

THIRD PLENARY SESSION

Inclusion Vs Exclusion: Risks and Opportunities

May 14th, 2019/ 9:00-10:30, ROOM 2

Context	<p>The third plenary session aims to examine the following central messages emerging from WRC4 from the perspective of an interplay between the risks of exclusion and the opportunities offered by inclusion in recovery :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marginalised groups are more likely to suffer from disasters. 2. Disasters exacerbate vulnerabilities and social inequalities. 3. Vulnerable groups tend to be excluded from recovery decision-making, thus making them even more vulnerable to the impacts of disasters. 4. Vulnerable groups should be included in recovery processes as active agents of change to effectively and equitably build resilience. <p>Marginalized sections of society demonstrate a high vulnerability to disasters, based on low coping and adaptive capacities typical of excluded groups. Inequality and social exclusion determine that certain social groups or sectors suffer more in extreme events and disasters because of their place within a system of unequal social power relations and underlying intersecting vulnerabilities. A clear awareness of the costs of exclusion and the advantages of inclusion is essential to bring about resilient recovery. The session proposes a critical reflection of the practical as opposed to the ideal for sustainable and effective change in the long term.</p> <p>An inclusive approach to recovery promotes equal rights and opportunities and the dignity of the individual. It acknowledges diversity and contributes to everyone's resilience, which means not leaving members of a community behind because of their age, gender, disability or other discriminating factors. It is hoped that such a framework will promote inclusive strategies and practices through the participation and empowerment of the excluded groups themselves.</p> <p>The risks of exclusion are both substantial and diverse. The impact of disasters is greater when more vulnerable populations lose assets and access to infrastructure. Those who suffer most are poor, marginalized, and isolated. Surveys after severe flooding in Indian cities found that poor and migrant families were the worst affected, with some losing more than they earned in a year (ADB, 2019). Informal sector and small businesses fall into financial distress, some having to sell their assets and close down. Beyond the immediate loss of life and wealth that disproportionately affect marginalized groups, effects tend to persist over time. More than a decade after the 1995 Kobe earthquake in Japan, for example, income per capita in Hyogo Prefecture was 12% lower than it otherwise would have been. Several studies of flooding show that, in the absence of social protection, disaster-hit families deplete their savings or borrow at high interest rates from informal sources, pushing them into indebtedness and poverty traps. Recent research reveals that</p>
---------	--

	<p>disasters can affect victims for decades as reduced household spending on food, medicine, and education, for example, stunts a child’s potential well into adulthood.</p> <p>Effects can spread and link up with epidemics, conflict, and other risks, all of which exacerbate and multiply the impacts on the poor and the vulnerable. Disaster-induced migration can expose migrants to flooding, landslides, heat stress, and other hazards. It may also facilitate the spread of disease and even spark social disorder in urban areas, as suggested by new evidence on flood-induced migration (Asian Development Outlook, 2019). The poorest of the poor often lack the social and financial networks necessary to allow family members to migrate and remit.</p> <p>However, managing recovery can also enhance equity, resilience, and sustainability - a greater focus on strengthening disaster resilience and preparing for recovery can ensure that rebuilding in the wake of disasters—building back better (BBB) - emphasizes safety, timeliness, social equity, and the full realization of future socio-economic potential. Engaging the vulnerable and disadvantaged in recovery assessments and efforts can help, as can labor market interventions that can gainfully employ the the marginalized. Public planning for recovery and building back better must be inclusive and fair to vulnerable segments of society and can lead to better outcomes relative to pre-disaster levels of well being for the marginalized and can even enhance their access to financial services that was hitherto lacking before.</p> <p>Communities are themselves the first responders to disasters, often with little or no immediate external support, and are key to ensuring sustained recovery and reconstruction. New evidence from flood resilience studies shows that community investments can build resilience while delivering broader development benefits, such as better education, transportation, and food supply. Proper waste management, for example, can prevent the spread of disease and keep rivers and drains clear to carry away floodwaters, while benefitting a community more broadly by improving public health and wellbeing in normal times.</p> <p>Looking on the bright side in the aftermath of a disaster, the recovery phase is often a window of opportunity to learn from experience, mitigate future vulnerability and exposure, and enhance resilience.</p>
Speakers/ Panelists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Pablo Suarez, Associate Director for Research and Innovation Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre • Governor of Borno State NIGERIA, H.E. Prof. Babagana Umara Zulum • Kiyoshi Murakami, Special Representative of Mayor & Senior Executive Advisor City of Rikuzentakata Japan • Emily Wilkinson (TBC) • Maureen Fordham (TBC), Gender and Disaster Network • Eddie Ndopu, South African Activist