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Importance of involving stakeholders early on

Inform policy makers of public values and preferences;
Contribute local knowledge;
Legitimate public decisions;
Improve implementation of policies.
Case 1: Seattle Earthquake 2001 – Citizen initiative with FEMA support

6.8 Richter scale
One death (heart attack)
Only minor injuries

Witt attributed the lack of deaths and injuries mainly to earlier efforts in Seattle to educate and involve the citizens in disaster preparedness.
Seattle Pre-2001

FEMA supported locally based initiatives
- Assessing risks,
- Disaster planning;

Project Impact
- 250 high-risk communities
- 2000 corporate partners

Seattle: Community/household efforts (Citizen initiatives)
- Fastening furniture
- Involvement of retirees
A participatory process including a stakeholder workshop suggested a high degree of solidarity for a Hungarian flood insurance system.

The parliament legislated a system without solidarity – It has failed.
The Upper Tisza Study

- Hydro-Model • One-dimension • Unsteady Flow
- Flood Model • GIS-Based • Flood Depth
- Loss Model • Agriculture • Infrastructure
- Policy Model • Cost-Benefit • Stochastic Opt.

Stakeholder Interviews
Public Survey
Stakeholder Workshop

Stakeholder Interviews informed by the model
After a major flood, the government should compensate...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Chosen by (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All victims by a certain percentage of their losses</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All victims by the same amount, above which they can choose to have insurance</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only needy victims, that is, not owners of vacation homes or well-to-do businesses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only victims with flood insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only victims who have not built their homes in high-risk areas without a permit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Tisza Participatory Process

Stakeholders agreed on removing levees in some areas and on a nation-wide insurance program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder consensus</th>
<th>Hungarian legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private reinsurance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Private Insurance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mandatory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flat rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk based</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidies for poor households</strong></td>
<td><strong>Small subsidies for poor households</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Compensation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Only for households with insurance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Public participation can make the difference between success and failure of government programs and regulations;
- Citizens can provide valuable inputs to public policy;
- Participation can improve credibility and legitimacy of governing processes;
- Participation part of democracy.
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Key Stakeholders

- National government
  - Finance ministry
  - Water ministry
- Local governments
- Water authorities
- Public
  - Upper Tisza
  - Downstream
  - Non-risk areas
- Insurance Companies
- NGOs