

REPORT ON INDIVIDUAL EVENT

Date of event: 17 June 2009 **Your name:** Yuki Matsuoka (UNISDR) and Gerald E. Potutan (IRP Sec)

<p>Event type (tick the box):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 20px; border: 1px solid black;"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Pre-session</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black;"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>High-level panel</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black;"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Round Table</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black;"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Informal Plenary</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">/</td><td>Special Event</td></tr> <tr><td style="border: 1px solid black;"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>Other</td></tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-session	<input type="checkbox"/>	High-level panel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Round Table	<input type="checkbox"/>	Informal Plenary	/	Special Event	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<p>Event name (write the name below):</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; min-height: 100px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Integrating Social, Economic, and Environmental, Concerns in Post-Disaster Recovery</p> </div>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-session												
<input type="checkbox"/>	High-level panel												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Round Table												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Informal Plenary												
/	Special Event												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other												

Number of participants **Total:63**
(Please count or estimate this, as not all will be recorded in the list.)

1) Key questions or issues raised, main challenges or constraints identified (say, max 5):
If possible, record who raised these.

The following are the key questions raised during the special event:

The facilitator (Mr. Praveen Pardeshi) raised the following questions:

- How can the Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) process be further improved as an integrated recovery tool?
- Are we learning from past recovery experiences?
- Are the recovery lessons and knowledge sharing institutionalized in the contexts of IRP?

Other questions raised were:

- To what extend is the environment considered in the recovery needs assessments? (Question from UNEP representative)
- How are psychological aspects addressed in recovery (a question to the Italian presentation)?

2) Principal proposed solutions, messages or recommendations:
If possible, record who offered these.

Message No.1: PDNA can be a practical tool for holistic recovery (from WB and UNDP), building on the ECLAC Methodology and including human and economic impacts. The report of Namibia specifically mentioned the following benefits of PDNA application, as it clearly connects assessment with national plans and reconstruction strategies:

- In the road sector, PDNA found that building materials are not up to standards and needs to be of higher quality. Thus, the first priority was to choose those roads that would give access to the main centre so that essential services are not cut.
- Private sector sustained more destruction of assets. Thus, there was a need to set up required funding by means of soft credit facilities for SMEs to bounce back.
- Many households, which are headed by women are unemployed and without livestock. Thus, agriculture is seen as an important sector to alleviate their plight.

There are many other reported lessons and experiences from other countries that have now applied PDNA, namely: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Madagascar, Myanmar, and Yemen. To further improve and promote PDNA, there is a need for dedicated manager, standby financing, and better coordination arrangements between agencies and experts.

Message No.2: While countries are learning from recovery experiences, there are still gaps in recovery processes that need to be addressed.

- It was reported that there are still some houses in Japan that are not yet anti-seismic and much more in other countries as reported in a survey conducted by GRIPS of Japan (Professor Okazaki)
- While psychological aspects are not addressed in some countries, this has been addressed well in the recent Italy earthquake. Italy closely works with experts and over 100 psychologists together with the medical team at the disaster sites (Undersecretary Bertolaso)

Message No. 3: There is still a need to further strengthen the institutionalization process of sharing knowledge, tools, and guidelines on recovery.

- Further discuss and learn details from recent experiences through the International Recovery Forum (e.g. Italy to be invited in the next Forum) (Alfredo Lazarte-Hoyle)
- The PDNA guideline has to be further discussed to cover other issues (including assessments of its benefits and applicability)

3) Conclusions by the Facilitator of the event:

The Facilitator raised two major points in his conclusions.

First, recovery tools have to be adaptive. Based on experience, the PDNA keeps on improving every time it is discussed. It becomes more integrated and holistic.

Second, there are some mechanisms already in place to address some of the identified gaps. For instance, there are standby funds (e.g. World Bank) to support recovery processes and initiatives of linking the recovery tools to disaster risk reductions.

4) Your additional thoughts on the event:

(E.g. on tone and success of event, unresolved issues, commitments made by participants, etc.)

The event sends a message that it is important to have a holistic approach to building resilience in the recovery process. This requires prioritizing disaster management at the central and local levels, ensuring that people know about emergency plans and how to respond. Improving coordination between the different institutions, improving regional cooperation, and putting legislation in place as a matter of urgency.