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| **Context** | Recovery happens at the local level in specific places and communities, each with their own character, culture, and context. Yet, ensuring inclusion in recovery remains a challenge. Those often left struggling to influence the recovery process include local government officials, which are overwhelmed by the loss of facilities, infrastructure, equipment, and records, as well as the inability of personnel to report to work. The loss in capacity and assets is often dramatic.  
Recovery is in many ways a top-down process, and national and prefectural (provincial) governments control a great deal of early recovery planning processes, resources, and decision-making. We must quickly build back and support local government capacity if we are to be successful in recovery. As recovery efforts are structured and organized, they should focus on restoring local government capacity, authority, resources and expertise.  
While international frameworks recognize and encourage inclusion at every level in society, this seldom translates into programs that promote bottom-up, participatory processes and include the populations that have been directly impacted. Disaster survivors are citizens, constituents, and residents of impacted cities, districts and small rural towns that have been affected, and want to be supported in their efforts to shape their own destinies and dreams when it comes to recovery. Unfortunately, more than any other group, they often find it difficult to insert their voice in the process and be considered partners in their own recovery. Local knowledge, different cultural groups, and marginalized populations are often excluded, and do not have the power to affect change in their communities and realize their own recovery goals in a top-down process.  
CSOs are involved in processes that can change this dynamic and empower local populations through advocacy, activism, community-level support and intervention. They can elevate the concerns, goals and aspirations of different ethnic or indigenous groups, vulnerable populations, women and children, the disabled and elderly, who otherwise find themselves excluded from decision-making about recovery priorities. But, CSOs need support to be effective and the importance of their role needs more recognition. Beyond this, they must have a place at the table with government partners, donors, IOs, and other key stakeholders from the outset. |
and should not be included in recovery processes as an afterthought. Being recognized as a key stakeholders in recovery is critical for CSOs if they are to lay the groundwork for inclusive processes and work with partners that recognize their value, facilitate and empower their efforts.

We face a situation in which we are moving from knowing what we should do, to figuring out how to do it. In order to achieve our highest ideals, we must act on them. Knowing the right thing to do is not enough. We must make real progress if we are to realize truly inclusive recovery processes.

### Session Objectives and expected Outcomes

**Objective:**
The objective of the session is to highlight the challenges, barriers and successes faced by local governments, CSOs, community members and marginalized groups during the recovery process.

**Expected outcomes:**

1. A common understanding among participants about the major challenges facing local government when creating an inclusive recovery process for citizens and vulnerable populations (time pressure, project/planning loads, resource scarcity, uncertainty, need to increase local capacity quickly and effectively).

2. A common understanding among participants about the major challenges facing CSOs when designing inclusive recovery processes for citizens and vulnerable populations (scale of unmet needs, loss and trauma in communities, resource scarcity, uncertainty, social injustice, societal mechanisms that preserve status quo and prevent social change needed to reduce risk, vulnerability & inequities).

3. Good Practices / Bad Practices witnessed in terms of inclusion of local populations and role that local governments / CSOs play as drivers of inclusive local recovery,

4. Innovative and excellent inclusion practices (solutions to an inclusion problem - real world examples), and


### Key elements for the discussion

The members of this panel are representatives of local governments and CSOs. Each will discuss the issues faced by their respective organizational type (government, CSO or NGO), the gaps that exist in terms of empowering impacted populations to fully engage in their own recovery, and will provide examples from their own (or more than one) country context.

- Identify gaps in terms of theory vs. practice.
- During the course of the Hyogo Framework years, we consolidated knowledge about what do, but our ability to implement these ideas effectively has lagged behind our understanding.
- Share success stories from different country contexts as a counterpoint to failures and lessons learned that would help others “do it right”.
- Share your insights about “what” would empower your sector to greatly improve practice, what needs to change and how can we improve practice?
- Discuss time and pressure to perform as a factor in deciding to take shortcuts in terms of participatory processes and inclusion. They are not easy, are often contentious, and are time-consuming and can lead to delays.
- Reflect on root causes for lack of optimal interventions and possible remedies.
- Identification of any excellent tools for implementation, coordination and cooperation that promote inclusive practices.
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**Discussion agenda and structure**

The session will open with the moderator presenting background on the challenges facing local governments, CSOs, & impacted populations surrounding inclusive practices and being included in recovery decision / policy-making processes.

Then each speaker will take 8-10 minutes to present on the topics outlined in this Concept Note in reference to their own type of organization and context. This is your chance to tell your own very important story.

After 40-50 minutes of presentation on the themes of this panel, we will sit in a talk show format and the moderator will direct some reflections back to the panelists, trying to help the group identify some shared conclusions and policy recommendations. This will be followed by inviting the audience to engage with the panelists. If possible, we will change the seating format in the room for our session, putting chairs in the audience in a large half circle to invite the audience in and remove barriers between us, so that the final portion of the session becomes interactive, a think tank of sorts, and the audience becomes part of the effort to find solutions.

Panel comments and discussion: 60 min.
Q & A: 25 min.

**Expected number of participants**

40-70

**Technical Equipment Required**

Video projector, screen, sound, computer, lapel microphones for panelists + 1 moderator, panel set-up, 1 podium