



International Work Conference - Managing Response and Recovery: Sharing Situational Awareness and Uniting Efforts 25 May 2011, The Hague

All participants are welcomed by Harold Bousché (TNO), chair of the day.

Henk Geveke (TNO Defense, Safety and Security)

Innovation is no luxury. We need it to cope with demographic changes and budget cuts!

Three fields of innovation:

- flexible capability plan
- use of social media in crisis response
- serious gaming

Gerrit Dubbeld (director of DG Water)

Crisis is never far away. Flooding is the most severe disaster that can happen to the Netherlands. Lessons learned:

- Listen to operational people, don't interfere with them;
- Prepare for the worst;
- Unambiguous communication is needed.

Gerard Laanen (head of DCC)

Failing to prepare is preparing for failure. Lessons identified in TMO/Waterproof 2008 are incorporated in a handbook, which will be tested in the next national exercise (2012).

Key note Jack Harrald (Virginia Tech) – Community Resilience: Building an Evidence Based Approach

- Level of community resilience determines the response.
- Resilience is a useful concept, but not (yet) a decision criterion.
- Comparative study on community resilience to hurricanes and coastal flooding;
 - o Rural coastal area
 - o Wealthy coastal area (Fisher Island, Florida)
 - o Urban coastal area
- Three vulnerabilities that determine response;
 - o Physical vulnerability
 - o Social vulnerability
 - o Structural vulnerability

Workshops round 1

1. Crisis communication and social media - Joe Trainor (Disaster Research Centre, University of Delaware) & Hester Stubbe (TNO)

This session was focused on general observations about crisis communications and the specific challenges and opportunities that social media channels present emergency management agencies. The session led to a number of notable observations. Participants suggested the importance of moving beyond the idea that crisis communications would be successful if people do what is recommended by officials. Instead it must be recognized that that official information supports decision making it does not determine it. Given this observation we noted that officials should adopt an open communication strategy that recognizes that it is important to communicate incomplete information as it becomes available.

Specifically dealing with social media we felt it was important to recognize that this is simply a new channel for communication, it is a new tool in the tool box. As a new channel for communication it is here to stay, so official communication should try to make the best use of it. What makes social media important is that it has several characteristics that are unique in comparison to more traditional channels 1) it is a direct connection to end users as rather than a mediated one, 2) it provides an opportunity to create a “relationship” in normal times that might increase trust, 3) finally Social media allows for two-way communication or feedback. In short, social media can allow for monitoring, communication, and engagement as opposed to unidirectional flow.

2. Community resilience - John Harrald (Virginia Tech) & Georg Frerks/Jeroen Warner (Wageningen University)

The workshop started with two presentations. The first one was given by Dr. Jeroen Warner (Disaster studies, Wageningen University) focusing on the political and governance aspects of resilience, while the second by Dr. Liesel Ritchie (Natural Hazards Centre, University of Colorado) paid attention to the role of community capitals in disaster recovery.

In the discussion a number of observations and conclusions stood out:

- Resilience is not only ‘bouncing back’, it also implies ‘bouncing better’ and ‘bouncing forward’
- The concept of resilience has to be seen as a part of broader governance relations, including changes resulting from a neo-liberal policy that leaves more societal domains to the public to resolve. It, however, should not lead to a hands-off policy as resilience promotion can only be done as part of a conscious and well-considered approach, especially in the realm of disaster that encompasses risks and possibly fatal outcomes of wrong initiatives
- Resilience has to be multi-actor and multi-level, meaning that it should focus on the individual, the community or neighbourhood, the village or town, the region and society at large
- Resilience should go beyond response or recovery. It needs to be pro-actively addressed in planning and development
- Resilience should not be approached as a static equilibrium. It should be conceived of as dynamic and transformative
- The resilience of aid providers also was a matter of concern. How to guarantee that they can continue to function when a disaster hits them?
- It was suggested to carry out a pilot case to compare and learn from US and Dutch experiences in the field of resilience. This should include 1) an inventory of the concepts in use; 2) experiences with resilience-in-practice; 3) the development operational and both qualitative and quantitative indicators to ‘measure’ resilience; 4) to test these indicators in reality; and 5) report

3. Public-private partnerships: asset or liability? - Greg Shaw (George Washington University) & Karen Engel (COT)

The workshop was co presented by Greg Shaw and Karen Engel. The workshop started with a short presentation of efforts within the United States over the past fifteen years to promote and institutionalize Public/Private Partnerships in the United States. Examples included the Public Private Partnerships (PPP 2000) initiative of 1997 – 1999, the FEMA sponsored Project impact – Working Together to Reduce Vulnerability to Natural Hazards from 1997 - 2002, and the recent National Research Council study: Private-Public Sector Collaboration to Enhance Community Disaster Resilience of 2009 – 2010. The terms partnership, collaboration and cooperation were discussed by the workshop participants in an effort to define what each actually means in the United States and Dutch context.

The workshop attendees then participated in an interactive exercise to identify motivators and barriers to developing meaningful and sustainable Public/Private partnerships in the Netherlands. The following motivators and barriers were identified.

| Motivators | Barriers |
|--|---|
| Knowledge of Emergency services | Reluctance to reveal risks |
| Stimulate effectiveness of government policies | Lack of trust |
| Identify useful knowledge of partners | Lack of reliability of partners |
| Increased profit and economic benefits | Costs associated with partnerships |
| Reliability of partners | Lack of a single point of contact |
| One face for shared responsibilities | Mismatch capabilities |
| Incentives | Lack of understanding each other's cultures |
| Cost savings | Resistance to resolution |
| Avenue to innovation | Lack of open communication |

Following this exercise the work participants reviewed recommendations and best practices for Public/Private partnerships to include.

1. Co-share leadership
2. Identify common issues, objectives and points of departure
3. Develop sustainability
4. Open communication
5. Trust

Workshops round 2

4. How safe is safe enough? - Joe Trainor (Disaster Research Centre, University of Delaware), Bas Kolen (HKV) & Kees van Ruiten (Deltares)

See presentation.

5. Decision making and coordination of regional policy teams - Kathleen Tierney (Natural Hazards Centre, University of Colorado) & Josine van de Ven (TNO)

Training policy teams

- Improve expertise of Chairs of regional policy teams
- Rather than training 416 mayors one's a year, train chairs of policy teams 4 times a year. Create expert teams.
- Train the role, dilemma's, decision making and information needs and on how to interact with others.
- Train experimental manner (not too much theory), get feedback on performance goals, discuss issues and learn from each other
 - Right decision strategy (situationeel beslismodel)
 - Right advisors and networkpartners
 - Right decision criteria

Whole of society

- Focus on incorporating non-traditional actors.
- Do not focus too much on organizational structures: we need a culture shift.
- Make organizational structures organic and focus on processes of coordination.
- Be aware of capabilities of others
 - Focus on training collaboration between sectors (not only within)
 - Focus on training with private and non-profit partners (not only with public partners).

6. Community involvement - Liesel Ritchie (Natural Hazards Centre, University of Colorado) & Georg Frerks/Jeroen Warner (Wageningen University)

See presentation.

Reflection on workshops

- Bas Kolen - How safe is safe enough?
We need metrics!

- Kees van Dongen - Decision making and coordination of regional policy teams
We need Training, Training and Training! Kathleen: "Make it organic!"

- Greg Shaw - Public-private partnerships: asset or liability?
Co-share leadership!

- Joe Trainor - Crisis communication and social media
Help people to make the best choice! Freedom of choice! It's a dialog!

- Georg Frerks - Community involvement
We need an explicit framework and actions for improving resilience (what is it)! Bouncing back (better), forward, backwards. No laissez faire.

- Jeroen Warner - Community resilience
Bonding and bridging social capital! People can cope! Urban survival training!

Annex: list of participants

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|---------|----------|--|
| 1 | Alberts | | Frank | Rijkswaterstaat, Waterdienst |
| 2 | Anema | | Kim | UNESCO IHE |
| 3 | Balfoort | | Hans | Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, DG Water |
| 4 | Beckers | | Joost | Deltares |
| 5 | Blok | | Hanneke | Provincie Zeeland |
| 6 | Bol | | René | Rijkswaterstaat |
| 7 | Bousche | | Harold | HCSS |
| 8 | Craats | van der | Irene | Antea Group |
| 9 | de Vries | | Arno | TNO |
| 10 | Dekkers | | Chris | Veiligheidsberaad |
| 11 | Dubbeld | | Gerrit | ministerie van I&M, DG Water |
| 12 | Engel | | Karen | COT |
| 13 | Frerks | | Georg | Wageningen UR, Disaster Studies |
| 14 | Geveke | | Henk | TNO |
| 15 | Goemans | | Corsmas | Ministry of Safety & Justice |
| 16 | Harrald | | John | Virginia Tech |
| 17 | Heul | van der | Paul | Ministry of Defence |
| 18 | Hommes | | Saskia | Deltares |
| 19 | Kathleen | | Tierney | University of Colorado, Natural Hazards Center |
| 20 | Kelder | | Ellen | Gemeente Dordrecht |
| 21 | Kolen | | Bas | HKV Lijn in water |
| 22 | Kooijman | | Leo | project Netcentrisch Werken |
| 23 | Laanen | | Gerard | ministerie van I&M, DCC |
| 24 | Matthijssse | | Marcel | Veiligheidsregio Zeeland |
| 25 | Mohnen | | Ralf | Nederland 2.0 |
| 26 | Os | van | Nico | Safety region Zuid-Holland Zuid |
| 27 | Paats | | Marc | Twijnstra Gudde |
| 28 | Reitsma | | Ruurd | A3R2 |
| 29 | Ritchie | | Liesel | University of Colorado, Natural Hazards Center |
| 30 | Robbemont | | Cornelis | waterschap Hollandse Delta |
| 31 | Sevenstern | | John | inspectie openbare orde en veiligheid |
| 32 | Shaw | | Greg | George Washington University |
| 33 | Stijnen | | Jan | HKV lijn in water |
| 34 | Stubbé | | Hester | TNO |
| 35 | Teunissen | | Esther | Bureau Veiligheidsberaad |
| 36 | Tonnaer | | Clemon | Nederlands Instituut Fysieke Veiligheid |
| 37 | Trainor | | Joe | University of Delaware, Disaster Research Centre |
| 38 | van Buul | | Kim | TNO |
| 39 | van de Ven | | Josine | TNO |
| 40 | van Dongen | | Kees | TNO |
| 41 | van Ruiten | | Kees | Deltares |
| 42 | Veen | van der | Maarten | Nederlandse Rode Kruis |
| 43 | Velotti | | Lucia | University of Delaware, Disaster Research Centre |
| 44 | Verdouw | | Rob | DCC-Infrastructuur |
| 45 | Verseveld | van | Martijn | Safety region Zuid-Holland Zuid |
| 46 | Warner | | Jeroen | Wageningen UR, Disaster Studies |
| 47 | Weijs | | Bart | Wageningen UR, Disaster Studies |
| 48 | Zannoni | | Marco | COT |