WRC4 KNOWLEDGE REPORT: LEITMOTIFS, SUBTHEMES AND MESSAGES

"Together we can ensure we leave no one behind, make recovery more resilient, and foster risk-informed and inclusive development."
Asako Okai, Assistant Secretary General and Director, UNDP's Crisis Bureau

"We have to build back better – meaning that the repaired or replaced assets are more resilient, but also that the recovery process is shorter and more efficient, that culture is at the heart of the reconstruction and recovery process, and that the entire recovery process does not leave anyone behind. Everyone, including the poorest and most vulnerable, must receive the support they need to fully recover."
Sameh Wahba, Director of Urban and Territorial Development and Disaster Risk Management at the World Bank

"We know that in many cases it is the voices of women, girls, older persons, persons living with disabilities, single parent families, ethnic and religious minorities, indigenous peoples which are most often ignored when it comes to disaster preparedness and planning. Those same people are placed at further risk of being ignored and sidelined in the recovery phase."
Mami Mizutori, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction

"Being inclusive in recovery is not an option if we are truly committed to 'leave no one behind' and build more inclusive societies with equal opportunities for all."
Léonard-Emile Ognimba, Ambassador, Assistant Secretary General – Political Affairs and Human Development of the ACP-EU Secretariat

Acronyms

ABA	Area-Based Approach
BBB	Building Back Better
BRAC	Building Resources Across Communities
CHUD	Cultural Heritage and Urban Development
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CURE	Culture in City Reconstruction and Recovery
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EO	(Satellite) Earth Observation
EU	European Union
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
GPA	Global Plan of Action
GPDRR	Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
ILO	International Labour Organization
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
PDNA	Post-Disaster Needs Assessment
RO	Recovery Observatory
RPBA	Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

UNDRR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UN WOMEN	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
URF	Urban Recovery Framework
WB	World Bank
WRC	World Reconstruction Conference

Table of Contents

The Fourth Edition of the World Reconstruction Conference was held in Geneva on May 13-14, 2019 in conjunction with the Sixth Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and gathered more than 1000 participants from national and local governments, civil society, the private sector, academia, and international organizations from around the world. The conference was jointly organized by the World Bank's Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, and the European Commission.

WRC4 addressed the theme of "Inclusion for Resilient Recovery" and shared experiences on different dimensions of social inclusion in recovery processes, with a view to advance the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. Inclusion ensures the full and meaningful participation and leadership of all groups and individuals in pre- and post-disaster phases. It also promotes equality of rights and opportunities for all in the face of risk and responds to the diverse characteristics, capacities and vulnerabilities of all. An inclusive approach leads to social cohesion and builds resilience of communities exposed to disasters.

The conference noted that impressive development gains have been made over the last few decades. However, hundreds of millions of people have been excluded from human development, innovation, economic growth, or globalization benefits. Adverse natural events, including climate-related events, undermine development gains and contribute to increased vulnerability and exclusion with average annual welfare losses of over US$500 billion and up to 26 million people pushed into poverty each year. Across countries, a large part of the population (e.g. women and girls, people with disabilities, people in rural areas, indigenous peoples, ethnic and linguistic minorities, migrants, displaced people, gender and sexual minorities, youth, and the elderly) are disproportionately excluded from several dimensions of development, including post-disaster recovery. To remedy this, 193 countries pledged to "leave no one behind" and "endeavor to reach the furthest behind first" through the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Five intersecting factors explain who is being left behind and why, and solutions need to be shaped accordingly: discrimination, geography, governance, socio-economic status, and shocks and fragility. The WRC4 focused on the latter factor while recognizing the intersectionality of all five factors. The Conference hosted 20 sessions with plenaries on "Leave no one behind – making inclusion a reality", "Inclusion for people with disabilities", "Inclusion vs. exclusion – Risks and opportunities", and "Inclusion as a right for all". Special focused sessions were held on South Asia, inclusive and green recovery in the Indian state of Kerala and the uses of technology to promote inclusion. Participants identified and shared best practices, lessons and solutions for promoting inclusion and reaching the

furthest behind first through various dimensions of post-disaster recovery and pre-disaster resilience building. As intended, the conference provided a platform to share new tools and innovative approaches to increase participation of the most vulnerable in recovery as well as proposed policy recommendations for making recovery inclusive.

Deliberations on the issue of inclusion for resilient recovery have strengthened our resolve to:

- **Support marginalized groups that are especially vulnerable to the impacts of natural hazards and who risk being made even more vulnerable through the recovery process.**
  The poor and marginalized are particularly vulnerable to adverse natural events due to a combination of their financial, socioeconomic, cultural, age, health, age, and gender status; their geographical location; and their lack of access to services, decision-making and justice. In a post-disaster context, these groups can face further obstacles to accessing entitlements such as government relief or recovery assistance. They may be less likely to understand how to work through the bureaucracy and/or may not have access to key documentation such as national identity cards or birth certificates. We will promote a more inclusive recovery which protects the rights and opportunities to ensure that poor and marginalized groups are not left behind and adversely affected by recovery efforts. We will do this by putting people at the center of recovery processes, making certain that they have a role in assessments, planning, policy development, implementation, and monitoring of recovery. Ultimately, our joint efforts will bring a demonstrable improvement to the lives of the poor and vulnerable through safer housing, decent jobs, access to services, and increased livelihood options.

- **Adopt and promote more inclusive approaches to recovery to promote greater resilience for the community as a whole.**
  Inclusive recovery does not mean accommodating special groups – it is about putting vulnerable people at the center of decision-making at all stages of the recovery process to strengthen resilience for everyone. Groups that are traditionally marginalized typically have a lot to contribute. For example, women have very strong risk management skills that can be mobilized if they are empowered to be leaders and participants. The traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities can offer sustainable solutions to build back better. In our recovery programs, we will draw on the knowledge and skills of indigenous communities, women and people with disabilities and address the pre-existing structural issues which aggravate inequality, chronic poverty and vulnerability. Our programs will ensure that we build our infrastructure and facilities in a way that is accessible to

persons with disabilities, but also others, e.g. the elderly, children, pregnant women, and people with temporary injuries.

- **Ensure a more resilient future for all by acting on the commitments we made in the 2030 Agenda, the Sendai Framework, the Paris Agreement, and other key accords.**
  In practice, this means taking explicit action to end extreme poverty, promote shared prosperity, curb inequalities, confront discrimination, and fast-track progress for the furthest behind. To move this agenda forward, we will continue to equip development and disaster risk management practitioners with innovative approaches, tools and methodologies for mainstreaming social inclusion in recovery and reconstruction while ensuring transparent and accountable recovery and reconstruction processes.

- **Change our behaviour and actions to be more inclusive in planning, implementing and monitoring recovery.**
  We will advocate for and assist local and national governments to include vulnerable groups in the planning, implementation and monitoring of resilient recovery as well as ensure that the benefits of building back better are equitably shared. We will place community participation at the center of recovery to enhance greater understanding of people's needs in recovery as well as access to information, decision-making opportunities, and protection of lives, livelihoods and food security. We will strive to work with community-based organizations to increase participation in monitoring recovery through social audits that track the benefits of recovery programs to the most marginalized. We will support civil society to give greater voice to those who are traditionally excluded from recovery efforts as well as help hold accountable those who design and execute recovery programs. We will promote the participation of the private sector to increasingly view those left behind as an underserved market for goods and services in the rebuilding process, including public-private partnerships. We will work with academia to contribute through the generation of data, research and analysis on the dynamics of more inclusive recovery. And we will enable international partners to mainstream the objective of inclusive, equitable and sustainable recovery and commit to smarter use of assistance in their recovery portfolios. Inclusion is not an imposition; it is a better path to resilient recovery for all.

Geneva, 14 May 2019

Introduction

The fourth edition of the World Reconstruction Conference (WRC4) was held in Geneva on May 13-14, 2019 with the theme 'Inclusion for Resilient Recovery,' and focused on the inclusion of marginalized groups in terms of participation and consultation during assessment, planning, and decision-making processes to ensure no one is left behind and to achieve more equitable recovery outcomes. WRC4 has built on the consensus of the previous editions of the Conference that recovery can risk reinforcing existing inequalities, a resilient recovery is imperative for sustainable development and poverty reduction, and that to be resilient, recovery must build back better.

The World Reconstruction Conference (WRC) is a global forum that provides a platform for policy makers, experts, and practitioners from governments, international organizations, community-based organizations, the academia, and private sector from both developing and developed countries to come together to collect, assess, and share experiences in disaster recovery and reconstruction and take the policy dialogue forward. More than 1,000 stakeholders, practitioners, and policy-makers from across the disaster recovery landscape came together in Geneva for the fourth edition of the Conference. With the theme of 'inclusion for resilient recovery,' the WRC4 was an opportunity for attendees to share the latest best practices and account for progress on the pledges made through the 2030 Agenda and, particularly, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

Inclusion in disaster recovery and reconstruction is a key condition for resilience. A more inclusive recovery fosters equal rights and opportunities, dignity and diversity, guaranteeing that nobody from a community is left out because of their age, gender, disability or other factors linked to ethnicity, religion, geography, economic status, political affiliation, health issues, or

other life circumstances. By including disadvantaged groups in pre- and post-disaster recovery processes, recovery efforts can address underlying risk factors and contribute to building back better. Inclusive recovery processes give agency to disadvantaged groups and can leverage their unique capacities, knowledge, and experience to improve recovery outcomes for everyone. The main objective of the event was to renew and accelerate efforts towards realizing inclusive recovery processes. To this end, the Conference discussed the challenges and inherent biases in the process of recovery and the reasons for which certain population groups are systematically excluded, and suggested the broad contours of the way forward. The Conference was jointly organized by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank (WB) and the European Union (EU) in conjunction with the 6th Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (GPDRR), convened by the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), and aligned with its thematic focus on managing disaster risk and risk-informed development investments towards sustainable and inclusive societies. The traditional WRC partners thus had the opportunity to renew and expand their partnership with UNDRR on a common platform for the two events. Other United Nations (UN) agencies, such as United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN), International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and UN Environment, have enriched the debate and shared their experiences.

This report offers the opportunity to outline the breadth of knowledge that has been shared during the Conference.

Disability rights activist Eddie Ndopu set the tone for the Conference, delivering an inspiring opening address in which he invited attendees to "not just reconstruct buildings, but to reconstruct communities – to reconstruct the world and fashion it in such a way that it is truly open to all."

Despite WRC4's short duration, participants dove deep into the inclusion theme. They noted that there was broad consensus around the central

challenges: that vulnerable and marginalized groups not only get hit harder by disasters, but can also be left worse off after a disaster because they are frequently excluded from the recovery process. However, they also recognized that inclusive solutions were not yet widespread or mainstreamed.

Across 20 sessions, participants identified and shared best practices, lessons, and solutions for promoting inclusion through the various dimensions of post-disaster recovery and pre-disaster risk management. Some focused on considerations for specific groups of people, such as women and people with disabilities. Others explored especially vulnerable contexts, including those affected by conflict, small island states, and displaced communities. Many demonstrated ways to build inclusiveness into Disaster Risk Management (DRM) practices such as risk financing, civil protection, and building back better.

Plenary Session 1: Leave No One Behind – Making Inclusion a Reality

There were four plenary sessions that highlighted the flagship themes of the Conference. The opening plenary session emphasized the importance of leaving no one behind and suggested concrete approaches to make inclusion a reality in recovery. A distinguished panel concluded that the most critical test of a recovery program is its ability to provide differentiated and targeted assistance to everyone. This brought up the issue of community outreach and social inclusion without bias or discrimination when people receive assistance and use it to rebuild their lives. Recovery and reconstruction also need to go beyond humanitarian assistance to disaster-affected people, and provide them with adequate financial and technical support for their sustainable recovery.

Recent experiences from India and Japan demonstrate that effective inclusion needs to go beyond compliance. It requires a far more substantive involvement, with politics and reforms reflecting the diversity of the needs of vulnerable sections of society. There is a need for innovative approaches, with communities and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) working closely

with the affected people and with the government to make inclusion in recovery and reconstruction more effective. The greater the inclusion, the greater the participation, the greater will be the accountability. Planning needs to take a bottom-up approach. The session stressed the need for strong institutional frameworks that ensure rehabilitation packages address the basic needs of the most vulnerable and impoverished sections of society, and give them equal entitlements and rights. The aim is to achieve an equal partnership between the government and NGOs with a strong role for the private sector. An upgraded system to make information-sharing between the government and NGOs more institutionalized is likely to facilitate better coordination, and help make inclusion a reality on the ground. People with disabilities, women, the poor and the elderly, and other vulnerable sections cannot be an afterthought, but need to be included from the outset, so that vulnerable communities are present at every stage of the decision-making process thus enabling an entire ecosystem of inclusion.

Plenary Session 2: Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities

The second plenary session underscored the importance of people with disabilities not being on the fringes, but rather at the center of recovery and reconstruction programs. There is a strong need for a more nuanced, disaggregated, and localized approach to the specific needs of people with diverse disabilities. The successful experiences of Bangladesh and Ecuador showed how tremendous impact has been achieved because of governmental intervention working hand-in-hand with rigorous follow-up on the part of local organizations and the community in situations of disaster to evacuate people with disabilities. It is also vital to ensure that their livelihoods as well as their assets are secured when they move to the evacuation center, which can be one of the biggest impediments to evacuation. Several countries have the guidelines and frameworks, but enforcement and implementation continue to remain a distant dream.

One of the primary reasons for the exclusion of people with disabilities in disaster preparedness, recovery and reconstruction is the lack of prioritization due to institutional path dependencies that keep the focus on finding efficiencies that will move a lot of food or cash to a broad target group. People with disabilities have a diverse range of vulnerabilities, which makes it difficult to target them in the same way. This signals the amount of granularity that the system can deal with. The second challenge is that disabled people's organizations are generally small and local, and the system is not configured to support a large number of small local partners. Governments need to reconfigure their understanding of localization in order to find a way to shift resources to disabled people's organizations.

Inclusive early warning signals need to be disseminated through various messaging tools such as flags, hand microphone, community radio, and other media, which can be interpreted using sign language. The scale of preparation is also important – in Bangladesh, four million volunteers have been trained to evacuate people with disabilities. Cyclone shelters and other facilities need to be accessible to people with disabilities. During Cyclone Fani, 1.6 million people, including 100,000 with disabilities, were evacuated within eight hours. Volunteers, citizen committees, central and local government organizations, and NGOs who work on post-disaster recovery and reconstruction need to be trained to be sensitive to the needs of people with disabilities.

The session also underlined that governments need to offer sufficient and dignified support to people with disabilities so their rights, benefits, and the assistance enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) are honored. Modern geo-reference-based databases that are continuously updated need to be developed in all countries to understand the location, specific needs and unique vulnerabilities of people with disabilities.

Plenary Session 3: Inclusion vs. Exclusion - Risks and Opportunities

The main thrust of the third plenary session was to articulate the risks of exclusion and the opportunities offered by inclusion. A simple change of perspective among stakeholders can transform a risk into an opportunity. Disasters do not discriminate, but people do, and it is those expressions of exclusion that contribute to people's vulnerability to the impacts of natural hazards and climate change. If reconstruction and recovery programs are to achieve the often-stated goal of making communities more resilient to future hazard events and climate change, three things are required: a clear understanding of the pre-existing social, political, and economic factors that contributed to the vulnerability of the poor and marginalized before the disaster; recognition and understanding of how relief, recovery, and reconstruction interventions can reduce, reinforce or increase those vulnerabilities; and investment in actions to ensure these groups are effectively reached and empowered and their capacities are mobilized.

There are costs incurred when we exclude people. And there are real opportunities when we ensure an inclusive approach. The Boko Haram insurgency devastated the social and economic fabric of Borno state, Nigeria pushing people further into poverty. The deficient case of crisis recovery here stemmed from a lack of community participation. Citizens need to be consulted to evolve integrated approaches in tandem with their cultural values and aspirations. This requires time, patience, and engagement with the community. Besides physical infrastructure such as hospitals, water supply, security, and the provision of livelihood support, policy implementation needs to reach the hearts and minds of the community to be truly inclusive. Empowering the community and setting up grievance redress mechanisms are central to minimizing risks of exclusion. Participatory planning in reconstruction, for instance, could have saved substantial resources in toilet construction because community feedback would have revealed that the water closet system is not used by communities in Nigeria.

The case of post-tsunami disaster recovery efforts in the town of Rikuzentakata in Iwate prefecture of Japan has become symbolic of inclusive methods in the recovery and reconstruction efforts of the city. The recovery and reconstruction effort focused on Building Back Better, creating a resilient city, with inclusiveness and accessibility. Action Plans for reconstruction entailed detailed discussions with diverse groups including people with special needs. The reconstruction was predicated on the ideal that no one should be left behind. Eight years later, despite an unrelenting and coordinated inclusive effort, 675 people are still living in 275 temporary housing units, emphasizing the need for a long-term policy and sustained effort, and the need to fast-track innovations through further community engagement.

Recovery efforts in the Chimani district (Zimbabwe) excluded women, which came at a significant cost as cultural norms were not addressed. The gender bias that excluded women's participation in recovery planning meant that the lessons learned were not received by the community. Women had local strategies they could have contributed which would have helped in recovery, but because information was not shared with them and they were excluded from the planning process, the loss was the greater. As a result, the same vulnerable groups suffer from repetitive loss due to flooding year after year. Existing organized groups that study risk and do mapping must include women to harness the skills available in the community so that lessons learned are integrated into it. Grassroots women are the real stakeholders in the recovery process, so communities need to build capacity and share key learnings with their meaningful, authentic and robust participation.

Plenary Session 4: Inclusion as a Right for All

The closing plenary session solemnly reaffirmed inclusion as a right for all. This concluding component of the Conference expressed the need to arrive at a globally-shared and comprehensive view of various forms of inclusion (or exclusion) that need to be addressed and integrate these insights into a rights-

based framework, and to provide guidance and outline actions to make sure the focus on execution and implementation of a rights-based global compact is translated into initiatives at the local, national, regional and global levels. The session identified approaches that enable the realization of a rights-based paradigm and guide inclusive recovery systems in order to (a) ensure the full and meaningful participation of all groups and individuals in identifying and reducing risk (b) provide institutional guarantees that those at risk of being excluded are included in the recovery process (c) appreciate and respond to their diverse characteristics, capacities and vulnerabilities (d) contribute to resilience for everyone by removing barriers that keep excluded people out of the planning and decision-making process and finally (e) transform existing power relations.

The session highlighted the importance of developing a platform to exchange best practices so that countries all over the world can share their experience and benefit from the learnings of others. The commitment to not leaving anyone behind is reflected in a number of initiatives linked to inclusion, such as guidelines for drawing up public policies. In Ecuador, for instance, rights are guaranteed and respected through equality councils that coordinate policies, programs, laws and services which ensure that people are able to access and exercise their rights in terms of health, social rights, education and security. In terms of risk reduction, the inclusion of marginalized and other groups serves victims of domestic violence, children, disabled people, and indigenous peoples. The best way to comply with the inclusion objective is to use tools that take into account the most vulnerable people, acknowledging their needs in various scenarios.

The success of BRAC (Building Resources Across Communities) International, the world's largest NGO, is due to its focus on community and people. The mindset was that of emphasizing the community and its people as individuals with ideas and resilience, active agents who needed tools to support them, rather than considering them passive recipients of charity. With increasing urbanization, the nature of disasters in Bangladesh changed, which necessitated a different kind of preparation to protect against them. The focus

needed to be on relief but also on building back better to enable more effective prevention and relief in the future.

In Senegal, it was noted that inequalities are created, widened, and deepened because of the way conflict is managed when the population is displaced. These inequalities existed, but new interventions often aggravate them. This provides an opportunity to modify the intervention to create a paradigm shift so that new interventions can lead communities to a different dynamic that could reestablish the balance. It is important to build proactive instead of reactive approaches – there is a need to work not only on emergency situations, but also to anticipate situations more accurately so that effective prevention measures can be taken to avoid their occurrence.

Subsequent to the great earthquake in the Hyogo Prefecture, Japan, it was discovered that 50–60 percent of the victims were either elderly and/or people with disabilities, and they experienced secondary issues despite being successfully relocated to shelters due to the conditions prevailing at the shelters. Inclusion for recovery assumes the fundamental belief that no one will be left behind. This is best achieved by ensuring that vulnerable groups participate in the policy planning process and its implementation in order to reduce disaster risks. This can be as detailed as the creation of personal evacuation plans for people. Managers are trained to understand the particular situations involved in making these plans more effective. Disseminating the lessons Japan learned from its successful experience with inclusive recovery after the earthquake would significantly assist other countries to be better prepared for future disasters.

The time has come for the global community to talk about inclusion, as was clear from the focus on it in every session of this Conference. For disaster recovery to be inclusive, it is important that advocacy and policy come together. Learning from the past and documenting the past is vital and forms the basis of building back better. Building back better is not just about building infrastructure, but about building a better society. Disasters can be thought of as opportunities for rebuilding entire societies on the basis of

social inclusion. Finally, there is a need for more data, more evidence, and robust evaluations that work.

Thematic Session 1: Recovery and Inclusion through Satellite Earth Observation (EO)

One of the key messages of the WRC4 pertains to taking advantage of state-of-the-art technologies for enhanced effectiveness. The first thematic session focused on facilitating recovery and inclusion through Satellite Earth Observation (EO). Satellite imagery can be used to scale up inclusion in the recovery process. Apart from advocating the use of satellite EO to enable inclusive recovery efforts, new and improved methods to support recovery planning and monitoring were explored. The Recovery Observatory (RO) in Haiti has been used for a range of thematic issues dealing with early recovery planning, long-term recovery monitoring, capacity building and technology transfer to ensure Haitian experts are able to generate satellite-based products to support recovery after future events.

The use of satellite imagery offers a cost-effective, fast and detailed response after major events, thus reducing Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) costs. Another advantage is the rapid overview of the situation right after the impact assessment of accessibility issues, which can serve to prioritize the response. Better response can be organized if there is good baseline data before the event. Organizing this baseline data should be a priority for better exploiting this technology in the future. Norway is a good example for having accumulated large volumes of baseline data that can used to detect change after disasters and better assess the impact on vulnerable populations. EO can also help in increasing risk awareness among populations, keeping the memory of risk of major disasters, when populations quickly forget catastrophic events. In Kenya, satellite data plays a critical role in reducing financial risk as it can drive indices that trigger payouts when used for assessing drought impact.

Another important dimension is that recovery products based on satellite data would be valuable for ecosystem-based approaches to recovery, if also linked to livelihoods. Two years after Cyclone Matthew in Haiti, the ecosystem-based products are the most critical, and enable planners to understand long-term environmental changes from satellite data.

In Haiti in 2010, 430,000 buildings were inspected on the ground in the weeks after the earthquake. These data sets need to be better merged with satellite data for integrated products. In Palau in 2018, 1500 people died from liquefaction. This is something not well understood, and satellite data can help us understand the extent of liquefaction after an event and help manage the response to this. In Mozambique, satellite data was critical to assess the full extent of the impact but was better at calculating affected area than the extent of damages. Damage estimates were undervalued in the satellite-based assessment process. Cross-validation and merging with other complementary data sets are critical for more accurate assessments.

Implementing the lessons learned in Haiti, Kenya, Mozambique and Dominica etc. in other countries and scaling the RO to a global level is not straight forward. This requires the mobilization of significant resources and investment in institutional relationships. It is critical to understand the financial implications of future RO work, which must be closely coordinated with both the PDNA process and recovery planning, to do this more cost-effectively. A clear institutional cooperation framework must be established to chart out how international stakeholders can forge relationships at the national level in the days after a major disaster so that satellite agencies can identify the right capacity in a country and work on developing it in the months after a disaster. It cannot work without strong capacity development and empowerment of national agencies.

Satellites cannot do everything. We need to find the best fit with other technologies and procedures and bring all this together for more effective recovery. A final comment was made on better exploiting popular well-

adopted technologies like mobile apps to ensure we can bring information to the end user in a form they can work with.

Thematic Session 2: BBB in Infrastructure - Making It Stronger and Accessible to Everyone

One of the main and recurring themes at the World Reconstruction Conference has been Building Back Better (BBB). BBB has been advocated since it was first promoted in 2005 after the Indian Ocean Tsunami. While the notion of BBB is increasingly embraced as a guiding principle, there remains a great need for countries and communities to adequately prepare to build back better before disaster strikes. For most decision makers, it is less of a question of whether to build back better, than of how building back better should be done.

The core principles of building back better are (a) Do no harm: learn from the past and avoid unnecessary damage to future recovery (b) Agencies must be accountable to the people they seek to assist (c) People affected by disaster should be the decision-makers (d) Recovery of local economy and livelihoods must be a priority (e) Reconstruction and recovery efforts must recognize diversity (f) Communities should be allowed to use their own resources wherever possible and (g) Reconstruction must take account of future hazards and risks.

Building back stronger reduces well-being losses by ensuring that reconstructed infrastructure can resist more intense events in the future. Building back faster reduces disaster impacts by accelerating reconstruction through measures such as contingent reconstruction plans, pre-approved contracts, and financial arrangements. Building back more inclusively ensures that post-disaster support reaches all affected population groups. This emphasizes the importance of providing reconstruction support to low-income households, which are typically more exposed, more vulnerable, and less comprehensively supported.

The session deliberated on the success factors and the options for practical application of the principles of BBB, looking not only at safer and stronger reconstruction of infrastructure and physical assets, but also addressing the social and human impact of disasters and taking recovery as an opportunity to improve the quality of lives and their future prospects.

Panelists representing governments in Armenia, Serbia and India described how having institutional and legal arrangements, policies and systems in place, agreed in an ex-ante approach, facilitate the management of infrastructure recovery and the application of BBB principles. Armenia's experience in BBB application at the local level infrastructure recovery and the role of the National Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Platform in ensuring inclusiveness of these processes was highlighted. Integrating BBB principles into Serbia's large-scale recovery program after the 2014 floods was enabled by the legal and institutional framework employed. Countries like India have launched the Coalition for Disaster Resilient Infrastructure at the UN Climate Action Summit in September 2019 which will work towards reducing damage to critical infrastructure as called for by Target (d) of the Sendai Framework.

Countries can strengthen their resilience to natural shocks through a better reconstruction process. The benefits of building back better could be very large – up to US\$173 billion per year globally. According to a recent World Bank Report (2018), a stronger, faster, and more inclusive recovery would lead to an average reduction in disaster-related well-being losses of 59 percent in the 17 small island states covered in the report.

A striking finding concerns the rural incidence of the impact of large earthquakes on the poor. Given that more than 90% of earthquake fatalities occur in rural environments, new ways to protect the population need to be explored. With most rural buildings being one- and two-story dwellings, the earthquake closet offers an affordable solution as a protection unit. The cost of constructing such a closet in a single-family home is taken to be \$500–\$600 in developing countries.

Disaster-affected households in low- and middle-income countries rebuild their homes in situations where little or no support is available from humanitarian agencies. Households' self-recovery experiences following Typhoon Yolanda (Haiyan) in the Philippines in 2013 and the Gorkha Earthquake in Nepal in 2015 were examined. It is important to understand the different governmental, economic, environmental and socio-cultural contexts in which self-recovery takes place, and how this affects progress, the process of reconstruction and building back safer, the drivers and barriers to self-recovery, as well as what is needed to effectively support self-recovery.

Hazards impact rich and poor countries differently because of differences in vulnerability, which is the probability and exposure of a population to risks. These differ dramatically between rich and poor populations within a country. The world's poor have fewer choices as to where they can live, fewer protections when shock events such as flooding and earthquakes occur. In poor countries, the trend of rapid urbanization occurs in particularly hazardous areas. The inclusion of recovery as Priority 4 of the Sendai Framework is a clear recognition of the importance of recovery as an opportunity to Build Back Better through safer infrastructure, resilient livelihoods, stronger governance systems, better early warning and improved preparedness of governments and communities to manage disaster risks.

Lessons from large-scale recovery programs show that recovery would be implemented more successfully, and overall preparedness could be significantly strengthened if BBB principles are already included as part of the Disaster Risk Reduction systems in the country or set up soon after the disaster to lead recovery processes. However, at present, the general level of preparedness and capacities for BBB application remains rather limited in most countries. Governments generally set up institutions and overall policies for recovery in response to a large disaster event and use existing institutions to respond to smaller events fully ignoring BBB principles.

Thematic Session 3: Ensuring the Inclusion of Displaced Persons in Recovery

The third thematic session explored different approaches in ensuring that displaced persons are included in recovery processes in accordance with these key inclusion principles: (a) Full and meaningful participation of displaced persons' groups and their leaders in identifying and reducing risk (b) Equality of rights and opportunities for displaced persons in the face of risk (c) Responsiveness to the diverse characteristics, capacities and vulnerabilities of displaced persons, especially women and children and (d) Building resilience of displaced persons by transforming power relations and removing barriers that keep them excluded. Successful examples and lessons learned from participatory approaches, methods and practices were presented and discussed.

Successful recovery means rehabilitation of not just homes, but also livelihoods, and this can be successfully achieved only by coordination between various stakeholders, including the displaced persons themselves, who need to be included in decision-making, planning and implementation to ensure successful recovery. It is rare to find Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) included at every stage of decision-making. Participatory planning at local levels involving IDPs and host communities, affordable housing with security of tenure, access to livelihoods and basic services, linking new settlements to previous livelihoods and new markets, creation of new livelihoods, and support for recovery of local businesses are effective means to include displaced persons in recovery. This is not happening because people are working in silos and determining needs from the perspective of mandates instead of looking comprehensively and holistically at what displaced persons want and need. National organizations need to establish frameworks that leave a lot of room for local organizations to ensure inclusion of displaced persons in recovery.

Inclusion of displaced persons in recovery in the wake of Category 5 Tropical Cyclone Winston in 2016 (South Pacific Basin) that affected 62% of the

population in the affected areas (Fiji, Vanuatu, Tonga and Queensland in Australia) was a stiff challenge. There was internal displacement and relocation. Ensuring inclusion of displaced persons in the recovery process entailed state support in the form of shelter assistance, social protection in the form of welfare assistance, food ration distribution, and superannuation funds drawdown. The panel stressed the need for improved networking and coordination among stakeholders involved in disaster recovery management, humanitarian collaboration, and building resilience and inclusion at all levels. Spatial planning is critical in disaster-prone zones. It is important to look at not just reconstruction and rehabilitation of the affected area, but also resettling new areas in safer places for displaced persons.

Profiling and quality data can transform recovery initiatives into meaningful solutions when working in collaboration with national, subnational and local agencies and the community. Profiling was used to inform the National Development Plan in Mogadishu, Somalia, the Durable Solutions Strategy in El Fasher, Sudan, and Urban Integration Planning in Thessaloniki, Greece. The importance of working with the right partners, prioritizing the collaborative process through neutral coordination and quality data, comparing population groups, analyzing people and place, linking analysis to the identified planning process and recovery framework from the beginning, and engaging with the community to enhance the validity and usefulness of results are the essential components of an effective strategy.

Housing is at the center of creating stability for families across all cultures and socioeconomic classes. Lack of claim to the land on which their home is built is a core impediment to securing families from disaster. In order to achieve disaster-resilient communities globally, (a) inclusion must be considered from the outset (b) community input and community-led mapping should be used to identify existing land tenure arrangements and conflicts as a first step to protect residents from eviction laws (c) regulations that protect security of land tenure should be reinforced and implemented at the local level (d) reconstruction efforts must reflect a holistic approach regarding land rights to

inform the design of recovery programs in an effort to increase a family's land security over time, and (e) reconstruction efforts must prioritize onsite reconstruction over relocation where feasible. The securing of land tenure rights is vital for the recovery of displaced persons.

Thematic Session 4: Community-led Recovery

The fourth thematic session sought to delineate a framework that governments and stakeholders can use to act on their commitment to community-led recovery processes. The emphasis was on learning from best practices around the world. This was an ideal platform for mainstreaming community-led recovery and building on the existing consensus in order to promote a framework of thinking and identify the critical aspects of successful community involvement. Agencies and organizations involved in recovery and reconstruction processes can work with communities as partners. Involving communities in recovery is absolutely essential as only 10-20% of disaster victims are assisted by outside agencies. Most disaster-affected people rely on themselves and their communities for recovery.

After Typhoon Haiyan/Yolanda in the Philippines, well-organized communities were deeply involved in both recovery planning and implementation. The importance of trusting communities to lead recovery efforts and work with government agencies as knowledge holders and partners was stressed. Lessons from several recovery case studies that show the importance of preparing communities for recovery before a disaster happens were shared. Recovery planning must always consider the specific socio-cultural dynamics and must recognize that there can't be any standard recipes or blueprints. Community-led recovery is all about context. The major role of external organizations and agencies is to facilitate and enable communities. Simple measures such as supporting families with filling applications for reconstruction grants (Nepal) or providing tools and construction expertise through mobile units that reach affected communities directly (Philippines) go a long way in assisting effective recovery. Best

practices in community involvement were successfully transferred from Japan to the Philippines, where community workshops improved post-disaster land-use and relocation planning. The focus needs to be on non-structural measures and developing tools that can easily be disseminated to other affected areas.

The session showed that engaging directly with communities and making them equal partners in planning, implementing and monitoring recovery and reconstruction ensures that these strategies align with community needs and makes them more effective. While meaningful community involvement may seem to take time, it leads to smoother implementation of recovery programs and more sustainable long-term results. The panelists agreed that there is further need for strengthening community capacities and building trust between grassroots organizations and local and national governments.

Thematic Session 5: South Asia – Where Resilience and Inclusion Meet

Several South Asian countries have pioneered innovative approaches and practices and produced action plans to adopt inclusive resilience concepts in their DRM portfolios. A dedicated session discussed the way forward for the implementation of successful practices to take these countries to the next level and to consider replicability in other countries of the region. The main objectives were to generate interest to advance inclusive resilience at the project level in any region or country, disseminate sample action plans which include concrete inclusive resilience activities that project managers (from Government) and development partners can customize for their projects, and expand the inclusive resilience network thus helping find various partners to help countries implement their action plans.

The session highlighted the importance of framing different areas of DRM and integrating them with social needs so that these areas become social inclusion entry points. Examples of such areas include risk assessment, structural resilience, hydro-met, emergency response services, and community

resilience. The panel was optimistic that the lessons from technical approaches that work in one country can successfully be transplanted to other South Asian countries.

South Asia as a region is unique in two ways: the increasing frequency of natural disasters over the last 10-20 years, which affect its large populations and densely populated areas, and its very heterogeneous population groups with a unique age profile comprising many children on the one hand and many elderly on the other. There is an increasing awareness in the region of the need for inclusion of persons with disabilities, both in the immediate aftermath of a disaster, and in the recovery and rebuilding processes.

The experiences from the devastation wrought by the 2015 earthquake in Nepal were shared. PDNA and recovery efforts focused on not just social, but also technological, economic, cultural, legal, and institutional aspects. The main challenges were political transition and federalization, geo-spatial and seasonal hurdles of access, and a significant financial resource gap. The future action plan is to focus on socioeconomic recovery and livelihoods with special support to socially excluded and vulnerable groups, sustainable and socially inclusive resilience in DRM, and urban housing reconstruction including traditional settlement and heritage conservation involving the local population.

Flood-hit Pakistan's social inclusion challenges include gender and patriarchy, class, social and ethnic inequality, embankment-protected and unprotected agricultural settings, and disabilities being defined in terms of immobility. Multiple efforts are being currently undertaken to enhance the social inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups. The action plan for mainstreaming inclusive resilience includes socially inclusive disaster vulnerability assessments, community response plans and drills, and community consultations.

In Bangladesh, the challenges to mainstream inclusion were presented by economic status, gender, poor capacity to respond to early warning and

forecasts, and lack of a dissemination mechanism to reach vulnerable communities in time. Opportunities for more socially inclusive DRM in disaster-prone areas include strengthening information services and early warning systems in meteorology and hydrology, developing agro-meteorological information systems, and an effective dissemination mechanism for farming communities. Key challenges include lack of sufficient network to draw weather data, absence of sufficient location-specific research data, issues in dissemination, and technical problems of forecast. Key problems in agricultural climate services include the need to empower various stakeholders, increase cross-sectoral awareness, and enhance coordination among climate service providers.

Sri Lanka called attention to its persistent vulnerability to floods and landslides. Current efforts to enhance social inclusion include (a) ensuring equity and priority in resource distribution to vulnerable groups (b) recognizing the right of disaster-prone communities to participate in and contribute to decision-making and addressing the specific concerns, vulnerabilities and capacities of vulnerable groups (c) prioritizing them in delivery of emergency supplies and compensation under the national natural disaster insurance policy, gender and social inclusion in DRR and (d) enhancing hydro-met service delivery systems, flood mitigation infrastructure, and resettlement assistance to be inclusive for vulnerable households and persons with disabilities. The challenges to social inclusion in DRR relate mainly to translating theory into practice. Practitioners need to be trained and empowered to convert theory into concrete plans that include vulnerability profiles. Data collection and sharing, and coordination among agencies continue to be a significant challenge, as does investment in inclusion, since the output is not tangible.

The session showed how far governments in South Asia have come in terms of excellent risk management, and inclusion of people who are most at the risk of being left out. Inclusion becomes a reality when three things happen. First, policy makers acknowledge that there are excluded groups, and that

something needs to be done about them. Second, data and evidence exist. Lastly, there is learning from the past. Countries are doing well on the first and last score, but much more needs to be done in terms of collecting robust data and evidence rather than relying on anecdotal information. The panelists agreed that specific, relevant data collection, cooperation among stakeholders, participation and contribution from the community, capacity building, and a focus on livelihood resilience were needed to ensure better inclusion.

Thematic Session 6: From Local Government to Civil Society, from Urban to Rural Settings - Making Recovery Inclusive

This session looked at recovery from the local government's and civil society's perspectives to identify good practices witnessed in terms of inclusion of local populations and the role that local governments and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) play as drivers of inclusive local recovery. The major challenges facing local governments when creating an inclusive recovery process for citizens and vulnerable populations are typically time pressure, project/planning loads, resource scarcity, uncertainty, and the need to increase local capacity quickly and effectively. On the other hand, disaster-affected citizens and vulnerable sections of society are daunted by the scale of unmet needs, loss and trauma in communities, resource scarcity, uncertainty, social injustice, and societal mechanisms that preserve the status quo and prevent the social change needed to reduce risk, vulnerability and inequities. The idea was to fine-tune innovative and excellent inclusion practices and hard-won wisdom and lessons for future recovery efforts to improve inclusion and participatory practices.

The reconstruction experience of the city of Rikuzentakata, Japan, in the wake of the earthquake and tsunami of 2011 was cited again, this time from a different perspective. The pillars of the original plan were to build back better, to create a resilient city, and to ensure inclusiveness and accessibility for all so that no one is left behind. The landscape was rebuilt on a height by cutting

into a mountain and using the world's largest conveyor belt to carry the soil for the reconstruction of the raised city. An emergency radio station was built to communicate with the people to finalize plans and policies. The goal was to build a model city of Japan where Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) would be the focus and inclusion the basic norm. Building back better involved the creation of new industry, an inclusive community, universal town design and developing international friendships. These efforts culminated in the creation of a global campus to disseminate lessons learned to the rest of Japan as well as to other countries.

The synchronous experience of Sendai, another Japanese city, was also underscored for restoring disaster victims' livelihoods in the wake of the earthquake and tsunami. Disaster victims were moved to prefabricated housing, where service representatives made door-to-door visits to understand and assess the problem. This resulted in the classification of the affected into four categories, based on whether the feasibility of home rebuilding was high or low, and whether they had a high or low level of autonomy in their daily lives. Support was designed by all stakeholders based on the needs of disaster victims. Citizens were trained to take charge of disaster prevention operations and to educate children, emphasizing community self-help principles.

An eloquent comparison was made between two commensurate events - the 1999 cyclone in Orissa, India that killed over 10,000 people and Cyclone Fani of 2019 that killed 60 people. This transformative outcome of enormously reduced loss of life can be attributed to three causes: better risk-informed infrastructure building, the existence of political will to analyze from the perspective of groups that were disproportionately affected, and a shift of power and entitlement in reconstruction towards those who were most impacted by the disaster. It is imperative to look beyond quick fixes, and to go through the time-consuming and labor-intensive task of involving communities in designing and leading recovery processes so that long-term and sustainable impact can be achieved. DRR needs to be integrated into solutions so that finance, resources and capabilities are dedicated to it.

The need to identify vulnerable sections of disaster-affected communities was articulated. Based on experiences from India, recovery could be inclusive if five conditions are met: (a) there is political will to involve citizens and vulnerable sections in designing, developing, implementing, and monitoring post-disaster recovery interventions (b) DRR and Response and Rehabilitation are inclusive (c) all stakeholders recognize the differential vulnerability of vulnerable sections of disaster-affected communities (d) the development planning process incorporates DRR interventions through consultative and participatory processes, and (e) the unmet needs of unreached communities can be addressed by all stakeholders. Good practices of inclusive recovery efforts such as peer-to-peer exchanges with elders in the Philippines, a Community Resilience Fund for grassroots women leaders in Asia, Africa, and Central America, and employment opportunities for transgenders in India were highlighted.

The root causes of lack of inclusion are dominant power dynamics across agencies and the political context they operate in, donor fatigue, and the attitude that those affected by disaster are helpless, hopeless and a liability. Stakeholders need to understand that the disaster-affected are assets, and offer an opportunity to practice inclusive recovery. In addition to outcomes, they need to create an accountability framework for all stakeholders. For inclusion to be a reality, there is a great need for improved data capture, affirmative action, consultation with vulnerable communities, and empowerment of the people by giving them titles to land. The session showed how transformative change has been achieved whenever inclusion has been part of the disaster recovery process. The term to focus on is 'agency'. People need to be empowered to act on their own behalf, to be agents.

Thematic Session 7: Civil Protection for Inclusive Recovery

In many countries, civil protection agencies play a pivotal role when disasters strike. Dedicated men and women from these agencies lead efforts to save lives, alleviate suffering, and protect livelihoods. A well-functioning civil

protection system is a diverse ecosystem of people and agencies, each with a clear and valuable role to play. Over the last century, civil protection systems grew into stronger entities that could rapidly respond to a disaster, significantly reducing the number of lives lost to disasters.

In the last few decades, rather than waiting for disaster to strike, civil protection shifted towards a more proactive and integrated approach – focusing on better preparedness and actionable early warnings to minimize disaster risks and enhance the efficiency and speed of response. Agencies in some countries organize large-scale earthquake simulation drills and use education, ICT tools (including mobile phone apps), and other participatory techniques to galvanize preparedness efforts, and build a culture of safety and resilience.

Civil protection systems contribute through their traditional focus on disaster preparedness and response, and also by stimulating the engagement of governments to address appropriate disaster risk reduction policies, and through participation in National Platforms for disaster risk reduction. The customary focus of civil protection systems on preparedness and response and its recent involvement in the broader disaster risk reduction agenda together present an entry point into the development of inclusive recovery strategies by enhancing their relevant capabilities and information sharing through a review of their strengths, needs and opportunities.

The session showcased civil protection as a multidimensional system based on a broad range of cultural, geographical and economic enablers and barriers. Civil protection activities during the phase of emergency preparedness mainly consist of disaster risk forecasting, early warning systems, emergency preparedness plans, collection and storage of emergency items, safe evacuation, and mock drills. Further, during the disaster response phase, civil protection agencies are typically involved in disaster emergency service and assistance during or immediately after the disaster. Saving human life and preventing additional physical loss are the priority actions at this

stage. Search, rescue, relief, emergency health services, temporary shelter, safe drinking water and sanitation, and arrangement of food are the other priority activities of this stage. Finally, the recovery and reconstruction phase includes rehabilitation and improvement of disaster-affected services and facilities, and income generation and livelihood activities that need to be restored. This phase of rehabilitation and reconstruction comprises activities like raising people's awareness, institutional strengthening and coordination, financing and implementing arrangements including communication, information, and mechanisms to address grievances. All these phases need to promote inclusion and participation of the communities that are at the heart of implemented activities.

As civil protection systems are at the inception of such processes since the preparedness phase, they constitute relevant instruments of inclusive recovery promotion. This community-based civil protection and DRR approach without any discrimination based on sex, age, race, religion, ethnicity, geography or social status is a strong basis for inclusion of all at every phase. In the future, civil protection mechanisms need to extend their effectiveness and continued engagement in the recovery phase and strictly adhere to inclusive approaches.

The concrete examples discussed during the session showed the centrality of the involvement of all stakeholders in promoting effective civil protection systems. Private sector engagement and community involvement are crucial in successful civil protection. The Haiti case showed that using local engineers and training them was more efficient in rebuilding better and quicker. Therefore, the inclusion of CSOs in the civil protection system is important. However, recent Mexican experience showed that their involvement is not always guaranteed in the post-response and recovery stages after the emergency passes.

EU emergency response mapping was cited as one of the premier existing tools fit to be replicated elsewhere to ensure an efficient civil protection approach. It is recommended that the technical and scientific bodies that

provide the main data and information used by civil protection be strengthened and developed. The session called for the development of human resources to be prioritised alongside technological innovations. It was concluded that in many countries, there is a severe mismatch between the importance of civil protection and the resources allocated to it, which was also illustrated by similar incompatibilities in the civil protection mechanisms in many countries such as Niger and Togo.

The potential of civil protection systems in promoting inclusive recovery is not fully understood and supported by governments across the globe. Therefore, it is critical to focus on advocacy and profile enhancement to secure not only funding for this sector but also a higher consideration from different stakeholders. In the foreseeable future, an inclusive approach to communities and CSOs in designing the civil protection system will be indispensable in most countries.

The objective of the session was to showcase how civil protection can be an impressive engine for inclusive recovery through the implementation of the successive phases of disaster risk management. Discussions clarified the need for a better understanding of the relationship between the level of inclusion of all stakeholders and successful phases of disaster management, and better design of the roles and responsibilities of civil protection actors (governments, private sector, civil society, communities, etc.) for inclusive recovery.

Thematic Session 8: Fostering Social Inclusion through Culture in City Reconstruction and Recovery

City reconstruction is a field of increasing importance across the globe. Each year, more than 200 million people are affected by storms, floods, cyclones, and earthquakes. The world is urbanizing at a speed and scale that is unprecedented in human history. Today, nearly 55 percent of the world's population lives in cities. Compounding this, we are witnessing a rapid increase in the impacts of disasters on urban areas. At the same time, armed

conflicts are increasingly causing widespread destruction in cities. City reconstruction, necessitated by both conflicts and disasters, is challenged to reconcile communities, ensure social inclusion, promote economic development, and manage complex social, spatial, and economic transformations. Cities are not just a collection of buildings - they are about people and their interaction with each other and their cultural identity. Therefore, culture can be key to success in 'building cities back better'.

This thematic session examined the ways to foster social inclusion in city reconstruction and recovery using culture and heritage as tools. Discussing the international experience in this niche area led to the analysis of options for development practitioners, national and local authorities, planners, and international organizations to integrate culture both as an asset and as a tool, in all phases of recovery projects, and showcased good practices with universal elements that can serve as examples elsewhere and can be adapted to suit local specificities.

A joint position paper by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Bank introduced a new framework christened CURE (Culture in City Reconstruction and Recovery). Culture is increasingly under threat especially in conflict-affected places to the extent that it can be termed 'cultural cleansing'. The CURE framework is a roadmap for integrating culture in post-crisis reconstruction and recovery. It accentuates the critical importance of culture in achieving sustainable urban development. Various case studies have illustrated how culture is critical to boosting local tourism development (Seoul, South Korea), engaging communities and fostering social cohesion and reconciliation (Timbuktu, Mali) and adopting innovative land readjustment mechanisms for resilient city building (Tokyo, Japan). Further, reconstructing landmarks has started a reconciliation process in Mostar, Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is important to balance people's immediate needs and the recovery of a city's historic character as is the case in Mosul, Iraq.

An earthquake in 2016 damaged about 200,000 buildings in the City of Kumamoto, Japan - among these the world-famous Kumamoto Castle that dates back to 1607. Reconstruction of the castle became one of the top priorities in the city's recovery plans, because of its symbolic value for the citizens. Supported by an elaborate communications strategy, Kumamoto Castle became a symbol of building back better in the city and will serve as a reminder of earthquake risks for future generations. Another illustrative example is that of the reconstruction process after the liberation of the city of Marawi from ISIS-linked Maute terrorist groups by the national security forces in the Philippines. The importance of Marawi as the premier Islamic city in the country was upheld by the Government as it utilized the reconstruction process to foster trust between the Muslim minority and the predominantly Christian majority population of the country by integrating cultural sensitivity as a cross-cutting issue.

The CURE framework builds on existing DRM and recovery frameworks, but introduces culture as an important driver and enabler for post-crisis reconstruction and development. It is vital to combine people-centered and place-based reconstruction approaches and ensure that culture underpins the entire process.

Thematic Session 9: Financing Risk for More Inclusive Recovery

Recovery from a disaster is a multi-faceted, complex and deeply challenging undertaking for country and community, family and individual, and often forces suboptimal choices that would not otherwise have been made. For the most vulnerable, recovery is even more of an issue: firstly, the most vulnerable families are more likely to be affected by disaster, often due to fringe-of-habitat living locations; secondly, they are more likely to be affected deeply because their housing, employment and infrastructure are likely to be particularly fragile; and lastly, these families are more likely to face an uphill battle for recovery as they are often outside the usual ecosystem of social welfare, banking, and the broader financial services.

Risk financing can be a key tool in tackling the complex issue of recovery, especially in the case of vulnerable groups such as women, the elderly, displaced communities, and people with disabilities - not just looking to ensure that recovery is swift, but also to build long-term resilience. And the route to delivering on that resilience, especially for the vulnerable, is to provide access to micro and inclusive insurance, because it not only provides for coverage of key areas of life and living, but can increasingly be used to connect the financially excluded to the critical world of finances, credit, pensions and more.

The issue at hand, however, is not just one of providing insurance coverage to the most vulnerable, perhaps through a subsidy provision. There are many interlocking challenges. On the demand side a lack of experience of insurance and a lack of trust will compound issues of cost and moral hazard. On the supply side, an inadequate regulatory environment is often compounded by the limited size of the available market. In addition, the conditions and institutions under which insurers can develop and provide products in a sustainable manner are yet to be established in developing countries.

An exclusive session examined opportunities to increase insurance coverage for the most vulnerable in the most vulnerable countries. The bouquet of services and the current and potential mechanisms that are required for financing risk in the context of recovery which will enable the impacted vulnerable household to bounce back and be productive in an efficient manner were explored. The need for dynamic coordination between governments and the international community as well as the public and private sectors was stressed.

In addition to the direct and indirect value it may provide to clients, microinsurance often has significant social value, in the form of market or economic development, as families and communities are increasingly connected with more beneficial financial products and services. Studies have demonstrated a causal link between the development of the insurance industry in general and overall national economic development. By mobilizing

savings, insurers tend to be an important source of long-term investment capital for initiatives such as infrastructural improvements and can stimulate the development of debt and equity markets.

Country examples of Uganda and Kenya highlighted insurance programs these governments are undertaking to prevent losses from primary drought. These programs, supplemented by other disaster risk management initiatives, act as effective tools to assist in long-term recovery. The government's role extends beyond provision of subsidies to include facilitating the private sector in playing a complementary role. The session identified three major challenges: access to data, scalability, and sustainability. Critical to overcoming these challenges is the need to increase integration of recovery financing tools and options into broader development planning and implementation as well as to create a framework to generate awareness at not just the individual beneficiary level but also across government agencies and channels.

Thematic Session 10: Urban Reconstruction in Post-Conflict Settings

Urban areas are frequently at the center of modern conflicts and therefore face a unique set of challenges in post-conflict settings. Urban reconstruction in post-conflict settings needs to be spatially coherent, inclusive of different social groups and vulnerable populations, and attentive to cultural heritage. Collaborative post-conflict urban planning tools can ensure that reconstruction efforts are people-centered and accessible to all. While it is common knowledge that workshops, Q&A meetings and charettes allow for community participation in the process of planning cities and level the playing field among stakeholders, a special session shifted the spotlight to how this process translates in a post-conflict setting and focused on practical tools to support engagement in post-conflict urban reconstruction.

Three approaches were examined: (a) the Area-Based Approach (ABA) which addresses needs spanning multiple sectors in geographically circumscribed areas within cities (case study: Yemen Integrated Urban Services Emergency Project) (b) the CURE framework which places culture at the core of

reconstruction and recovery processes by embedding cultural heritage and creativity at the foundation and intersection of place-based and people-centered policies (case study: Cultural Heritage and Urban Development Project) and (c) the Urban Recovery Framework (URF) which encompasses strengthening institutional arrangements, enabling the policy environment, financing urban reconstruction, and improving implementation arrangements (case study: Urban Recovery Framework in Syria). Building on the presentation of these tools and their operationalization in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, the session discussed the relative strengths of these different tools.

The objective of the project implemented in Yemen was to restore access to critical urban services in selected cities while the conflict was ongoing and lay the foundation for long-term reconstruction in the future. The project applied an area-based multi-sectoral approach aimed at coordinated reconstruction activities in different sectors such as water, health, transport, and education. To be successful in the challenging environment of a conflict-torn country, the project applied a flexible implementation approach that relied heavily on local institutions and citizen engagement thus benefiting from their capacity and expertise.

The case of Lebanon was presented to explain how restoration of historic sites, buildings and markets promoted urban recovery and cohesion between various factions of society. Culture and heritage could be one common denominator to bring together warring groups. Recently developed by the World Bank and the UNESCO, the CURE Framework places culture at the core of reconstruction and recovery processes by embedding cultural heritage and creativity at the foundation and intersection of place-based and people-centered policies. While place-based strategies prioritize the reconstruction of physical assets, people-centered strategies strengthen community ownership and social inclusion, improve livability of the built environment, and accelerate the socioeconomic recovery of cities.

Since 2003, the World Bank Group, the Government of Lebanon, the Government of Italy, and the Agence Française de Développement have been jointly supporting an ambitious project, the Cultural Heritage and Urban Development (CHUD) Project, focused on the regeneration of five historic cities. With their densely populated neighborhoods, the cities of Tripoli, Byblos, Baalbek, Saida, and Tyre are dotted with historic, world-class heritage assets. Parts of these legendary cities have been successfully regenerated and rehabilitated, building more inclusive communities. The project created a space for residents to live and enjoy, linking public space, cultural heritage, and private business. The specific case of Tyre was showcased as an example of how the revitalization of historic assets can be leveraged to provide larger societal benefits, fully exploring the potential of cultural heritage as a force for social inclusion and cohesion, and economic development in local communities.

The session also reflected on the drivers of urban conflict such as unmanaged population movement and growth, and increase in poverty and overall fragility. It provided an overview of the URF that supports resilient urban recovery at scale, and the renewal of the social contract. The framework starts with the establishment of a common urban information baseline regarding damages and needs. Building on this baseline, a common vision and strategic objectives guide the development of urban recovery plans from the national to the household level. The framework calls for these plans to be complemented by an enabling institutional structure and a sustainable financing strategy. Remote sensing-based methods were employed to assess damages, and reconstruction and recovery needs in Syria. High-resolution satellite images were used to get a detailed picture of the dynamic situation on the ground. The data was not only able to support the mapping and evaluation of damaged infrastructure but also gave insights into current conflict dynamics by showing the establishment of frontlines. Such data and analyses can support future reconstruction planning.

Thematic Session 11: Building Back Better and Inclusive Recovery in Small Island Developing States

Small Island Developing States (SIDS) suffer disproportionately from the adverse impacts of natural hazards exacerbated by climate change. They include more than two-thirds of the countries with the highest relative average annual disaster losses caused by natural disasters – between 1 to 9% of their GDP – and the costs are growing. Climate change is expected to greatly increase the SIDS' exposure to natural hazards such as hurricanes, storm surges, flooding and extreme winds. The recurrence and severity of natural disasters compound existing challenges and place added burdens on the SIDS' efforts to achieve the SDGs by diverting funds from social programs and infrastructure to disaster response.

There are several approaches to achieve inclusive recovery, and one of them is to apply the principles of Building Back Better (BBB), operationalized through three dimensions: building back faster, stronger and more inclusively. BBB can lay the foundation for building inclusive and resilient societies and benefit the SIDS specifically due to their high vulnerability and small scale. Seven of the top ten countries with the highest gains from BBB belong to the SIDS. As was noted earlier, the World Bank report *Build Back Better* showed that a faster, stronger and more inclusive recovery would lead to an average reduction in disaster-related well-being losses of 59 percent in the SIDS and that such resilient and effective recovery can only take place through targeted actions before the disaster hits. Another thematic session attempted to understand what BBB meant in practice in the SIDS, and the challenges to its implementation.

The SIDS are the most vulnerable to natural disasters due to their higher risk relative to their populations and economies. They are also at the frontline of climate change, which greatly increases their exposure and vulnerability to natural disasters. The islands in the Caribbean, Africa, and the Pacific and Indian Oceans are heterogeneous, but they also share specific and unique

commonalities such as small size, geographic isolation, narrow expertise-based industries and high infrastructure costs.

The Caribbean experience highlighted the key challenges in BBB, among which the need to highlight the multi-hazard context in which the SIDS operate instead of focusing on the hydro-meteorological hazards alone. It is important to identify the end-goal of BBB, to recognize that the scale of damage to built environment is not restricted to housing alone, but also impacts other sectors such as tourism, public infrastructure, human resources, etc. and to highlight that the three dimensions of BBB may require some measure of trade-offs. Prior policy articulation and planning, using data to make informed decisions to address the needs of vulnerable sections of the population, inclusiveness, and strengthening horizontal cooperative arrangements of capacity with an emphasis on non-structural recovery were among the lessons learned to support faster and stronger recovery.

The view from Tonga showed how social resilience and inclusiveness on the ground can be promoted by integrating BBB into national policy that considered immediate response, inclusiveness based on reliable data, and financing for recovery. Community self-recovery can be enhanced by raising awareness at the community level, enforcing regulation at the policy level, and a mutual understanding between the two.

A perspective from Vanuatu emphasized how women's voices were still not heard. If they were made aware of their rights, policy makers could engage them to use their specialized knowledge to take collective decisions on issues affecting them, thereby Building Back Better.

In Jamaica, adaptive social protection has been built around targeting and data, with financial resources being channeled to provide access to cash so the most vulnerable can receive the response they need. The importance of thinking about BBB before disaster strikes is to enhance preparedness across sectors, to focus on local leadership, and to drive first response. Strategic investment coupled with the right information, monitoring programs to

evaluate the effectiveness of delivery of social protection, local leadership and volunteerism are crucial in building community-based organizations with a wide representation, and offer the best chance of protection.

The session concluded that the three principles on which Building Back Better is operationalized viz. faster, stronger and more inclusively, need to be defined more specifically in the context of the SIDS. The role of data in identifying vulnerable communities, prioritizing actions to help them better prepare and recover from disasters, and identifying the gaps where benefits are not being delivered was highlighted. BBB sounds good in theory, but there are a lot of challenges on the ground in terms of how it is defined and implemented. There is a need for data to drive policy, which must work hand-in-hand with local communities for effective response and to Build Back Better. Planning ahead of disasters, social vulnerability assessments, adaptive social protection systems, community resilience and women's leadership can help BBB to contribute to sustainable and resilient societies in the SIDS.

Thematic Session 12: Addressing the Inequality of Risk and Promoting Women's Leadership in Recovery

Crises, including conflicts and disasters, affect different groups of society – women, girls, boys and men – differently. Due to preexisting socioeconomic conditions, social norms and beliefs and traditional practices, women and girls are disproportionately affected by crises, and have different and uneven levels of resilience and capacities to recover. When disasters and conflicts strike, gender inequalities are often exacerbated, leading to increased levels of gender-based violence, reduced access to livelihood resources, and even greater levels of mortality due to exclusion from life-saving services and decision-making processes due to discriminatory social norms. Women and girls also face increased unpaid care work.

At the same time, crises can also serve as an opportunity for shifts in gender roles that lead to new responsibilities and opportunities for women and men in economic decisions and activity, political engagement and community

arbitration. Yet women's actual and potential contributions, including their leadership as first responders, and their central role in community stability and resilience, continue to be largely untapped assets in crisis recovery.

While there is a plethora of normative commitments recognizing the importance of gender-responsive disaster risk reduction, recovery and peace building, significant gaps remain in their implementation. This is, among others, exemplified by lack of funding. Similarly, the implementation of the Women, Peace and Security agenda stemming from the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 and of the Sendai Framework have been uneven in focus, prioritizing some areas of action, such as protecting women from sexual violence, over others. Little attention has been paid to addressing the structural inequalities that perpetuate exclusion and undermine recovery, sustainable peace and development, or to elements of these agendas that could create meaningful opportunities for women's political, social and economic empowerment in the long term.

In light of this, a thematic session discussed some recent initiatives to promote women's leadership and shared good practices in the integration of gender dimensions in risk analysis and the design of effective disaster and conflict recovery and peace building interventions. The session aimed to contribute to the Conference's goal of 'building consensus on gender responsive approaches to promote shared recovery benefits' by improving knowledge of the gender dimensions of disaster and security risks using an intersectional perspective and highlighting innovative strategies for supporting the leadership of women and girls.

This session addressed the vulnerabilities and challenges of women, children, youth and persons with disabilities. It recognized their role as key contributors to effective disaster recovery and resilience building by examining cases from Indonesia, Japan, and the Solomon Islands. These contexts showed how the intersectionality of gender, age and disability lead to an inequality of risk faced by women, youth, children and persons with disabilities. Gender and disability were identified as key intersecting factors

that led to double exclusion during the Kumamoto Earthquake in Japan in 2016. Disasters can exacerbate existing gender inequality in political participation, decision-making, and access to resources and information.

In the Solomon Islands, there was evidence of locally driven response by women that addressed the root causes of inequality by strengthening partnerships and localizing interventions. Through the Womanitarian Initiative of Oxfam Solomon Islands, funded by UN Women, women developed capacities and tools to support their families and communities in DRR.

The case from the drought-affected areas of Indonesia endorsed the messages from the Solomon Islands by painting an accurate picture of the burden on youth, particularly adolescent girls who had to travel up to 2 hours daily to reach available water sources. Youth in Indonesia are becoming change agents by strengthening their collective capacity through an Adolescent Toolkit, emphasizing community outreach and training strategies. They have been actively participating in the DRR process by engaging in village government.

Although women are often on the frontlines of most crises, as evidenced by a recent pilot project on gender, climate and security in Sudan, there is very little programming targeting women as leaders in recovery, risk reduction and peace building. There is an urgent need for (a) increased investment in resilience that is sensitive to gender and age, and diversity (b) collection of sex, age and disability disaggregated data and most of all (c) the recognition of the roles of women and other groups in recovery and resilience, making the invisible visible. The international community needs to move from commitment to action.

Thematic Session 13: Renewable Energy for Displaced Communities

The ability of displaced communities to cope with and rapidly recover from crises depends in many ways on their ability to regain sustainable access to energy. It fuels displaced communities' access to water, to social services like health and education, to transport and communication, and is critical for

regenerating livelihoods and local economies. It is this recognition that defines the focus of the global collaborative efforts of the Global Plan of Action for Sustainable Energy Solutions in Situations of Displacement (GPA) which aims at providing concrete actions for accelerated progress towards energy for displaced communities. Providing sustainable energy solutions in the context of communities impacted by conflicts and disasters is both critical and challenging.

Renewable energy solutions for restoring livelihoods allow faster re-integration while accelerating recovery for internally displaced communities, returnees of conflict, and refugees. This is a critical and recurrent theme where communities face an escalation of conflict such as in the Arab region, which has more than 20 million refugees and IDPs. Most places hosting refugees and IDPs also face high levels of energy insecurity. While setting the foundations for long-term resilience, decentralized solar solutions have emerged as one potential solution to meet the emergency needs of crisis-affected communities, of which a majority are women and children. The goal of scaling up solar solutions in crisis contexts is in many ways a litmus test for the aspired goal of making crisis response more inclusive and helping communities build back better.

A designated session discussed options to scale up the use of renewable energy solutions for resilient recovery in displaced communities and showcased emerging success stories in the Middle East and Horn of Africa region including Yemen and Sudan. Recent experiences in these countries have provided a better understanding of how solar solutions can meet urgent needs such as access to water, health and education services, and regeneration of livelihoods. The transition to low-carbon, climate-resilient forms of energy allows countries to be more resilient to crises, and helps ensure access to sustainable energy for communities when a crisis does occur.

Countries hosting displaced populations are also under tremendous pressure so energy has to be about long-term inclusiveness to ensure cost-effective solutions to recover from natural disasters, climate change-induced impacts

and shocks, and crisis impacts of protracted conflicts. A risk-informed approach to planning, increasing institutional capacity to help predict crises, actions to cope with crises as they unfold, and actions to recover from crises sustainably and quickly inform the way forward. A combination of upstream policy support and downstream innovative actions is needed, and solar energy has emerged as the technology of choice. Inclusive recovery responses include integrating climate action into crisis prevention policies and integrating energy responses into crisis response and recovery investments to build empowered communities and a resilient ecosystem. Strong global, regional and local partnerships that promote integration of long-term sustainable energy actions for crisis recovery and responses are a prerequisite for energy investments in a crisis context for displaced communities. Such partnerships ideally would aim to allow a continuous transition from a humanitarian to a development trajectory.

The Darfur Development Strategy has used sustainable energy for basic services and reconstruction of livelihoods to allow economic development and improved access to social services. The inclusive, decentralized solar energy system has been implemented for basic services such as water, health, education, and security, and towards productive activities like agriculture. Specifically targeting women, girls, midwives, elders and children has ensured inclusion. Sustainability issues are tackled from the perspective of project financing, quality assurance, and training. In two years of implementation, better health and educational services, safe movement at night, fast police responses to emergent situations, and entertainment were indications that a resilient solution had taken effect in the region.

Solar power has not only helped healthcare by providing safe water drinking systems that have improved access to water and reduced water-borne diseases, but has also provided livelihood by teaching people to generate and sell electricity. In so doing, it has broken the gender barrier, enabling increased mobility of women and their engagement in economic activity. In Yemen's tribal culture, inclusion meant identifying areas and individuals who

could not access aid despite their eligibility for it, including the marginalized such as the gypsies, who weren't even integrated into the community. Thus, renewable energy can be treated as a good entry point to build a humanitarian, development, and peace nexus.

The aforementioned GPA is a multi-stakeholder process aiming to mainstream sustainable energy solutions in displacement settings at the household, community, and institutional operational levels. The challenges are manifold: energy is not a formal priority in humanitarian assistance, displaced people are not included in energy access agendas, lack of funding, limited expertise and capacity to plan and implement sustainable energy solutions, and limited and poorly shared data on humanitarian needs and solutions. Active forums for collective activity operate across five working areas viz. planning and coordination, policy, innovative financing, capacity building, and data. Pathways for collaboration include advocacy, bundling of projects from different agencies, ensuring engagement with key stakeholders, sharing data and best practices, and liaising with the private sector.

The session showed that renewable energy for displaced communities has not only successfully helped them cope with crises as they unfold, and helped with sustainable recovery, but also worked hand-in-hand with development, inclusion, and income generation to break gender barriers and create a resilient community engaged in skill and capacity building towards a long-term development solution. There is a need for more partnerships across agencies, and with the private sector and NGOs, so that gains can be collated and shared, and greater impact achieved faster.

Thematic Session 14: Greening Recovery - The Case of the 2018 Kerala Floods

Between June and August 2018, the Indian state of Kerala was affected by a series of disasters caused by a once-in-the-century rainfall event. The flooding and landslides which resulted from the rainfall resulted in approximately 500

casualties, 19,000 homes destroyed, temporary displacement of 1.1 million persons, and 5.5 million people affected. The World Bank estimated a total economic loss of 3.4 billion USD and the UN system estimated 3.7 billion USD in recovery costs.

One noteworthy session focused on inclusive and green recovery in Kerala following these floods. During recovery, the government conducted the first Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) with the support of UN agencies to include community stakeholders. Those stakeholders, in turn, helped develop differentiated strategies to address the needs and priorities of vulnerable groups and made recommendations for addressing specific issues related to gender and culture. It is likely the first PDNA which has included such substantive recommendations on environmental sustainability and gender inclusiveness as a foundation for the recovery process.

The Government accepted the UN recommendations to integrate building back better and greener as its operating philosophy in its reconstruction plan 'New Kerala -*Nava Keralam*', supported by the UN and the World Bank. Extensive consultations were conducted while formulating the recovery plan to ensure it is inclusive for women, children, migrants and differently-abled women and men.

Recovery and reconstruction plans were discussed from various angles, including environment and inclusion and emphasized the exemplary resilience shown by Kerala as a community. The experts also shared the impact of human interventions on ecology that led to the disaster. The main lessons from the experience include risk-informed land use planning which is fundamental to sustainable reconstruction, promoting the construction of eco-safe roads and green infrastructure (such as roadside vegetation and coastal green belts) as a cost-effective means of increasing resilience against the impacts of hazard events, and including integrated water resources management, such as 'Making Space for Water' for a more sustainable approach to reducing disaster risk, especially in the low-lying Kuttanad area.

A gender-sensitive and -inclusive approach for disaster management in a patriarchal society such as Kerala still remains a work-in-progress. The goals of a truly inclusive system may be achieved only by involving marginalized communities in the decision-making process. The media's response during all phases of the disaster was significant in bringing together the community and administration.

There needs to be a paradigm shift in the approach towards building construction post-floods where the Habitat Agenda should be read along with the Sendai Framework. A people-centered approach with appropriate technology and materials is vital. In the near future, the focus needs to be on creatively rebuilding Kerala's critical infrastructure with cultural sensitivity.

'Chekkutty' dolls, the symbols of Kerala's resilience, were presented in the session. Chekkuttys are cloth dolls made by volunteers from the soiled clothes of the Chendamangalam handloom industry, which were sold widely and generated revenue to revive the industry. The positive role that social media and youth groups can play during and in the aftermath of disasters may be documented and imbibed into the system. Follow-up actions include collaboration on the new project 'Upscaling Community Resilience through Ecosystem-based Management'. The project will bring together UN Environment and the Kerala State Disaster Management Authority along with other partners to collaborate in creating replicable models for increasing disaster resilience among the most vulnerable.

Thematic Session 15: Ensuring Inclusion and Conflict Sensitivity during Recovery in Contexts Affected by Fragility and Conflict

Recovery is a complex undertaking and it becomes even more challenging when it occurs in a context that is continuously affected by fragility and conflict. In such settings, due to an amalgamation of multi-dimensional risks, access to certain areas may be restricted and existing tensions between different social actors or groups can lead to a situation where the overall

planning process, the allocation of resources, and the implementation of recovery projects can become highly politicized. This may lead to criticism of legitimacy and undermine recovery efforts.

Additionally, recovery interventions are often discriminatory by nature as they tend to focus on disaster- or conflict-affected populations, and exclude non-affected but equally destitute populations. The planning and implementation process may unintentionally create additional issues of social exclusion by promoting the needs of certain groups over others, which can lead to social cleavage and division. Therefore, identifying potential sources of conflict and adopting a conflict-sensitive and inclusive approach when assessing needs as well as planning and implementing a post-crisis recovery strategy ensures that the measures taken do no further harm and help strengthen social cohesion and stability.

A special session shared experiences from different disaster- and conflict-related recovery processes and reflected on lessons learned with respect to integrating conflict sensitivity and ensuring social inclusion throughout the recovery process. Integrating a conflict-sensitive approach in the tools for assessment and recovery programming (e.g. Post-Disaster Needs Assessment, Disaster Recovery Framework, Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment, Social Impact Analysis and Monitoring, etc.) and the combined use of these with conflict sensitivity tools (e.g. tools for analyzing the impact of assistance on peace and conflict dynamics) was recommended to help recovery processes avoid the creation or exacerbation of tensions and effectively address inclusion.

Conflict sensitivity is not just applicable to violent conflict but also to latent conflict. Interventions are never neutral - they are part of the context and therefore influence it. Every context is characterized by connectors and dividers (systems, institutions, actions, symbols, etc.). Three key steps to apply a conflict-sensitive approach are: (a) understanding the context (b) understanding the interactions between the interventions and the context (c)

taking action and using this understanding to maximize positive impacts and minimize negative ones.

Recovery is a critical phase to apply a conflict-sensitive approach in the development process because development, political, and security processes are simultaneously intersecting. Analysis of the context is not enough – it is the design and the implementation of interventions that ensures the integration of conflict-sensitive approaches. The European Union's experience has stressed the importance of developing indicators to measure how much conflict sensitivity is included in the interventions, and evaluating the interventions once they have been implemented.

In Nigeria, a Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPBA) was very useful to identify the impact and the type of response required. The assessment helped prioritize interventions and bring necessary financing. Two big challenges were coordination across all actors involved and ensuring that tension was not built between displaced and host communities. It was important to provide livelihood support to both communities. Climate change has further complicated the challenge of addressing conflict issues as it impoverishes the availability of natural resources which form the basis of people's livelihoods. The conflict-related recovery can be viewed as an opportunity to build back better – not just infrastructure, but also more resistant livelihoods and more cohesive communities.

When disasters happen in contexts of fragility and conflict, recovery cannot be approached solely in a technical fashion but must recognize the social dynamics, the impact of relief on social relations, etc. Following its first involvement in a post-disaster assessment in Turkey in 1999, the World Bank evolved its approach to analyze social impact by developing a practical tool to capture the social impact in a compressed time frame via qualitative research that looks at different aspects of recovery. In Myanmar, regular yearly monitoring was conducted between 2008 and 2013 in the communities most affected by Cyclone Nargis. This helped better understand the context and social dynamics and not to miss what is generally missed when methods only

use quantitative systems. Monitoring the progress of interventions together with ensuring that communities are involved in decision-making is critical to minimize the negative impact that interventions can have on the relationships between communities and leaders.

Recognizing that disasters do not happen in a political vacuum, the UNDP has developed a guide on how to integrate a conflict-sensitive approach into PDNAs. Conflict sensitivity has always been a core principle of PDNAs but there was no codified guidance on how to do it until recently. The guide is prescriptive, and it stresses the need to integrate conflict sensitivity from the beginning of the PDNA process, starting with the very design of the assessment. Governments generally expect the assessment to give dollar figures of what is needed for the recovery rather than address conflict-related issues. Hence, as conflict sensitivity is not a technical issue but a political one, it is a challenge to integrate conflict sensitivity into PDNAs, and needs to be negotiated with Governments.

Risk needs to be approached from a resilience angle, taking into consideration all types of shocks that can affect people. The DRR community must reach out to conflict prevention specialists to enhance its knowledge and capacity to integrate the conflict sensitivity approach into disaster recovery interventions. This will facilitate innovative approaches to address recovery in conflict and fragile settings. For greater impact, it is necessary to improve the coordination and integration of the various instruments existing on conflict sensitivity and peace building across various organizations. To this end, it is crucial to ensure that both macro (government) and micro (community) perspectives are taken into account.

Thematic Session 16: How Can Disaggregated Data Support Inclusion?

From 2005–2015, disasters caused US$1.4 trillion in economic damage, killed 0.7 million and affected 1.7 billion people. In 2017 alone, 318 disasters killed over 9,500, affected 96 million and displaced 18.8 million women, men, boys

and girls internally, causing US$314 billion in economic damage. These impacts are not evenly distributed across the population. As noted earlier in this report, specific population groups, including women, girls, boys and persons with disabilities are disproportionately affected by disasters and have different and uneven levels of resilience and capacity to prepare, respond and recover, due to various dimensions of inequality of risk.

As a result, key impacts associated with specific population groups are concentrated in crisis. These groups also face a slow and challenging recovery during reconstruction. For instance, some 60 percent of all preventable maternal deaths in the world take place in countries experiencing humanitarian emergencies. Similarly, higher mortality rate of women, children and persons with disabilities in some disaster cases are reported in Asia and the Pacific.

Evidence and experience show these groups' contributions to disaster recovery and reconstruction, their leadership as first responders, and their central role in community resilience is significant. Yet these roles and their potential expansion remain largely unrecognized and unleveraged in preparedness, recovery and resilience-building strategies.

In order to better understand how different parts of a community are impacted by disasters and how they prepare, respond and recover from them, the collection, dissemination and analysis of risk, disaster and recovery data is critical, particularly data disaggregated by sex, age, disability and other characteristics. In addition, the analysis of financial data, such as budget aid allocation through contingency and recovery plans to different groups of affected populations, is critical to determine current gaps, needs and priorities as well as ensure meaningful engagement of affected populations.

Exposing the cases of women, young men, boys and girls as well as persons with disabilities, and engaging with key data sources used to assess and respond to risks and impacts, a thematic session discussed the collection and analysis of disaggregated data in the continuum of preparedness, response and recovery, contributing to the broader spectrum of gender-responsive

recovery and reconstruction. Best practices, including the recent PDNA in India, technology-based response in Indonesia, DRR initiatives led by local women in the Solomon Islands, risk assessments and use of data in contingency planning development in Latin America, and data collection in high-risk settings were highlighted. In addition, main findings from a UNICEF-UN Women study on the gender and age inequality of risk were introduced.

The showcased evidence and experience demonstrated how the usage of disaggregated data led to more effective disaster recovery, preparedness and response, reaching vulnerable and marginalized population groups, and highlighted how it can promote inclusion and leadership by those left furthest behind. Improving data systems and disaggregation in high-risk, crisis, and recovery settings was insisted upon.

This session articulated the need for collecting disaggregated data to identify the differentiated impacts of disasters. Without comprehensive data we can't know who is being impacted; particularly in terms of women and individuals with disabilities. There will be challenges and barriers to collecting credible disaggregated data, particularly in crisis settings. As a potential solution, perspectives from the Solomon Islands showed how countries with limited data can identify and mobilize marginalized and invisible populations through engaging local communities to develop Community Profiles that accelerated recovery efforts.

Effective data collection can lead to the pre-disaster identification of vulnerable communities. This is exemplified in Kerala where disaster-related mortality for persons with disabilities was extremely low due to targeted preparedness work informed by comprehensive data. Vulnerable and hard-to-reach persons may not always be reflected in disaggregated quantitative data. To leave no one behind, UNFPA suggested adopting human rights-based approaches to data collection which can address the failures in identifying the most marginalized. However, it must be noted that attempting to collect disaggregated data for inclusion can often lead to exclusion due to political and social factors. Post-disaster damage and loss assessments are seldom

disaggregated by sex, age and disability, and are usually recorded in terms of productive resources, leading to a substantial undervaluation of the impact on women and other vulnerable groups.

To bridge this gap, panelists highlighted the need for political will to turn commitments into action. A starting point is to build on good practices, using the means and modalities which were introduced during the session, such as (a) learning from the Kerala PDNA which highlighted how the inclusion of disaggregated data and the participation of marginalized populations can inform better recovery (b) utilizing open source data and volunteerism to build self-reported maps and (c) assessing needs by including local participation. Joint research for the UNICEF and UN Women utilized mixed data and targeted interviews to build a disaggregated data set that pieces together a complex puzzle of the differentiated impact of disaster. To identify missing voices, it is essential to gather adequate pre-disaster data.

The main recommendations of the session include (a) collection and sharing of disaggregated data to be made part of program evaluations to inform and guide humanitarian response and recovery (b) promotion of investment in targeted inclusive pre-disaster programming (c) advocacy for the combination of disaggregated quantitative data with qualitative information on vulnerability, impacts and recovery and (d) systematic inclusion of vulnerable and hard-to-reach individuals who are not reflected in disaggregated quantitative data to ensure their needs and concerns are reflected.

Conclusion

The WRC4 provided a platform to share new tools and innovative approaches to increase participation of the most vulnerable in recovery, and to propose policy recommendations for making recovery inclusive. Importantly, it also impressed upon participants that inclusion wasn't about special accommodation, but about making recovery better for everyone. The

discussions surrounding these goals and ideas resulted in the issuance of a joint communique, affirming a strong commitment to:

- Support marginalized groups that are especially vulnerable to the impacts of natural hazards and who risk being made even more vulnerable through the recovery process.
- Adopt and promote more inclusive approaches to recovery to promote greater resilience for the community as a whole.
- Ensure a more resilient future for all by acting on the commitments made in the 2030 Agenda, the Sendai Framework, the Paris Agreement, and other key Accords.
- Change the behavior and actions of all development partners to be more inclusive in planning, implementing and monitoring recovery.