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SUMMARY

The first activity in task 29 was the scoping of the text-based knowledge transfer, which implied a review of target audiences and the drafting of a provisional table of contents with authors and/or links to task-final reports, size of chapters/sections, etc. This report is the result of this activity, in tune with task 28.

FLOODsite is primarily a research project, explicitly focusing on Integrated Flood Risk Analysis and Management Methodologies. So, most findings will concern methodologies, not actual flood risks. It means FLOODsite has a message it wants to convey on concepts, approaches, methods, and general findings, and not so much on levels of hazard, vulnerability, and risk in the conterminous European States. Therefore, we propose to address the following target groups:

a. the flood risk professionals (both authorities and advisors) as well as the next generation professionals (product nr. 1),

b. potential next generation professionals and interested civilians/potential stakeholders (product nr. 2).

As it is impossible to produce texts in all European languages we propose:

1. Guidance document/book in English,

2. Summary report in some (3-4) key languages (e.g. English, French, German, (Spanish); i.e. at least 1 truly Germanic language, one truly Roman language plus ‘simple international’ English.

ad 1: As professionals and scientists in many member countries may be somewhat allergic to guidelines enforced upon them we propose not to use the word guideline or guidance document explicitly, but instead propose to write a document with a core message on method to follow (approach) which is so convincing that it will be used purely by its being authoritative. It would be:

- paperback,
- size A4 or 80% A4
- max 150 pages, about 100 on the core message and 50 for text boxes and further reading (specified: say some 50 on essence, 50 for figures and tables, 20 on concrete examples (text boxes), 20 on specific issues (text boxes) and 10 for further reading, contents, etc.)
- full colour

ad 2:
Informing non-professionals is important to recruit the next generation of professionals committed to sustainable FRM and to allow new stakeholders to participate in the planning of FRM. To raise their interest, it is especially relevant to dwell on the flood risk problems (to enhance commitment to the case), to emphasize the core message (new/integrated approach) and to refer to daily life. We propose to summarise product one, but:

- more lively,
- more concrete,
- much shorter (max 40 pp)
- in simpler (plain) language

In view of the role of FLOODsite in a larger context, we conclude that we should focus on the contents and ensure that the main message of FLOODsite is conveyed in a simple enough form. Task 29 is to provide the main basic text on what FLOODsite is about. This requires:

- building on the papers and presentations by the coordinator (esp. the Language of risk document)
- ample involvement of the coordinator in screening of the provisional texts
- involvement of all relevant disciplines from all themes
- one final editor

Appendix B gives the first (provisional) table of contents for the guidance document..
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Background**

Within the context of theme 5, dedicated to the communication and dissemination of FLOODsite’s results, the objective of task 29 is to communicate the findings of the whole IP (all themes) in the form of clear and concise best practice guidance and dissemination material, with special attention to the target audiences identified for FLOODsite, i.e. the professional community, as well as the general public, teaching/academic communities and decision-makers.

The planned deliverables of task 29 are twofold:

A. a Best Practice Guide (report) aiming at the professional community – in particular technical advisors, decision-makers in European, national and local government/agencies as well as the academic communities, and emergency planners – that **collates as a single reference** the FLOODsite findings concerning 4 topics:
   1. the science of undertaking flood risk analysis, including reference to state of the art approaches and models;
   2. practical guidance to support the implementation of integrated flood risk management, with particular emphasis on the range of flood risk management measures and policy instruments
   3. the development of long term strategic risk management plans
   4. practical guidance to support emergency management planning.

B. public education material (e.g. a summary report/brochure) to be used in schools (A-level) and for the bachelor degree at universities, but also suited for educated lay-people, addressing the issues around flooding and flood risk management at their level.

1.2 **Approach**

- Task 29 will first identify target groups for dissemination of knowledge.
- Then it will – within the context of an overall communication plan for FLOODsite (see proposal by Paul Samuels) – focus on the desired contents and form of the deliverables.
- Finally, the editorial team will ask task leaders and key authors to already take into account the delivery of texts for the professional and public reports.

- After a pause, in the 4th year of FLOODsite, the authors will be asked to deliver their texts for the book, after which it will be edited by the editorial team, technically laid-out and published.

The first activity (Activity 1) in task 29 is the scoping of the text-based knowledge transfer, which implies two actions:

**Action 1: Review target audiences (WL | Delft Hydraulics)**

- Identification and discussion of target groups
- Discuss and establish links with Communication and Dissemination Strategy.
- Identify scope and goal of text-based knowledge transfer, e.g.:
  - guidance document/book on FRM
  - teaching material/summary report
- The level of detail of the products is limited by the time and scope of FLOODsite and predominantly refers to the knowledge and experience of its partners.
Action 2: Outlining content and prototype (WL | Delft Hydraulics and TU Delft)

Next, provisional tables of content will be drafted, for both products, with authors and/or links to task-final reports, size of chapters/sections, number of figures etc.

This action comprises:
- Outlining content and required contributions (WL | Delft Hydraulics and TU Delft)
- Developing prototype Guidance Documents (WL | Delft Hydraulics and TU Delft)

For the Guidance Document, the form of a report or, alternatively, a book may be considered. This will be further discussed in 2006 with the task partners, the theme leader and the FLOODsite lead-partner (because of its relationship to the FLOODsite communication strategy).
2. Scoping

2.1 General and target audiences

FLOODsite is in the middle of developing a Dissemination and Communication Strategy within theme 5, with an important role for the co-ordinator to spread ‘the news’ to an audience as large as possible. However, FLOODsite is primarily a research project, explicitly focussing on Integrated Flood Risk Analysis and Management Methodologies. So, most findings will concern methodologies, not actual flood risks. This has important consequences.

- Firstly, it means that FLOODsite has a message it want to convey; there are no real stakeholders involved in the sense of people at risk who could turn to FLOODsite for information on their own situation (Europe is simply too large and too complex, FLOODsite has no formal task in this respect nor the financial means and/or continuity of existence for such a task) ==> focus lies on dissemination instead of communication;
- Secondly, neither the knowledge about risk communication gathered for FLOODsite (see Baan, 2004) nor the literature on how to communicate on risks (see list of references and appendix) are of immediate relevance to how the text-based knowledge transfer should be designed; we should rather refer to guidelines and experiences concerning how to communicate on scientific progress in general ==> focus on the content of the message and only then determine the target audience;
- Thirdly, there is a logical division of tasks (or should we say hierarchy?) related to responsibilities. In fact, responsibilities are multi-layered. Science focuses on providing background information, which may be on concepts, approaches, methods, and general findings (e.g. FLOODsite), but which may also be on facts (levels of hazard, vulnerability, risk) concerning large (Europe), intermediate (a river basin) or local (a village) scales. Providing the latter is rather a task of national to local authorities (policy makers and their affiliated research institutions) than of FLOODsite. Only in the pilots concrete findings can be expected to be found. These can be used as examples, but can never provide an overview for the conterminous European States. Next, we meet European, national, regional and local authorities, who are really responsible for providing information on concrete risk levels. To our opinion, these authorities and their (scientific) advisors are the main target audience for FLOODsite. ==> address the flood risk professionals (both authorities and advisors) as well as the next generation professionals with product nr. 1, address potential next generation professionals and interested civilians/potential stakeholders (who may want to engage in participatory planning) with product nr. 2.

This delimitation of Task 29’s target audience is quite fundamental, but it is supported by something very practical, namely the language problem in Europe. Risk communication must be done in simple language and tuned to the different addressees (cf. Covello & Sandman, 2001; Baan, 2004). If the addressees were to be civilians in the many EU-member states, we would have to provide leaflets in many languages as well as in various levels of complexity/simplicity. This is simply impossible. ==> 1 Guidance document/ Book in English, 1 Summary report in some (3-4) key languages (e.g. English, French, German, (Spanish); i.e. at least 1 truly Germanic language, one truly Roman language plus ‘simple international’ English (apologies to the real Brits).

Finally, the level of detail of the products is limited by the time and scope of FLOODsite and the knowledge and experience of its partners, but also by the fact that the majority of the target audience can only be reached when a relatively simple message is conveyed (even when the subject is very complicated and should be discussed form many points-of-view). We shouldn’t underestimate the audience, but the core message must be very clear and explicit.
2.2 Links with Communication and Dissemination Strategy.

The communication and dissemination strategy for FLOODsite as a whole is being developed in task 28. This strategy mainly aims at attracting attention of as large an audience as possible. This implies involving mass media such as newspapers, TV and radio broadcasting. Tasks 29 to 31 are rather focussed on disseminating the findings of FLOODsite.

It is, of course, essential that the message spread is consistent throughout all the media applied, although differences may be expected in the level of detail and the level of complexity. It seems that a certain hierarchy can be discerned, with:

1. 1st level: the tasks and themes, focussing on scientific publication in journals and presentations in scientific congresses
2. 2nd level: text-based summary report and cover-papers to be produced by theme-leaders and the coordinator, as well as task 29. This should focus on the overall view on FRA and FRM. **Content is leading.**
3. 3rd level: web-based access to all texts (the medium is different, the information is however copied from 1st and 2nd level; but with added possibilities in the form of examples, demo’s etc.
4. 4th level: general-public (lay-people) oriented approach (task 31): simplification of the contents of task 29, different medium, perhaps a focus is required on the relevance for the local situation?

In retrospect, we may thus conclude that task 29 should focus on the contents and ensure that the main message of FLOODsite is conveyed in a simple enough form. Task 29 provides the main basic text on what FLOODsite is about. Tasks 30 and 31 should be attuned to this (copy texts or simplify texts). This requires:

- building on the papers and presentations by the coordinator (esp. the Language of risk document and e.g. Paul Samuels presentation in the ISFD3 congress)
- ample involvement of the coordinator in screening of the provisional texts
- involvement of all relevant disciplines from all themes (ensured in the responsible writing/editorial team)
- one final editor

2.3 Scope and goal of text-based knowledge transfer

In the RIP for task 29 it is, following the FLOODsite DoW, suggested that the text based knowledge transfer might rely on 2 products:

- a guidance document/ book on FRM
- teaching material/ summary report

Obviously, this is not a final decision yet, although two different products for two different audiences can be regarded fixed. For the rest, some considerations and a proposal.

2.3.1 Guidance document

The EU favours the production of guidance documents, as it shows that EU funding leads to guidelines which could/should be applied throughout Europe. However, professionals and scientists in many member countries seem to be somewhat allergic to guidelines, standard procedures etc. enforced upon them. This means there is a huge danger that they would rather boycott the guidelines instead of follow them.

Therefore, **I propose not to use the word guideline or guidance document explicitly; but instead try to write a document with a core message on method to follow (approach) which is so convincing that it will be used purely by its being authoritative.** This means we should have the ambition to make a guidance document without calling it a guidance document and which does not look like a cookbook.

For the Guidance Document, the form of a report or, alternatively, a book may be considered. For the style we refer to ‘**Room for the Rhine Branches in the Netherlands, what the research has taught us**’
(Silva et al., 2001). This report addresses a large number of questions which are at the same time the headers of sections. This facilitates the search for specific topics and immediately invites the readers to start thinking for themselves. Also, asking the question is the first step towards providing answers (See further Provisional Contents).

Criteria for a wide spread of such a report/book comprise: cheap, student edition, good looking. This means:

- paperback,
- size A4 or 80% A4
- max 150 pages, about 100 on the core message and 50 for text boxes and further reading (specified: say some 50 on essence, 50 for figures and tables, 20 on concrete examples (text boxes), 20 on specific issues (text boxes) and 10 for further reading, contents, etc.)
- full colour

As for the way of publishing and distributing it, we may turn to:

- a professional publisher (marketing ensured, costs may be imperative)
- HR Wallingford (costs not covered within FLOODsite, marketing not ensured, may appear too much advertising HR)
- the EU (are they good at it?; how would the target audience react?)

The latter should be decided by the coordinator, who is responsible for the communication strategy. I propose to aim at a professional publisher, and not something with too obvious FLOODsite or EU design (for acceptance and sustainability reasons). Of course, it is without saying that due reference shall be given.

2.3.2 Teaching material/ summary report

Raising interest among non-professionals is important for two reasons:

1. first, a next generation of professionals committed to sustainable FRM must be recruited; this can be enhanced by confronting school children with the current and future problems of water management in general and flood risk management in particular.
2. secondly, the ongoing integration of water management implies the involvement of many more stakeholders; not only authorities from different fields (nature conservation, cultural heritage, spatial planning), NGO’s but also civilians who are affected by either floods or management measures. For a sound participation in the planning of FRM, these new stakeholders must be well-informed.

Providing those two target audiences with knowledge about the essentials of FRA and FRM should be the aim of the teaching material/ summary report. To raise interest, it is especially relevant to dwell on the flood risk problems (to enhance commitment to the case), to emphasize the core message (new/integrated approach) and to refer to daily life.

As for the form, the summary report should be:

- more lively,
- more concrete,
- much shorter (max 40 pp)
- in simpler (plain) language

As for the publishing and distribution, it would preferably be made available via schools (school book publishers) and libraries.

Costs are inhibiting?
3. Provisional content Guidance Document

According to the RIP, provisional tables of content will be drafted, for both products, with authors and/or links to task-final reports, size of chapters/sections, number of figures etc. This action comprising:

- Outlining content and required contributions (WL | Delft Hydraulics and TU Delft)
- Developing prototype Guidance Documents (WL | Delft Hydraulics and TU Delft)

In Appendix B, a first, very preliminary, draft of a table of contents is provided. This should be amended after having discussed and finalised the main issues in this scoping activity.
4. References


5. **Appendix A: RISK COMMUNICATION BIBLIOGRAPHY**

by DR. STEVE DEPOE  
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATION STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI  

(21 June 1995)

**Articles**


Books


6. Appendix B: PROVISIONAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

Flood risk assessment and flood risk management: lessons from FLOODsite (an EU-funded Integrated Project)

General intro/ appetizer: about flood disasters in the recent past and future (2-3 pages)

Appetizer about why flood risk is important to be concerned about:

- biggest floods in Europe (history)
- recent floods in Europe (since e.g. 1900/ 1950?)
- numbers of people dead
- damage done
- some nice pictures

Expectations for the future:

- climate change, expected effects
- demographic change: expected effects
- economic growth: expected effects

About what to do about them

Some literal citations from the EU-proposal for a Flood Risk Analysis and Management Directive

About this book

What is this book about? : Scientific progress in how to analyse flood risk, and how to manage flood risk
Chapter 1: On the science of flood risk analysis (MU/FHRC)

1.1. Basic concepts (3 pages; primarily from Language of risk and theme 1)

What is flood risk? (LoR)

What is a flood then? (LoR)

So if flood is a natural hazard, when does one speak of flood risk? (LoR)

Ah, vulnerable people or property. Does that mean that there is no risk without vulnerability? (LoR)
(definition: hazard * exposure * vulnerability)

And what about this alternative definition of flood risk? (LoR)
(probability * consequence)

What different kinds of floods can be recognised? (LoR)
FF, lowland floods, estuaries, coastal

Do they pose comparable risks? (LoR, task 12)
(No, very different conditions, very different spatial scales, different timing, different effects)

This idea of risk seems very logical and rational; but is this also how people experience risk? (task 9)

How are flood risks viewed in relation to other risks in life then? (task 9)

1.2. The analysis of flood risk (10 pages)

How does one usually analyse the flood hazard? (task 4, 7?)

Is that the same for flash floods, lowland rivers, estuaries and coasts? (task 1, 2, 3)

So probability is an essential feature? How is that determined?
- for flash floods (task 1)
- for lowland rivers (task 2)
- for estuaries and coasts (task 2)

Is probability of design conditions the only issue; or is there something else we should know?
(probability of failure, strength of defence works) (task 4)

And what about exposure then? How is that analysed? (task 8)

If exposure can be incorporated in the quantification of the hazard, how is that done? (task 2, 7)

Can exposure also be incorporated in an estimation of consequence? (task 9, 10)

How are flood consequences quantified, in general? (task 9, 10)

Could you specify how loss of life is quantified?

... and economic damage?

We have discussed loss of life and economic damage now, but what about other effects? (task 9, 10, 11)
psychology,
health
ecology
etc.

Have I understood well that risk analysis is the combination of probability analysis and consequence analysis? *(theme 1 overall, language of risk)*

How can that be expressed then? *(theme 1 overall, language of risk)*

Many things seem uncertain, both re probabilities and consequences. Could you elaborate on uncertainties a bit? *(task 2, 7, 20)*

Now we know about the facts and their uncertainties, could you explain about the evaluation of risk? What does it mean? *(task 10)*

Are the views on flood risk the same in different countries? *(task 10, 11)*

It seems we now know what flood risks are, their magnitude and their societal importance (valuation); I suppose we proceed towards what can be done about those risks

answer: yes, let’s go to the next chapter
Chapter 2: On flood risk management policy, measures and instruments (basic concepts, explanatory; IOER-Dresden, 12 pages)

When risks result from a combination of flood hazard and societal vulnerability, which one needs most attention then, or which one is the most profitable? (task 12)

And before we go into details, I would like to know how FRM differs from what was done in the past? (Flood abatement, flood control, flood management) (proposal; task 12, 13, 14)

2.1 On measures and instruments

Pause, please. You introduce so many new things now. Please first explain what kinds of measures may be taken. (task 12)
(technical, regulatory, financial, communicative; structural versus non-structural)

Could you give some examples of structural technical measures? (task 12)

And of technical measures to reduce the vulnerability? (task 12)

And those other instruments: regulatory, financial and communicative; what should one think of with those? (task 12)

I guess not all these measures and instruments are equally effective, or are they? (task 12; IRMA-SPONGE)
(supportive versus individually effective)

How can the effectiveness of measures and instruments be assessed, anyway? (task 12)

So effectiveness is not the only important criterion? (task 1; 9, 10?)
(No also costs, and hence efficiency; and other societal effects: CBA or MCA)

Perhaps we should come back on this later, but first I would like to know whether those measures and instruments perform well in all situations. In other words: could you explain a bit about their applicability? (task 12)

So, along coasts other technical measures are best than along large rivers? (task 12)

And what about mountainous rivers, with those flash-floods? (task 1, 15, 16)

Could you explain a bit more a about the non-technical measures? For example, those regulatory measures; when do they apply? (task 12)

And financial measures, such as insurances. What is the experience with those? (task 12)

And I guess communication just concerns explaining the rest ...? (task 12, 13)
difference between risk comm. for raising awareness/preparedness, comm. to support other measures, and warning

So, communication is also about sharing responsibilities; who is responsible for flood damage in the end then? (task 12, 13)

2.2 On flood risk management strategies (explanatory, basic concepts, not prescriptive on methods)
Somewhat earlier you mentioned the word strategy in relation to flood risk management. What does that mean? *(task 13, 14)*

So a strategy is about acting in the course of time ...? *(task 13)*

Perhaps we should take one step back: towards the goal/ purpose of a flood risk management strategy. What is the real aim of flood risk management? *(task 13, 14, LoR)*

**2.3. Management processes**

Alright, and now about this process aspect..... Who are the relevant actors in FRM? *(task 13)*

You mention differences between different European countries. Could you give some examples and general trends? *(task 13?)*

And what about stakeholders: what kind of stakeholders should be taken into account? *(Task 13, Harmoni-COP)*

Nowadays, we here a lot about Public participation: What about that?
Chapter 3 Design and assessment of preventive flood risk management strategies (HR Wallingford, 12 pages)

In the foregoing we learned that a strategy consists of a set of related measures and instruments? But how should one design strategies for the future then? *(task 13, 14)*

(guiding principles: resistance, resilience, adaptation, etc)

What do these concepts mean; and how do they influence the design of strategies? *(task 14)*

Could you give examples of some different strategies for the same location? *(task 14)*

What are the main differences between those strategies, then? *(task 14)*

Do I understand well that the different strategies relate to different kinds of people? *(task 14)*

So, one might expect different strategies in different countries with different cultures and also changing strategies with changing views in time...? *(task 14)*

I suppose the decision as to what strategy is best is to be based on some assessment ... . *(task 14, 9,10, 12)*

(again CBA or MCA, in view of future developments)

What is the difference between cost benefit analysis and multi-criteria analysis then? *(task 10)*

But, as I understand the basis for both assessments is always averted risk in relation to costs of measures? *(task 14)*

And what other criteria are used for such an assessment? *(task 14, 10, 12)*

How to combine the results for all those criteria? *(task 14, 10, 12)*

Are there general protocols (or even computer-tools) for such assessments? *(task 18)*

So, discussion support systems are the future? But what about earlier experiences with DSS’s in the past; these were seldom used to my knowledge? *(task 18)*

And what about public participation in design and assessment? *(task 14, 18)*

**On scenario-analyses**

When designing and planning for the future, I would estimate that this is a very uncertain road. Could you explain how to take uncertainties into account? *(task 14)*

(scenario analysis)

What are good scenarios then, or are there no good or bad scenarios? *(task 14)*

But different scenarios mean different performance of different alternative strategies. How to tackle that? *(task 14, 18)*

Is it still possible to draw robust conclusions for a future flood risk management strategy then? *(task 13, 14, 18)*

Well, I would like to hear those conclusions....
Chapter 4 On emergency management planning (WL | Delft Hydraulics, 10 pages)

In the foregoing we have discussed how to be prepared for floods. Now, what if a flood does come all the same and cannot be limited to the floodplains? (task 16, 17)

So, warning and evacuation schemes are the main issues then? (task 16, 17)

What does a warning system look like? (task 16, 17)

So, it relies on weather forecasts and models ...? (task 16, 17)

What is the difference between flash flood basins and large rivers then? (task 16, 17)

And how about estuaries and coasts? (task 16, 17)

When a flood is predicted to become dangerous; what then? (task 16, 17; 6)
(predict flooded area and/or location of breach in defence structures)

And when a breach is likely, what then? (task 8, 17)
(prediction of flooding pattern in time)

Is that possible during a flood? (task 17, 19)
(no, pre-defined runs; results in database)

So, in fact, one uses the same models as are used for designing long-term strategies?
(Yes, in many cases true; but variation lies in timing and scenarios: location of breach varies, not layout of dikes and alternative instruments)

So, the concept of scenarios applies here as well, but in another time-scale?
(Yes, ..)

When it is concluded that a warning should be issued or that evacuation is needed; what then? (task 16, 17?; 11)
(about warning; problem to get the message with the people; prevent a hype; etc)

And when large polder areas, e.g. along the coast, must be evacuated, what then? (task 17, 19)

Could you give some examples of evacuation schemes for some different geographical situations? (task 17, 19)

References and further reading