

# Common template for risk assessment and management operational tools and best practices identification (Action B1)

## Document classification

<b>Title</b>	<b>Case Study Slovenia FRISK Assistance</b>
<b>Description (one sentence)</b>	Presenting a case study on good practice of cooperation , connect-collect-exchange for crisis support
<b>Country</b>	<b>Slovenia, Germany</b>
<b>Date</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Partner</b>	<b>FVA BaWü, EFI, Slovenia Forest Sector</b>
<b>Document type</b>	<b>Case study repor, Fact Finding mission report for JRC</b>
<b>other</b>	<b>n.a.</b>
<b>Source/origin</b>	<b>Library of Options / good Practice</b>

## Topic

<b>Area</b>	Risk assessment	
<b>Risk</b>	Wildfires	<b>Risk assessment and planning</b>
	Storms	Storm damage management
	Avalanches	2T
	Floods	2T
<b>Level</b>	EU	
<b>Phase in the DRM cycle</b>	Response	
<b>Domain of DRM</b>	Disaster response	

## Description and analysis

<p><b>Quick presentation of the Good Practice</b> <i>[Objective : summarize in a few lines the key elements of the good practice]</i></p> <p><i>Snow and Ice break of magnitude in Slovenia, situation overwhelmed local forst authorities. FRISK Secretariat did send C Hartebrodt of FVA / PUMA network to Slovenia on a reconnaissance mission, damage evaluation. Following that mission, a delegation from Slovenia, fundend through EoE programme, couldd visit Baden Württemberg for a knowledge exchange visit.</i></p>
<p><b>Place in national/regional policy</b></p> <p><i>Bilateral, two countries and EFI involved. Later also a damage assemenet for JRC</i></p>
<p><b>Goals and achievements</b></p> <p>Goal was to support Slovenian decision makers in managing the response activities after the ice sleet / snow break. Baden Württemberg could provide the experiences from two major storm events, and the management of crisis response as well as lessons learned.</p>
<p><b>Stakeholders involved</b></p> <p><i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i></p>

Basically the whole forestry sector of Slovenia was represented, from university to forest administration, owner associations, ministry, etc

**Implementation stage**

*closed*

**Context and Issues** [Objective : good knowledge of the context in which the good practice is implemented]

Context was similar damage, similar feeling of “this is too big for me”. Baden Württemberg could share what their experiences were and what lessons were made. This gave a lot of advise and re-assurance to Slovenian participants, created a feeling of trust and “shared problems”. It also produced a good permanenetn contact between FVA and Slovenia.

**Regulatory Context**

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

None, all actors acted as “tourists”, no official strings attached, very flexible

**Socio-economic context**

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

**Technical context (state of technical knowledge)**

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

**Detailed Characteristics** [Objective : detail the conditions of the implementation of the good practice]

**Description of the implementation**

Exchange of Expert tool was used to cover costs for travel, FRISk did support costs for damage assessment mission initially and after that it was just a exchange of people and their knowledge, lessons and mistakes.

**History of establishment**

*It happened sponatneous*

**Priorities identified for a good implementation of the good practice**

- Coordination
- Willing network of experts
- Logistical Support / Finance

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

**Governance (responsible authority)** EFI, FVA, EU EoE, Slovenian Government. But the actual exchange was done quite informal

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

Problems / solutions incurred

none

**Lessons learnt** [Objective : compare the results obtained to the objectives set at the establishing of the good practice and learn from experience]

*The big lesson was that it needs a combination of Coordination, network and budget to make things happen. The motivation of people is high, the willingness to share is there, but it needs someone to drive the process and to cover costs. As these costs come “by surprise” to any budget, it is very important to have flexible budget for operational tools and travel*

Evaluation process (if exists) (internal or external)

An informal review is generally discussed between officers.

*[free text – 5 lines max]*

Assessment of results (quantitative and qualitative) <i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>
NA <i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>

<b>Impact of the good practice</b> <i>[Objective : evaluate the impact of the good practice. Examples: on decision processes, on national policies, on relationship with stakeholders, on the local population, etc]</i>
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i> It did show that the FRISK model of connect-collect-exchnage is working and it sevrd as a model case for exchnages and assistance. It was copied again for other missions during the FRISK GO project

<b>Durability and transferability</b> <i>[Objective : evaluate the integration of the good practice and its sustainability, give recommendations for the transfer]</i>			
<b>Is this information:</b>	<b>Replicable</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Measurable</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Notably successful</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>			
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>			
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>			
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>			
<i>[free text – 5 lines max]</i>			

<b>Additional elements, if any</b>	
Documents joined	<i>[name of the file]</i>
Web links	<a href="http://www.friskgo.org/media-center/case-study-package.html">http://www.friskgo.org/media-center/case-study-package.html</a>
Contact facts	

]