of decisions taken during the emergency relief phase

5.2	Sheltering process: Examining the continuum from initial shelter to permanent reconstruction of dwellings.
5.3	Growth or reduction of vulnerability within the recovery process
6.1	Linkages between various sectors of recovery: psycho-social, economic (livelihood development), physical, environmental and institutional recovery actions based on local experience or evidence on the recovery process
6.2	Relevant conclusions or findings of case studies or analyses on the recovery sectoral linkages
7.1	Implication of housing and property rights issues in recovery operations and the recovery process as a whole
7.2	Possibility or necessity to change land tenure structures in rural or urban areas
8.1	Major resources mobilized or provided for the recovery process and their sources
8.2	Above implications for (a) designing of programmes, (b) institutional structures, (c) co-ordination between government and international funders, and (d) transparency and corruption issues