



Handbook on Recovery Institutions

**A Guidebook for
Recovery Leaders
and Practitioners**

NOVEMBER 2021

Copyright © UNDP September 2021

All rights reserved

United Nations Development Programme

1 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA

UNDP is the leading United Nations organization fighting to end the injustice of poverty, inequality, and climate change. Working with our broad network of experts and partners in 170 countries, we help nations to build integrated, lasting solutions for people and planet.

Learn more at undp.org or follow at @UNDP.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the United Nations, including UNDP, or the UN Member States.

Reproduction: All rights reserved. Neither this publication nor any part of it may be reproduced, stored by any means or system or transmitted, in any form or by any medium, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopied, recorded or of any other type, without the prior permission of the United Nations Development Programme.

Foreword

As I write, we are just over one year and a half into the global COVID-19 pandemic and ongoing recovery efforts. It has been a year marked as well by a great number of adverse hazard events throughout the world which have led to compounded disasters. The increasing intensity and frequency of such disasters require us to capitalize on past recovery experiences, while taking a closer look at how these responses were managed at the institutional level and what additional efforts may be necessary to strengthen the capacities of national governments to plan for and effectively manage recovery from disasters.


More than ever, the global pandemic has made us acutely aware of the multisectoral challenges that disasters present for the lives and livelihoods of the people and communities affected. Therefore, effective and efficient recovery processes are crucial in order to maintain those development gains that remain after an adverse event and build resilience in the efforts to “bounce forward” to improved development pathways. Avoiding delays, carrying out successful recovery interventions and building back better, stronger and faster are central components in the reduction of disaster impacts. For this to occur, it is imperative that countries have a clear institutional set up to lead, manage and monitor their paths to recovery. Supported by evidence shown in this *Handbook on Recovery Institutions*, we advocate that planning the institutional arrangements for recovery before a disaster occurs greatly enhances the likelihood of a positive recovery process and has the potential to result in more sustainable outcomes.

The *Handbook on Recovery Institutions* is a tool for national government leaders and officials to plan for and establish the dedicated institutional support needed for delivering effective recovery outcomes. As recovery is multidimensional, this handbook is intended as a resource for experts, practitioners and anyone tasked with developing, supporting and implementing institutional recovery plans.

Recognizing that recovery processes require a complex range of knowledge, skills and capacities to manage multisectoral recovery efforts, the *Handbook on Recovery Institutions* supports designing or refining the relevant recovery institutional arrangements in line with national, regional or local government priorities, needs and disaster scenarios.

In addition to presenting key elements for success and good practices, which are informed by the analysis of six case studies (Chile, India, Indonesia, New Zealand, Serbia, Mozambique), we also wish to provide practical support by sharing the universal Tool to Assess Recovery Preparedness at Country Level and sample Terms of Reference for key institutional staff involved in recovery processes.

The key driver behind the *Handbook on Recovery Institutions* is our strong collective desire to see communities recover quickly and become more resilient, through a path facilitated by the most appropriate and robust institutional arrangements.



Ronald Jackson
Head of the Disaster Risk Reduction &
Recovery for Building Resilience Team (DRT)

Acknowledgements

This guide was written by independent consultants Laura Olson and Josef Leitmann under the guidance of Krishna Vatsa and Rita Missal, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Many people went out of their way to provide their insights, innovative practices and advice regarding how best to build effective Institutional Arrangements for Recovery. We thank all UNDP Country Office staff who contributed to the development of the case studies:

- Angelika Planitz, Team Leader, Disaster Risk Reduction & Recovery for Building Resilience Team, UNDP Crisis Bureau
- Claire Rubin, CEO of Claire B. Rubin and Associates LLC, author of the Recovery Diva Blog.
- Dr Roberto Moris, Director of Plans and Urban Projects UC PPUC, Professor of Architecture and Urban Studies, UC: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Dr William Siembieda, Professor of City and Regional Planning, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo. Member of CIDIGEN - Chile's Research Center for Integrated Disaster Risk Management.
- Elizabeth McNaughton, Director, McNaughton and Wills Company, former Executive Director, Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Lessons Learned project in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, former National Recovery Manager, New Zealand Red Cross and recipient of the Winston Churchill Fellowship for Disaster Recovery Leadership.
- Ian McLean, former Member of New Zealand's Parliament (1978 to 1990), former Chair of the Earthquake Commission, lead author of the 2012 Review of the CDEM Response to the 22 February Christchurch Earthquake.
- Laurie Johnson PhD AICP, Principal, Laurie Johnson Consulting and Research.
- Nadia Adrião – Program Coordinator, GREPOC, Mozambique.
- Roger Sutton, former CEO of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA), New Zealand.
- Sandra Nedeljkovic, Deputy Director, Public Investment Management Office, Government of the Republic of Serbia.
- Titus Kuuyuor, Former Chief Technical Adviser for Disaster Risk Reduction/Climate Change Adaptation-UNDP Mozambique, Crisis Prevention, Recovery and Environment Unit (CPR/E).
- Violeta Sretenovic, Coordinator of Key Partnerships, Public Investment Management Office, Government of the Republic of Serbia.

We would also like to thank Joana Sampainho (UNDP) and Geraldine Becchi (UNDP) for their invaluable support as reviewers of this document.

Finally, UNDP would like to thank the European Union, the European Commission Service for Foreign Policy Instruments and the Government of Luxembourg for their support for the publication of this document through the projects “Strengthening Capacities for Post-Disaster Needs Assessment and Recovery Preparedness” and “Building Capacities for Resilient Recovery”.

Table of Contents

Foreword	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Abbreviation	8
1. OVERVIEW	9
Objectives and scope	9
Intended audience.....	9
Structure	9
2. WHY INSTITUTIONS MATTER FOR RECOVERY	10
What are institutional arrangements for recovery?	10
Recovery from major disasters is not business-as-usual.....	11
Institutional arrangements are a key element of a Disaster Recovery Framework.....	12
Lack of institutional arrangements can result in delays with human and economic costs.....	13
Importance of preparedness.....	13
3. OPTIONS FOR MANAGING THE RECOVERY PROCESS	15
Institutional roles for recovery	15
Assessing existing institutional capacity.....	16
Models for institutional arrangements	18
1. Strengthen and coordinate existing line ministries and/or local authorities.....	20
2. Establish a new agency.....	22
3. Hybrid approach	25
Comparison of models.....	27
Criteria for selecting an appropriate model	28
4. KEY REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCCESS	30
Legal framework.....	30
Creating a legal mandate for post-disaster land-use planning and standards.....	31
Leadership for effective recovery	31
Staffing	32
Immediate human resource needs	32
Long-Term Human Resource Requirements	33
Ensuring stakeholder participation.....	34
Good governance	34
Linkage to financing mechanisms	36
5. GOOD PRACTICES	37
Communicate accurate information and realistic targets and/or timetables	37
Achieve early visible wins.....	38
Use existing capacities in the short term and build local capacity in the long-term.....	38
Clarify roles and responsibilities	39
Maintain flexibility as recovery evolves.....	39
Use recovery to promote sustainable development	40
Be based in the disaster-affected area	40

CHECKLIST OF KEY CONSIDERATIONS	41
--	-----------

ANNEXES	42
----------------------	-----------

1. Key concepts and terms.....	42
2. Case studies.....	43
Characteristics of the cases	43
Summaries of the case studies	44
3. Terms of reference for key staff	50
Leadership	51
Financial management	53
Legal	54
Resilience.....	55
Communications and external relations	56
Sectoral expertise	58
Capacity-building	62
Monitoring and evaluation.....	63
4. Tool to Assess Recovery Preparedness at Country Level.....	64
5. Organization charts for selected institutional arrangements	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	71

Tables

Table 1. Comparison of models.....	27
Table 2. Checklist of key considerations	41
Table 3. Key concepts and terms.....	42
Table 4. Case studies	43
Table 5. Area 1 – Legislation and Policies for Recovery.....	64
Table 6. Area 2 – PDNA and Recovery Planning.....	65
Table 7. Area 3 – Financing Recovery.....	66
Table 8. Area 4 – Implementation Arrangements for Coordination Communications and Monitoring.....	67

Figures

Figure 1. Critical components of how the institutional arrangements govern the recovery process.....	11
Figure 2. Phases of Disaster Recovery.....	12
Figure 3. India case study: examples of post-disaster establishment of institutional arrangements for recovery	13
Figure 4. Critical question senior government leaders and executives responsible for designing institutional arrangements for recovery face	16
Figure 5. Lead agency functional capacities	17
Figure 6. Model for new institutional arrangements.....	19
Figure 7. Six criteria to consider to select the appropriate institutional process.....	28
Figure 8. Key requirements for success.....	30
Figure 9. Good practices.....	37

Boxes

BOX 2.1:	Recommendations for better pre-disaster preparedness in New Zealand	14
BOX 3.1:	Capacity assessments lead to new institutional arrangements in New Zealand	18
BOX 3.2:	Central government coordination led the recovery efforts in Chile	21
BOX 3.3:	A tradition of decentralized recovery management in India	21
BOX 3.4:	A successful temporary recovery agency in Indonesia	23
BOX 3.5:	A temporary recovery agency becomes permanent in Serbia	24
BOX 3.6:	Using a Project Implementation Unit in Turkey	26
BOX 4.1:	Legal frameworks for institutional arrangements	31
BOX 4.2:	Strategies to meet staffing needs in New Zealand	33
BOX 4.3:	Rapidly meeting immediate staff needs in Indonesia	33
BOX 4.4:	Examples of transparency and accountability from Indonesia and Serbia	35
BOX 4.5:	Examples of strong linkages to financing	36
BOX 5.1:	Lessons learned from unrealistic communication in Chile	37
BOX 5.2:	Examples of small, visible, early wins in New Zealand	38
BOX 5.3:	Examples of the use of existing capacities	39
BOX 5.4:	Clarifying the role of international partners	39
BOX 5.6:	Basing institutional arrangements in the disaster-affected area	40

Abbreviation

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BBB	Building Back Better
BRR	Agency for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias (Indonesia)
CERA	Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (New Zealand)
CMICT	Committee of Ministers of Infrastructure, City and Territories (Chile)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DRF	Disaster Recovery Framework
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EU	European Union
FAAARO	Government Office of Reconstruction and Flood Relief (Serbia)
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
GSDMA	Gujarat State Disaster Management Authority (India)
IFI	International Financial Institution
IHRC	Interim Haiti Recovery Commission
INGC	National Institute for Disaster Management (Mozambique)
IO	International Organization
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PDNA	Post-Disaster Needs Assessment
PIMO	Public Investment Management Office (Serbia)
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PPP	Public-Private Partnerships
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_11396

