

Risk governance evaluation



Urbano Fra Paleo

University of Santiago de Compostela

The concept of risk governance

- Double failure
 - Failure to avoid risk exposure
 - Pushed to strengthen
 - response (+recovery and reconstruction)
 - mitigation and adaptation strategies
 - Failure in policy implementation
 - Gap between scientific+indigenous knowledge and policy design
 - Gap between policy design and policy implementation

The concept of risk governance

- Double failure
 - Failure to implement policies
 - Failure to avoid risk exposure

The concept of risk governance

- Higher complexity
 - Environmental processes
 - Human processes
 - Complexity of interactions among agents
 - Complexity of decision-making processes
 - Interactions between human-natural systems
 - Increasing uncertainty

The concept of risk governance

- Multiactor
 - Not only administrations (but also businesses and social actors)
 - They have the *potestas* but have to regain the *auctoritas*
- Multilevel
 - Not only national government but
 - Global
 - Macro-regional
 - National
 - Micro-regional
 - Local
- Multisector
 - Not only development but all the sectors
 - Needless to say: environment

The concept of risk governance

- Need of a comprehensive framework to address complexity
 - Beyond risk management
 - To incorporate policy goals of risk avoidance, retreat, mitigation, adaptation
- Need to measure/evaluate performance of policies that have to do with risk

Evaluation of risk governance

Goals

- Measure performance and quality of the governance system
 - Quality of components, processes and relations
- Level of policy development and implementation success
- Identify weaknesses
 - Adopt/adapt policies
- Repeated evaluation
 - Monitoring reform

A tool for evaluation

Evaluation principles

- Collaborative evaluation
 - Consensus-based (agreement needed)
 - Open loop (when it repeatedly reaches the participant, evaluation is in a different phase)
 - Ensure checks
 - Avoid close loops and stagnation
- Qualitative evaluation
 - Not a quantitative measure
 - Helps to identify strengths
 - Helps to identify weaknesses
- Participatory/expert-based
- Distance/physical

Panel of participants and roles

- Coordinator
 - Planning/implementation of process
 - Oversees process
 - Elaborates reports
- Evaluators
 - Perform seed evaluation
 - Contribute with expert knowledge
- Facilitators
 - Help to reach a consensus among experts
- Social actors
 - Review expert evaluation
 - Contribute with indigenous knowledge and practitioner expertise

Structure of evaluation

- Dimensions [policy blocks]
 - Components [operational blocks]
 - Criteria [measurable conditions]
- Baseline criteria based on HFA
- Criteria supported by descriptors
 - Primary descriptors. Describe the *sine qua non/essential* conditions]
 - Secondary descriptors. Describe the *adjunct* conditions
 - Fine adjustment to differentiate among close states

Phases of evaluation

- Expert evaluation
- Consensus proposal
- Consensus review
- Expert consensus
- **Public participation**
- Draft report
- Report review
- Evaluation review

Levels of development

1. None of the constituents of the descriptor are met or the level of development is very low
2. Some of the constituents of the descriptor are met or the level of development is low
3. About half of the constituents of the descriptor are met or the level of development is intermediate
4. Most of the constituents of the descriptor are met or the level of development is high
5. All of the constituents of the descriptor are met or the level of development is very high

[Process information](#)[Evaluation process](#)[Save](#)

Process information

Process number

Start date



Completion date



Geographical area

Type of consensus

Virtual ▾

Public participation

Commissioner

Administration

Contact person

Email

Phone

Participation request

In order to access the tool and participate in this evaluation process you should fill in this form. A communication will be sent to the evaluation coordinator and this person will be notified that you wish to participate in the process.

It is advisable that you explain in detail your interest in the participation process and the value of your potential contribution in order to make a sound decision about your entitlement.

If you are admitted to the process, you will be able to contribute and comment on the criteria used in the evaluation. An email will be sent within days with access information.

If you are rejected it implies that the coordinator does not consider you represent a key actor or your organization is already represented. Anyhow, your request will be public and other participants will be aware of this status.

Personal data

First name*	<input type="text"/>	Last name*	<input type="text"/>
Work phone*	<input type="text"/>	Personal phone*	<input type="text"/>
Email*	<input type="text"/>	Address*	<input type="text"/>
City*	<input type="text"/>	Zip Code*	<input type="text"/>
State/Province*	<input type="text"/>	Country*	Please select ▾

Affiliation

Organization*	<input type="text"/>	Position*	<input type="text"/>
Department*	<input type="text"/>		









Geographical area Please select ▾





Motives of interest

Contribution value

Completed evaluation processes

Search:

Data 	Geographical area 	Start date 	Completion date 	Phase	Process 
	Santiago	2009-01-01	2010-05-01		

  1 / 1   10 ▾

Thank you

urbano.fra@usc.es