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Background

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 guides us to manage ‘risk’, rather than managing ‘disasters’. In the context of the Priority Four of the Sendai Framework, the International Recovery Platform (IRP) is recognized provider of information including lessons and best practices in the area of build back better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.

There has been an appreciation that recovery is an opportunity to build back better which covers both the restoration of communities and assets/infrastructures that strengthen resilience. Over the year, various challenges were reported along the course of disaster recovery. In many large scale disasters for instance, recovery is often plagued by significant time-gaps, a lack of continuous attention by international and national partners, and declining resource commitments. Often, momentum tends to slow down following post-disaster assessments, making it hard to plan and implement later stages of recovery and reconstruction. Even with so many capacity building efforts, nations still face serious limitations in terms of planning and implementing recovery and reconstruction.

Reflecting on “how to do” effective recovery and reconstruction that seizes the opportunity to build back better is the overarching theme of the forthcoming forum. The International Recovery Forum 2016 intends to discuss the implementation guidance from the Sendai Framework on how to build back better and explore strategies and action for localization at national and community levels. The discussions will revolve around the following areas: Experiences on Build Back Better; Development Continuity Planning; and Messages on Build Back Better from IRP partners. The rationale for having these themes is detailed below.

1. Experiences in Build Back Better

Recent studies\(^1\) indicated that understanding ‘build back better’ implies consideration of various factors, such as the following:

- Different hazards necessitate different approaches to ‘build back better’;
- Regional characteristics require different approaches, especially in the face of trade-offs between safety and the speed of reconstruction;

---

• Build Back Better efforts beyond disaster-affected areas are sometimes required when considering the safety of an entire country; and,
• International assistance can be a key factor in reconstruction for developing countries.

The forum will explore knowledge and understanding through sharing of experiences, programs, and case studies. Representatives from USA, Bangladesh, the Philippines, and Nepal as well as other government institutions and partners will attend to share their respective experiences. The aim is to share experiences in reconstruction and recovery, and to identify some common characteristics and universal elements of ‘build back better’. This understanding is critical to help facilitate stronger and more resilient nations and societies and to help in the implementation of the Sendai Framework and Priority Four in particular.

2. Development Continuity Planning

Effective recovery and reconstruction means development continuity. To illustrate, the figure below represents a typical development path and the effect of disaster event. The outcome is usually a loss of development gains not only in time but also financially which requires a significant effort in terms of resources and money to regain the development that has been lost. The aim therefore should be is to move from humanitarian response to recovery and reconstruction as quickly as possible to minimize the impact of the losses. In effect the outcome should change the shape of the curve (see figure below).

The factors that influence the shape of the curve will be the risk profile and the resilience of the community or region or country. The scale of destruction reflects the total risk to the system while the shape of the recovery curve is controlled by the system resilience. In effect, what is commonly understood as disaster recovery and reconstruction planning is generally a “development continuity planning” because it functions to ensure development in the midst of disaster risks.

---

In this light, development continuity planning implies two critical actions: (i) reducing the scale of destruction; and (ii) increasing the speed of recovery and reconstruction. Both of these actions encourage governments to undertake development in a way that not only increases resilience, but also, more effectively manages the risks associated with development and to build back better. The discussions along this theme will be valuable to other countries and can contribute to further strengthening the operational guidelines and mechanisms for long term recovery integrated into development. This Forum can be a venue for governments to share knowledge, information, and strategies on risk informed-development as well as lessons on development continuity planning.

3. Messages on Build Back Better

Build back better can be localized through a variety of strategies, including enhancing preparedness, relocating critical facilities to safer areas, integrating disaster risk reduction measures into infrastructure improvements, strengthening governance structures, using the reconstruction process to address urban planning challenges, and establishing predictable contingent financing mechanisms, including disaster risk financing. In order to localize these strategies, tangible policies, programs, and actions need to be put in place.

Stakeholders in the Tohoku region of Japan have a range of experience on recovery, rehabilitation, and reconstruction following the Great East Japan Earthquake of 2011. Likewise, IRP partners globally have been introducing programs and projects to advocate for resilient recovery and build back better. These messages are essential to provide insights on localizing build back better as provided in Priority Four of the Sendai Framework.

Research and practice have shown that there are many factors that can likely affect successful recovery and reconstruction. Governance, leadership, technology as well as social, cultural, and economic factors are among the many that may influence success or failure of recovery efforts. In this regard, the forum can be one of the venues to identify key messages for build back better along various sectors.

The International Recovery Forum 2016 is proposed to provide a venue for governments and partners to share experiences, knowledge, strategies, technologies, and tools on build back better.

Objectives

(i) Explore knowledge and understanding of ‘build back better’ in recovery, rehabilitation, and reconstruction” through sharing of country experiences
(ii) Spread emerging ideas and initiatives on development continuity planning
(iii) Determine messages and trends from countries and partners on build back better based on their experiences.

Expected Outputs

The outputs of the Forum will contribute to greater understanding and localization of build back better, where IRP can forward by developing knowledge products for general public access.

1. Policy Note on “Build back better in recovery, rehabilitation, and reconstruction”
2. Forum Proceedings
Organizer

International Recovery Platform (IRP), including the Government of Japan, Hyogo Prefectural Government, Asian Disaster Reduction Center (ADRC), United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)

Participants

The International Recovery Forum 2016 is expected to gather approximately 150 participants including IRP community of practice, experts, professionals, national and local government officials, representatives from the academia, civil society organizations, private sector, and more.

Flow of Activities

Pre-event (25 January 2016)
- IRP Steering Committee Meeting (16:30~18:30)

Forum 2016 (26 January 2016)
- “International Recovery Forum 2016” (09:45~17:30)

Post-event (27 January 2016)
- “Open Dialogue Session” (09:30~14:00)