



Module 10: Expedite Recovery and Build Back Better

Uscore2: City-to-City Peer Review Tool

This document has been prepared as part of the Uscore2 - City-to-city local level peer review on Disaster Risk Reduction project. The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the author(s). This document covers civil protection activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union's DG-ECHO **Call for proposals 2016 for prevention and preparedness projects in the field of civil protection** programme under, agreement number: ECHO/SUB/2016/743543/PREV04. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Website: www.Uscore2.eu
Twitter: @Uscore2EU



CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Background	4
Further Information	5
How can Recovery and Building Back Better be Assessed and Improved?	6
How can this be measured?	7
Methodology	8
Phase 2, Step 7: Information to send to Review Team prior to the Review Team visit	8
Suggestions for the type of pre-visit evidence that could be shared between cities	8
Phase 2, Step 8: Arrangements for the Peer Review Visit	10
Who should the Review Team interview?	10
How can the Host City multi-agency capacity be demonstrated?	11
Phase 2, Step 9: Review Team: Gathering Evidence	12
Phase 3, Step 11: Recording Information and Drafting Initial Recommendations	15



INTRODUCTION

Uscore2 is a peer-to-peer review process for cities. Designed with funding from the European Commission, it enables cities to share and learn from good practice in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in other cities across the world. Uscore2 focuses on the use of city-level peer reviews as a tool with which the activities of one city in the area of disaster risk management and civil protection are examined on an equal basis by fellow peers who are experts from other cities. This approach facilitates improvements in DRR through the exchange of best practice and mutual learning, whilst also maintaining impartiality and transparency. This peer review programme integrates an evidence based methodology for impact evaluation, enabling participants to demonstrate the value generated by the investment in the peer review.

Cities undertaking a peer review of Recovery and Building Back Better will generally be undertaking this as part of a wider review as outlined in the 'Uscore2 Step-by-Step Guide to City-to-City Peer Reviews for Disaster Risk Reduction'. The Step-by-Step Guide provides an essential overview of the peer review process, the Impact Evaluation Methodology (IEM) used to measure the impact of the peer review, and the 11 modules for conducting city-to-city peer reviews for DRR.

It is strongly recommended that cities interested in inviting another city to peer review their DRR activity work through the step-by-step Guide as a precursor to undertaking Module 10. This Module Guide gives information relevant to those steps in the peer review process which are specific to Module 10.

During the development of Uscore2, the peer review process has been piloted by three cities: Amadora (Portugal), Salford (UK) and Viggiano (Italy). The pilot cities spoke positively of their experiences:

"Peer reviews are interactive and about mutual learning, exchange of best practice and policy dialogue, a support tool for prevention and preparation under the EU civil protection mechanism and promote an integrated approach to disaster risk management, linking risk prevention, preparation, response and recovery actions."

BACKGROUND

This module addresses post-disaster recovery which incorporates the rebuilding of infrastructure, utilities, livelihoods, communities, the economy and ecosystems to support long-term development and reduce future risk (Fox-Lent et al. 2015; Keating et al. 2016). Such processes should ensure that the needs of those affected are at the centre of recovery and reconstruction and that affected communities are engaged in the design and implementation of rebuilding programmes after a disaster (UNISDR, n.d).

Central to recovery is the prevention and reduction of disaster risk through 'Building Back Better' (UNISDR, n.d; UNISDR, 2017). This includes increasing public education and awareness of disaster risk (van Niekerk 2015; Gillisen et al. 2016) and consideration of the wide-ranging needs of communities, organisations and individuals in a coordinated manner (Khunwishit et al. 2018). In order to do this, cities need to build capacity for recovery ahead of a disaster through: creating and strengthening recovery-focused relationships, establishing planning and coordination mechanisms and ensuring procedures and protocols to inform and support recovery activities are in place (UNISDR, 2012). Additionally, pre-disaster recovery planning requires strong leadership and a multi-stakeholder approach which should include vulnerable populations (UNISDR, 2017 p. 16). Effective approaches to recovery address the wide ranging needs of communities, organisations and individuals in a coordinated manner.

Peer reviews are able to facilitate this process by bringing together a multitude of stakeholders to discuss recovery and reconstruction preparations with independent experts. In turn, this supports the integration of DRR and resilience into development measures which can include: updating infrastructure; changing land use planning; and embedding climate change adaptation into future strategies (UNISDR, 2017 p. 16). To do this, pre-planning, leadership, coordination and financing are key.

However, cities are built over decades or centuries and hence are difficult to rebuild in a short period of time. There is continual tension between the need to rebuild quickly, to restore essential services and to rebuild as safely and sustainably as possible. An affordable, well-planned and participatory recovery and reconstruction process can help cities limit their losses and risk of further disruptions, reduce the risk of lost confidence in city leadership, and help avoid cascading failures. In turn, this supports the city in reactivating itself, restoring and rebuilding its damaged infrastructure and ecosystems, recovering its economy, and empowering citizens to rebuild their lives, housing and livelihoods (UNISDR, 2012, p.54).

Alongside participatory approaches which consider multiple stakeholders, cities must also consider financial issues such as the mechanisms through which financial government assistance and material and technical resources are provided in support of disaster-impacted communities (Kernaghan and da Silva 2014; Manyena 2016). Additionally, cities should consider local management of recovery and reconstruction programmes and the disbursement of funds (Fleischhauer et al, 2012).

Increasingly, due to multiple global threats, spaces are required to adopt security and resiliency measures to retain their reputation, as reputation is at the core of ensuring cities remain attractive to tourists and investors and therefore to maintaining the local economy and supporting local livelihoods (Coaffee and Rogers, 2008). This is promoted through the notion that locales are safe, secure and resilient (Coaffee and Rogers, 2008, p. 205).

It is important for cities to consider the complexity of recovery and reconstruction (UNISDR, 2017) and the ways in which the city will navigate certain trade-offs between time - starting recovery and reconstruction quickly, sustainability - taking into account DRR and resilience to mitigate future risks and resources (UNISDR, 2012).

Peer reviews therefore provide a platform to discuss these issues and to develop learning loops which, through establishing what went well, not so well and what can be learnt in the future, provide critical steps to expedite recovery strategies.

References

- Coaffee, J. and Rogers, P. (2008). Reputational risk and resiliency: The branding of security in place-making, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 4(3), pp.205-217
- Fox-Lent, C., Bates, M. E., & Linkov, I. (2015). A matrix approach to community resilience assessment: an illustrative case at Rockaway Peninsula. *Environment Systems and Decisions* 35(2): 209–218.
- Fleischhauer, M., Flex, F., Greiving, S., Scheibel, M., Stickler, T., Sereinig, N., Koboltschnig, G., Malvati, P., Vitale, V., Grifoni, P., Firus, K., (2012). Improving the active involvement of stakeholders and the public in flood risk management: Tools of an involvement strategy and case study results from Austria, Germany and Italy, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 12(9), pp. 2785–2798.
- Gilissen, H. K., Alexander, M., Matczak, P., Pettersson, M., and Bruzzone, S. (2016). A framework for evaluating the effectiveness of flood emergency management systems in Europe. *Ecology and Society* 21(4): 27-42.
- Keating, A., Campbell, K., Szoenyi, M., McQuistan, C., Nash, D., & Burer, M. (2016). Development and testing of a community flood resilience measurement tool. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions*, (May), 1–39.
- Kernaghan, S., & da Silva, J. (2014). Initiating and sustaining action: Experiences building resilience to climate change in Asian cities. *Urban Climate*, 7, pp. 47–63.
- Khunwishit, S., Choosuk, C., and Webb, G. (2018). Flood Resilience Building in Thailand: Assessing Progress and the Effect of Leadership. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* 9(1): 44–54.
- Manyena, B. (2016). After Sendai: Is Africa Bouncing Back or Bouncing Forward from Disasters? *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 7(1): 41–53.
- UNISDR (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction). (n.d), Essential Ten: Expedite Recovery and Build Back Better, available from: <http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/index/Essential%20Ten:%C2%A0Expedite%20Recovery%20and%20Build%20Back%20Better/?id=10>
- UNISDR (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction). (2017), Build Back Better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, available from: https://www.unisdr.org/files/53213_bbb.pdf
- UNISDR (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction), (2012). How to Make Cities More Resilient: A Handbook for Local Government Leaders [2012 Edition], p.54 available from: <https://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/toolkitblkitem/?id=2>
- van Niekerk, D. (2015). Disaster risk governance in Africa A retrospective assessment of progress against the Hyogo Framework for Action (2000–2012). *Disaster Prevention and Management* 24(3): 397–416.

Further Information

For further information on Peer reviews visit: www.Uscore2.eu. Also refer to ISO 22392 when published. Currently it is in draft and will contain further information about Peer reviews.

HOW CAN RECOVERY AND BUILDING BACK BETTER BE ASSESSED AND IMPROVED?

The description of Essential 10: Expedite Recovery and Build Back Better taken from the UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient website and given below, describes the activities a city should be demonstrating to improve resilience in this area. A city's capacity for resilience is the responsibility of a number of organisations, though it is usual for local government to take the lead and enable effective collaboration.

Essential Ten: Expedite Recovery and Build Back Better

Recovery must be addressed in various aspects

- Provide shelter, food, water, communication, addressing psychological needs etc. post-event;
- Limit and plan for any use of schools as temporary shelters;
- Identify the dead and notifying next of kin;
- Conduct debris clearing and management;
- Take over abandoned property.

Include the affected population in the definition of needs and recovery plans

- Build systems to help communities integrate disaster risk reduction into decisions they take to recover from the disaster, to reduce future vulnerabilities;
- Take specific actions for recovery of sectors including livelihoods, health, education, critical infrastructure, environment and ecosystem, psycho-social support, cultural heritage and governance issues such as accountability, roles and responsibilities and corruption control;
- Manage local, national and international aid and funding, and coordination of efforts and prioritising and managing resources for maximum efficiency, benefit and transparency.

Recovery is an opportunity to build back better and improve development

- Undertake retrospective / post-disaster assessments to assess potential new vulnerabilities and build learning into future planning and response activities;
- Promote business continuity and economic reboot.

Seek resources, strengthen alliances and ensure sustainability

- Ensure that the recovery programmes are consistent and in line with the long-term priorities and development of the disaster affected areas;
- Integrate further disaster risk reduction in all investment decisions for recovery and reconstruction.

HOW CAN THIS BE MEASURED?

The following table describes the high level indicators for Essential 10 taken from the Disaster Resilience Scorecard Preliminary Level Assessment. These are used in this Module as indicators against which to gather evidence and make recommendations.

Ref	Subject / Issue	Question / Assessment Area
P 10.1	Post event recovery planning – pre event	Is there a strategy or process in place for post-event recovery and reconstruction, including economic reboot, societal aspects, etc.?
P 10.2	Lessons learnt / learning loops	Do post-event assessment processes incorporate failure analyses and the ability to capture lessons learned that then feed into design and delivery of rebuilding projects?

The full Detailed Assessment from the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities is available through the following link:
<http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/toolkitblkitem/?id=4>.

METHODOLOGY

PHASE 2, STEP 7: INFORMATION TO SEND TO REVIEW TEAM PRIOR TO THE REVIEW TEAM VISIT

Please refer to the Step-by-Step Guide for advice on both conducting and hosting peer reviews. This section sets out information that is specific to this Module, which begins in Phase 2, Step 7.

As set out in the Step-by-Step Guide if Modules 1 (Organise for Disaster Resilience) and 2 (Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios) are not undertaken at the same time as Module 10, then an overview of both the city's disaster risk governance and DRR risk assessment should be included in the pre-visit information sent to the Review Team

The Host City should aim to send the pre-visit evidence to the Review Team three months ahead of the Review visit. It is recommended that the pre-visit evidence is limited to 3 – 5 items for each Module.

Suggestions for the type of pre-visit evidence that could be shared between cities

A selection of evidence should be sent to the Review Team before their visit to the Host City. This could include the type of information listed below or any other information that the two cities agree would be of benefit.

It is **highly recommended** that the Host City prepare a **summary** of how the city promotes Recovery and Building Back Better including:

- An overview of the Host City's disaster recovery arrangements including the governance arrangements that would oversee recovery work and any plans the Host City has in place for post-disaster recovery
- The risks the Host City has used in planning its approach to recovery, including the most probable and most severe disaster scenarios
- The measures that the Host City has in place to learn from recovery efforts elsewhere in the world and to include relevant lessons in the city's plans.

In addition, **no more than 4 other items** should be selected from the suggestions below to demonstrate the Host City's baseline capacity.

Overview: A Shared Understanding of Roles and Responsibilities

- A recovery plan or other document that provides an example of how institutions in the Host City are planning to work together to support communities in recovering from a disaster and to build back better whilst also restoring essential services
- A plan or protocol describing how the Host City will engage with the affected communities in rebuilding and reducing vulnerabilities
- A structure chart and description of who, in the Host City, will hold the roles and responsibilities for managing local, national and international aid and funding, for coordinating efforts and for reporting on the prioritisation and management of resources to facilitate maximum efficiency, benefit and transparency
- The outcomes of local completion of the UNISDR's Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities, Module 10.

P10.1 Post event recovery planning – pre event

- An example of a disaster management plan in the Host City that would be used to coordinate the recovery process in the event of an emergency
- A plan or description of the arrangements for disaster victim identification and notifying the next of kin, including measures to manage any media interest

- A copy of the programme together with a list of the stakeholders that participated in a recent training and exercising event to rehearse the post-disaster recovery process
- An example showing how the Host City models the requirements for food, shelter, fuel, communication and essential services that would be needed to support recovery in the event of both the most probable and the most severe disaster scenarios
- An example of any pre-prepared leaflets or other advice that will be made available to those affected to assist with immediate and ongoing psychological need
- An example of a business continuity plan from a key institution in the Host City that would enable the economic performance of that institution to be maintained post-disaster
- An example of how disaster risk analyses have been used in a recent investment decision to reduce the exposure or vulnerability of the Host City's population
- An example of how a disaster has affected the Host City's reputation, for example, through its placing in international indices or ratings.

P10.2 Lessons learnt / learning loops

- A report assessing learning from any exercises held in the Host City to rehearse recovery plans, together with any action plan to implement the learning identified
- A case study of a retrospective or post-disaster assessment to assess vulnerabilities and how this has then informed mitigation activity or has been built into future planning and response / recovery activities
- An example of any formal reports, perhaps drafted for the local government or Mayor, on lessons learnt from a previous disaster
- An example of how the Host City has used learning identified in disaster scenarios elsewhere in the world to strengthen its own recovery plans.



PHASE 2, STEP 8: ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PEER REVIEW VISIT

As described in the 'Step-by-Step Guide', in the 3-6 months before the peer review visit, the Host City and Review Team are recommended to agree an agenda for the visit. This will include a range of activities to enable the Review Team to understand how the Host City is strengthening and improving its preparations to expedite post-disaster recovery and build back better. The types of activities could include some or all of those listed below, or any other relevant actions. It is anticipated that the review of this Module will take a day. For all interviews, the Host City should ensure translators are available if they are required.

At the start of the Review Team's assessment of Module 10, the Host City is **highly recommended** to make a **presentation** to the Review Team which sets out its approach to expediting recovery and building back better.

This could include information about:

- The governance arrangements in the Host City to oversee and ensure an effective and coordinated post-disaster recovery including economic reboot, social issues and reconstruction
- The stakeholders in the Host City that will be involved in post-disaster recovery including how those affected will be engaged in decisions
- How Host City institutions will be coordinated and work together to deliver essential services during the recovery period, including the mechanisms for prioritising and managing resources for maximum efficiency
- Who will lead the post-disaster recovery efforts. In addition, where the accountability and responsibility for managing recovery funds, including local, national and international aid and funding, will sit and how transparency will be achieved in post-disaster expenditure and investment.

Who should the Review Team interview?

When considering who is important for the Review Team to interview and / or receive a presentation from, it is **highly recommended** that the **Mayor** and / or other key local political leaders who will give leadership in post-disaster recovery and a mandate to build back better are included and available. The Host City and Review Team should consider all Modules being assessed during the peer review and combine relevant questions with each senior politician or officer into one appointment.

The Host City and Review Team may also wish to consider who would be most appropriate in light of their initial exchange of pre-visit information and also given the most probable and most severe disaster scenarios for the city. Suggestions include:

- Officials who are responsible for drawing up the Host City's recovery plan and those who will lead the post-disaster efforts including the provision of shelter, food, water, communication; the identification of the deceased and notification of next of kin; debris clearing and environmental restoration
- Senior managers of institutions that deliver services critical to keeping the Host City functioning effectively, whether part of the city government or the private sector
- Representatives from the health sector responsible for long-term psychological support to emergency responders and the community following a disaster
- Municipal officials and community representatives who will establish systems to help communities integrate disaster risk reduction into decisions they take to recover from the disaster and to reduce future vulnerabilities

- Representatives from the insurance industry to discuss the risks to the Host City's institutions, insurance coverage, the protection afforded to the Host City's institutions in a disaster and how the industry might support efforts to build back better
- Those in the Host City who would be responsible for management of local, national and international aid and funding
- One or more senior representatives from an organisation(s) that is important to the Host City's economy and who can discuss business continuity plans and the measures in place to protect the business and the livelihoods of those working there
- Practitioners who have been involved in a city-to-city knowledge exchange to explore how this has helped the Host City to strengthen its preparations to expedite recovery and to build back better post-disaster
- Technical experts who assess the disaster risks to which the Host City is exposed and who would undertake post-disaster assessments to assess potential new vulnerabilities
- Representatives of the tourism and marketing organisation who lead on managing the reputational issues for the Host City in the event of a disaster.
- Visits to sites where the Host City has invested to reduce the exposure or vulnerability of communities to disaster risk
- Visiting one of the Host City's emergency supplies stores and one of its distribution centres through which it will disburse supplies to citizens
- Site visits to identified evacuation centres and areas identified for temporary housing and shelter
- Talking with community representatives including, if possible, those who have experienced and been involved in recovering from a disaster.

Exercises and Training

Observing an example of a public or practitioner training event taking place in the Host City at the time of the visit, or observation of a table top or live exercise to rehearse the recovery of the city following a disaster may be helpful, however, given the limited time available, if this is not feasible, the Host City may wish to include video or other evidence from these activities.

How can the Host City multi-agency capacity be demonstrated?

In addition to interviews and presentations, suggestions for activities within the programme for the visit include but are not limited to:

- Site visits to any location(s) in the Host City that have been reconstructed after a disaster to understand the strengths of the approaches taken and the lessons identified through the process
- Visiting at least one of the key emergency response agencies with a significant role in disaster recovery to understand and view the capabilities available for effective disaster recovery



PHASE 2, STEP 9: REVIEW TEAM: GATHERING EVIDENCE

The Review Team will gather evidence from the pre-review information submitted before the peer review visit, together with information from interviews and activities undertaken during the visit, to gain a view of the effectiveness of the existing capacity to expedite recovery and build back better post-disaster. This will include:

- How the institutions have assessed the risks to the Host City and whether they have in place suitable, sufficient and scalable plans and procedures, capabilities, systems and arrangements to recover from predicted disaster scenarios
- How effective the strategies within the Host City are to engage all relevant agencies and organisations to support and augment the disaster recovery programme
- How the Host City acts to maintain essential services in the aftermath of a disaster and balances the need to return to normality with the benefits of building back better
- Areas of strength and good practice.
- What activities currently support performance in this area, are these activities effective?
- What, if any, additional activities would the Host City like to undertake in future? What are the barriers to extending activities?
- How are resources / information / training shared? Are there exclusions or barriers to access?
- How is the Host City accessing local / national / international sources of expertise to improve DRR in this area? Which networks is Host City part of to support this activity?

Although the Review Team should design their own detailed questions in order to explore issues they consider relevant in the context of the Host City, the following questions are offered as suggestions that may be helpful in stakeholder interviews for Module 10. They are example questions and it is wholly acceptable to tailor them or, equally, not to use them, according to the individual peer review. The Review Team could choose to select just the relevant questions as well as asking additional questions that have not been listed below.

The Review Team will structure their evidence gathering and interviews to enable the Host City to describe and demonstrate their approach against each of the indicators included in the Disaster Resilience Scorecard Preliminary Level Assessment. Overall, the Review Team should determine

- Who leads / contributes / coordinates / assesses performance in this area? Is this effective? Is shared ownership of DRR evident?
- Who is missing / underperforming or underrepresented?
- What skills and experience are evidenced? Are there deficits?



Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 10.1	Post event recovery planning – pre event	<p>Is there a strategy or process in place for post-event recovery and reconstruction, including economic reboot, societal aspects etc.?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What arrangements does the Host City have in place to ensure stakeholders have a shared understanding of post-disaster recovery principles, priorities and sequencing of recovery activities? • How will political ownership and leadership of the recovery process be delivered? • How will partners be coordinated during the recovery and reconstruction processes? • How will the Host City access national and international support for recovery and reconstruction? • What local laws / ordinances are available to ensure disaster assessment outcomes are factored into long-term recovery decisions? • What systems are in place to ensure DRR-driven regulations including land use planning, building codes and critical infrastructure assessments can be rapidly updated following disasters to build back better? • How do the Host City's recovery plans include building back in such a way as to reduce the impact of future climate-related risks? • How does the Host City link recovery efforts (or planning) to sustainable development, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction? • How does the Host City measure its performance in relation to preparing for disaster recovery? • How are vulnerable people and their needs assessed and supported during post-disaster recovery? • How are women, children and vulnerable groups included in recovery plans? • What arrangements are in place for the Host City to manage recovery financing including mechanisms to collate the cost of damages and losses as well as the quantification of needs? • What access does the Host City have to human and financial resources for recovery and how will it access additional resources if required?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What arrangements are in place to assess and address reputational issues for the Host City in the short and long term? • What arrangements do communities have to access the necessary financial, human and technical resources to ensure that recovery needs are addressed in post-disaster assessments? • What pre-arranged recovery schemes and packages of support exist in the Host City for affected communities? • To what extent does recovery aim to build back better and to what extent does recovery aim to return back to 'normal'? • What are the main challenges in the Host City's ability to build back better? • What enablers for building back better exist? Do the Host City's recovery processes include gender concerns, equity, vulnerability reduction, conservational of natural resources, protection of cultural heritage and environmental protection? • How are recovery arrangements exercised / tested? • What good or best practice exists in the Host City, perhaps particularly around converting adversity into opportunity?
P 10.2	Lessons learnt / learning loops	<p>Do post-event assessment processes incorporate failure analyses and the ability to capture lessons learned that then feed into design and delivery of rebuilding projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons have been learned in relation to the Host City's recovery arrangements if they've been tested post-disaster? • How does the Host City's recovery planning incorporate lessons learnt elsewhere and national and international good practice? • What processes are in place for the Host City to rapidly assess why essential and other services failed in a disaster and to incorporate these analyses into the design and delivery of reconstruction projects? • How will the Host City identify, analyse, monitor and address long term impacts of disasters? • How does the Host City encourage multi-stakeholder, cross-sector learning following disasters?

PHASE 3, STEP 11: RECORDING INFORMATION AND DRAFTING INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The 'Step-by-Step Guide' describes how the Review Team can record information during the peer review visit and includes a generic form that can be used to capture information during individual presentations, interviews and other activities.

At the end of each day, it is recommended that the Review Team assemble to consider all the information that it has heard during the day and summarise the evidence to understand:

- Areas of good practice and strengths on which the Host City can build
- Areas where further information may be needed before the peer review visit is finished
- Areas where possible recommendations for the future may be made.

This process will help to inform both the remainder of the visit and the drafting of the peer review outcome report.

The two tables below are offered as a way of recording the overall findings for Module 10 together with the initial recommendations arising from the activities experienced during the day.



SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

	Comments	Justification for assessment	Good practice identified
P 10.1 Post event recovery planning – pre event Is there a strategy or process in place for post-event recovery and reconstruction, including economic reboot, societal aspects etc.?			
P 10.2 Lessons learnt / learning loops Do post-event assessment processes incorporate failure analyses and the ability to capture lessons learned that then feed into design and delivery of rebuilding projects?			
Other			

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
E.g. Post-event assessment processes, failure analyses and lessons learned.	E.g. Ensure a consistent flow of information between multi-agency partners.	E.g. A regular flow of information would improve understanding of risk and aid planning for partner agencies.	E.g. Short, medium, long term implementation.
P 10.1 Post event recovery planning – pre event Strategy or process for post-event recovery and reconstruction.			
P 10.2 Lessons learnt / learning loops Post-event assessment processes, failure analyses and lessons learned.			
Other Area / issue			

NOTES:

Handwriting practice lines consisting of 20 horizontal dotted lines.

NOTES:

Handwriting practice lines consisting of 20 horizontal dotted lines.

