



RISK GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNICATION

An inclusive approach

Diana Dus, Chelsee Lisbon
Juan Pablo Valencia, Lingzhi Zhang

INDEX

1. The demand
2. The response
3. Hybrid Strategic Scenario
4. Recommendations

1. The Demand

THE DEMAND

- Research on risk communication
- Gather experiences in other sectors
- Design a methodology for risk communication

2. The Response

THE RESPONSE

- Definition
- Tools
- Best practices

3. Hybrid Strategic Scenario

What is Futures literacy?

“Futures literacy is the capacity to question the assumptions used to make decisions today and to systematically explore the possibilities of the world around us through a mastery of rigorous imagining techniques (Riel Miller, 2006).”

HYBRID STRATEGIC SCENARIO

1. Values and expectations towards RC
2. Variables, form and function of RC.
3. Identification of strategic policy choices.

3.1 LEVEL ONE

VALUES AND EXPECTATIONS

- Inform
- Educate
- Involve
- Mitigate/reduce risk
- Achieve policy choice
- International credibility
- Build trust
- Public health
- Economy
- Sovereignty
- Technology
- Environment
- Social stability

3.2 LEVEL TWO

DEFINITION

Risk communication is any purposeful exchange of information about risk”

(OECD, 1997)

VARIABLES

1. Decision
2. Inclusion
3. Channel
4. Message
5. Functionality

1. DECISION

“The process of deciding to act or not”

Resources

Time

2. INCLUSION

“ To consider various worldviews as part of the policy-making process”

Number of actors

Diversity of views

3. CHANNEL

“the specific, prescribed, or official course or means of communication”

Automaticity

Directness

4. MESSAGE

“Communication containing some information, news, advice or request”

Clarity

Expertise

5. FUNCTIONALITY

“being of use or service; serving some purpose; advantageous, helpful, or good effect and producing material results”

Trust

Perceived benefit

FUNCTION AND FORM

- Function

- Inform, educate, involve, build trust

PARTICIPATION

- Form

- Organization

HIERARCHY

SCENARIOS

	HIERARCHICAL	NON HIERARCHICAL
LESS PARTICIPATORY	1	2
MORE PARTICIPATORY	3	4

SCENARIO 1

Hierarchical/Less participatory

- Strong capacity of implementation
- Public participation is not a must
- Target: experts and politicians
- Research sustains regulation
- Unitary, centralist countries
- Printed materials, websites, press releases, radio/tv interviews

SCENARIO 2

Non hierarchical/Less participatory

- Weak capacity of implementation
- Local governments in charge
- Focus: to follow international rules
- Target: local governments and NGOs
- Society uses NGOs to gain attention
- Decentralized
- Developing countries with different priorities
- Printed materials, websites, newspaper, press releases, radio/tv interviews.

SCENARIO 3

Hierarchical/More participatory

- Strong capacity of implementation
- Risk emerges due to a public demand
- Focus: Wide spectrum of stakeholders
- Strong national governments with cultural and political diversity
- Open houses, radio/tv, phone in, dialogues, third party networks, information hotline, sponsor telephone and internet surveys.

SCENARIO 4

Non hierarchical/more participatory

- Weak capacity of implementation
- Local policies are effective
- Focus: optimize public participation
- Target: local communities
- Governments rely on international data
- Federal, decentralized countries fit here
- Open houses and meetings with local leaders.

3.3 LEVEL THREE

SCENARIO 1

Hierarchical/Less participatory

- Strengths
 - Production of scientific knowledge
 - Strong capacity of implementation
 - Faster responses
- Weaknesses
 - Knowledge is less accessible and exclusionary
- Values
 - Economy, sovereignty, technology

SCENARIO 2

Non hierarchical/Less participatory

- Strengths
 - Legitimate policies due to international standards
 - Broader sense of world-views
- Weaknesses
 - Hard to implement due to internal circumstances
 - Lack of resources
 - Programs will be ad-hoc or less formal
- Values
 - Public Health, economy, technology, social stability

SCENARIO 3

Hierarchical/More participatory

- Strengths
 - Management is inclusive (experts and lay people)
 - High awareness of worldviews
- Weaknesses
 - Possibilities for the risk to be politicized
- Values
 - Public health, environment, technology and social stability

SCENARIO 4

Non hierarchical/more participatory

- Strengths
 - High awareness of risk factors
 - Non expensive since they do not do research
 - Plans are specific to their needs
- Weaknesses
 - Possibilities for the risk to be politicized
 - If local governments or interest groups lack interest, some sectors will be less informed than others
- Values
 - Economy, sovereignty and social stability

Example: scenario 2

Non hierarchical/ Less participatory

- Developing countries
- Lack of resources, weak capacity of implementation, depending on outside sources, **OTHER PRIORITIES**
- NGOs, third parties, independent consultants, outside sources.

4. Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

- More time tracking emerging risk issues
- Avoid “one size fits all” policies
- Evaluation according to values and expectations
- Constant assessment
- RC as a tool for accountability
- Flexible policies
- Information must be clear, avoid ambiguity

Thank you
