# Conflicting Policy Objectives

### Urban resilience and disaster management

Fredrik Bynander Center for Societal Security



# Policy coordination, instrument of power

- Core question: Top-down or bottom-up?
- Today's plans all too often create the illusion of coordination, and thus the illusion of control, which may undermine the preparation for, and response to, disruptive events.
- The greater an event, the lower effectiveness of top-down coordination (initially).



# Imposing coordination, tolerating selforganization?

- Bottom-up perspective has greater support
  "ad hoc teaming" and self-organization.
- Works the best in "emergent coordination" (Faraj & Xiao)
- But, overburdened in acute phase, crumbles in the face of reconstruction challenges.
- "Top support" needed.



### Central levels in acute disaster response

- Supporting communication, "sensemaking", situational awareness
- Muster external resources
- Support local, regional coordination
- Plan transition to top-down
- Plan for strategic priorities on reconstruction
- Participate in processes of accountability and learning



## Disaster response to resilience policy

- Mitigation, prevention → resilience
- Same networks, problem ownership
- "Strategic" dimension of emergency preparedness politically indistinguishable from resilience
- Same dynamics top-down/bottom-up (scalability, silos, emerging actors)
- Formal democratic process vs. autonomy/self-reliance



#### Centralization

- Immense pressure to centralize in major events.
- Always politicized
- Top decision-making levels already own response and failures as post-event begins
- Self-organized parts of networks often fall apart



# **Trends in Policy Coordination**

Political fragmentation – repoliticization

Buck-passing

Coordination without mandate

Single agency reforms



#### More trends

Recentralization

Openivation (?)

Securitization

"Semi-authoritarian" administrative leadership

