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

Title: Operational Tools and Best Practices for Risk Assessment and Management

The identification of tools and best practices on risk assessment and management helps providing an idea of the state of the art in the field. By completing this form, the best practice will be included in the knowledge repository platforms and available for the practioner community to use. We encourage the user to complete as many fields as possible from the template in order to provide the most relevant information needed to apply the best practice to other practitioners. Instructions:

- **Blue boxes are mandatory fields**
- **More than one item can be selected in multiple choice boxes**

Document classification

Title	**Journal Club Programme**
Description *[1 sentence]*	**Creation of free and open debate spaces for stakeholders and local communities on fire risk prevention and awareness**
Country, location	**Spain**
Date	**Since 2009**
Contact e-mail	**info@paucostafoundation.org**
Institution	**Pau Costa Foundation**
Net Risk Work Partner	**PCF**
Document type	**Best practice**
Language	☒Catalan ☐English ☐French ☐German ☐Italian ☒Spanish ☐Other
Source/origin	☒Partner's expertise ☐Expertise from the network ☐Other (internet)

Topic

Area	☒Risk assessment		□Risk Planning	□Risk Management
Risk	☒**Wildfires**	☒Fire behaviour patterns and typologies □Fire ignition and spread models ☒Wildland urban interface		☒Fuel management ☒Fire service needs ☒Prescribed burning □Other *Societal communication*
	□**Storms**	□First measures after storm □Work safety during salvage logging □Timber storage and cost containment □Forest protection and pest control		□Regeneration and afforestation □Preventive sylvicultural measures □Other [*Introduce which ones*]
	□**Avalanches**	□Technical protective measures □Maintenance of protection forests		□Other [*Introduce which ones*]
	□**Floods**	□Prevention through land use management □Technical protective measures		□Other [*Introduce which ones*]
	□**Other**			[*Introduce which ones*]
Cross-sectoral topics	☒Risk and vulnerability assessment and mitigation		☒ Risk planning, governance and policy framework	

net risk work

	☐ Cost-effectiveness assessment ☒ Civil protection, emergency and post-disaster management	☒ Community involvement and risk communication ☐Other: [Introduce which ones]
Level	☒Local ☒Regional ☐National	☐Cross-border ☐EU ☐Global
DRM cycle phase	☒Prevention ☒Preparedness	☒Response ☒Recovery
DRM domain	☐Policy making ☐Early warning system	☒Disaster response
Sendai priorities	☒Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk ☒Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk ☒Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience ☒Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to "Build Back Better" in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction	
Contribution to Sendai Targets	☐Reduce global disaster mortality ☒Reduce the number of affected people ☐Reduce the direct disaster economic loss ☒Reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure ☒Increase the number of national and local disaster risk reduction strategies ☐Enhance international cooperation to developing countries ☐Increase availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster risk information and assessment	

Description and analysis

Summary: quick presentation of the Good Practice *[Objective: summarize in a few lines the key elements of the good practice]*
Place in national/regional policy *[Mentioned in the law/regulation/guidelines? Mandatory? Recommended?]* • Review and recommendations for the regional fire prevention policy
Goals and achievements *[Objectives, goals and the achievements of the Good Practice]* • To gather stakeholders • To disseminate challenges of fire resilient landscapes among policy makers and land managers • To foster fire risk awareness among population and land owners • To engage local population
Actors involved *[Explain who is involved in the development: practitioners, stakeholders, educators, …]* • Land owners • Wui residents • Land managers • Fire managers • Fire emergency response system • Policy makers
Implementation stage *[Is it operational? Since how long? Is it a pilot experiment?]* • Fully implemented, after remarkable fire event.
State of technical knowledge *[state of the art and technical background of the Best Practice]* • The Journal Clubs are organized by professional staff, experts on the field of forest fires. • Each Journal Club has a topic related to a local/regional remarkable event (wildfire event, forest management issue, etc.). • Guest experts on the topic of the Journal Club are invited to actively present their knowledge on the topic to foster discussion.
Context *[regulatory, socio-economic, political]* • Non-adapted fire prevention policies to fire behaviour context and WUI areas

net risk work

- Basic dissemination actions about fire risk awareness
- Lack of intersectoral discussion spaces among policy makers and technicians

[free text – 5 lines max]

Detailed Characteristics [*Objective: detail the implementation conditions of the Good Practice*]

Description of the implementation steps *[different stages in the implementation process, duration]*
- To hold on field "post-fire" meetings inviting local and regional stakeholders on fire risk management
- Free access and open debate among stakeholders
- To foster participation of local population

Governance *[responsible authority and roles of the different actors involved]*
- There's no responsible authority

Necessary means to implement the Good Practice in efficient conditions *[human resources, materials, financial...]*
- The meeting is led by an entity that is impartial and with capacity to gather the different actors on the field.

Challenges encountered during implementation and solutions incurred
- Practitioners (e.g. firefighters) may have difficulties for attending during the fire season, therefore it is not recommended to organize during this time.
- Land owners and local population need to be informed about the event, and the importance of their participation in the Journal Club shall be highlighted for them to attend.

Priorities identified for successful implementation of the Good Practice
- To engage local stakeholders:
  o Land managers
  o Land owners
  o To engage local councillors and mayors
- To foster the participation of local population
- Regional and national exerts on a topic are invited to actively participate in the meeting
- Meetings conducted by impartial entity and with a baseline knowledge on wildfires

Impact of the Good Practice [*Objective: evaluate the impact of the Good Practice*].

[Added value on decision processes, on national policies or regulations, on relationship with stakeholders, etc.]
- Meetings were created to give answers to land owners and local land managers from the emergency managers point-of-view about a recent fire event.
- These meetings provide and discuss lessons learnt and needs from emergency managers
- These meetings allow identification of land management challenges.
- Feedbacks, lessons learnt arose and challenges identified, have been translated and adapted into technical recommendations for EU projects (Fireefficient, eFirecom, Wuiwatch).
- The outcomes of the meeting are then published online, so that the whole community can benefit from the in-situ discussion and the knowledge gathered during that day.

Future developments [*Objective: understand the follow-up perspectives*]

[Continuation, future improvements,]
- The Journal Club Programme will continue to be implemented at a local and regional scale.
- The topics of the meetings will continue being related to past and recent wildfire events.
- The topics of the meetings can involve topics that effect wildfire (forest management, climate change, societal perception, WUI material construction optimisation…)

External resources *[Objective: provide further information]*	
Attached materials	*[include format (document, photo, video...) and name of the file]*
Web links	http://www.paucostafoundation.org/ing/single_projectes.php?id=14&categoria=Divulgacio
Contacts	

[Additional information - optional]

Lessons learnt *[Objective: compare the results obtained to the objectives set at the start of the Good Practice]*
Evaluation process, if exists (internal or external) *[free text – 5 lines max]*
Assessment of results (quantitative and qualitative) and comparison with main goals • Average of 50 attendees per meeting. • Capitalization of lessons learnt, challenges and feedbacks from all stakeholders. • To have created a free and open debate space for all stakeholders and population.
Negative aspects identified *[free text – 5 lines max]*
Unexpected consequences (short / mid / long term) and corrective measures implemented • Lack of active engagement of WUI residents in urban areas

Durability and transferability *[Objective: evaluate the integration of the Good Practice and its sustainability, give recommendations for transferability]*			
Is this information:	**Replicable ☒**	**Measurable ☒**	
Regulatory Framework *[free text – 5 lines max]*			
Stability of the human environment *[Stability of partnership, structures, population enabling successful implementation and positive impact in the long term]* • Participation and engagement is opened.			
Financial requirements *[business model]* • A financial model is not required, other than the financial structure of the organizing entity, to sustain de development of the programme. • Guest experts may require the payment of a fee or covering the transport, but this has not included in any financial model.			
Success factors *[political, technical, human, financial...]* • Outcomes of the discussion reach the identified actors of the meeting (stakeholders, land owners, local population. • Organising entity has the technical, human and financial resources to organize and prepare all the meeting.			
Risk factors *[legal, financial, safety...]*			

• To become a discussion of constraints and claims to policy makers and technicians from land owners and residents.

Additional and non-formal experiences contributing to the implementation of Good Practice
[free text – 5 lines max]