



Enhancing Synergies for disaster PRevention in the EurOpean Union



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 700342.

Challenge 3: 'National regulations for the preparation to trans-boundary crises'

Gilles Grandjean, BRGM, France
Stefano Parolai, GFZ Potsdam, Germany

Kick-off Meeting

Napoli - June 23-24, 2016

Hotel Palazzo Esedra



Challenge 3 'National regulations for the preparation to trans-boundary crises'

Disasters frequently cross national borders, e.g., wind storms, droughts, majors floods, e.g., 2013 European floods (Germany, Austria, Czech Republic, Switzerland, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary).

One problem is that while the number of stakeholders increase, cooperation may also increase but so does competition, as does the complexity of not only the actual problem, but the coordination of any response.

Leads to what is probably the first and foremost issue!

Communication, communication, communication

Some general considerations about risk management across transboundary areas

- Transboundary crisis may increased due to:
 - Intensity of CC hazards → Katrina Hurricane
 - Densification/dangerousness of stakes at risk → Fukushima
 - Interconnection (complexity) of EU infrastructures → Power networks
 - Information systems (social networks, ...) change the perception of a crisis
 - Geographically extended
 - In terms of intensity
 - Produce different understanding of a crisis due to cultural contrasts between two countries

Some general considerations about risk management across transboundary areas (2)

- Friction may exist between EU capacity and the emergence of new kinds of risk due to CC or economic developments:
 - legislative instruments, often specific to nations
 - decision making procedures, at the different administrative scales
 - framework policy programs, depending of government orientations
 - Agencies functioning, very heterogeneous across countries

Some general considerations about risk management transboundary areas (3)

- Different alternatives to discuss, depending on scale effects:
 - Do we need a supranational EU organization to propose homogeneous answers?
 - In case of event: How can the role of the EU civil protection be harmonise with the local ones?
 - Do we need EU Directives for boosting National policy harmonization?
 - Do we need a better cooperation at local scale, depending on the particularities of risk basins?
 - Do we need a mixture?

Some general considerations about risk management across transboundary areas (4)

- How to improve our understanding of transboundary crisis and find the most efficient solutions: a few ideas...
 - Learn from the past: emblematic disasters, abnormal cases, dysfunctioning ...
 - Evaluate all components of the impacts on all sides of the border: physical, economic, social
 - Study relationships between remediation/attenuation actions and resilience (monitoring policies)
 - Working at different time scales: from security actions to long-term risk attenuation

Questions/issues about trans-boundary crisis response

- Differences in each country's civil protection organisation:
 - Top down versus bottom up.
 - National, regional, local.

“who does one actually call?”

- Is the response (organisationally) dependent upon the hazard?
- How is infrastructure managed/protected?
- Actual operational procedures?
- Who responds/is in charge? (police, ministry, civil protection, military)
- What (in general) is the operational capacity? (i.e., technological capacity, not just for the CP, but also general population, e.g., first aid knowledge).

Questions/issues about trans-boundary crisis response

WP4 – Working out how to make things work better.

WP1 – Finding out who we are to talk to.

WP2 – Finding out who does who what, how, and what they are allowed/not allowed to do.

WP3 – Developing the scenario training tool to see how well everything works (or not).

RMT toolbox

The Risk Management Simulator Toolbox (WP3) is one means of identifying weaknesses in communication, lack of flexibility, and general awareness.

Its value is that it does not necessarily need to be only applied to crises professionals (community groups may also exploit it).

‘Imaginative’, but realistic scenarios can be proposed, while at the same time allowing a ‘big picture’ to be presented which, in a real disaster, may not be available, or outside the scope of responders, decision makers etc.

RMT toolbox

- Playing with the scenarios
- Checking the reaction
- Analysing the differences
- Finding the causes (in terms of National regulations?)