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Executive Summary

The International Recovery Platform (IRP), specifically the World Bank’s Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), UNISDR, and Cabinet Office Japan had organized two public forums at the United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction on March 16, 2015 in Sendai, Japan. The sessions were on (i) Effective Implementation of Recovery Plans and Programs: Bridging academic findings and country experiences and (ii) Actions on Engaging Private Sector in Recovery: Ensuring greater impacts of recovery programs at the community level.

The accumulated lessons on recovery from past experiences served as rationale for organizing the sessions. 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 declining 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.

The common objective of the sessions was to draw critical recommendations on how to effectively implement recovery programs at the national and local levels, outlining clear strategies and actions to support the implementation of Priority 4 of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR).

The recommendations for effective implementation of recovery plans include: (i) understanding risk in the context of recovery, (ii) strengthening governance with significant engagement and support of political leaders, and (iii) promoting pre-disaster recovery planning.

The recommendations for effectively engaging the private sector in recovery include: (i) promoting public-private partnerships, (ii) harnessing capacity of private sector, (iii) promoting business continuity planning, (iv) providing incentives for the private sector, and (v) establishing business standards for disaster risk management activities.
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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. In recognition of these gaps, the International Recovery Platform (IRP), specifically the World Bank’s Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), UNISDR, and Cabinet Office Japan had organized two public forums at the United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction on March 16, 2015 in Sendai, Japan. The titles of the public forums are:

   **Effective Implementation of Recovery Plans and Programs**
   *Bridging academic findings and country experiences*
   Room C101, Kawauchi-kita Campus, Tohoku University
   10:00-12:00, 16 March 2015

   **Actions on Engaging Private Sector in Recovery**
   *Ensuring greater impacts of recovery programs at the community level*
   Room C101, Kawauchi-kita Campus, Tohoku University
   14:00-16:00, 16 March 2015

3. The accumulated lessons on recovery from past experiences served as rationale for organizing the public forums. 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 declining 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.

4. The common objective of organizing the two sessions was to draw critical recommendations on how to effectively implement recovery programs at the national and local levels, outlining clear strategies and actions in support of the implementation of Priority 4 of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR).
Session on Effective Recovery

Expected Outcome

5. This session explored various contexts and perspectives of bridging research and experiences. It drew from the discussions critical recommendations on how to effectively implement recovery plans.

6. Post-disaster recovery is unquestionably the most complex disaster management function. The recovery timeframe is measured in years or even decades and requires capital outlays that can match and even exceed national GDP. Moreover, the success of a recovery effort hinges upon the availability of and access to skills and resources from a remarkably diverse community of stakeholders. Disasters significantly disrupt lives and livelihoods, stunt or even stall economic and social development, and inflict long-lasting physical and psychological damage, to name a few of the many possible impacts. The challenges encountered by affected communities and countries as they sustainably and equitably rebuild what was lost and realign their development trajectory are monumental.

7. The panelists of this session (Annex 1) affirmed that bridging academic findings and country experiences on recovery processes can be one of the options to help facilitate effective implementation of recovery plans and programs. There exists no shortage of data to show that inadequate or misguided recovery actions, even when driven by the best of intentions, results in unnecessary suffering and long-lasting detrimental effects for those impacted. At the same time, there are several examples where the presence of the skills, structures, and leadership applicable to the complex recovery task enabled an efficient and effective recovery.
Why is effective recovery important?

8. This session reaffirmed that when a disaster occurs, there exists a unique opportunity to conduct activities that might not otherwise be possible. Recovery affords impacted communities with the chance to not only reduce risk from the precipitating hazard, but also from many other hazards and conditions that have no bearing on the recent event yet still threaten the community henceforth. Recovery actions can also promote both physical and economic resilience, and prompt or facilitate investment in infrastructure upgrades and urban revitalization.

9. However, is that there exists significant variability in how disaster-affected communities fare. In fact, many suffer significant development lags that beleaguer the community and its residents for decades. The greatest share of international attention and assistance is focused on the support of shorter-term disaster relief and response activities, but it is during the longer-term recovery and reconstruction period that the fate of the disaster impacted country is sealed. Recovery decisions shape and reinvent the community, painting a picture of what it will look like and how it will operate.

10. Successful recovery can be so effective in boosting community development that causes a leapfrog effect. Conversely, ineffective recovery can so be so devastating to the character and viability of the community that residents see no other option for avoiding persistent suffering than to migrate elsewhere.

11. The principal problem facing those tasked with recovery is that recovery operations occur where two equal yet opposing needs converge: victims’ desires to resume their lives and planners’ needs to research and deliberate each of the many possible recovery solutions. But this pressure to move forward is more than just a desire to alleviate victim discomfort or dissatisfaction. Rather, the very survival of victims depends on the resumption of a range of basic social services that typically cannot resume in earnest until recovery has begun or progressed. For instance, damage to or destruction of schools leaves students without an adequate source of education; the loss of hospitals and clinics decreases medical services and increases vulnerability to chronic and communicable diseases; and business interruption and loss result in unemployment surges, decreased economic stability and strength, and a loss in tax revenue for the impacted governments. The longer it takes to initiate and conduct recovery activities, the more these effects will exacerbate the already difficult conditions faced by the affected population.

12. The efficiency and effectiveness of both planning and operations ultimately determine whether poverty in the country is alleviated or exacerbated, whether lives and livelihoods are viable, and whether the recipients of assistance are accepting of their post-recovery status. We know that, like response, recovery requires unique skills, equipment, resources, and personnel if it is to be successful. Unlike response, however, communities and countries rarely conduct planning for recovery prior to the onset of an actual disaster.
13. It was noted that in the disaster’s aftermath little time exists to plan effectively. Rebuilding without fully considering the disaster’s effects, new hazard information, and each of the options that exist to address risk reduction (and likewise development trajectory), is unwise and irresponsible. Unfortunately, decisions made in the critical early-recovery phase are often done so with little or no analysis, and many opportunities for improvement are thus lost.

**Session on Private Sector Engagement**

**Expected Outcome**

14. This session drew from the discussions recommendations on how to effectively engage the private sector in recovery programs at the national and local levels, outlining clear strategies and actions.

15. Among the objectives of organizing the session were: (i) to explore the role that private sector entities and the business community as a whole play in facilitating community disaster resilience and recovery from major disaster events; (ii) to examine the wide range of risk reduction and recovery capabilities the private sector has to offer, as well as the responsibility of businesses to do provide them; (iii) to consider what is needed to initiate, implement, and sustain private sector engagement in DRR and recovery, what investments and initiatives the private sector has to offer, and what knowledge gaps and barriers stand in the way of greater levels of private-sector engagement; and (iv) to outline different strategies that might foster and/or enhance public-private participation in DRR and recovery, and determine ways to implement those strategies in alignment with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

16. The panelists of this session (Annex 2) affirmed that businesses are important and influential components in the communities where they operate, and their collective ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters can bring about dramatic
shifts in a community’s disaster resilience. Essentially, businesses are much more than the facilities that contain them or the equipment they require to carry out their work. For the communities where they operate, businesses represent a source of jobs, tax revenue, civic vitality, and a general sense of identity. However, for these very same reasons, businesses also represent a significant source of vulnerability in disaster-impacted communities. Businesses are exposed to the same damaging consequences that citizens, schools, or any other entities. An inability of businesses to survive a disaster, therefore, puts the whole community’s economic and social well-being in jeopardy.

**Why businesses are also at risk?**

17. The prominent role of the private sector in disaster risk management is one most businesses are only just recently starting to appreciate. Businesses are important and influential components in the communities where they operate, and their collective ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters can bring about dramatic shifts in a community’s disaster resilience. Businesses are much more than the facilities that contain them or the equipment they require to carry out their work. For the communities where they operate, businesses represent a source of jobs, tax revenue, civic vitality, and a general sense of identity. But for these very same reasons, businesses also represent a significant source of vulnerability in disaster-impacted communities. Businesses are exposed to the same damaging consequences that citizens, schools, or any other entities are. An inability of businesses to survive a disaster, therefore, puts the whole community’s economic and social well-being in jeopardy.

18. It was presented that businesses reduce their vulnerability to the impacts of unforeseen events, including major emergencies and disasters, by conducting business continuity planning (BCP). BCP is defined as the process by which companies of any size identify the risks threatening their business operations; determine what solutions exist to either eliminate or reduce the risk; and formulate plans and procedures to ensure that critical business functions may be maintained or resumed in the event of an emergency or disaster (whether of internal or external origin).

19. Any major disruption to the community has the potential to adversely impact the private sector, and a lack of planning leaves businesses exposed. This is particularly true for the many small and medium-sized enterprises that even in the absence of adverse events are operating on the brink of survival. When disasters strike, business owners and operators have very little time to react to the needs of customers, creditors, and suppliers. At the same time, they are simultaneously trying to recover from direct damages to facilities, inventory, and equipment as well as possible human losses.

20. All businesses, regardless of sector, serve an important function in the community, and the preservation of community character is therefore tied to their resilience. Businesses allow access to vital goods, including food, gasoline, and construction supplies, and they provide important services such as medical care, childcare, entertainment, and banking. If the affected business or businesses are local-regional or national in their operations, the disaster’s economic and social impacts can extend far beyond the directly-affected area.
Role of Private Sector

21. One of the critical roles mentioned by panelists was that in addition to protecting their own facilities, operations, and employees, businesses can also play an active role in disaster risk management activities. The traditional view of disaster risk management is one of governmental and nongovernmental agencies working hand-in-hand to execute response and recovery while businesses play a small to nonexistent role. Yet there is increasing recognition that public-private partnerships can vastly expand the collective disaster risk management capacity of communities and countries.

Recommendations

22. Both sessions came up with a list of recommendations, which IRP and co-organizers can further review and appropriately disseminate to partners and clients.

23. The recommendations for effective implementation of recovery plans include:

**Understand Risk in the Context of Recovery.** Long-term development plans should consider how disasters might impact development and incorporate recovery actions and opportunities into change management plans. Opportunities for alleviating poverty through effective recovery should be considered. It is possible to anticipate post-disaster recovery needs and the actions, human and financial resources, coordination and decision-making mechanisms, legal and regulatory authorities, and other factors that will be required in addressing those needs. This information can be gained by modifying standard hazard identification and risk assessment methods.

**Strengthen Governance.** Recovery requires significant engagement of and support from political leaders. Leaders should be informed of anticipated recovery requirements and the benefits of building recovery capacity prior to the onset of disaster. Leaders should understand and be trained in managing their post-disaster recovery roles and responsibilities. Agencies or offices that will be responsible for coordinating specific recovery functions, such as recovery planning, infrastructure, or shelter, can be identified. Their roles should be clarified and any necessary mandates established. Legal frameworks, including legislative mechanisms, regulations, ordinances, and other standard operating procedures required for recovery and reconstruction can be anticipated and enacted to ensure post-disaster recovery operations are not delayed unnecessarily.

**Pre-Disaster Recovery Planning.** Pre-disaster recovery plans and/or frameworks should be developed, enacted, and maintained because post-disaster recovery operations draw upon a monumental reserve of human resources from the wide stakeholder community inclusive of the public, private, and nongovernmental sectors. Governments can build strong working relationships prior to disasters by identifying these stakeholders, establishing the expectations, and maintaining an ongoing rapport. Recovery planning committees and decision-making bodies can be established and adequately staffed at all government levels prior to the onset of disaster.
24. The recommendations for effectively engaging the private sector in recovery include:

**Promote Public-Private Partnerships.** The public sector holds the key to creating the access vehicle of the public-private partnership, and only government can invite the private sector into disaster response and recovery command structures. Fostering these partnerships post-disaster is too late. PPPs should be created well before the disaster occurs. In most disasters the main constraint is not money, but rather management capacity. PPPs can enable an infusion of management capacity, which includes management on the ground to support local response rather than having experts from outside the affected area flown in. When these PPPs are created prior to a disaster, communities institutionalize the capacity to remain self-supporting and, subsequently, more resilient.

**Harness Capacity.** Disasters create opportunities for the private sector. As a result, the private sector needs to make recommendations for how actors can reduce risk, build back better, and retain economic strength and investment wealth within the community. It matters little whether the business sees the opportunity as a profit-making opportunity or a matter of corporate responsibility – they are a component of community and national capacity if and only if they are engaged.

**Promote Business Continuity Planning.** Governments must continue to promote business continuity planning efforts and provide the education and guidance to facilitate it (especially among small businesses where participation in such schemes is lowest). Continuity planning is the most basic manner in which the private sector is able to contribute to reductions in community risk.

**Incentives for the Private Sector.** Communities and governments can promote DRR in the private-sector by creating economic incentives. Government can offer tax benefits and subsidies to businesses that are willing to incorporate safer building practices. This is a low-cost or no-cost means for impacted governments to increase the likelihood that redeveloped properties, structures, or infrastructure will be more resilient than those that were lost.

**Business Standards on DRM Activities.** Risk reduction almost always translate to increases in up-front costs, although studies have shown risk reduction investments reap a four- to 10 fold return. By raising minimum standards for protections whether through land use or corporate laws, building codes, safety regulations, or other mechanisms, however, the playing field is re-leveled and businesses no longer face losing this edge by mitigating risk. Business and consumers alike must be informed about how increases in protection far outweigh the associated rises in cost such that statutory and legal mechanisms are able to garner necessary legislative support.
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Effective Implementation of Recovery Plans and Programs

*Bridging academic findings and country experiences*

Room C101, Kawauchi-kita Campus, Tohoku University
10:00-12:00, 16 March 2015

**Hon. Lianne Dalziel**
Mayor, Christchurch New Zealand

The honorable mayor graduated with a law degree from Canterbury University before becoming involved in the union movement. From 1990 she was a Labour Party Member of Parliament for two decades, holding a range of portfolios in the Fifth Labour Government, including immigration, senior citizens, commerce, small business, and women's affairs. She was elected mayor of Christchurch in 2014.

**Prof. Santosh Kumar**
Director, SAARC DMC

Prof. Santosh Kumar is an Economist with formal training in disaster management. He has long experience in this profession, including working for the Government of India, the World Bank, and the UN agencies in India and abroad. He previously held key posts at the National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM) and Rajasthan State Institute of Public Administration (RSIPA). At the SDMC, Dr. Kumar puts emphasis on contributing toward the formulation of a Framework for Mainstreaming DRR in development planning and climate change adaptation.

**Dr. Md. Akram H. Chowdhury**
Executive Chairperson, Institute of Strategic Recovery Studies for Disaster Resilience & Research (ISRSDRR)

Dr. Md. Akram H. Chowdhury was born in 1954 in his village Chakrail, under the Badalgachhi upazila (sub-district) at Naogaon District in Bangladesh. He was Member of Parliament (MP) at the 9th Parliament (2009-2014) and a member of the standing committee of the both the Ministry of Food and the Ministry of Disaster Management. Currently he is Executive Chairperson of ISRSDRR and also one of the members of Asian Advisory Group of Parliamentarian (APAG) for Disaster Risk Reduction affiliated with the UNISDR.
Dr. Marqueza Cathalina Lepana Reyes
Technical Advisor, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

Working as ASEAN Technical Advisor for Disaster Risk Reduction for the past five years, providing guidance and technical support in strategic policy development in disaster risk management as well as responsible for the developing, implementing and mobilizing resources for programmes and projects on disaster risk financing and insurance, disaster risk assessment, science-based disaster risk reduction, mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in development and sectoral planning such as risk-sensitive land use planning, and resilient recovery. Core competencies in policy analysis and development, project development and implementation in the areas of disaster preparedness, mitigation, and prevention, land use planning, urban and regional planning, and environmental management, further honed by experience in the field for more than 20 years. Marqueza received her doctorate degree in urban planning minor in disaster risk reduction (magna cum laude) at the University of Kassel in Germany. She finished her master’s degree in urban and regional planning and bachelor’s degree in geology from the University of the Philippines. She is also a published author of a book titled “Risk-Sensitive Land Use Planning: Towards Reduced Earthquake Disaster Vulnerability,” peer-reviewed articles on disaster vulnerability and risk in various journals, and editor of numerous international conference proceedings.

Mr. Roy Barboza Sequeira
Executive Secretary of CEPREDENAC

Roy Barboza Sequeira: Civil Engineer, with specialization in environmental engineering. His work experience exceeds 25 years of activities in the fields of environmental engineering, sanitation, comprehensive risk to disaster management, teaching and formulation of environmental, economic and health-related projects. He has worked with national and international institutions, as executive officer of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (BCIE by its acronym in Spanish) in environmental topics, as Vice Minister of Housing and Human Settlements of Costa Rica, and has served in other important posts within the Central American Integration System (SICA, by its acronym in Spanish). He currently occupies the post of Executive Secretary of the Coordination Center for the prevention of Natural Disasters in Central America (CEPREDENAC) since January 1st of 2014. His last job posts in public administration are: Vice Minister of Housing and Human Settlements within the Ministry of Housing and Human Settlements of Costa Rica 2010-2013; Executive Secretary of the Regional Water Resources Committee (CRRH) until 2010.

MR. TAM HOANG
Vice Chair, Youth Beyond Disasters, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

Tam is the Global Focal Point for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) for the UN Major Group for Children & Youth and Deputy Chair of the Youth Beyond Disasters network – a global youth-led network for the Post-2015 Development Agenda. An accredited General Rescue volunteer, Tam has been part of NSW SES for the past nine years attending to storm and flood relief missions in Australia and abroad. He is currently pursuing a post-graduate in Disaster Risk Management at Fiji National University and is a member of the International Association of Emergency Managers.
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Actions on Engaging Private Sector in Recovery
Ensuring greater impacts of recovery programs at the community level
Room C101, Kawauchi-kita Campus, Tohoku University
March 16, 2015, 14:00-16:00

Mr. Damon Paul Coppola
Partner, Bullock and Haddow, LLC

Mr. Coppola is a professional emergency management analyst with over 15 years’ experience. He has authored several best-selling books on emergency management and homeland security, including the first professional text on planning and conducting a public emergency preparedness campaign. He rendered consultancy services to the United Nations, the World Bank, national and local governments in the North America, Europe, Asia, and the Pacific, as well as to nonprofits and private sector entities including the Council on Foundations, Save the Children, the Humane Society, Casey Foundation, and the Sloan Foundation. He is an adjunct professor for the graduate Global Public Health program at the Loma Linda School of Public Health in California.

Mr. Stefan Kohler
Head of Programme, UNOPS

He spent eight years in KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, working as a project manager focusing on infrastructure and housing projects for low income beneficiaries, in both greenfields and informal settlement upgrading contexts. He is former CEO of a Development Trust (NGO) which brought together corporate donors and communities who lacked education facilities to deliver affordable, quality education infrastructure. In January 2012, he relocated to the UK and joined Arup International Development as an Associate Director. In this role he has also been responsible for managing the Long Term Agreement that UNOPS has with Arup for provision of technical services related to infrastructure delivery. Stefan is currently managing UNOPS infrastructure assessment programme.
Mr. Gay Mitchell  
Former Member of the European Parliament

Mr. Mitchell was member of the European Parliament from 2004 to 2014. Prior to this, Gay Mitchell was member of the Irish Parliament for 26 years. Mr. Mitchell own-initiative report on the EU approach to resilience and disaster risk reduction in developing countries: learning from food security crises was adopted by the European Parliament, Development Committee in December 2013. He is also the author of the standard work on the role of the Comptroller and Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee: “By Dail Account: Auditing of Government Past Present and Future”, published by the Institute of Public Administration, 2004. He is member of UNISDR Global Advisory Group of Parliaments since 2012.

Dr. H. Kit Miyamoto  
CEO and President  
Miyamoto International

H. Kit Miyamoto, Ph.D., S.E., is the CEO of Miyamoto International, a global earthquake structural engineering company, and the nonprofit organization, Miyamoto Global Disaster Relief; he also is a California Seismic Safety Commissioner. Known for innovative engineering, Dr. Miyamoto has garnered significant industry recognition, including a Global Best Project award by ENR magazine. Dr. Miyamoto specializes in disaster risk reduction and reconstruction. Dr. Miyamoto was an expert consultant to the World Bank on the disaster risk reduction projects for 1,500 schools in Turkey and 3,800 schools in Philippines. He worked with the government of Haiti, the United Nations and the USAID to conduct seismic assessments of more than 430,000 earthquake-damaged structures in that country. Dr. Miyamoto is currently implementing the repair and strengthening of more than 120,000 damaged Haitian buildings. He is also involved with disaster reconstruction and disaster risk reduction programs in New Zealand and Philippines. Dr. Miyamoto and his team also work on the African continent, where they are helping the country of Liberia solve its post-civil war housing crisis based in part on an award-winning housing program in Haiti. A past director for the Structural Engineers Association of California, Dr. Miyamoto also is an American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Fellow. Dr. Miyamoto holds graduate degrees from the Tokyo Institute of Technology and California State University, where he has been recognized as a Distinguished Alumni and is a former adjunct professor. Dr. Miyamoto has published more than 100 technical papers and is a frequent speaker on disaster issues. He has been featured by several media organizations, including CNN, NBC, the Discovery Channel, the New York Times, and Rolling Stone.
Mr. Mihir Bhatt
Managing Trustee, All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI)

Mihir Bhatt leads independent All India Disaster Mitigation Institute recognized as Centre of Excellency by UN Office on South South Cooperation. AIDMI works across 35 cities and 49 districts in 9 states of India as well as 7 countries in Asia Pacific on reducing disaster and climate change risk since 1995. Since there is hardly any key initiative in which he is not involved either as a promoter or as a partner. He has reviewed long term recovery of 2001 Gujarat Earthquake, 2004 tsunami, and 2008 cyclone Nargis. He is a member of several government and civil society committees and task force in India and abroad.

Mr. Dale Sands
Senior Vice President and Global Practices Director
Environment, AECOM

Mr. Dale Sands is Senior Vice President with AECOM Technology and Global Practices Director for the Environment business line. Mr. Sands has led cross business unit working groups that have client facing implications in serving both public and private organizations. Mr. Sands has worked for AECOM, and predecessor companies for 14 years, and has both lived and worked internationally with experience in more than 40 countries. Mr. Sands is leading the Global Practices for Environment which includes Air Quality, Environmental Health and Safety, Impact Assessment & Permitting, Remediation Engineering and Construction, Specialty & Emerging Technologies, Water & Natural Resources and Waste Services.

Ms. Shukuko Koyama
Disaster and Employment Specialist, International Labour Organization (ILO)

Ms. Koyama has over 14 years of operational and research experience in disarmament, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, crisis response (natural disaster and armed conflict) and reconstruction within the United Nations System. She has a range of experience in policy development, project management, inter-agency coordination, gender analysis, and participatory monitoring and evaluation in the field of peacebuilding and post-disaster reconstruction. Ms. Koyama has intensive field experience in crisis-affected countries including the Democratic Republic of Congo, Japan, Liberia, Mali, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand.
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Effective Implementation of Recovery Plans and Programs
_Bridging academic findings and country experiences_

Room C101, Kawauchi-kita Campus, Tohoku University
10:00-12:00, 16 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>International Recovery Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:45</td>
<td>Sharing of Experiences and Discussions</td>
<td>1. Hon. Lianne Dalziel, Mayor Christchurch New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Prof. Santosh Kumar, Director SAARC DMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Dr. Marqueza Cathalina Lepana Reyes, Technical Advisor, ASEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dr. Akram H. Chowdhury, Institute of Strategic Recovery Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mr. Roy Barboza, CEPEVENAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Mr. Tam Hoang, Co-chair, Youth Beyond Disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Ms. Ana Cristina Thorlund, Knowledge Management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-11:55</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55-12:00</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions on Engaging Private Sector in Recovery
_Ensuring greater impacts of recovery programs at the community level_

Room C101, Kawauchi-kita Campus, Tohoku University
March 16, 2015, 14:00-16:00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00-14:15</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>International Recovery Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15-14:30</td>
<td>Overview: Guidance Notes on Recovery – Private Sector</td>
<td>Mr. Damon Coppola, Senior Associate Bullock and Haddow, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:45</td>
<td>Sharing of Experiences and Discussions</td>
<td>1. Mr. Gay Mitchell, Former Member of European Parliament, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Stefan Kohler, designated chair of the International Recovery Platform, Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience Programme, UNOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mr. Mihir Bhatt, All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dr. Kit Miyamoto, CEO and President, Miyamoto International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mr. Dale Sands, Vice Chair of UNISDR Advisory Group of Private Sector, AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Ms. Shukuko Koyama, Disaster and Employment Specialist, ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45-15:55</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:55-16:00</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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