













Conclusions

The conventional risk prevention and management approach based on the protection of people has gradually been integrated into the broader framework of territorial resilience. Economic globalization and its increasing impact on the daily life of society, calls for a risk analysis based on the evaluation of the economic consequences of damaging events and the analysis of the relevance of suggested risk-mitigating solutions. It has been acknowledged that relevance should not be confined to the technical level but instead embrace the economic and social dimensions.

Several approaches and tools for economic analysis have been developed, both by national and international donors, to justify the granting or refusal of funds for the development of risk-mitigating solutions. The understanding of relevance criteria for possible solutions is especially important for the local communities. They should not only be defined by general risk acceptability considerations but be framed into an integrated "territorial and risk planning" scenario. Risk management is first and foremost a matter of territorial planning and communication. The definition of protection levels should be framed into a global action aimed at constraint management and reduction, taking account of the actors involved, of possible use conflicts, decision-makers' responsibility, budget needs and territorial development plans.

Experience has shown that no long-term development goals can be set without the required investments for risk prevention and management. Nonetheless, it is equally clear that no effective natural risk policy can be implemented without a territorial plan, nor without strong sustainable development policies.

With the shrinking of public budgets and land availability and the lack of resources, emphasis is now being laid on the management of constraints. It is therefore desirable to offer the decision-makers and politicians scientific and economic tools to analyse risks and enable them to set priorities, negotiate them and make the appropriate decisions in a responsible and transparent way.

The international workshop that took place on May 11, 2011 in Aosta showed that the existing tools and risk management initiatives, especially territorial ones, should be:

- scientific and technical: improve knowledge, tools, procedures ...;
- political: implement rules and regulations ...;
- integrated and systemic: identify interactions and dynamic relations relevant to territorial and society developments: identify thresholds of irreversibility;
- shared: implement a new governance, develop information and education...partnership with all the actors, including economic ones;
- prioritized: set the priorities (you cannot do everything at once!), make choices, negotiate, define and implement planned approaches;
- balanced: strike a balance between development and protection, between economic growth, people and the environment (sustainable development);
- functional and pragmatic: implement operational solutions in the field, involving the local community (one should not do things for the community but with the community);
- future-oriented: develop assessment and monitoring tools starting from a reliable basis and following the setting up of clear objectives (whether shared or not), clearly identified human and financial resources, monitoring indicators to allow for readjustments (both for actions and objectives);
- innovative: suggest new approaches, no fear of suggesting new and different solutions.

Referring to the current constraints and budget cuts, Albert Jacquard commented that "far from being just bad news, they give us the opportunity to clearly define the terms of a possible marriage between the Earth and humanity and to come up with a realistic plan for living together".

All the presentations are available on:

http://www.fondazionemontagnasicura.org/en/available-online-international-workshop-natural-ri-k-evaluation-presentations.aspx