

## **Group Discussions and Plenary**

**Date:** 13 May 2005, 9:30-13:00

**Venue:** Plenary - Briefing Room, JICA Hyogo International Center, Kobe  
(connecting with WB in Washington, D.C. and Tokyo)

**Theme:** What do we expect from IRP?

**Format:** Group discussions

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

**Rapporteur:** Mr. Mihir Bhatt, Honorary Director, DMI, India

### **Outline**

The participants examined and identified what the keys are and how to promote the main pillars of the IRP activities: Advocacy and knowledge management, Capacity building and Enhancement of recovery operations. They also expressed their collaborative contribution for making the activities efficient and active. In the Plenary Session following the group discussions, a matrix of the work plan which shows the specific activities of IRP and commitments by various stakeholders based on the discussion was presented to the participants as a result of the three-day continued Seminar.

### **1) Group A**

#### **Advocacy and knowledge management of recovery information and experiences**

(with special focus on lessons learned and best practices in recent recovery operations)

Coordinator: Mr. Anil K. Sinha, Senior Technical Advisor, ADRC

Rapporteur: Dr. Carlos A. Villacis, Consultant, ADRC

### **(1) Objectives**

The objective of this session was to propose an action plan for identifying, capturing, and disseminating lessons learned and good practices as well as for sharing accumulated knowledge from global experiences through the development of common tools and mechanisms.

### **(2) Summary of Discussions**

The Session Coordinator, Mr. Anil K. Sinha, welcomed the participants and explained the objectives of the session. He emphasized that people must always be at the center of recovery and that physical recovery is not enough; mental recovery and re-establishment of livelihood should be incorporated in any post disaster recovery process.

After the self-introduction by the participants, Ms. Margaret Arnold, Program Manager, the World Bank, presented five case studies carried out by the ProVention Consortium in Bangladesh ('98

floods), Honduras (Hurricane Mitch), India (Gujarat Earthquake), Mozambique (2000 and 2001 floods), and Turkey ('99 Earthquake). From the analysis of 502 studies in the last 20 years, in which the policies, systems, resources, and impact of the recovery processes were investigated, Ms. Arnold presented the following lessons learned:

- (a) Lessons have not been learned; mistakes are repeated again and again;
- (b) Better tools are required to assess needs after a disaster;
- (c) An institutional framework is required to integrate risk reduction into the recovery process;
- (d) Gaps in the recovery processes include insufficient attention to the livelihood of the affected communities and insufficient participation of the community in the planning and implementation of the recovery processes;
- (e) Disaster should be seen as challenges/opportunities to address other issues that need sensitive treatment such as social and gender equities.

Mr. Ryu Fukui, WB, explained the applications of teleconferencing technology for knowledge sharing. He indicated that technology is just a tool and that the learning processes should address the differences among communities. \*See CD 4.a.1.

Mr. Yoshinobu Fukasawa, Deputy Executive Director, Disasters Reduction and Human Renovation Institution (DRI), pointed out how the Great Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake of 1995 had shown the many needs to improve community preparedness and safety and how DRI contributes to the satisfaction of these needs through the training of disaster experts, the creation of international networks for disaster research and policy applications, and the systematic preservation of disaster memories.

Finally, Dr. Rajib Shaw, Associate Professor, Kyoto University, presented a strategy to identify advocates and institutions that could utilize best practices, case studies, and motivational tools to develop an effective learning process for appropriate recovery. He indicated that priorities should be set up to make the process effective and efficient. \*See CD 4.a.2.

### **(3) Conclusion**

After summarizing the presentations, the Coordinator opened the floor for discussions among the participants to produce recommendations for better addressing advocacy and knowledge management of recovery information and experiences. Ms. Helena Molin Valdes, Deputy Director, UN/ISDR, suggested that, since concepts and institutions are more or less well identified, the discussions should move towards the preparation of a working plan for IRP. The Coordinator then suggested the discussion to focus around the following issues:

- Systematization of recovery experiences;
- Information management tools;
- Programming tools.

Broadly speaking, the recommendations produced by the participants addressed three main aspects that are crucial for the advocacy and knowledge management functions of IRP:

- (a) Establishment of a Conceptual Framework that lays common ground for the recovery's basic concepts, language, and knowledge structure;
- (b) Definition of Learning Processes and Mechanisms that identify participants, target groups, educational mechanisms, and evaluation methods;
- (c) Delineation of strategies to ensure sustainability of these activities.

Among the recommendations for specific activities to be undertaken by IRP, the following ones can be highlighted:

- (a) IRP should make existing information available for discussion and application. IRP may be the forum to facilitate knowledge sharing and move from publication to discussion, learning, and application;
- (b) IRP should build the conceptual framework that establishes common definitions for best practices, basic concepts, and evaluation parameters in the recovery process;
- (c) IRP should advocate to donors for fund allocation that supports advocacy and knowledge management in the recovery process;
- (d) IRP should collect recovery reviews to assess the actual impact of emergency and recovery activities on the livelihood of the affected communities;
- (e) IRP should document and promote the linkage of recovery activities to long-term, sustainable development processes;
- (f) IRP should identify, strengthen, and integrate existing global, regional and local networks to promote both advocacy and knowledge sharing of recovery information and experiences;
- (g) IRP should promote the regular evaluation and long-term monitoring of recovery processes to assess their actual impact and effectiveness;
- (h) IRP should identify, document, and organize indigenous knowledge, which although rich in many regions remains largely underutilized.

To conclude the session, the Rapporteur summarized the recommendations produced by the participants and collected the final comments from the attendants. There was a general agreement among the participants on that IRP should be an action- and service-oriented initiative.

## **2) Group B**

### **Capacity building**

(including human resource development (Training and international roster of experts))

Coordinator: Mr. Alfredo Lazarte, Director, a.i., ILO

Rapporteur: Mr. Angel L. Vidal, Programme Manager, ILO ITC Turin

Mr. Mohamed Abchir, Programme Officer, UN/ISDR

### **(1) Objectives**

The objective of this session was to propose an action plan for identify the gaps and challenges in building capacities of actors of post disaster recovery.

### **(2) Summary of Discussions**

#### **Introduction From Mr. Angel L. Vidal, Programme Manager, ILO, International Training Centre**

##### **3 major challenges for IRP:**

- (a) sharing common knowledge and framework (what we are going to train);
- (b) institution/organization;
- (c) how can we conduct capacity building at national/local level ? (methodology should be different among each level).

##### **Priority:**

Targeted at vulnerable key actors at local level (socially/economically vulnerable groups, and local authorities)

##### **Expected outcomes:**

- (a) Creation of curriculum/manual/module (not meaning to create a new one, but accumulate the information from existing organizations/institutions);
- (b) Development of information and communication technology;
- (c) Training of key human resources (at local/national/international levels);
- (d) Global network of experts (of recovery and prevention), which will be transferred to vulnerable countries;
- (e) Network of local authorities and regional networks, which will be developed and operated.

##### **Difficulties and obstacles:**

- (a) Infinite amount of institutions and initiatives in this field;
- (b) Big number of existing projects/initiatives, making it difficult to categorize these initiatives. However, it is important to be taken into consideration, since these have positive impact;
- (c) Fragmented panorama of the intervention level;
- (d) Thematic aspects take different shapes according to the area and region.

**Mr. Ramanathan Balakrishnan, Programme Specialist, UN Volunteers**

- No existence of key player;
- Importance to involving NGO's and volunteers;
- Training for volunteers.

**Mr. Hiroichi Kawashima, Programs and Capacity Building Coordinator, TDLC, WB**

- Importance of linking ongoing programmes undertaken by ADB, WB and JBIC;
- Importance of concrete programmes identification.

**Prof. Benjamin Wisner, Visiting Research Professor, DRS/DPRI Kyoto University / Professor Oberlin College Ohio USA**

- Professional knowledge has not been utilized well enough;
- Importance to think about obstacles such as 1) globalization; 2) political issue (even if we know the importance of training at local level, politics has been always a gap for the implementation); 3) global climate change; 4) gender issue;
- Possible partner: UNU;
- Training approach needs to be slow and participatory.

**Dr. Rudy Soeprihadi Prawiradinata, Head Section for Urban Policy, BAPPENAS, Indonesia**

- Important to targeting communities.

**Mr. Mohamed Abchir, Programme Officer, UN/ISDR**

- Importance of educational training & training programme;
- How to include preventive measures;
- Recovery in Africa is very difficult, problem of drought disasters.

**Mr. Kenji Okazaki, Coordinator, UNCRD Disaster Management Planning Hyogo Office**

- Who should we train at local level? There are millions of local communities. There should be some system needed;
- UNCRD has developed a community based disaster management guideline. UNCRD is happy to participate.

**Dr. Antonio Fernandez, Researcher, Earthquake Disaster Mitigation Research Center**

- IRP should utilize the resources in HAT Kobe such as JICA.

**Mr. Alfredo Lazarte, Director, a.i., ILO**

- Lack of common knowledge and idea;
- Facilitation of knowledge transfer from national level to local level;
- Rationalization of training programmes at local level;

- Association and dialogue among regional/local/national levels;
- Recovery phase provides an opportunity for disaster prevention.

**Mr. Angel L. Vidal, ILO, ITC Turin**

- Improving operational capacities qualitatively as well as quantitatively;
- Holistic/universal/common approach training;
- ILO conducted training programmes at the time of the Gujarat Earthquake, as well as women employment training;
- Training for journalist is also important;
- Systems and platforms for capacity building and sharing knowledge;
- Interactive database (to receive and to provide data).

**(3) Conclusion**

- Needs of Intranet forums;
- Transition from strategy to activities;
- Creation of internet based inventory (criteria) and provisional website;
- Visualization of existing resource map;
- Identification of additional stakeholders and targets;
- ILO: Development of definition of capacity building by the beginning of June;
- Increase of information on the website;
- Discussion forum: End of June;
- Creation of matrix.

\*See CD 4.b.1.

**3) Group C**

**Enhancement of recovery operations and promotion of cooperation**

(With emphasis on post disaster assessment tools and methodologies)

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

Rapporteur: Mr. Emmanuel de Guzman, Consultant, ADRC

**(1) Objectives**

The objective of this session was to propose approaches, methodologies, procedures and mechanisms for assessing transitional recovery needs and develop transitional recovery strategies, plans and programmes.

**(2) Summary of Discussions**

Mr. Andrew Maskrey expressed the challenge of making a difference in recovery operations at the national and local levels. In this regard, he explained the need to streamline available tools for

damage and needs assessment and for planning in the recovery phase. He also cited the need to define well the deliverables of IRP in the next years.

Furthermore, Mr. Maskrey cited some pressing issues related to the challenge. These included collecting and collating damage and needs data for effective relief, pooling relevant data for recovery planning, duplicating data collection, disaggregating and integrating data for analysis, the lack of assessment methodology and tool for post disaster recovery planning, transitioning from damage assessment to recovery planning, and the financing of support for initial needs.

As a starting point for the group discussion, two case studies were presented:

- (a) Mr. Thomas Schaef, Senior Planning Officer, GTZ, gave an overview of the Post Conflict Needs Assessment Methodology (PCNA), explaining its framework, guidelines, and the review and consultative process for its development. Moreover, he cited several pertinent issues: the need for agreement on key concepts of PCNA, the need for linking PCNA with existing longer term development frameworks, the need to integrate PCNA into common planning approach, and the need for definition of key quality standards for PCNA.
- (b) Mr. Julio Serje, Technical Architect, LA RED, gave an overview of DesInventar system as applied to damage assessment in Sri Lanka after the tsunami. He explained the use of the system as an info management tool for post disaster activities, providing reference maps and tables for spatial and sectoral analysis.

### **(3) Conclusion**

The discussions that followed highlighted the gaps and challenges that IRP has to address. These include:

- (a) encouraging national governments to define their respective country's recovery in the context of long-term development goals;
- (b) developing further the existing UNDAC/UN Flash Appeals as effective tools for early response and recovery;
- (c) ensuring common understanding of the root causes of disasters towards more effective response and recovery;
- (d) considering risks and vulnerabilities in developing the assessment methodology, involving local stakeholders in the process;
- (e) conceptualizing the methodology as a sequence of assessment activities towards recovery planning;
- (f) adopting existing development planning tools and "striking a balance";
- (g) assessing the local capacity for recovery, considering that recovery is above all a local

- responsibility;
- (h) linking existing information management tools, e.g. GLIDE, Relief Web, etc;
  - (i) IRP as a genuinely service oriented initiative;
  - (j) ensuring the timely use of assessment tools;
  - (k) ensuring that the assessment process and outcome are politically accepted.

Mr. Praveen Pardeshi, Senior Advisor, UN/ISDR, presented the milestones for the development of the assessment methodology for recovery:

- The draft TOR for methodology development shall be validated by the Inter Agency Task Force on 25 May 2005;
- The Advisory Committee for this initiative shall be comprised of UN/OCHA, UNDP, UN/ISDR, WB Provention, UNEP, ECLAC, IFRC, and ADRC;
- The Technical Partners for this initiative include GTZ, LA RED, and UNOSAT etc;
- The co-funding of the process for methodology development will be committed by the members of the Advisory Committed;
- The case studies will have been reviewed by October-November 2005;
- The presentation by Technical Partners of the first draft of the methodology is set on May 2006.

\*See CD 4.c.1.

#### **4) Plenary Session**

##### **Wrap up**

##### **(a) Mr. Preveen Pardeshi, Senior Advisor, UN/ISDR**

A draft matrix of the roles and commitments made by the stakeholders in the IRP has been shown. It can be a starting point to form up the division of roles and to what to expect in the upcoming years. There is a breakdown around the 3 function areas. The third area contains the effective operations on the ground level, which really lay out like a time-frame. There is a long list of activities that need to be done for the other two areas, the capacity building side and also on the knowledge and advocacy side. But there was no time-frame laid out. That's why there is a great need to work on those time frames.

##### **(b) Ms. Margaret Arnold, Program Manager, WB, Washington, DC**

Since WB is a large player in the recovery process, it is important to stay in IRP. WB can provide much in terms of recovery learning. It can also be engaged in terms of methodology for damage and needs assessment; it has been quite active in that area indeed. WB has acquired some recovery experiences, and has built up such a network within its own institution. The needs are great, the plans are great, but in developing these work plans, it would important to consider doing some kind of initial assessment of what's needed, so that the first

stage of IRP can be much focused. This will allow developing initiatives, which will show the entire disaster vulnerable community the place to go for disaster learning and recovery.

**(c) Ms. Helena Molin Valdes, Deputy Director, UN/ISDR**

A lot has been done with the discussions of the last days. It is a good opportunity to move ahead on a critical area with a great ownership, with the UN agencies and more locally, with the countries themselves. The national and local experiences have been impressive, and seem to have fully grasped this issue of recovery being part of development and the participatory requirements and needs. There is a lot to stand on.

**(d) Mr. Satoru Nishikawa, Director for Disaster Preparedness, Cabinet Office of Japan**

The fact that this issue of disaster recovery attracted so much international attention is really impressive, not only because of the Earthquake and Tsunami in the Indian Ocean, but also because of the various countries that have experienced disasters. It is interesting to see that the multi-nodal Seminar with institutions around the world was a success. It is important to continue such Seminars in the future. It is a chance to have taken up this issue of recovery prior to 26 December, and many emerging issues have been addressed. It is important that the stakeholders emphasize this idea of better recovery by always trying to mention IRP, in order to bring better ideas and stimulate better understanding.

**(e) Mr. Masayuki Kitamoto, Executive Director, ADRC**

Substantial discussion tools were exposed during the Seminar period. In the future, active participation by the stakeholders is anticipated.

**(f) Dr. Johan Schaar, Special Representative for the Tsunami Operation, IFRC**

There is the need to go back and remember the context, that is, that stakeholders intervene in people's life when they are at the weakest, when they have been traumatized by a disaster. It is important to intervene as good as possible. Recovery is done by local communities, and has to be done in partnership with everybody involved. IRP should become a very action-oriented, service-oriented process. Everything will be done to help in that process.

**(g) Ms. Dilruba Haider, Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP, Bangladesh**

Good practices were discussed. Best outputs were brought out during the Seminar. IRP itself is an ambitious target that is not an easy task to accomplish.

**(h) Mr. Andrew Maskrey, Chief, Disaster Reduction Unit, UNDP/BCPR**

The plan is ambitious, and it is important to hold down to a key number of things that have to be delivered in a fairly short space of time. This will improve operations in the field.