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Executive Summary

ADRC/IRP, in collaboration Central America’s Center for Disaster Prevention (CEPREDENAC), had organized an Intergovernmental Dialogue on Recovery Processes, 11-12 November 2014 at Hilton Princess Hotel in San Salvador, El Salvador. The event was also strongly supported by UNISDR and UNDP. The main objective of the dialogue was to facilitate knowledge exchange so that government organizations and cities can improve their programs based on the sharing of experiences. The discussions dwelt on: How have recovery processes been institutionalized at the country and local levels? What institutional and policy arrangements were commonly adopted? What types of tools were adopted for assessment and framework development? Do governments secure necessary financial, administrative, and political resources for recovery? Are there mechanisms in place to monitor recovery processes? Answers to these questions inform the recommendations for next steps such as galvanizing national efforts on recovery and institutionalizing recovery processes.

Over 40 government officials and heads of development organizations participated in the dialogue. Among those represented included Paraguay, Honduras, Japan, Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Panama. The cities of Santa Tecla, Bogota, and Curundu were also represented. Moreover, the World Bank, the Swiss Development Council (SDC), and the Global Education and Training Institute (GETI) of UNISDR had representations. Participants to the dialogue were high-level with El Salvador Vice President Sr. Oscar Ortiz inaugurating the event.

ADRC/IRP shared available tools and guidance on recovery as well as global case studies on recovery processes. The sharing adds value to the ongoing initiatives in Central America by offering wide array of options concerning strategies and actions for ‘build back better’. In particular, Mr. Shingo Kochi, senior recovery expert at IRP, shared Japan’s experience by highlighting the advances, needs, and requirements for a more effective recovery process.

Several recommended next steps were outlined at the dialogue. These include efforts to further (i) disseminate best practices and lessons on recovery and reconstruction processes implemented in recent years; (ii) share the results of the dialogue processes to other regions and countries; (iii) inform the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction on recovery and reconstruction issues that should be taken into account.

Some specific actions were also mentioned such as the following: (i) recovery frameworks/plans may be prepared, discussed, and approved before the disaster happens; (ii) recovery process shall incorporate DRR and integrated into development; and (iii) evaluation and monitoring mechanisms of recovery projects to be implemented. It was also observed that there is so much recovery experience in Central America that should be documented, analyzed, and shared to other regions and countries.
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Background

1. Recovery is gradually seen as a fundamental part of preparedness, disaster risk reduction and the overall development efforts, due to the growing incidence of both recurring and less frequent high-impact disasters. Nonetheless, the majority of recovery processes are still characterized by significant blind spots, time-gaps, deficits in stakeholder attention, and declining resource commitments. While chances for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and enhance resilience into recovery and development processes are perhaps the clearest in the aftermath of big disaster events, national and international stakeholders have not always been able to capitalize fully on these opportunities.

2. This can be explained with the relatively low level of institutionalization for recovery, lack of adequate financial support, weak coordination and integration of development sectors and the participation of different levels of government. Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) can provide a venue for promoting resilient recovery in national systems and promote the strengthening of local capacities of cities and municipalities.

3. In recovery planning for instance, the Central America’s Center for Disaster Prevention (CEPREDENAC) has included in their Regional Policy for DRR the important role of recovery by assisting member countries in formulating their respective post-disaster recovery frameworks. The process includes creating a recovery task force and organizing training for governmental technical and political staff. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has been organizing various regional workshops leading to development of a recovery planning toolkit for use of its member countries; the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA) has drafted its comprehensive disaster management strategy and programming framework, where recovery component is well integrated and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is embarking an institutional mechanism for trans-boundary recovery in the region. National Governments have also developed tools for recovery based on lessons learned post-disaster: livelihoods, shelter, financial mechanisms and planning among others.

4. Additionally these regions are actively promoting the participation of their local governments in the Resilient Cities Campaign, promoted by UNISDR through national launching of the campaign, city-to-city exchanges, technical support, and other actions for the enhancement of their respective programmes.

5. In view of the above, the workshop brought together regional, national, and local leaders to discuss the opportunities and challenges of recovery (Annex 1 Agenda). The recommendations and findings from the dialogue were utilized to inform the consultations on the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals and Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

6. The Intergovernmental Dialogue on Recovery Processes took place at the Hilton Princess Hotel, 11-12 November 2014, in San Salvador, El Salvador. The event was also strongly supported by ADRC, UNISDR, and UNDP, which are members of IRP.
Objective

7. The main objective of the dialogue was to facilitate knowledge exchange so that regional intergovernmental organizations can improve/initiate ongoing/new programs based on the sharing of experiences. Specifically, the event will be a venue to address some of the following issues:

   • How have recovery processes been institutionalized at the regional/country and local levels?
   • What are the most common national/local institutional and policy arrangements for recovery found in countries?
   • Which are the tools that countries have been making use of to conduct post disaster needs assessments and recovery frameworks?
   • How have governments secured the necessary financial, administrative, and political resources for recovery?
   • Are there mechanisms in place to monitor recovery processes?
   • How can regional initiatives help galvanize national efforts among member nations to institutionalize recovery and promote the principles of disaster risk reduction and resilience in recovery?

8. This dialogue will provide recommendations for specific actions that will strengthen regional, national and local capabilities for recovery planning and the achievement of more resilient communities. It is expected that each IGO will commit to implement some of the activities of the voluntary commitments on recovery in support of the implementation of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

9. The event was primarily organized by the International Recovery Platform (IRP) in collaboration with UNISDR Americas, UNISDR-GETI, UNDP BPPS, UNDP-LAC/RH, and CEPREDENAC.

Participants

10. Over 40 government officials and heads of development organizations participated in the dialogue. Among those represented included Paraguay, Honduras, Japan, Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Panama. The cities of Santa Tecla, Bogota, and Curundu were also represented.
11. Moreover, the World Bank, the Swiss Development Council (SDC), and the Global Education and Training Institute (GETI) of UNISDR had representations. Participants to the dialogue were high-level with El Salvador Vice President Sr. Oscar Ortiz inaugurating the event.

**Sessions**

*Sharing of Experiences*

12. The sharing of regional, national, and local experiences was the key highlight of the event. Regional experiences were shared by CEPREDENAC and UNDP based on programs and projects on recovery. In Central America, pre-disaster recovery planning and the development of recovery frameworks were way ahead compared to other regions.

13. National level experiences were shared by: (a) Paraguay wherein the weaknesses of subnational governments were recognized. Hence, paradigm shift in policy development was recommended so that functional structures and mechanisms can be put place, (b) Honduras, where contingency measures and legal framework were explored and subsequently documenting the recovery processes; (c) Japan, wherein the Cabinet Office playing a key role in coordinating and implementing the DRR measures; (d) Costa Rica, wherein recovery concept is yet to be adequately framed in the legal frameworks and community programs.; (f) Guatemala, which has a pioneering role in developing and putting in action the National Recovery Framework that started in 2013, paving clear guidelines of coordination and adequate planning; (g) Panama, wherein a new financial mechanism was created to facilitate long-term recovery; and (h) El Salvador, where the National Recovery Framework is progressing towards the final stage of completion with ongoing consultations.

14. Local government experiences were shared by: (a) Bogota, where efforts for social integration were highlighted in the relocation program. Mechanism for facilitating an action platform for collaborative and participatory processes was initiated; (b) Sta. Tecla, where mayor emphasized the important role of leadership, including the process of
investing in recovery, learning from experience, and correcting past mistakes; and (c)
Curundu, wherein the challenges on implementing relocation project were addressed
through community engagement and integrated implementation.

Financial and Technical Cooperation Mechanisms

15. In order to explore potential support mechanisms for the ongoing recovery processes,
the World Bank and the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) presented their
respective portfolios and windows for financial support. In particular, the Global Facility
for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR) and the parametric insurance mechanisms
were introduced.

16. For the technical component, IRP/ADRC, UNISDR-GETI, and UNDP shared their
respective training modules on recovery that were designed to assist governments. In
particular, IRP/ADRC’s module on recovery planning, GETI’s module on making cities
resilient, and UNDP’s module on post-disaster needs assessment (PDNA) were
presented.

Voluntary Commitment

17. The objective of this session was to gather support for the recovery component of the
Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. The concept of “Build Back Better” is
expected to be highlighted in the framework, which will be adopted at Third UN World
Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, 14-18 March 2015. In view of this,
a voluntary commitment by country governments was explored and deliberated in this
occasion.

18. The accumulated lessons from past experiences serve as rationale for proposing key
actions on recovery. Firstly, while governments have implemented large-scale recovery
and reconstruction programs in the wake of certain disasters, success hinges upon the
availability of and access to skills and resources from a remarkably diverse community of
stakeholders. Secondly, despite ongoing and expanding efforts to minimize hazard
impacts through disaster risk reduction, the recovery function remains relevant and
necessary given that catastrophic events continue to occur at an alarming frequency.
Finally, the post-disaster recovery response has been increasingly plagued by significant
time-gaps, a lack of continuous attention by international and national partners, and
decreasing resource commitments. Often, recovery momentum tends to slow following
post-disaster assessments, making it hard to plan and implement later stages of
recovery and reconstruction. Even with so many capacity building efforts, nations still
face serious limitations in terms of pre-disaster recovery planning and implementing an
effective recovery processes.

19. There is a clear need to further step-up efforts on recovery. In this context, some
government officials, through initial consultations, proposed key actions that country
governments may voluntary commit.
20. The following commitments were identified and discussed (Annex 3 Voluntary Commitment on Recovery):

(i) Building greater financial resilience and predictability within government to manage and respond to disaster triggered by natural hazards, and formalized strategic and resource commitments towards recovery planning, implementation and performance management;

(ii) Promoting the institutionalization of post disaster assessments and national recovery frameworks to enhance risk governance, ensure recovery readiness; strengthen coordination of governments, civil society, multi-laterals and other, and; increase efficient and effective recovery and reconstruction operations;

(iii) Strengthening capacity for recovery planning and monitoring at the national, local, and community level, and establishing clear roles and responsibilities for all actors in a recovery setting, including national and local governments, private sector, academia, and civil society organizations;

(iv) Strengthening mechanisms for cooperation with services in areas of recovery and reconstruction that include sharing rosters of experts, capacity building, tools, bi-lateral support between countries, progress monitoring; and standardized approaches for post-disaster assessments and recovery planning frameworks;

(v) Development of national and international policy standards for informing and guiding disaster recovery strategies;

(vi) Maintaining an institutional continuum between preparedness, response, recovery, mitigation and sustainable development measures.

21. If political support and commitment of governments for recovery are in place, there is greater opportunity for promoting risk reduction and building resilience. It will also expected to promote a greater chance for recovery and reconstruction to be implemented in an efficient and effective manner that avoids negative consequences, such as vulnerable groups sliding below poverty lines.

Way Forward

22. Several recommended next steps were outlined at the dialogue. These include efforts to further (i) disseminate best practices and lessons on recovery and reconstruction processes implemented in recent years; (ii) share the results of the dialogue processes to other regions and countries; (iii) inform the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction on recovery and reconstruction issues that should be taken into account.

23. Some specific actions were also mentioned such as the following: (i) recovery frameworks/plans may be prepared, discussed, and approved before the disaster
happens; (ii) recovery process shall incorporate DRR and integrated into development; and (iii) evaluation and monitoring mechanisms of recovery projects to be implemented. It was also observed that there is so much recovery experience in Central America that should be documented, analyzed, and shared to other regions and countries.
## Annex 1: Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Nov 11, Tuesday</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30-09:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>CEPREDENAC, SAV-DGPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09:00-09:30 | **Session 1**: Introduction and Objectives  
Rationale and objectives | UNISDR |
| 09:30-10:15 | **Paving the way for recovery and resilience**  
- UNISDR (Mr. Julio Garcia)  
- UNDP (Mr. Luis Gamarra)  
- IRP (Ms. Ana Cristina Thorlund & Mr. Gerry Potutan)  
- CEPREDENAC (Mr. Roy Barboza) | Moderator: CEPREDENAC |
| 10:15-10:45 | Coffee Break | |
| 10:45-12:15 | **Session 2**: Sharing of Experiences (with discussions)  
- Paraguay (Mr. Ricardo Maidana)  
- Honduras  
- Japan (Mr. Shingo Kochi) | Moderator: UNDP |
| 12:15-13:45 | Lunch | |
| 13:45-15:15 | **Session 3**: National Experiences, advances, needs and requirements  
- Guatemala  
- Costa Rica  
- El Salvador (H.E. Jorge Antonio Melendez)  
- Panama | Moderator: UNDP |
| 15:15-15:30 | Coffee Break | |
| 15:30-17:00 | Group Discussions (Governance, institutionalization, and financial predictability) | Moderator: UNISDR-IRP |
| 18:00 | **Inauguration of the Meeting and Launch of the Central American Regional Assessment Report on DRR**  
- UN El Salvador  
- CEPREDENAC  
- El Salvador Vice President Sr. Oscar Ortiz | Facilitators: UNISDR, IRP, CEPREDENAC, SAV-DGPC |
<p>| | Welcome Cocktail | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Financial and technical cooperation mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>UNISDR/IRP/UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- World Bank</td>
<td>Facilitator: Julio Garcia, UNISDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UNDP (Ms. Jeannette Fernandez)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SDC (Mr. Fabrizio Poretti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- GETI (Mr. Gerry Potutan on behalf of Sanjaya)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-12:15</td>
<td><strong>Session 5: Voluntary Commitments on Recovery</strong></td>
<td>Facilitator: IRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:15</td>
<td><strong>Session 6: Cities Experiences</strong></td>
<td>Facilitator: UNISDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Santa Tecla, El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bogota, Colombia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Curundu, Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-15:30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 7: Way Forward on Recovery Processes at national level &amp; Conclusions and Commitments</strong></td>
<td>Facilitators: UNISDR, IRP, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How can one take advantage of the lessons from other countries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Linkages amongst regional, national and local level actions for recovery planning and implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What will be the next steps? What support is needed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Indicative Action Plans: Commitment to do certain activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results exchange (Spanish-English groups)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wrap up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Presentation of results: regional, national and local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:00</td>
<td><strong>Closing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Core Electrode</th>
<th>Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Johnson</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dialogo Intergubernamental sobre Procesos de Recuperacion Posdesastre**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Firma</th>
<th>Correo Electrónico</th>
<th>Instituto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>Fresh Vies</td>
<td>DEPC</td>
<td>Corinto</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio Alvarado</td>
<td>CORREDAOR</td>
<td>corinto</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Hernández</td>
<td>REDPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:albert@redpa.org">albert@redpa.org</a></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego García</td>
<td>CORREDAOR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diego@corredor.com">diego@corredor.com</a></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Mejía</td>
<td>CORREDAOR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis@corredor.com">luis@corredor.com</a></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diálogo Internacional: Procesos de Recuperación Postderrame**

1. Fresh Vies
2. Julio Alvarado
3. Albert Hernández
4. Diego García
5. Luis Mejía

---
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Annex 3: Voluntary Commitment

Conference Statement:

Preamble:
The growing incidence of high-impact disasters has made countries recognize the importance of building long-term disaster resilience. Such recognition stems from the experience of post-disaster recovery which several countries have implemented in the aftermath of a disaster. Governments, parliamentarians and other stakeholders such as international agencies, NGOs, and civil society view recovery as an important context for introducing several measures which not just restore their lives, homes, and livelihoods, but build them more resilient. Though recovery was not explicitly included in the Hyogo Framework for Action, the financial and technical resources allocated for recovery across the world has placed it on the agenda for building resilience.

Going forward, the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, recovery must be viewed as part of an continuum, inseparable from preparedness, response, mitigation and sustainable development. It is important to acknowledge the critical role that recovery can play in seizing opportunities that arise through the adversity of disasters and steering countries towards a state of greater resilience. The Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction should, therefore, actively promote the institutionalization of recovery as a means to risk reduction and sustainable development, and better define and measure outcomes such as resilient recovery and "Build Back Better."

Goal:
Advance consensus, nationally and internationally, on the critical role of resilient recovery for sustainable development and poverty reduction.

Conference Statement:
We, the participants of the Second World Reconstruction Conference from 36 governments and countries, parliamentarians, civil society organizations, academia, UN agencies, regional organizations and the World Bank Group, bringing expertise and knowledge from all regions of the world, have met in Washington, D.C., from 10-12 September 2014. We support to further the actions below to include and strengthen Resilient Recovery and Reconstruction in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, which will be deliberated and finalized through the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, Japan in March 2015:
1. Promote and ensure efficient, inclusive, and effective recovery and reconstruction interventions and measures through the institutionalization of post disaster needs assessments and recovery frameworks across regions and all levels of government. This would enhance risk governance, strengthen coordination, and empower communities and marginalized groups.

2. Provision for sufficient financial reserves and resources within government to manage and respond to disasters triggered by natural hazards, and formalized strategic and resource commitments towards equitable recovery planning, implementation and performance management; promoting more dependable and predictable international financial mechanisms for financing recovery.

3. Strengthening mechanisms for cooperation with services in areas of recovery and reconstruction that include standardized approaches for post-disaster needs assessments and recovery planning frameworks, and other support services such as sharing of information, data bases and rosters of experts, best practices, capacity building, tools, bi-lateral, regional and multilateral support to countries, and progress monitoring.

4. Strengthening readiness and capacity for recovery planning, implementation, and monitoring across regions and all levels of government, and establishing clear roles and responsibilities for all actors in a recovery setting.

5. Consider further consultations in the development of a “Draft Voluntary Commitment in Support of Recovery and Reconstruction in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction” (Annex I) at Second Preparatory Committee Meeting and the Third UN World Conference for Disaster Risk Reduction, and other events ahead of the Third UN World Conference for Disaster Risk Reduction to be held in Sendai, Japan in March 2015

**Supporting Participants:**

At the second World Reconstruction Conference, participants had initiated an in-depth discussion to explore voluntary commitments for recovery in support of the implementation of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction as per resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. While the discussions resulted in identifying proposed commitments, this initial draft is still a work-in-progress that will be further deliberated by governments at the sides of the Second Preparatory Committee Meeting, 17-18 November in Geneva and at the Third UN World Conference for Disaster Risk Reduction, 14-18 March 2015 in Sendai. This initiative is coordinated by the International Recovery Platform. Further comments should be sent to thorlind@recoveryplatform.org; imercadante@worldbank.org

### Annex I

#### 1st Consultation on the possibility for a Voluntary Commitment for Recovery in Support of the Implementation of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you like to submit?</th>
<th>1st Consultation on the possibility for a Voluntary Commitment for Recovery in Support of the Implementation of the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the goal it will address?</td>
<td>Goal 3 – <em>Strengthening Resilience</em> by investing in recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Commitment</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Recovery as an Opportunity to Achieve Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Description of Commitment | 1. Promoting the institutionalization, through legislation and other means, of national recovery strategies and plans as a policy imperative to risk governance to ensure recovery readiness and enhanced resilience and to mainstream disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation into post-disaster recovery and reconstruction;  
2. Integrating appropriate recovery indicators into the post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction that governments and stakeholders can use to monitor progress of implementation and achievement of recovery goals;  
3. Provision for sufficient financial reserves and resources within government to manage and respond to disasters triggered by natural hazards, and formalized strategic and resource commitments towards recovery planning, implementation and performance management; promoting more dependable and predictable international financial mechanisms for financing recovery;  
4. Strengthening mechanisms for cooperation with services in areas of recovery and reconstruction that include standardized approaches for post-disaster needs assessments and recovery planning frameworks, and other support services such as sharing of information, data bases and rosters of experts, best practices, capacity building, tools, bi-lateral, regional and multilateral support to countries, and progress monitoring;  
5. Strengthening capacity for recovery planning, implementation, and monitoring at the regional and all levels of government, and establishing |
“Changing the Paradigm:
Disaster Recovery as a means to Sustainable Development”

| Targets | A. **Short and medium term**  
|---|---|
|  | • Conduct capacity building and Training of Trainer (ToT) on recovery planning/framework in disaster prone countries and local governments  
|  | • Compile, update, and disseminate best practices through the existing platforms and mechanisms  
|  | • Disseminate indicators, tools, and technical guidelines widely amongst nations via networks and capacity building events (translate tools for local use)  
| B. **Long term**  
|  | • Recovery plans/programs and integrated risk reduction are aligned with national development plans  
|  | • Legislative reforms pursued — regulations, legislation, standard operating procedures relating to recovery and reconstruction |

| Indicators | A. **Short and mid-terms**  
|---|---|
|  | • Increased local and national governments' and other relevant actors capacity on recovery planning  
|  | • Updated compilation of best practices and disseminated in existing platforms  
|  | • Tools and guidelines are translated, and are available for use by local and national governments  
| B. **Long term**  
|  | • Policies and legislation on recovery passed and adopted — improved regulations, legislation, and standard operating procedures to reflect the principle of build back better/smarter  
|  | • Appropriate ministries or agencies of the government play a key role in the recovery process and for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development policy. All public investment projects to involve risk assessment and mitigation measures. |

| Means of Verification | A. **Short and mid-terms**  
|---|---|
|  | • Number of training events conducted, and reported on websites  
|  | • Best practices published and translated  
|  | • Tools and guidelines translated and made available at local and national levels of government and other relevant actors  
|  | • Number of countries that have applied recovery planning concepts  
|  | • Number of recovery strategies formulated based on comprehensive socio-economic analysis  
|  | • Number of comprehensive recovery strategies implemented  
| B. **Long term**  
|  | • Legislation, Regulation/Standard Operations Procedures amended  
|  | • Joint activities between key ministries/agencies and DRR focal point  
|  | • Check list for DRR for all public investment projects  
|  | • Centers of Excellence operational |

| Timeframe | The short term activities are done within the framework of 1-2 years, while the mid-term and long term activities are for 1-3 years and 3-5 years, respectively. |
16. There is a call to further strengthen early warning and preparedness systems, motivated by the increase in disaster events as well as evidence that such systems contribute to saving lives and increasing efficiency of preparedness and response. With the increase in magnitude of disaster impacts, not least in highly urbanized settings, and of disasters affecting large numbers of people and high-value national and local infrastructures and economic assets, the cost and complexity of reconstruction is rising. Actions should include:

a) Preparing or reviewing and periodically updating disaster preparedness and contingency plans and policies at all levels, with a particular focus on ensuring in the design and planning the participation of all social groups, including the most vulnerable.

b) Continuing to further strengthen early warning systems and tailoring them to users’ needs, including social and cultural requirements.

c) Promoting regular disaster preparedness exercises, including evacuation drills, with a view to ensuring rapid and effective disaster response and access to essential food and non-food relief supplies, as appropriate, to local needs.

d) Adopting specific public policies, and establishing coordination and funding mechanisms and procedures to plan and prepare for post-disaster recovery, rehabilitation, reconstruction and displacement in order to mitigate and minimize losses.

e) Engaging diverse institutions, multiple authorities and stakeholders at all levels, in view of the complex and costly nature of post-disaster reconstruction. Learning from the reconstruction programs over the HFA decade and exchange of experience is critical to provide guidance for preparedness for reconstruction in the future.

f) Promoting the incorporation of disaster risk management into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes and use opportunities during the recovery phase to develop capacities that reduce disaster risk in the medium-term, including through the sharing of expertise, knowledge and lessons learned.
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