Background of the study

- Intended as the first of a series of ex-post recovery studies conducted approximately ten years after major disasters
- Focus on processes and recovery, rather than specific programmes and risk
- Inspired by TEC findings which indicated that links between rehabilitation/recovery and development can only be verified ex-post
- Questions similar to those being applied in the TEC LRRD phase two evaluation
Questions

- **The return of the state and civil society**: How have the state and civil society regained their capacity to lead recovery, development and risk reduction, and has decentralisation and the introduction of participatory approaches brought decision-making to local level.

- **Poverty, livelihoods and economic recovery**: How have economic actors revived their activities, and what has been the role of aid in this process.

- **Rebuilding the social fabric/community development**: Have communities rebuilt their internal relations and has development assistance contributed to this process.

- **Reduction of risks from natural hazards and conflict**: How have the preceding factors increased or reduced the risks of future natural disasters or conflict.

Initial findings:

**The return of the state and civil society**

- Initial response was dominated by international aid agencies, but this had little long-term impact on Nicaraguan state and civil society roles.

- The Stockholm Declaration was in many respects a precursor to the Paris Agenda.

- Mitch was portrayed as a ‘socio-environmental disaster’, which highlighted risk but downplayed political processes and encouraged a technical approach.

- Decentralisation must be driven by the interests, incentives and capacities of the municipalities.
Initial findings:

Poverty, livelihoods and economic recovery

- The pre-Mitch ‘road map’ for rural development changed, i.e., more attention to environment and poverty alleviation
- Efforts to follow the Stockholm Declaration and subsequent harmonization and alignment have led to new policies
- Evaluations of innovative rural reconstruction positive about outcomes but little scaling up
- Few efforts to link analysis of disaster recovery with the design and assessment of social protection structures

Initial findings:

Rebuilding the social fabric/community development

- Very little analysis of these factors in evaluations and studies, indicating low priority of these objectives (?)
- Gender and socio-cultural factors have also generally been ignored in most literature, and there is little disaggregated data available
- Great differences between the responses of, e.g., younger and older women, suggesting the need to disaggregate according to age when looking at gender/culture in order to find meaningful data
Initial findings:
Reduction of risks from natural hazards and conflict

- Post-Mitch plans frequently included risk reduction ‘components’, little evidence of a genuine mainstreaming of risk in the vast majority of recovery investments
- Progress in terms of new plans, policies and structures for DRR, but little evidence of significant national budgetary allocations
- Risk reduction aspects of recovery closely related to watershed management, but little analysis of whether these investments actually reduced risk
- The impact of climate change efforts on the risk reduction agenda is not yet clear, which may be due to drought being largely delinked from the disaster risk discourse
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