

Modeling of the socioeconomic consequences of an earthquake at the urban scale and responsibilities

C. Dollet¹, P. Guéguen¹,

¹ ISTerre, Grenoble Alpes University, Savoie Mont-Blanc University, CNRS, IRD, IFSTTAR, France

Email: cyrielle.dollet@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Abstract

In moderate-to-low seismic hazard regions, the estimation of the socio-economic consequences of an earthquake at an urban scale is a costly, difficult but essential task, since the necessary resources become insufficient for seismic evaluation. However, public authorities have the duty to take into account this risk and mitigate it according to their resources. Thus, the positioning of the acceptable level of responsibility in the implementation of the earthquake regulations and the induced economic cost is a key issue. The responsibility of the public persons but also that of insurers in their approach to prevent is at the forefront when natural disasters happen. The modification of the seismic regulation has a direct impact on the level of responsibility. In this study, the impact of prevention's policies implemented is translated in terms of decision variables thanks to the qualitative analysis of the interviews conducted with elected representatives, insurers, technicians, lawyers and first-aid workers. Consequently the decision variables selected are damages to structures, the number of deaths, injuries, homeless people to be managed, the repairing's costs for damaged buildings or their destruction / reconstruction, the impact on economic activity (business interruption) and responsibility. Thus, in this study, by analyzing the existing global earthquake data bases as well as the literature, a loss database listing all the world earthquakes between 1906 and 2018 with a magnitude greater than 4.5 has been updated and prepared showing the social losses (dead, wounded...) and economic losses (direct and indirect costs, number of buildings destroyed or damaged...), in relation with the ground motion footprint provided by USGS Shake-Map. In this talk, we first analyzed the relevancy of information contained in the databases, related to earthquakes and induced losses and we propose an analysis of the database, in terms of loss prediction and consequences.

Keywords

Socioeconomic loss database, loss modelling, earthquake, government and liability.

MEETING FORMAT*

*Select an option (X).

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Regular Poster Presentation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Young Scientist Poster Presentation |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| | Regular Oral Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Oral Presentation |
| | Symposia |
| | Roundtable |

AREAS*

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Natural hazards | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Seismic |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Flooding |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subsidence |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hurricanes |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Landslides |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Volcanic eruption |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Wildfire |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Technological and manmade hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> | Chemical and petrochemical industry |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Nuclear industry |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | New and emergent technologies |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Natech |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Critical infrastructures |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cyber attacks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Terrorism | |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Complex hazard interactions and systemic risks | <input type="checkbox"/> | Climate change and its impact |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Natech |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Epidemics / pandemics |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Critical infrastructures |

TOPICS*

*Select an option (X)

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Learning from experience | <input type="checkbox"/> | Organizations, territories and experience feedback |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Expertise and knowledge management |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Weak signals |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Early warning systems |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Social and human sciences for risk and disaster management | <input type="checkbox"/> | Human, organizational and societal factors |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Risk perception, communication and governance |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Systemic approaches |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Risk and safety culture |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resilience, vulnerability and sustainability: concepts and applications |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | History and learning from major accidents and disasters |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Territorial and geographical approaches to major accidents and disasters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Social and behavioral aspects | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| Cross-disciplinary challenges for integrated disaster risk management | | Compound/cascading disasters (simultaneous and/or co-located) and Mega-disasters |
| | X | Connecting observed data and disaster risk management decision-making |
| | | Practical applications of Integrated Disaster Risk Management |
| | | Development and disasters |
| | | Build Back Better (than Before) |
| | | Disaster-driven innovation and transformation |
| | | STGs and disaster governance |
| Complex systems | | Complexity Modeling |
| | | System of Systems / Distributed Systems |
| | | Critical Infrastructures |
| | | Probabilistic Networks |
| Economics and Insurance | X | Disaster impacts and economic loss estimation |
| | | Cost-benefit approaches |
| | | Insurance and reinsurance |
| Decision, risk and uncertainty | | Decision aiding and decision analysis. |
| | | Disaster risk communication |
| | | Ethics. |
| | | Gender |
| | | Responsibility |
| | | Governance, citizen participation and deliberation |
| | | Community engagement and communication |
| | | Scientific evidence-based decision-making, modelling and analytics |
| | | Policy analysis |
| | | Uncertainty and ambiguity |
| | | Multi-criteria decision aid and analysis |
| | Operational research | |
| Artificial intelligence, big data and text data mining | | Disaster informatics, big data, etc. |
| | | Deep learning |
| | | Neural networks |
| | | Experts systems |
| | | Text data mining |

Engineering Models

| | |
|--|--|
| | Numerical modelling & functional numerical modeling Formal models / formal proofs |
| | Model-based approach |
| | Safe and resilient design and management. |

Legislation, standardization and implementation

| | |
|--|--|
| | Certification and standardization. |
| | Regulation and legislation. |
| | Legal issues (scientific expertise, liability, etc.). |
| | Precautionary principle and risk control and mitigation. |

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Demonstrates current theory or practice |
| | Employs established methods to a new question |
| | Presents new data |
| X | Presents new analysis |
| | Presents a new model |
| | Groundbreaking |
| | Assesses developments in the field, in one or more countries |
| | Other (Please specify) |

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Theoretical |
| X | Applied |
| | Theoretical and Applied |
| | Review |
| | Perspective |
| | Other (Please specify, e.g. success/failure practices, lessons learned, and other implementation evidence) |

Practice of Disaster Education in Mexico

"Cultural Tuning" Based on Comparative Study of Public Educational Curriculum Between Japan and Mexico

Takuya Iwahori¹, Genta Nakano², Katsuya Yamori²

¹ Shonan Fujisawa Campus , Keio University

² Disaster Prevention Research Institute, Kyoto University

Email: ...iwahori@sfc.keio.ac.jp

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to compare curriculum of public education between Japan and Mexico with specific focus on knowledge of seismology. The authors at first review the public compulsory educational curriculum in each country, and secondly, carried out practice of disaster education in a university in Mexico City and analyzed the questioner survey of the class. As the result, the authors found that "plate tectonics" is the key to compare the system of the knowledge constructed in the course of public education in each country.

Keywords

...

MEETING FORMAT*

*Select an option (X).

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Regular Poster Presentation |
| | Young Scientist Poster Presentation |
| | Regular Oral Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Oral Presentation |
| | Symposia |
| | Roundtable |

AREAS*

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Natural hazards | X | Seismic |
| | | Flooding |
| | | Subsidence |
| | | Hurricanes |
| | | Landslides |
| | | Volcanic eruption |
| | | Wildfire |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| Technological and manmade hazards | | Chemical and petrochemical industry |
| | | Nuclear industry |
| | | New and emergent technologies |
| | | Transportation |
| | | Natech |
| | | Critical infrastructures |
| | | Cyber attacks |
| | Terrorism | |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Complex hazard interactions and systemic risks | | Climate change and its impact |
| | | Natech |
| | | Epidemics / pandemics |
| | | Critical infrastructures |

TOPICS*

*Select an option (X)

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Learning from experience | | Organizations, territories and experience feedback |
| | | Expertise and knowledge management |
| | | Weak signals |
| | | Early warning systems |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Social and human sciences for risk and disaster management | | Human, organizational and societal factors |
| | X | Risk perception, communication and governance |
| | | Systemic approaches |
| | | Risk and safety culture |
| | | Resilience, vulnerability and sustainability: concepts and applications |
| | | History and learning from major accidents and disasters |
| | | Territorial and geographical approaches to major accidents and disasters |
| | Social and behavioral aspects | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Cross-disciplinary challenges for integrated disaster risk management | Compound/cascading disasters (simultaneous and/or co-located) and Mega-disasters |
| | Connecting observed data and disaster risk management decision-making |
| | Practical applications of Integrated Disaster Risk Management |
| | Development and disasters |
| | Build Back Better (than Before) |
| | Disaster-driven innovation and transformation |
| | STGs and disaster governance |
| Complex systems | Complexity Modeling |
| | System of Systems / Distributed Systems |
| | Critical Infrastructures |
| | Probabilistic Networks |
| Economics and Insurance | Disaster impacts and economic loss estimation |
| | Cost-benefit approaches |
| | Insurance and reinsurance |
| Decision, risk and uncertainty | Decision aiding and decision analysis. |
| | Disaster risk communication |
| | Ethics. |
| | Gender |
| | Responsibility |
| | Governance, citizen participation and deliberation |
| | Community engagement and communication |
| | Scientific evidence-based decision-making, modelling and analytics |
| | Policy analysis |
| | Uncertainty and ambiguity |
| | Multi-criteria decision aid and analysis |
| Operational research | |
| Artificial intelligence, big data and text data mining | Disaster informatics, big data, etc. |
| | Deep learning |
| | Neural networks |
| | Experts systems |
| | Text data mining |

Engineering Models

| | |
|--|--|
| | Numerical modelling & functional numerical modeling Formal models / formal proofs |
| | Model-based approach |
| | Safe and resilient design and management. |

Legislation, standardization and implementation

| | |
|--|--|
| | Certification and standardization. |
| | Regulation and legislation. |
| | Legal issues (scientific expertise, liability, etc.). |
| | Precautionary principle and risk control and mitigation. |

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Demonstrates current theory or practice |
| | Employs established methods to a new question |
| | Presents new data |
| X | Presents new analysis |
| | Presents a new model |
| | Groundbreaking |
| | Assesses developments in the field, in one or more countries |
| | Other (Please specify) |

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Theoretical |
| | Applied |
| X | Theoretical and Applied |
| | Review |
| | Perspective |
| | Other (Please specify, e.g. success/failure practices, lessons learned, and other implementation evidence) |

IDRIM 2019 paper proposal

This paper proposal is intended for challenge 2 (How to foster individual, organizational and territorial abilities to manage and govern known and emerging risks and resiliencies, AREA 2 (Technological and manmade hazards), Topic 9 (Legislation, standardization and implementation).

Risk management and mandatory regulation: the lessons of SEVESO directives

Claire Auplat – Myriam Merad – Mohammad Habibpourfatideh

Abstract

The paper aims to bring a new brick of knowledge on the dynamics of risk management and corporate governance by looking at the influence of mandatory regulation on risk management.

Our research question is: To what extent does mandatory regulation have an impact on risk mitigation in product manufacturing?

To answer this question, we look at the SEVESO REGULATORY FRAMEWORK, and its impact on the number of accidents in the EU perimeter. The name of the regulation comes from the industrial accident that took place in a chemical manufacturing plant in the Italian town of Seveso in 1976 and prompted the adoption of EU-wide standardized legislation on the prevention and control of such accidents. The first Seveso-Directive (Directive 82/501/EEC) was later amended in view of the lessons learned from accidents such as Bhopal, Toulouse or Enschede resulting into Seveso-II (Directive 96/82/EC). In 2012 Seveso-III (Directive 2012/18/EU) was adopted considering, amongst others, the changes in the Union legislation on the classification of chemicals and increased rights for citizens to access information and justice. The Directive applies to more than 12 000 industrial establishments in the European Union where dangerous substances are used or stored in large quantities. We use the eMars database to study the relationship between the mandatory SEVESO regulation and the characteristics of the industrial accidents taking place on SEVESO sites. eMARS contains reports of chemical accidents and near misses provided to the Major Accident Hazards Bureau (MAHB) of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) from EU, EEA, OECD, and UNECE countries (under the TEIA Convention). Reporting an event into eMARS is compulsory for EU Member States when a Seveso establishment is involved, and the event meets the criteria of a "major" accident" as defined by Annex VI of the Seveso III Directive (2012/18/EU). For the 12 000 registered SEVESO sites, the eMars database contains a total of 961 declarations, corresponding to 462 fatalities and 1395 injuries over forty years.

In our paper, the analysis of the risk management variables accounts for the lags between the occurrence of events and their SEVESO declaration, as well as the overlaps of SEVESO 1, 2 and 3.

The paper may bring a significant contribution to the understanding of the role of mandatory regulation on risk management, and therefore to the field of integrated disaster risk management.

Impact Analysis of Designating Disaster Risk Zones on Land Prices of Tourist Regions

A study across four regions in Japan

Ryuuske Adachi¹, Yasmin Bhattacharya² and Hitoshi Nakamura¹

¹ Department of Architecture and Environment Systems, Shibaura Institute of Technology

² SIT Research Laboratories, Shibaura Institute of Technology

Email: yasmin@shibaura-it.ac.jp

Abstract

The Great East Japan Earthquake and the large scale disasters in the years following it, have affected many tourist regions Japan. Thus recently, disaster preparedness has been of concern not only to tourism-oriented facilities that welcome tourists, but also to those who visit the region as tourists. In order to incentivize long-term disaster mitigation for regions vulnerable to tsunamis and landslides, the national government has enacted policies that permit the voluntary designation of special risk zones in these areas which can entail land-use- and building restrictions and/or special regulations.

Different levels of risk zone classification (yellow, orange, red in order of strictness of the measures implied on the area) can be designated depending on the likely risk of the area in question. However, to date there are only limited number of areas that have been designated as high risk zone (i.e. red) due to fear of it impacting land and property values near where such risk zones may be designated. This concern is especially high in regions where nature-based tourism (coastal and mountainous) is the primary industry of the region as people fear that the inflow of tourists may also decrease if the risk is publicized as part of the designation process.

As such, this work sets out to investigate whether such concerns are valid. We use the hedonic regression approach to consider the whether any impact from risk zone designations have been observed on land prices in the past. We find that while an area's value may be affected by the *presence* of risk, it is not necessarily impacted by the *designation* of the risk zones. This implies that designating risk zones is likely to provide more benefits (in terms of better disaster preparedness in the long run) than any expected losses the residents might presume.

Keywords

Hedonic regression, risk zone designation, tsunami, landslide, tourism

MEETING FORMAT*

*Select an option (X).

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Regular Poster Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Poster Presentation |
| | Regular Oral Presentation |
| | Young Scientist Oral Presentation |
| | Symposia |
| | Roundtable |

AREAS*

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Natural hazards | | Seismic |
| | | Flooding |
| | | Subsidence |
| | X | Hurricanes |
| | X | Landslides |
| | | Volcanic eruption |
| | | Wildfire |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Technological and manmade hazards | | Chemical and petrochemical industry |
| | | Nuclear industry |
| | | New and emergent technologies |
| | | Transportation |
| | | Natech |
| | | Critical infrastructures |
| | | Cyber attacks |
| | | Terrorism |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Complex hazard interactions and systemic risks | | Climate change and its impact |
| | | Natech |
| | | Epidemics / pandemics |
| | | Critical infrastructures |

TOPICS*

*Select an option (X)

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Learning from experience | | Organizations, territories and experience feedback |
| | | Expertise and knowledge management |
| | | Weak signals |
| | | Early warning systems |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Social and human sciences for risk and disaster management | | Human, organizational and societal factors |
| | | Risk perception, communication and governance |
| | | Systemic approaches |
| | | Risk and safety culture |
| | | Resilience, vulnerability and sustainability: concepts and applications |
| | | History and learning from major accidents and disasters |
| | | Territorial and geographical approaches to major accidents and disasters |
| | | Social and behavioral aspects |

Cross-disciplinary challenges for integrated disaster risk management

| | |
|---|--|
| | Compound/cascading disasters (simultaneous and/or co-located) and Mega-disasters |
| X | Connecting observed data and disaster risk management decision-making |
| | Practical applications of Integrated Disaster Risk Management |
| | Development and disasters |
| | Build Back Better (than Before) |
| | Disaster-driven innovation and transformation |
| | STGs and disaster governance |

Complex systems

| | |
|--|---|
| | Complexity Modeling |
| | System of Systems / Distributed Systems |
| | Critical Infrastructures |
| | Probabilistic Networks |

Economics and Insurance

| | |
|--|---|
| | Disaster impacts and economic loss estimation |
| | Cost-benefit approaches |
| | Insurance and reinsurance |

Decision, risk and uncertainty

| | |
|--|--|
| | Decision aiding and decision analysis. |
| | Disaster risk communication |
| | Ethics. |
| | Gender |
| | Responsibility |
| | Governance, citizen participation and deliberation |
| | Community engagement and communication |
| | Scientific evidence-based decision-making, modelling and analytics |
| | Policy analysis |
| | Uncertainty and ambiguity |
| | Multi-criteria decision aid and analysis |
| | Operational research |

Artificial intelligence, big data and text data mining

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Disaster informatics, big data, etc. |
| | Deep learning |
| | Neural networks |
| | Experts systems |
| | Text data mining |

Engineering Models

| | |
|--|--|
| | Numerical modelling & functional numerical modeling Formal models / formal proofs |
| | Model-based approach |
| | Safe and resilient design and management. |

Legislation, standardization and implementation

| | |
|---|--|
| | Certification and standardization. |
| | Regulation and legislation. |
| | Legal issues (scientific expertise, liability, etc.). |
| X | Precautionary principle and risk control and mitigation. |

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Demonstrates current theory or practice |
| X | Employs established methods to a new question |
| | Presents new data |
| X | Presents new analysis |
| | Presents a new model |
| | Groundbreaking |
| | Assesses developments in the field, in one or more countries |
| | Other (Please specify) |

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Theoretical |
| X | Applied |
| | Theoretical and Applied |
| | Review |
| | Perspective |
| | Other (Please specify, e.g. success/failure practices, lessons learned, and other implementation evidence) |

Legal challenges for the effective public participation in flood risk management plans

Author Katažyna Mikša¹, Paulo Pereira²

¹ Assoc. Professor at the Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

² Professor at the Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Email: kbogdzevic@mruni.eu

Abstract

Since the beginning of the 21st century the floods are affecting Europe regularly and a number of extreme weather events will continue to grow in the future. The impact of flooding on human life and health, environment, economy, finally the cultural objects cannot be overestimated. Therefore, the issue of flood protection, prevention and flood risk management is raised both on international and national levels. The good example is the Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks. It is the first international document providing binding legal norms related to flood risk management. It requires the European Union Member States, among others, to prepare the flood risk management plans. The national authorities shall encourage active involvement of the interested parties in the whole process of the preparation and later review of those plans. The participation of the interested parties facilitates policy implementation and improves the quality of measures that are or have to be undertaken. However, the process of involvement is not always effective. One of the reasons of the lack of effectiveness is a weak legislative basis for the implementation of the public involvement. For instance, the law does not require the authorities to consider the conclusions of public consultations or there are no clear deadlines for announcing the documents, that are the subject of these consultations, moreover, the selection of the interested parties could be arbitrary and not including local communities or local businesses etc.

The given study presents the European legal requirements for the public participation in flood risk management and their implementation in Lithuanian and Polish legal systems. The study will contribute to a broader understanding both of the requirements related to public participation in flood risk management as well as the obstacles in their implementation in national legal systems. The results of the study will contribute to mutual learning and future comparative analysis. Moreover, the conclusions of the study could serve for the development of the more effective legal measures for the public involvement in flood risk management.

The study will contribute to the area of Natural Hazards, namely: legal issues of flood risk management.

Keywords

...

MEETING FORMAT*

*Select an option (X).

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Regular Poster Presentation |
| | Young Scientist Poster Presentation |
| X | Regular Oral Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Oral Presentation |
| | Symposia |
| | Roundtable |

AREAS***Natural hazards**

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| | Seismic |
| x | Flooding |
| | Subsidence |
| | Hurricanes |
| | Landslides |
| | Volcanic eruption |
| | Wildfire |

Technological and manmade hazards

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| | Chemical and petrochemical industry |
| | Nuclear industry |
| | New and emergent technologies |
| | Transportation |
| | Natech |
| | Critical infrastructures |
| | Cyber attacks |
| | Terrorism |

Complex hazard interactions and systemic risks

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| | Climate change and its impact |
| | Natech |
| | Epidemics / pandemics |
| | Critical infrastructures |

TOPICS*

*Select an option (X)

Learning from experience

| | |
|--|--|
| | Organizations, territories and experience feedback |
| | Expertise and knowledge management |
| | Weak signals |
| | Early warning systems |

Social and human sciences for risk and disaster management

| | |
|--|--|
| | Human, organizational and societal factors |
| | Risk perception, communication and governance |
| | Systemic approaches |
| | Risk and safety culture |
| | Resilience, vulnerability and sustainability: concepts and applications |
| | History and learning from major accidents and disasters |
| | Territorial and geographical approaches to major accidents and disasters |
| | Social and behavioral aspects |

| | |
|--|--|
| Cross-disciplinary challenges for integrated disaster risk management | Compound/cascading disasters (simultaneous and/or co-located) and Mega-disasters |
| | Connecting observed data and disaster risk management decision-making |
| | Practical applications of Integrated Disaster Risk Management |
| | Development and disasters |
| | Build Back Better (than Before) |
| | Disaster-driven innovation and transformation |
| | STGs and disaster governance |
| Complex systems | Complexity Modeling |
| | System of Systems / Distributed Systems |
| | Critical Infrastructures |
| | Probabilistic Networks |
| Economics and Insurance | Disaster impacts and economic loss estimation |
| | Cost-benefit approaches |
| | Insurance and reinsurance |
| Decision, risk and uncertainty | Decision aiding and decision analysis. |
| | Disaster risk communication |
| | Ethics. |
| | Gender |
| | Responsibility |
| | Governance, citizen participation and deliberation |
| | Community engagement and communication |
| | Scientific evidence-based decision-making, modelling and analytics |
| | Policy analysis |
| | Uncertainty and ambiguity |
| | Multi-criteria decision aid and analysis |
| Operational research | |
| Artificial intelligence, big data and text data mining | Disaster informatics, big data, etc. |
| | Deep learning |
| | Neural networks |
| | Experts systems |
| | Text data mining |

Engineering Models

| | |
|--|--|
| | Numerical modelling & functional numerical modeling Formal models / formal proofs |
| | Model-based approach |
| | Safe and resilient design and management. |

Legislation, standardization and implementation

| | |
|---|--|
| | Certification and standardization. |
| X | Regulation and legislation. |
| X | Legal issues (scientific expertise, liability, etc.). |
| | Precautionary principle and risk control and mitigation. |

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| X | Demonstrates current theory or practice |
| | Employs established methods to a new question |
| | Presents new data |
| X | Presents new analysis |
| | Presents a new model |
| | Groundbreaking |
| X | Assesses developments in the field, in one or more countries |
| | Other (Please specify) |

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Theoretical |
| | Applied |
| | Theoretical and Applied |
| X | Review |
| X | Perspective |
| | Other (Please specify, e.g. success/failure practices, lessons learned, and other implementation evidence) |

Conceptualising the Communicative Behaviour of Citizens towards Natech Risk Information Disclosure in Japan

TZIOUTZIOS Dimitrios¹, CRUZ Ana Maria¹, KIM Jeong-Nam²

¹ Disaster Prevention Research Institute, Kyoto University

² Center for Applied Social Research, University of Oklahoma

Email: dimitrios.tzioutzios.33x@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract

The contribution of effective risk communication towards active community involvement in disaster risk management has been explicitly emphasised by academics and practitioners. Fostering transparency and dissemination of risk information seems to create favourable conditions for participatory risk management, since it encourages trust-building and community engagement. Moreover, disseminating such information empowers all involved stakeholders to make comprehensive and risk-informed decisions. In this vein, assessing the community's actual demand for such information is an important first step in comprehending their willingness to meaningfully engage in risk management processes. This discussion gains specific importance in consideration of large-scale complex disasters, for instance technological accidents triggered by natural hazards (i.e. Natech); sharing critical information related to the associated chemical risks goes a long way in enhancing the local community's disaster preparedness.

This research ventures to understand citizens' communicative behaviour towards Natech risk information disclosure in the Japanese context through the prism of the Situational Theory of Problem Solving (STOPS) (Kim & Grunig, 2011). According to STOPS, an individual's perception of the problematic situation concerning the lack of Natech risk information (Problem Recognition), their perceived connection with it (Involvement Recognition) and the perceived obstacles which limit their ability to take action (Constraint Recognition), consist of the key factors of their Situational Motivation in Problem Solving. Along with any potential subjective knowledge, experiences and expectations (Referent Criteria), Situational Motivation determines the individual's engagement in Communicative Action as a means to seek out and exchange information to resolve this issue. In turn, this communicative behaviour is categorised in three types of actions: Information Acquisition, Information Selection and Information Transmission. Additionally, elements that define organisation-public relationship quality, namely Trust and Control Mutuality, in combination with an assortment of sociocultural factors were examined in this study in an attempt to better comprehend citizens' situational motivation to resolve the chemical risk information deficiency issue.

This study deals with a risk communication issue associated with complex and technological hazards, in particular chemical and Natech risk information disclosure. In order to analyse this emerging topic, a novel framework is presented through employing established methods from the Public Relations field. The research contributions in this regard are both theoretical and applied; the study introduces a new perspective concerning risk communication and community engagement in disaster risk management processes, while the survey findings highlight citizens' perceptions towards Natech risk information disclosure in Japan and the influence of key sociocultural factors on their communicative behaviour.

Keywords

Risk communication, Natech risk information, Situational Theory of Problem Solving (STOPS)

MEETING FORMAT*

*Select an option (X).

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Regular Poster Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Poster Presentation |
| | Regular Oral Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Oral Presentation |
| | Symposia |
| | Roundtable |

AREAS*

| | | |
|------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Natural hazards | | Seismic |
| | | Flooding |
| | | Subsidence |
| | | Hurricanes |
| | | Landslides |
| | | Volcanic eruption |
| | | Wildfire |

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| Technological and manmade hazards | X | Chemical and petrochemical industry |
| | | Nuclear industry |
| | | New and emergent technologies |
| | | Transportation |
| | X | Natech |
| | | Critical infrastructures |
| | | Cyber attacks |
| | | Terrorism |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Complex hazard interactions and systemic risks | | Climate change and its impact |
| | X | Natech |
| | | Epidemics / pandemics |
| | | Critical infrastructures |

TOPICS*

*Select an option (X)

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Learning from experience | | Organizations, territories and experience feedback |
| | | Expertise and knowledge management |
| | | Weak signals |
| | | Early warning systems |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Social and human sciences for risk and disaster management | | Human, organizational and societal factors |
| | X | Risk perception, communication and governance |
| | | Systemic approaches |
| | | Risk and safety culture |
| | | Resilience, vulnerability and sustainability: concepts and applications |
| | | History and learning from major accidents and disasters |
| | | Territorial and geographical approaches to major accidents and disasters |
| | X | Social and behavioral aspects |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Cross-disciplinary challenges for integrated disaster risk management | | Compound/cascading disasters (simultaneous and/or co-located) and Mega-disasters |
| | | Connecting observed data and disaster risk management decision-making |
| | | Practical applications of Integrated Disaster Risk Management |
| | | Development and disasters |
| | | Build Back Better (than Before) |
| | | Disaster-driven innovation and transformation |
| | | STGs and disaster governance |
| Complex systems | | Complexity Modeling |
| | | System of Systems / Distributed Systems |
| | | Critical Infrastructures |
| | | Probabilistic Networks |
| Economics and Insurance | | Disaster impacts and economic loss estimation |
| | | Cost-benefit approaches |
| | | Insurance and reinsurance |
| Decision, risk and uncertainty | | Decision aiding and decision analysis. |
| | | Disaster risk communication |
| | | Ethics. |
| | | Gender |
| | | Responsibility |
| | X | Governance, citizen participation and deliberation |
| | X | Community engagement and communication |
| | | Scientific evidence-based decision-making, modelling and analytics |
| | | Policy analysis |
| | | Uncertainty and ambiguity |
| | Multi-criteria decision aid and analysis | |
| | Operational research | |
| Artificial intelligence, big data and text data mining | | Disaster informatics, big data, etc. |
| | | Deep learning |
| | | Neural networks |
| | | Experts systems |
| | | Text data mining |

Engineering Models

| | |
|--|--|
| | Numerical modelling & functional numerical modeling Formal models / formal proofs |
| | Model-based approach |
| | Safe and resilient design and management. |

Legislation, standardization and implementation

| | |
|--|--|
| | Certification and standardization. |
| | Regulation and legislation. |
| | Legal issues (scientific expertise, liability, etc.). |
| | Precautionary principle and risk control and mitigation. |

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Demonstrates current theory or practice |
| X | Employs established methods to a new question |
| | Presents new data |
| X | Presents new analysis |
| | Presents a new model |
| X | Groundbreaking |
| | Assesses developments in the field, in one or more countries |
| | Other (Please specify) |

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Theoretical |
| | Applied |
| X | Theoretical and Applied |
| | Review |
| X | Perspective |
| | Other (Please specify, e.g. success/failure practices, lessons learned, and other implementation evidence) |

Decision-making in ERM (enterprise risk management) and risk analysis methods

Risk management is the set of procedures and mechanisms for identifying, evaluating, prioritizing and explaining, mitigating risks (Magne & Vasseur, 2006). These approaches are used to prioritize risks and make decision according to strategic objectives but also according to preferences of decision-makers.

Decision-making has become more a mathematical science (Figuera et al., 2005), with the emergence of more efficient methods and softwares, rather than operational research methods thanks to the technological revolution.

We are interested in risk analysis methods and decision-making process, to understand the impact of risk analysis results on decision maker ?

The Manager makes always taking into account methods and processes mobilized in the ante-decision phase. The decision maker is a human actor who is influenced by a range of indicators such as : previous experience, education, emotions, personal preferences, public pressure, advices of experts and analysts, or probabilistic and risk analysis results without projecting them to reality.

The qualitative research methodology based on grounded theory (Strauss & Glaser, 1967) has been implemented. This method allows us to develop new knowledge, based on expertise data collected from academic or professional experts in risk management, particularly in the decision-making phase.

A software of textual analyzes (Iramuteq) to treat the interviews of the experts and to find correlations between concepts, has been used to analyze them and to explain the obtained results.

As results, our study enables to :

- Identify of the 5 clusters of concepts mobilized during decision-making ;
- Importance order according to their importance in the decision-making phase.

The analysis of graphical results highlights the trends and can explain the interest of the professional and personal factors in the decision making.

Every decision making in enterprise risk management (ERM) is based on analysis of risks, hypothesis, quality and relevance of data and expertise. Methods of risk analysis and decision-making remain tools to support decisions and, their results are influenced by the availability and scarcity of data. Natural Language Processing can help in modeling and simplification of expertise data.

References :

1. Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1965). *Awareness of Dying*. Chicago : Aldine.

2. Magne L. et Vasseur D. (dir.), 2006, Risques industriels. Complexité, incertitude et décision : une approche interdisciplinaire, Cachan (France), Lavoisier.
3. Figuera J., Greco S., Ehrgott M. (Eds), 2005. Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis, State of the Art Surveys, New York: Springer

Optimal parameter estimation in a landslide motion model using the adjoint method

Mohit Mishra¹, Gildas Besançon^{1,2}, Guillaume Chambon³, Laurent Baillet⁴

¹ Univ. Grenoble Alpes, GIPSA-Lab, Grenoble, France

² Institut Universitaire de France, France

³ Univ. Grenoble Alpes, IRSTEA, UR ETGR, Grenoble, France

⁴ Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, ISTERre, Grenoble, France

Email: mohit.mishra@gipsa-lab.grenoble-inp.fr

Submitted for oral presentation to IDRIM 2019, Nice, France, as part of the special session organized by the cross-disciplinary projet RISK@Univ. Grenoble Alpes (funded by IDEX Univ. Grenoble Alpes)

Abstract

This work proposes an optimal approach for parameter estimation in a landslide motion, based on the so-called adjoint method. The system is described by an extended sliding-consolidation model made of an ordinary differential equation and 1D hyperbolic partial differential equation representing landslide motion and pore pressure evolution respectively. The main feature of this model is pore pressure feedback which regulates landslide motion, and leads to coupling between both differential equations. Parameters to be estimated include the mechanical strength and dilatancy angle of the material. The objective functional for the optimal estimation is composed of: i) a cost function defined as the least square error between measurements and related simulated values, and ii) a product of Lagrange variables and system dynamics. A variational approach is applied in order to get the gradients with respect to parameters to be estimated and adjoint model. The cost functional is optimized by means of steepest descent method to estimate parameters. Finally, the presented optimal estimation method is validated on a simulated synthetic test case and a preliminary application on real field data from the literature is demonstrated.

Keywords

Landslide motion, Dynamical model, Parameter estimation, Variational approach, Adjoint method.

MEETING FORMAT*

*Select an option (X).

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Regular Poster Presentation |
| | Young Scientist Poster Presentation |
| | Regular Oral Presentation |
| X | Young Scientist Oral Presentation |
| | Symposia |
| | Roundtable |

AREAS*

Natural hazards

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| | Seismic |
| | Flooding |
| | Subsidence |
| | Hurricanes |
| X | Landslides |
| | Volcanic eruption |
| | Wildfire |

Technological and manmade hazards

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| | Chemical and petrochemical industry |
| | Nuclear industry |
| | New and emergent technologies |
| | Transportation |
| | Natech |
| | Critical infrastructures |
| | Cyber attacks |
| | Terrorism |

Complex hazard interactions and systemic risks

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| | Climate change and its impact |
| | Natech |
| | Epidemics / pandemics |
| | Critical infrastructures |

TOPICS*

*Select an option (X)

Learning from experience

| | |
|--|--|
| | Organizations, territories and experience feedback |
| | Expertise and knowledge management |
| | Weak signals |
| | Early warning systems |

Social and human sciences for risk and disaster management

| | |
|--|--|
| | Human, organizational and societal factors |
| | Risk perception, communication and governance |
| | Systemic approaches |
| | Risk and safety culture |
| | Resilience, vulnerability and sustainability: concepts and applications |
| | History and learning from major accidents and disasters |
| | Territorial and geographical approaches to major accidents and disasters |
| | Social and behavioral aspects |

Cross-disciplinary challenges for integrated disaster risk management

| | |
|---|--|
| | Compound/cascading disasters (simultaneous and/or co-located) and Mega-disasters |
| X | Connecting observed data and disaster risk management decision-making |
| | Practical applications of Integrated Disaster Risk Management |
| | Development and disasters |
| | Build Back Better (than Before) |
| | Disaster-driven innovation and transformation |
| | STGs and disaster governance |

Complex systems

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Complexity Modeling |
| | System of Systems / Distributed Systems |
| | Critical Infrastructures |
| | Probabilistic Networks |

Economics and Insurance

| | |
|--|---|
| | Disaster impacts and economic loss estimation |
| | Cost-benefit approaches |
| | Insurance and reinsurance |

Decision, risk and uncertainty

| | |
|--|--|
| | Decision aiding and decision analysis. |
| | Disaster risk communication |
| | Ethics. |
| | Gender |
| | Responsibility |
| | Governance, citizen participation and deliberation |
| | Community engagement and communication |
| | Scientific evidence-based decision-making, modelling and analytics |
| | Policy analysis |
| | Uncertainty and ambiguity |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Multi-criteria decision aid and analysis |
| | Operational research |

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Artificial intelligence, big data and text data mining | Disaster informatics, big data, etc. |
| | Deep learning |
| | Neural networks |
| | Experts systems |
| | Text data mining |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Engineering Models | Numerical modelling & functional numerical modeling |
| | Formal models / formal proofs |
| | X Model-based approach |
| | Safe and resilient design and management. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Legislation, standardization and implementation | Certification and standardization. |
| | Regulation and legislation. |
| | Legal issues (scientific expertise, liability, etc.). |
| | Precautionary principle and risk control and mitigation. |

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| X | Demonstrates current theory or practice |
| X | Employs established methods to a new question |
| | Presents new data |
| X | Presents new analysis |
| | Presents a new model |
| | Groundbreaking |
| | Assesses developments in the field, in one or more countries |
| | Other (Please specify) |

EXPECTED CONTRIBUTIONS*

*Select an option (X)

| | |
|---|--|
| | Theoretical |
| | Applied |
| X | Theoretical and Applied |
| | Review |
| | Perspective |
| | Other (Please specify, e.g. success/failure practices, lessons learned, and other implementation evidence) |

