



PROCEEDINGS OF THE REGIONAL KNOWLEDGE FORUM ON POST-DISASTER RECOVERY

20–21 October 2015

Asian Development Bank

PROCEEDINGS OF THE REGIONAL KNOWLEDGE FORUM ON POST-DISASTER RECOVERY

20–21 October 2015

Asian Development Bank



Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 IGO license (CC BY 3.0 IGO)

© 2015 Asian Development Bank
6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City, 1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel +63 2 632 4444; Fax +63 2 636 2444
www.adb.org; openaccess.adb.org

Some rights reserved. Published in 2015.
Printed in the Philippines

ISBN 978-92-9257-218-1 (Print), 978-92-9257-219-8 (e-ISBN)
Publication Stock No. RPT157745-2

Cataloging-In-Publication Data

Asian Development Bank.
Proceedings of regional knowledge forum on post-disaster recovery
Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank, 2015.

1. Post-disaster recovery. 2. Disaster risk management. 3. Resilience. I. Asian Development Bank.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent.

ADB does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accepts no responsibility for any consequence of their use. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by ADB in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

By making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area, or by using the term “country” in this document, ADB does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.

This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 IGO license (CC BY 3.0 IGO) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/igo/>. By using the content of this publication, you agree to be bound by the terms of said license as well as the Terms of Use of the ADB Open Access Repository at openaccess.adb.org/termsfuse

This CC license does not apply to non-ADB copyright materials in this publication. If the material is attributed to another source, please contact the copyright owner or publisher of that source for permission to reproduce it. ADB cannot be held liable for any claims that arise as a result of your use of the material.

Attribution—In acknowledging ADB as the source, please be sure to include all of the following information:

Author. Year of publication. Title of the material. © Asian Development Bank [and/or Publisher].
<https://openaccess.adb.org>. Available under a CC BY 3.0 IGO license.

Translations—Any translations you create should carry the following disclaimer:

Originally published by the Asian Development Bank in English under the title [title] © [Year of publication] Asian Development Bank. All rights reserved. The quality of this translation and its coherence with the original text is the sole responsibility of the [translator]. The English original of this work is the only official version.

Adaptations—Any adaptations you create should carry the following disclaimer:

This is an adaptation of an original Work © Asian Development Bank [Year]. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of ADB or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent. ADB does not endorse this work or guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accepts no responsibility for any consequence of their use.

Please contact OARsupport@adb.org or publications@adb.org if you have questions or comments with respect to content, or if you wish to obtain copyright permission for your intended use that does not fall within these terms, or for permission to use the ADB logo.

Note: In this publication, “\$” refers to US dollars.
Photos: All are ADB.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iv
Abbreviations	vi
Shared Lessons	viii
Proceedings	1
Opening and Introduction	3
Setting the Stage for Resilient Recovery: Planning and Budgeting for Post-Disaster Recovery Needs	6
Beyond Business as Usual: Overcoming the Implementation Challenges of Post-Disaster Recovery	10
People-Centered Post-Disaster Recovery	12
Keeping Recovery on Track: National, Regional, and Local Monitoring	15
Closing	17

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Regional Knowledge Forum on Post-Disaster Recovery was organized jointly by the Philippines Country Office (PhCO) of the Southeast Asia Department (SERD) and the Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management Division (SDCD) of the Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department (SDCC) of the Asian Development Bank

The forum was made possible by the Integrated Disaster Risk Management (IDRM) Fund of ADB, with financial contribution from the Government of Canada. The participation of the government officials from typhoon Yolanda affected areas of Region 8 in the Philippines was supported by the ADB Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR).

Country Director Richard Bolt, PhCO and Preety Bhandari, director, SDCC, concurrently technical advisor (Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management) provided overall leadership for the preparation of the forum. SERD Director General James Nugent and SDCC Director General Ma. Carmela Locsin supported this cross-department collaboration in the spirit of “One ADB.”

Vice-President (Operations 2) Stephen P. Groff welcomed the participants and Vice-President for Knowledge Management and Sustainable Development Bambang Susantono gave the closing remarks.

Arsenio Balisacan, secretary of Socio-Economic Planning and the Director General of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) set the tone of the forum with his keynote speech.

All the speakers generously shared their firsthand knowledge of post-disaster recovery. They are:

- Mariano del Castillo, Bureau of Design project manager, Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), Philippines
- Scott Davis, former advisor to the President’s Hurricane Sandy Rebuilding Task Force, US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Visiting Fellow, RAND Corporation, United States
- Emmanuel Esguerra, deputy director general, NEDA, Philippines
- Suprayoga Hadi, director general for Special Regions, Ministry of Village, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration, Indonesia

- Ladawan Kumpa, deputy secretary general, National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB), Thailand
- Melchor Mergal, mayor, Salcedo Municipality, Eastern Samar, Philippines
- Heru Prasetyo, former director of International Relations, Agency for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias (BRR), Indonesia
- Mary Racelis, research scientist, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines
- Benilda Redaja, national program manager, Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Philippines
- Robert Sinkler, director of Water Infrastructure, The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) North America Freshwater Program and former US Army Corps of Engineers, United States

Tina Monzon-Palma, ABS-CBN News Channel and Andrew Parker, principal social sector economist, ADB moderated the panel discussions.

Anna Almodiel, Maynard Matammu (forum timekeeper), Dindo Mengote (forum master of ceremonies), and Jocelyn Saw from the Grant Management Unit of the JFPR Grant 9175-PHI Emergency Assistance and Early Recovery for Poor Municipalities Affected by Typhoon Yolanda Project provided forum secretariat assistance together with Karen Baydo, Buena-Marie Manansala, Maria Vic Mina, Teresa Mendoza, Olive Rillo, Christopher Reganit, Nevah Velasco, Maria Cristina Velez, Christopher Wensley, and the JFPR team at the Office of Cofinancing Operations, ABD.

TA 8536-PHI: Support for Post Typhoon Yolanda Disaster Needs Assessment and Response consultants Rowena Soriaga and Catherine Vidar were key to all aspects of forum preparation and documentation.

Elbert Or and the Pushpin Visual Solutions team made live hand-drawn graphic recordings and visual notes of the forum.

Michelle Lyn Visaya and the ADB Event Management Unit team were responsible for the smooth running of the forum.

Edith Creus, Ma. Theresa Mercado, and Kae Sugawara together with Rodel Bautista and the Department of External Relations team worked on the publishing of these proceedings.



SHARED LESSONS

Every disaster represents a setback to development, but it also opens a window of opportunity that needs to be capitalized to strengthen resilience and overcome the pervasive cycle of destruction and reconstruction. Recovery needs can be overwhelming and full recovery takes years to achieve. Aligning recovery priorities with long-term development allows for a more sustainable recovery. Critical components of a sound recovery include adopting a comprehensive post-disaster recovery framework, a phased and flexible approach to implementation, as well as a strong leadership role of government, coupled with principles of build back better, inclusivity, and accountable governance.

- **Commence recovery even while relief is ongoing.** After a large-scale disaster, the overlap between the humanitarian response on the one hand and early recovery and reconstruction on the other, often described in post-disaster recovery literature as “phases of post-disaster response,” may need to be increased to fast-track the initiation of economic recovery, thereby reducing the overall fiscal burden of the disaster. Moving forward, the development of ex ante financing instruments for post-disaster responses will be critical to ensure the availability of resources for timely recovery and reconstruction efforts.
- **Develop a strategic framework to guide recovery.** A strategic framework to guide recovery is needed in the aftermath of a disaster. The recovery framework should outline the strategies aligned with the long-term development strategies of the affected area, articulate the short- and medium-term needs across sectors and the budgetary requirements, describe the regulatory and institutional reforms needed to fast-track recovery implementation, and detail the role of the government and nongovernment stakeholders and the coordination mechanism between them.
- **Establish government-led institutional setup and coordination mechanisms.** The choice of institutional setup to lead and coordinate the recovery will differ among countries depending on their legislative, policy, and governance structure. However, experiences demonstrate that the success of such a setup rests on the political importance attached, including the selection of a credible leader; clearly defined mandates; and adequate power and authority to command actions across agencies. Coordination remains a crucial function of such setups and should strengthen—not weaken—existing government-led systems and ensure horizontal coordination across sectors and vertical coordination from the local to the national and international level.
- **Build on programs with a proven track record.** Recovery requires immediate restoration of services and facilities on the ground. Using programs with a proven track record—with an established implementation structure and rules for implementation—can significantly hasten the recovery process. Program designs that are simpler tend to move faster compared to those that are large and complex.
- **Build back better and strengthen resilience.** Despite the tragedy that each disaster brings, they also offer a unique window of opportunity to address root causes of vulnerability—such as improper land use zoning, poor enforcement of building codes, and gender inequality—and in the process strengthen

resilience. The “building back better” process should adopt a multihazard, systems-based, and integrated approach, factoring in current and future risks; apply engineering standards for strengthening the resilience of physical assets; employ strategies and tools for predisaster financial planning; and strengthen capacities for managing residual disaster risk through local preparedness and business continuity management.

- **Involve local communities in the overall recovery effort.** In the aftermath of a disaster, communities want to be informed of the government’s plans for recovery. Since the purpose of recovery is to support the affected communities and strengthen their resilience, the recovery process should give ample time and space for the voice and aspirations of the communities to be heard. Engaging local communities from day one will promote ownership of the recovery process and contribute to its success.
- **Strengthen local capacity.** Large-scale disasters can easily overwhelm local capacities. From assessment and planning to implementation and monitoring, local government units may not possess the adequate technical and financial capacity to carry out basic functions and mandates related to recovery. This requires abundant technical assistance to support the local governments and help build a cadre of local experts.
- **Establish monitoring systems to improve transparency and accountability.** Having a unified, web-based, and geographically referenced monitoring system that is accessible to all implementing agencies, local governments, and development partners is critical for successful recovery. Such a mechanism provides up-to-date information on the recovery process, pinpoints overlaps and gaps, and enables partners to strengthen synergies among their interventions.
- **Manage expectations by making critical use of communication.** As recovery is everyone’s responsibility, communicating roles, goals, and progress is an important pillar of the recovery process. It is therefore imperative that communication be consistent and comprehensive to coordinate all efforts. A robust monitoring system is needed to enable the effective communication of the process and progress toward recovery.
- **Adopt a phased and flexible approach.** Full recovery takes time, during which different priorities may be addressed at different periods. Thus the implementation of the recovery program requires a phased and flexible approach that allows for the program focus to be adjusted over time to meet evolving needs.
- **Revisit the recovery plan as information becomes available.** Assess the damage and loss as quickly and efficiently as possible to inform investment decisions. Existing assessment methodologies and technical knowledge from international experience can inform the initial estimation of disaster impacts. Subsequent assessments can be undertaken as additional information from post-disaster assessments, sector evaluations, and local information become available.
- **Maintain a culture of urgency.** Typical implementation and coordination among government agencies and their partners may not necessarily work to meet the urgent and critical tasks entailed in recovery. The first 2 years of implementation in any recovery process are characterized by slow delivery amid high expectations from the affected communities, especially in the wake of intensive relief efforts. Approaches beyond business as usual that achieve results for the most vulnerable are necessary to allow reconstruction to move.
- **Consolidate experience into policy, planning, and financing.** Recovery reveals policy issues, institutional bottlenecks, and operational hurdles that impede post-disaster recovery efforts. National laws and policies get in the way of speed in project implementation, such as policies on procurement, land acquisition, and the many required permits and clearances needed to start projects. Through monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge sharing, these policies can be reviewed and revisited as necessary.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	- Asian Development Bank
BRR	- Agency for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias, Indonesia
CDD	- Community-driven development
CRRP	- Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Recovery Plan
DPWH	- Department of Public Works and Highways, Philippines
DRM	- disaster risk management
DSWD	- Department of Social Welfare and Development, Philippines
HUD	- Department of Housing and Urban Development, United States
IDRM	- Integrated Disaster Risk Management
JFPR	- Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction.
KC-NCDDP	- Kapit-Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services-National Community-Driven Development Program, Philippines
LGU	- local government unit
NEDA	- National Economic and Development Authority, Philippines
NESDB	- National Economic and Social Development Board, Thailand
RAY-BBB	- Reconstruction Assistance on Yolanda: Build Back Better





PROCEEDINGS

Disasters caused from natural hazards cause significant loss of life, economic damage and present serious threats to the long-term socioeconomic development in Asia and the Pacific. In the period 2005–2014 alone, about 425,000 lives were lost and 1.4 billion were affected by natural hazards in the region, equivalent to 84% of persons affected globally. In the same period, the region accounted for 47% of global direct physical losses from disasters, amounting to \$722 billion in total and averaging \$120 million a day in Asian Development Bank’s (ADB) developing member countries. The intensity and, in some areas, frequency of climate-related hazards is expected to increase with climate change. This will further increase the trend of rising losses if significant action is not taken.

Among all the regions in Asia and the Pacific, the Southeast Asia region is one of the most hazard-prone, with its wide geographical diversity that includes highlands, floodplains, coastal plains, and deltas; large river systems and major water bodies; and seismically active faults and volcanic zones is at high risk from natural hazards. However, the growing disaster risk is also a function of the vulnerability and exposure of the population and assets, which can largely be attributed to the rapid pace of unplanned development, degrading ecosystems, and overexploitation of natural resources in the region. Thus the rising losses from disasters and related setbacks in poverty reduction are often results of skewed development and can be reduced through development interventions across different sectors.

It is in this context that specific time-bound opportunities for development, particularly after a major disaster, should be seized to carefully plan interventions that maximize long-term benefits across different sectors and strengthen disaster resilience. Interventions related to post-disaster recovery in critical sectors—livelihoods, housing, social services, and infrastructure—should incorporate disaster risk considerations and aim at strengthening institutions and local capacity to assess risk, prioritize investments to reduce risk, and improve systems to manage the residual risk. ADB’s integrated disaster risk management (IDRM) approach supports disaster response actions to strengthen resilience to future hazard events; and enhance access to innovative disaster risk financing solutions such as sovereign and household disaster insurance tools.

Further, with the post-disaster context creating strong public expectation to reduce the risk of a repeat disaster event and an appreciation of disaster risk management (DRM) for strengthening sector and local level resilience, the recovery and reconstruction processes provide the opportunity to foster innovation, share knowledge, and strengthen partnerships within and among governments.

On 20–21 October 2015, over 80 government officials and decision makers, development partners, and civil society representatives from Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand participated in the Regional Knowledge Forum on Post-Disaster Recovery, organized by ADB in Manila. The regional knowledge forum provided a venue to share common challenges and possible solutions on planning and managing recovery programs based on lessons and good practices from recovery programs for 2005 Hurricane Katrina and 2012 Hurricane Sandy in the United States; the 2011 floods in Thailand; the 2004 tsunami in Aceh and Nias, Indonesia; and the 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The forum thus allowed a vibrant exchange of ideas and insights which were especially useful to the participants from the Philippines, those from the Eastern Visayas region who are still in the implementation stage of recovery and reconstruction post-Typhoon Yolanda. The forum was made possible by the IDRMM Fund of ADB, supported by the Government of Canada.





OPENING AND INTRODUCTION

Stephen Groff, Vice-President, Operations 2, ADB

Welcome Remarks: Emerging Lessons on Post-Disaster Recovery

Guided by the principles of building back better, inclusiveness, and good governance, ADB has developed a range of instruments to assist its developing member countries in recovering from disasters. Many of these instruments were used in its assistance for post-Yolanda recovery. Over the course of 2 years, the Yolanda recovery experience has highlighted that the critical components of a sound recovery include (i) undertaking robust assessments of damage and losses to understand the full impact of the disaster, (ii) identifying the needs of the most affected and aligning recovery priorities with long-term development priorities, (iii) adopting a comprehensive post-disaster recovery framework that outlines a phased and flexible approach to meet the evolving needs of the affected communities, (iv) going beyond “business as usual” to implement priorities, and (v) supporting strong government oversight to lead and coordinate the recovery process.

Richard Bolt, Country Director, Philippines Country Office, ADB

Overview on Post-Disaster Recovery in Southeast Asia

The post-disaster recovery process requires early involvement and a long-term commitment. Flexibility, leadership, and coordination are critical, as the mode of doing business as usual is challenged by the urgency and necessity of delivering results on the ground. Practical approaches for efficient implementation include simple project designs and procurement processes, streamlined disbursements, and tapping capable partners to implement subproject activities. Knowledge building and sharing are also essential in the recovery process to inform policies and practices that become the building blocks of resilience. From a development partner perspective, it is important to be engaged right from the beginning, supporting post-disaster assessment, recovery planning, and policy dialogue among stakeholders. This enables a better understanding and prioritization of the required assistance.

Arsenio M. Balisacan, Secretary of Socio-Economic Planning and Director General, National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), Philippines

Keynote Address: Lessons Learned from Typhoon Yolanda Post-disaster Recovery in the Philippines

Fast-track the initiation of recovery. The social and economic toll especially of large-scale disasters needs to be managed immediately, before it continues to deteriorate further, adversely impacting the rest of the economy. Relief operations require vast resources that can weaken the fiscal position of governments. Shortening the humanitarian phase and commencing with recovery soonest is critical to arrest the cost of disaster and quickly lay the foundation for sustainable solutions.

“The first lesson from the post-Yolanda disaster recovery is coordination, coordination, and coordination. Coordination must be paramount and ingrained in the consciousness of everyone even long before a disaster strikes.”

—Arsenio M. Balisacan

A strategic recovery plan should be established to inform decisions and mobilize resources. A strategic plan, such as Reconstruction Assistance on Yolanda: Build Back Better (RAY-BBB) formulated by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), is intended to guide the recovery of the local economy and livelihoods of the affected population. RAY provides the first synthesis of the overall impact of the disaster, presents an estimate of the budgetary requirements to address critical needs, and outlines the short- and medium-term requirements for affected areas toward a full recovery. RAY-BBB also identifies the necessary regulatory and institutional reforms to fast-track recovery and the strategic role of the external stakeholders in the recovery process, including development partners, civil society, and the private sector.

Recovery targets must be aligned with the long-term development trajectory of the country and lessons incorporated in broader policies. NEDA, as the government’s lead planning agency, needs to ensure that recovery is on track toward achieving the broader development goals and that the lessons from the recovery process are integrated into the macroeconomic and fiscal policies to minimize economic disruptions caused by disasters. In line with this, risk transfer instruments that can reduce the cost of recovery, for example, are under consideration.

Bottlenecks in project implementation brought to light the need to revisit several national laws and regulations, such as policies on land acquisition and procurement.

Government is in the best position to lead and coordinate the recovery process. Coordinating the myriad of humanitarian and recovery efforts can be challenging and is best coursed through the government. For example, uncoordinated efforts in assessment and planning that are carried out parallel to government-led initiatives can be confusing and inefficient. External support is best dovetailed with government processes so as not to weaken them. The roles among stakeholders, including local and national governments, must be clearly delineated so that resources are allocated wisely and various efforts do not cross sensitive lines and.

Heru Prasetyo, Former Director of International Relations, Agency for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias (BRR), Indonesia

Lessons from Post-Disaster Recovery: Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias

Effective transition between relief and recovery is critical. Relief is “only a painkiller, but not the cure.” An effectively implemented relief operation creates high expectations for the recovery phase. It is therefore crucial to manage expectations, by setting up the structure and processes to meet them when transitioning to the recovery phase. Recovery is “the cure, but has to be done with care and speed” by applying nonbusiness-as-usual approaches and by maintaining a single mindset in the direction of the recovery.

Large-scale disasters need a single accountable agency to lead the recovery process.

While the areas affected by the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami in Aceh and Nias crossed several political jurisdictions in Indonesia, only one accountable recovery agency was appointed to lead and coordinate the overall recovery effort. The BRR, a special body established by the president, was provided with adequate power and authority to coordinate and implement projects and served as the “one-stop shop” for all issues related to the recovery. It provided a wide range of services, including issuing visas for international partners, developing communication tools for different types of stakeholders, and mediating among partners, contractors, and local governments. The agency decentralized operations and fund management by setting up offices at the field level so it could prioritize results on the ground. It expedited the recovery process through all possible legal means, thereby creating a culture of urgency within the organization.

The recovery process needs to involve media and the private sector. Venues for dialogue and coordination with important stakeholders—in particular the media and the private sector—should be provided, to make the working relationship more meaningful. The BRR appointed an internal team that dealt exclusively with the media and that produced reports jointly with its partners, to guarantee the credibility of the information shared with the public. In dealing with the private sector, it was important to not only solicit financial support but also harness their experience and technical expertise.

“Year 2 is the most difficult. This is the year when expectations are high and recovery is slow. I see similarities in the tone of articles coming out 2 years after the Indian Ocean Tsunami and 2 years after Typhoon Yolanda.”

—Heru Prasetyo





SETTING THE STAGE FOR RESILIENT RECOVERY: PLANNING AND BUDGETING FOR POST-DISASTER RECOVERY NEEDS

Emmanuel Esguerra, Deputy Director-General for Policy and Planning, NEDA, Philippines
Challenges in Undertaking Post-Disaster Assessments: Experience from the Reconstruction Assistance on Yolanda (RAY)

Damage assessment must be conducted as quickly and efficiently as possible to inform planning and investment decisions. Globally recognized assessment methodologies, technical knowledge from international experience, and best available quantitative and qualitative data from various sources can inform the initial estimation of disaster impacts. Subsequent assessment can be undertaken as additional information from post-disaster assessments, sectoral evaluation, and information from the field become available.

“Institutional flexibility was demonstrated when the government decided to move on with RAY before the PDNA.”

—*Emmanuel Esguerra*

The development of RAY was mainly driven from the central office. NEDA initiated a process based on damage and loss assessments. Figures were vetted as they were reported back to the central office and consolidated. The RAY was developed in view of the urgency to submit budget requirements as it takes 4 months to do a post-disaster needs assessment (PDNA).

A strategic plan is complemented by an implementation or action plan. Following the formulation of RAY-BBB, the Government of the Philippines, through the then presidential assistant for rehabilitation and recovery, coordinated the formulation of the Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Recovery Plan (CRRP). As the operationalization

of the Yolanda recovery and reconstruction program was anchored on the development principles of the Philippine Development Plan, the CRRP consolidated the plans of sector agencies and local governments through a vetting process, with inputs from civil society, communities, and households. However, this process was neither simple nor straightforward. Notable challenges included (i) the uneven technical soundness of local recovery plans; (ii) the inability to distinguish between response, recovery, and long-term development; (iii) handling of recovery plans as mere wish lists of needs without prioritization; (iv) absence of baseline data; and (v) the tendency to view the CRRP as a static end of a process, rather than a living document.

Suprayoga Hadi, Director General of Development of Special Regions, Ministry for Village, Development for Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration, Indonesia

Developing National Systems for Undertaking Post-Disaster Assessment: The Indonesian Experience

Institutionalize post-disaster assessment processes by adapting globally accepted assessment methodology to the local context. Over the last 15 years, the Government of Indonesia has significantly advanced its disaster risk management agenda, shifting from emergency response to risk reduction and building back better. In the process, it has ably localized post-disaster assessment tools and established recovery planning guidelines, based mostly on lessons learned from the recovery of Indian Ocean Tsunami in Aceh and Nias and earthquake in Yogyakarta. The localized post-disaster assessment methodology adopts the broad features from the damage and loss assessment methodology developed by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, but has been simplified and made practical to fit what can be realistically done at the local or field level in Indonesia. The methodology also strengthened the focus on human needs assessment and the integration of disaster risk reduction in the recovery process. With this localized methodology, a comprehensive post-disaster assessment can now be completed in 3 weeks.

The recovery framework developed in Indonesia has a large focus on planning for human recovery. High priority is accorded to sectors such as housing, local infrastructure, social services, local economy and livelihoods, and local institutions. The framework also prescribes a template for a financing scheme and a time line for implementation. It differentiates strategies between on-site and off-site recovery and places the primary responsibility on provincial governments to ensure the sustainability of recovery gains. Technical assistance is provided by the central planning agency to enable local governments to carry out this enhanced mandate on post-disaster recovery. Since the adoption of this framework, about 20 action plans have been developed by local governments and submitted to the national government, though local capacities still need further strengthening.

Scott Davis, Visiting Fellow, RAND Corporation; on loan from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, United States

Planning for Recovery – Challenges and Lessons Learned from Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina

Planning for recovery has three key challenges: coordination, capacity, and managing expectations.

Institutionalize post-disaster coordination. The level of coordination depends on the scale of the disaster and must be done vertically, i.e., across levels of governance, together with the nonprofit and private sectors, and horizontally, i.e., across sectors and jurisdictions, among others. Coordination is critical to command actions among implementing units, resolve pressing issues, prevent duplication, and break the silos in funding and authority. Even though it takes years to vet the adoption of these coordination frameworks, it is critical to have

“Institutionalize post-disaster coordination. Have the coordination frameworks in place. Understand your roles in advance so that you can hit the ground running when a disaster strikes. Start all collectively at the same time, with long-term people and short-term people doing parallel things.”

—*Scott Davis*

them in place so that people can “hit the ground running” when a disaster strikes.

Strengthen local capacities. Large-scale disasters can easily overwhelm local capacities. Local governments may not possess the adequate technical, financial, and implementation capacities to carry out basic functions and mandates related to recovery. Abundant technical assistance is required even before a disaster strikes to establish a cadre of local experts who can swiftly move on the ground.

Communicate to manage expectations. To manage expectations, regular communication is necessary to make known the goals and intentions of all actors in recovery and to increase transparency and accountability.

Land use and post-disaster recovery. In response to a question from the floor on the enforcement of land use regulations, the speakers stressed the importance of land use regulation and its strict enforcement to prevent resettling in exposed and vulnerable areas. However, in cases where settlements need to be relocated, access to livelihood must be guaranteed as it influences people’s willingness to relocate.

Panel Discussion – Setting the Stage for Resilient Recovery

The panel was composed of Secretary Arsenio Balisacan (Philippines), Suprayoga Hadi (Indonesia), Scott Davis (United States), and Ladawan Kumpa (Thailand) and was moderated by Andrew Parker (ADB). It explored the challenges that governments typically face in post-disaster assessments, and embedding principles of building back better in recovery planning and budgeting.

The panel discussion highlighted the following key points:

- a. **Disaster impacts are diverse, conditioned by the state of development, capacity of local governments, and quality of infrastructure, among others.** There is also diversity in disasters—scale, type, time frame, etc. Planning for response and recovery need not conform to a single prescription that fits all as it must be flexible enough to address varying needs. What works in one community cannot be expected to work in another. In addition, flexible living recovery plans that can adapt as they move forward are needed because present needs will not be the same 6 months down the road. If recovery plans do not adapt and are too rigid, there are likely to be deficiencies in meeting the evolving priorities.
- b. **Participation is needed to promote ownership of the recovery process.** Putting together a planning framework at multiple scales that can be rolled out and at the same has deep roots in communities themselves is a recognition that the different concerns and operational systems are not isolated from each other. Effective and meaningful participation is tedious but necessary for successful recovery.

- c. ***Building back better has different connotations.*** It is based not just on current hazard conditions, but also on future scenarios. It is also an aspiration of the people, which means achieving better development outcomes that entail a more systemic change and meaningful participation. Building back better also means improving environmental and/or ecological conditions and reforming policies and institutions.
- d. ***Long-term spatial planning seeks to prevent reverting to predisaster conditions.*** An effective spatial plan for recovery rests on regulations, institutions, and investments aimed at reducing future disaster risks.
- e. Coordination is needed at all stages of programming and implementation among development partners, national and local governments, and other stakeholders including civil society. When there are many planning efforts, the challenge lies in achieving consistency in structure so they can be converged. Plans must not be isolated and need to connect at some point across level and sectors.
- f. ***On managing expectations with regard to recovery plan targets,*** some guidance from panelists included communicating from the outset that targets are based on best available data but will be revisited down the line; ensuring that documents such as RAY-BBB are seen as a living, flexible document, which can be adjusted to reflect new information and knowledge.

“Disaster risk management is everybody’s business. A big challenge is the allocation of authority.”

—Suprayoga Hadi

“The challenge is to recognize the diversity in disasters—scale, type, and time frame.”

—Arsenio M. Balisacan





BEYOND BUSINESS AS USUAL: OVERCOMING THE IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES OF POST-DISASTER RECOVERY

Ladawan Kumpa, Deputy Secretary General, National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB), Thailand

Rebuilding the Private Sector's Confidence: Recovery from the Bangkok Floods

Large-scale disasters can have serious transboundary impacts. The 2011 floods in Thailand, with losses amounting to \$40 billion resulted in the Thai economy contracted in the fourth quarter of 2011 by 8.9% compared to a 3.7% growth in the third quarter. The floods inundated seven industrial estates, which led to an estimated 2.5% drop in global production.

Government plays a key role in private sector recovery. The private sector bore 90% of the economic loss of the 2011 Thailand flooding. The government launched a comprehensive recovery program with a total budget of \$4 billion that spanned the immediate-, short-, and long-term phases. While the largest component of the program focused on restoration of transport facilities and aid to households, the government also extended soft loans to the private sector, especially the industrial estates as well as small and medium-sized enterprises. The soft loans were not just for restoration but also for the implementation of flood prevention infrastructure in their facilities. These loans are coursed through government banks.

Mariano del Castillo, Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), Philippines

Upgraded Design and Technology for Public Infrastructure: Building Back Better Post-Yolanda

Site location and upgraded standards are the two important components of building back better public infrastructure in Yolanda-affected areas. The Government of the Philippines, through DPWH, developed guidelines with simplified instructions on how to build back better, particularly for classrooms, but which can also be applied for simple structures such as health centers and private homes. Site location is the first consideration for reducing exposure to hazards. Easements, floodplains, and slopes should be avoided for new construction, especially for critical infrastructure such as schools. Simple and cost-effective measures (e.g., proper roofing installation, J-bolts, and angle bars) can significantly increase the ability of structures to withstand even the wind load of typhoon Yolanda, as evidenced by surviving structures in the area. The guidelines were widely distributed for adoption among local governments and sector agencies.

“Monitoring and supervision are critical to ensure standards are being followed.”

—Mariano del Castillo

Robert Sinkler, Water Infrastructure Director for The Nature Conservancy’s (TNC) North America Water Program; Retired Colonel in the US Army Corps of Engineers, United States

Reconstructing New Orleans: Results a Decade Later

Recovery has to be considered a priority at the highest levels of government. To ensure the timely completion of a recovery program, decision makers in government must accord it the highest priority, which translates into provision of adequate and timely budgets to complete projects based on schedule, establishment of flexible rules and laws to address speed, a single authority to lead and bring the necessary capacity to support recovery, access to new construction methods and techniques and to expertise to implement them, and new contracting methods. Recovery managers must espouse a culture of urgency and should be allowed flexibility to creatively carry this out. External pressure to deliver should be maintained through the media and other forms of active communication on the progress of recovery.

During the post-disaster recovery of Hurricane Katrina, the US Army Corps of Engineers focused on delivering projects and established different teams to find ways to change the law, find waivers where necessary. It adopted a motto from Thomas Edison: “There are no rules here, we’re trying to accomplish something.” The army corps.

“Recovery has to be both a national and local priority.”

—Robert Sinkler

For communities in hazard-prone areas, it is necessary to have a recovery plan in place before the disaster hits, as this will save years in design work. These communities can benefit from having a post-disaster recovery plan ready on the shelf. Planning for recovery even before the disaster strikes is important as the approach to recovery is asset-building which differs from humanitarian relief activities.



PEOPLE-CENTERED POST-DISASTER RECOVERY

Benilda E. Redaja, National Program Manager, Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Philippines

Empowering Communities to Become Key Players in the Recovery Process: The Experience of Kalahi CIDSS-NCDDP

“Yolanda and past disasters emphasized that disaster risk reduction and management has to be seen as an integral part of development interventions.”

—Benilda E. Redaja

Community-driven development (CDD) can act as a vehicle for post-disaster recovery. The Kalahi CIDSS-NCDDP (Kapit-Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services-National Community-Driven Development Program) of DSWD has been ongoing prior to typhoon Yolanda, as it is a core poverty alleviation program of the Aquino administration. When Yolanda struck, the CDD program was made more responsive to the recovery needs of affected communities. The removal of the local government unit cost-sharing requirement, streamlining of processes, and expansion of eligible expenditures were among the improvements set in place to cover affected communities within the scope of the program. The CDD approach enabled a convergence of efforts with other agencies such as the Department of Education in restoring basic services. Through the CDD strategy, the affected communities were allowed to analyze their needs and identify priorities and were provided grants to address them. The CDD program covered over 5,000 affected communities in the Yolanda corridor. The communities also play an important role in ensuring that resilient designs and standards are met through vigilant monitoring and inspection of the construction process.

The structure of the CDD program also enabled the initial assessment of disaster impacts. When Yolanda struck, the community volunteers and facilitators became the source of information on disaster impacts. With their deep knowledge of the community members, these CDD contacts went from house to house to check on their neighbors and organized small gatherings of affected residents to determine their needs.

Mary Racelis, Research Scientist, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines

Toward Long-Term Sustainability: Sociocultural Roots of Post-Disaster Recovery

Lessons from Typhoons Ketsana and Parma. Twenty-one of the most affected communities by Tropical Storm Ondoy (international name: Typhoon Ketsana) and Typhoon Pepeng (international name: Parma) in 2009 participated in a social impact monitoring study 2 years later. The participants identified the following weaknesses in the recovery process: lack of recognition of community knowledge to facilitate recovery, inadequate assistance for long-term recovery, and off-site settlements without access to economic opportunities, among others. Recovery, to be sustainable, must link up with communities as able partners who can provide knowledge, capacities, and networks critical to rebuild more cohesive, resilient, and empowered communities. Women and youth, in particular, stepped up to fill the leadership void in their communities, showing a strong spirit of volunteerism and activism.

In response to a question on how to factor in the time needed for community participation processes in recovery planning, the speaker agreed that participation is time consuming. However it is an investment in people's capacities and therefore should be done before the recovery starts. Community organizing can be a slow process but it increases the likelihood of the sustainability of the recovery program. In addition, this will pay off over time as strengthened communities will already be able move fast because they have established systems for planning and implementing recovery programs.

“Vulnerability does not mean helplessness. People have capacity ... should be involved in planning and decision making.”

—Mary Racelis

Scott Davis, Visiting Fellow, Rand Corporation, United States

Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery Funds: Examples from the United States

Community development block grants in the United States. With supplemental funds from Congress, the federal government created block grants for various programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Access to the grant was based on local priorities and prescribed criteria. In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, the same community development block grant scheme was used to support community recovery. Integrated within a program called NY Rising led by the governor, the grant facility invited submissions of community action plans formulated through citizens' participation. The New York state government received 21 local plans consolidating 61 areas for funding between \$3 million and \$25 million.

Innovation in involving the public through a design competition. The HUD Rebuild by Design competition received a \$15 billion allocation from Congress to fund winning ideas. The competition focused on incorporating resilience in recovery and supported a participatory, multidisciplinary approach with public

“Community engagement is more than just a default public hearing. It is very much an exchange.”

— *Scott Davis*

involvement. The government promoted the competition by offering to implement the winning design if the private sector funds it. Partnered with nonprofit organizations to help administer it as well as with academia (New York University) and philanthropy, the competition was a reflection of the design thinking process: understand, create, and deliver. The US Climate Resilience Toolkit encompasses five steps starting with a needs and vulnerability assessment as well as an additional sixth step of monitoring. Ten multidisciplinary design teams comprising architects, finance experts, artists, sociologists, hydrologists, and economists worked on the design. The fundamental lesson learned is that strengthening resilience requires multidisciplinary and collaborative, iterative, participatory, inclusive, and multihazard, and solutions should produce cobenefits and not just perform one function.





KEEPING RECOVERY ON TRACK: NATIONAL, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL MONITORING

Panel Discussion – Challenges in Monitoring the Post-Disaster Recovery Process

The panel was composed of Heru Prasetyo (BRR), Robert Sinkler (TNC), and Mayor Melchor Mergal (Municipality of Salcedo, Eastern Samar) and was facilitated by Tina Monson-Palma (news anchor, ANC). It explored the challenges that governments typically face in monitoring and tracking progress and results of recovery as well as lessons on how gaps on the ground were addressed.

Heru Prasetyo said that monitoring and evaluation makes the recovery process transparent, accountable, and credible. Reporting mechanisms tied to progress, while allowing for adjustments in targets where appropriate, should be institutionalized. Preparing periodic reports, monitoring of actions would not be seen as an additional burden, but as a necessity. Indonesia's Recovery Aceh-Nias (RAN) Database is an example of how a monitoring system can enable different actors working in the same sectors and locations to plan and coordinate projects.

Robert Sinkler proposed that a unified tool is helpful in monitoring. A single platform using a geographic information system provides stakeholders with the same situational awareness of the recovery. All recovery operations are project-type interventions, with inputs, outputs, start and end dates, milestones, and accountable actors. A unified tool that is integrated into operations brings efficiency, confidence, trust in the process, credibility, and legitimacy.

Mayor Melchor Mergal shared monitoring challenges from the perspective of a local government unit (LGU). There is a lack of LGU capacity to absorb and implement the recovery and reconstruction projects. For example, the capacity and number of LGU personnel may be limited to undertake required

reports, engineering skills, processing of data, conduct monitoring. In addition, at times there is a lack of communication and coordination with the LGUs on project implementation by external development partners or humanitarian organisations make it difficult for the local level monitoring. As such, these projects are not monitored by local governments, unless problems needing intermediation arise. These types of projects undermine the leadership role of local governments that are accountable to their constituents.

The panel discussion highlighted the following key points:

- a. Local governments, especially the smaller and lower-income ones, may not necessarily have the absorptive capacity to monitor recovery efforts. Volunteers and other forms of technical support are welcome.
- b. Community monitoring can help promote transparency and quality of recovery. In Indonesia, the beneficiaries of the various recovery programs and projects, particularly those of international nongovernment organizations, have been trained to monitor the recovery projects that are being implemented in their communities.
- c. The media plays an important role in raising awareness on the conditions on the ground, especially in terms of highlighting the gaps that need the attention of the government and its partners.



CLOSING

Bambang Susantono, Vice-President, Knowledge Management and Sustainable Development, ADB

Closing remarks

In March 2015, the global community adopted the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, which has identified as one of its four priority areas the need to enhance disaster preparedness for effective response and to “build back better” in recovery, rehabilitation, and reconstruction ADB has adopted an IDRM approach which is in line with the priorities of the Sendai Framework and is also applied in our support for post-disaster relief, early recovery, and reconstruction. This integrated approach: (i) allows disaster response actions to strengthen resilience to future hazard events, taking into account both current and possible future forms and levels of disaster risk; and (ii) support enhanced access to innovative disaster risk financing solutions such as sovereign and household disaster insurance tools. For example, ADB is supporting efforts to strengthen ex ante financial planning for post-disaster response at both the national and subnational level.

Despite the tragedy that disasters bring, they also offer a unique window of opportunity to address root causes of vulnerability, such as improper land use management, poor enforcement of development regulations, and gender inequality, and, in the process, to strengthen disaster resilience.

“While no disasters are the same and the countries affected are different, there are common issues in recovery. Thus it is important to learn from such experiences.”

—Bambang Susantono

With the increasing intensity and in some areas increasing frequency of natural hazards, the following knowledge and insights from post-disaster recovery, as shared in this forum, are critical to inform policies and systems for governments and their constituents to be in a better position to carry out recovery in a more resilient and sustainable manner.

- a. **Coordination.** At the start of the knowledge forum, the Government of Philippines, emphasized the importance of “coordination, coordination, and coordination” in the post-disaster recovery context. As also reiterated by other speakers, the coordination process has to match the scale of the disaster and include both horizontal aspects across sectors and jurisdictions but also vertical from the local to the national and international level. Most importantly, the post-disaster coordination mechanism should build on existing country-led systems.
- b. **Flexibility.** Recovery is a complex and long-term process. The needs change as we move from the immediate days after the disaster to early recovery and long-term reconstruction. Thus, it is important to adopt a flexible approach which allows adjusting the focus of the recovery program over time to meet the evolving needs. The importance of “living recovery plans” was highlighted in the presentations from Indonesia and the United States.
- c. **Community engagement.** We need to remember that the purpose of recovery is to support the affected communities and strengthen their resilience. As articulated by the speakers from Thailand and Indonesia, the recovery process should thus allow the voice and aspirations of the communities to be heard. Engaging the communities from day 1 will promote ownership of the recovery process and contribute to its success.
- d. **Local capacity.** One of the most critical factors for a successful recovery, as emphasized in all the presentations, is strengthening the capacity of local governments. This requires capacity building and an “overabundance of technical assistance on the ground.” The ultimate objective is building a cadre of local experts.

Proceedings of the Regional Knowledge Forum on Post-Disaster Recovery

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has adopted an integrated disaster risk management (IDRM) approach which aims at strengthening disaster resilience in its developing member countries. The approach is also applied in ADB's support for post-disaster response, early recovery and reconstruction and includes disaster response actions strengthening resilience to future hazard events. Facilitating sharing of knowledge, such as through this Regional Knowledge Forum on Post-Disaster Recovery, plays an important role in the IDRM approach. This forum was organized with support from ADB's Integrated Disaster Risk Management Fund supported by the Government of Canada.

About the Asian Development Bank

ADB's vision is an Asia and Pacific region free of poverty. Its mission is to help its developing member countries reduce poverty and improve the quality of life of their people. Despite the region's many successes, it remains home to the majority of the world's poor. ADB is committed to reducing poverty through inclusive economic growth, environmentally sustainable growth, and regional integration.

Based in Manila, ADB is owned by 67 members, including 48 from the region. Its main instruments for helping its developing member countries are policy dialogue, loans, equity investments, guarantees, grants, and technical assistance.

