

University of Groningen

## The role of local communities in a global risk landscape

Imperiale, Angelo Jonas

DOI:  
[10.33612/diss.131472776](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.131472776)

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Imperiale, A. J. (2020). *The role of local communities in a global risk landscape: Using Social Impact Assessment to understand, recognise, engage and empower community resilience in vulnerable regions*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.  
<https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.131472776>

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

# Chapter 11

## **What role should Social Impact Assessment play?**

## Final conclusions and recommendations

Between 1998 and 2017, 4.5 billion people were affected by the direct impacts following the occurrence of natural hazards, of which 2,640,634 were killed (Wallemacq and House, 2018). Over the same time period, the disaster-affected countries reported direct economic losses (in terms of damage to assets and infrastructure) of \$2,908 billion (Wallemacq and House, 2018). Disasters, especially climate-related disasters, have become increasingly frequent. Some 91% of all disruptive events recorded in 1998-2017 were climate related disasters (Wallemacq and House, 2018). By 2050 some 40% of the world's population will be living near water basins that experience severe water stress, particularly in Africa and Asia. For people living in the so-called 'small island developing states', future disaster losses represent existential threats (UNISDR, 2015).

Recent reports have described the dramatic effects of climate change all around the globe, including: abnormal weather events such as extreme heat and droughts (e.g. IPCC, 2018); loss of biodiversity (e.g. IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2019); rising sea level (e.g. Church et al., 2013); negative impacts on human health (e.g. Mora et al., 2017; EASAC, 2019); and climate-induced displacement and migration (e.g. IOM, 2008; Rigaud et al., 2018). All this comprises the global climate crisis (Pelling, 2011; IPCC, 2015, 2018, 2019; IPBES, 2019; UNDRR, 2019), which, together with other global stressors (e.g. globalization and financial crises, resource scarcity, and demographic pressure), constitutes the *global risk landscape* we all live in.

When these risks turn into disasters, they create devastating impacts on local communities, their wellbeing, and the place where they live, affecting especially the most vulnerable. It has been reported that, in the last two decades, disasters push some 26 million people into poverty every year (Wallemacq and House, 2018; Hallegatte, 2017, 2018). When the economic losses deriving from disasters are expressed as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), it becomes evident that most of the overall disasters cost was borne by people living in low income countries. Amongst low income countries, the average annual death toll from disasters is 130 persons per million, seven times more than high income countries (Wallemacq and House, 2018). The inequality in the social, economic and environmental cost of disaster risk and impacts is evident not only between different countries in the world, but also among people within countries, since:

“\$1 in losses does not mean the same thing to a rich person and a poor person, and the severity of a \$92 billion loss depends on who experiences it. The same loss affects poor and marginalized people far more because their livelihoods depend on fewer assets, their consumption is closer to subsistence levels, they cannot rely on savings to smooth the impacts, their health and education are at greater risk, and they may need more time to recover and reconstruct” (Hallegatte, 2017, p.1).

For more than three decades, recognition of the unbearable human cost of disasters at global and local levels has led the international community to establish the DRR and resilience paradigm that should inform every disaster management and development interventions before and after disasters. The DRR and resilience paradigm advocates building resilience and supporting local communities, regions, and nations to reduce vulnerabilities and enhance local wellbeing and capacities at all levels of society, including at the local community level, to better reduce disaster risks and impacts before and after disasters (UNDRO, 1982; IDNDR, 1994; UNISDR, 2005, 2015).

The United Nations (UN, 2016, GA 71/276, p.22) define resilience as “the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management”. Resilience is the concept that best represent the capacity of systems, including social systems to learn and transform after disturbances. The increasing number of disasters and

economic and social crises that destabilize vulnerable areas has resulted in the concept of resilience gaining currency in the discourses of regional development (OECD, 2011, 2013; McManus et al., 2012; Scott, 2013; Schouten et al., 2013; Kelly et al., 2015), disaster risk reduction (Tobin, 1999; Paton and Johnston, 2001; Adger et al., 2005; Norris et al., 2008; Brown and Westaway, 2011), and climate change adaptation (Pelling, 2011; Khailani and Perera, 2013; Arnold et al., 2014; Dale et al., 2015). Policy discourses around the world also reflect this trend (e.g. UNISDR, 2005, 2007; 2015b; Mitchell, 2013; GFDRR, 2014, 2015; EC, 2013, 2014). More recently, the *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030* (UNISDR, 2015) further emphasised the need for “investing in the economic, social, health, cultural and educational resilience of persons, communities and countries and the environment” (UNISDR, 2015, p.11).

The 2030 Agenda explicitly mentions resilience in a variety of its goals and targets, such as SDG1, whose aim is to end poverty in all its forms everywhere, and, more specifically, Target 1.5, which represents the core resilience target, advocating for building “the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations, and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disaster” (UN, GA, A/RES/70/1, p.15). Building sustainable and resilient societies is currently understood as a “multidimensional challenge and a cross-cutting issue that will impact progress towards the SDGs and the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, and it is “central to eliminating poverty, augmenting shared prosperity and leaving no one behind” (UNECOSOC, 2018, p.1).

In this PhD research, it was found that community resilience is the set of the social survival processes that local communities put in action at the cognitive and interactional levels to learn, transform, and address the negative impacts they perceive as common problems in times of crises and disasters. Social resilience is the set of nested, inter-level, cognitive and structural interactions that enable external actors to be sensitive to, and learn from the agency of local community resilience, thus changing or transforming accordingly towards building resilience and social sustainability at all levels of society. Within local communities, however, there are positive and negative social processes and trends: there can be resilience, but there can also be the space for elite capture, rent-seeking, organised crime infiltration, disaster capitalism and corruption to arise even within the same local communities. Counter-productive actions that undermine building resilience at all levels of society can occur both at the local community level and at other levels of social organization. They can be enacted both by members of affected local communities and by external actors (decision-makers, proponents, and investors). The cognitive and interactional ways through which external actors intervene to support local communities to respond to disaster risks and impacts, may reduce, or reproduce (or even exacerbate) local pre-disaster vulnerabilities, inequities and social exclusion, and do have influence on local DRR and resilience outcomes before and after disasters.

The way disaster management and development interventions are carried out can facilitate negative and positive trends in local communities. They can exacerbate social risks (e.g. rent-seeking, elite capture, organised crime infiltration, inequity, social exclusion), pre-disaster vulnerability and disaster risks and impacts, or they can build resilience at all levels of society. If not carefully managed, disaster management and development interventions can create structural failures that produce severe impacts on community wellbeing and community resilience at the cognitive and interactional levels, creating further disasters. They can turn the positive feelings (e.g. empathy), attitudes (e.g. social responsibility and caring), actions and behaviours (i.e. mutual aid and cooperation) into fear and suspicion, rent-seeking and a gold rush, and elite capture, organised crime infiltration and disaster capitalism.

Too often, post-disaster and development interventions result in centralised, top-down approaches to disaster risks and impacts that fail to observe international principles and recommendations, and ultimately result into second disasters. These interventions perpetrate disaster myths, increase local dependency on external support, reproduce or worsen pre-existing inequities, social exclusion, vulnerabilities, violate human rights, create social and environmental impacts, and annihilate resilience at the local community level. Too often, such top-down approaches to disasters create windows of opportunities for elite capture, disaster capitalism, organised crime infiltration, and for corruption to flourish at the local, national, and international levels. Inadequate institutional and financial arrangements, and inappropriate management and planning models, all of which constitute the mechanism of the agency of external interventions, lead external actors to poorly acknowledge the social dimensions of disasters and disaster management and development interventions. Driven by such a mechanism, external actors often ignore the social and environmental impacts and human rights issues associated with disasters and with disaster management and development planning, thus failing to enhance inclusive social learning, transformation and resilience at the local community level.

Understanding ‘the mechanism’ through which states conceive, design and implement: (1) institutional strategies; (2) financial strategies; (3) physical planning; (4) community participation; and (5) risk management they use to respond to disaster risks and impacts, reduce local vulnerabilities and enhance local community wellbeing, is crucial to identifying the main constraints in these strategies that need to be overcome in order to enhance DRR and build resilience and social sustainability at all levels of society. In this PhD research, it has been shown that, in times of crises and disasters, states relying on top-down, centralized civil protection systems, such as the Italian state, design and implement *institutional and financial strategies* that still heavily rely on a strict, military-type, command-and-control approach to resources (e.g. financial resources, natural resources, the built environment and associated land use, environmental, social protection and planning approaches); emergency powers and procedures, state secrecy provisions and derogations; and top-down physical planning. Such military-type, top-down institutional and financial strategies lead to, and are accompanied and reinforced by, a scientific knowledge production process about vulnerabilities, risks and impacts of disasters and local vulnerabilities that is merely techno-scientific and intended to serve only the interests of the civil protection authorities. This scientific knowledge is not intended to be co-produced with local communities, or to be transformative, and fails to enhance inclusive social learning or pursue socially-sustainable transformations to improve DRR and build resilience at all levels of society. Such institutional and financial strategies accompanied by this kind of techno-scientific knowledge, lead to a *physical planning approach* that is not informed by any adequate risk management or impact assessment approach, does not consider the social dimensions of disaster or of disaster management and development interventions, nor does it consider the environmental and social impacts, nor the environmental and social sustainability of these interventions, nor the human rights that may be violated while conceiving, deciding, designing and implementing disaster management and development.

Both before and after disasters, such institutional and financial strategies lead to a *risk management approach* that only considers the social risks that threaten the command-and-control approach. Such risk management only considers those things national and local authorities believe need to be suppressed to maintain control over the situation, including: collective panic, anxiety, hysteria, unjustified alarmism, ‘jackalism’ and other likely deviant behaviours that may arise within affected local communities. It leads civil protection authorities to consider civil protection issues as a matter of paternalistic communication and assistance, and of public control, which, before disasters, requires police action, and after disasters, requires an overwhelming militarization of the affected area.

These institutional and financial strategies, and top-down physical planning and risk management approaches lead to enabling only the local authorities and influential local building firms and professionals. This means that the local political leaders become the civil protection authorities of the disaster area. As the L'Aquila case shows, this mechanism exacerbates local social and environmental risks and impacts, and inhibits a broader constituency of local communities from learning from disasters, and from taking part in post-disaster interventions. Furthermore, there is nothing in this system to prevent the other forms of social risks that truly threaten DRR and resilience at the local community level and other levels of society, such as rent-seeking, elite capture, organised crime infiltration, corruption, inequity, social exclusion, all of which exacerbates local pre-disaster vulnerability and, therefore, disaster risks and impacts.

After Hurricane Katrina (2005), the L'Aquila disaster was the greatest disaster to have ever occurred in a western country in the last 30 years. The L'Aquila disaster is not just an Italian story of corruption and mafia, it reveals much more. With Italy being one of the eight countries in the Group of 8 (G8) and one of the 29 in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the theory and practice applied by the Italian government to disaster management and to national strategic development grew within the traditional para-militaristic NATO approach to reconstruction and development. With the implementation of the European Recovery Fund (i.e. the Marshall Plan), the command-and-control approach was intended to be an effective tool that states should use to manage the emergency loans to spend them efficiently, thus avoiding any delay in the execution of recovery or re-development programs. Around the 1990s, this approach was extended to other domains, including political consultation and decision-making processes, the expropriation of land for large infrastructure projects, civil protection, humanitarian, and peacekeeping operations and associated management of public funds and financial support addressed to implement national or international strategic development interventions, especially in times of economic and financial crisis.

Although there was a switch from civil defence to civil protection arrangements following the paradigm shift from a 'war approach' to considering disasters in the context of socially-produced vulnerability, this was not accompanied by any change in the top-down, militaristic command-and-control institutional and financial arrangements and management models that traditionally accompany disaster management (Alexander, 2002). Despite this switch, the fundamental nature of the command-and-control approach that continues to be utilised by civil protection systems has not changed. When such a top-down social protection approach is implemented through traditional, top-down, centralised civil protection systems, it leads, both before and after disaster, to considering local people as disaster victims to protect and as mere spectators of the disaster management carried out (UNDRO, 1982), thus increasing dependency on external assistance (i.e. counterproductive learning), and reproducing (or even worsening) those local social factors and structures which locally contribute to inequity, social exclusion, vulnerability and risk-creation (i.e. counterproductive transformation).

By being still inspired by para-military arrangements, all efforts made by states and civil protection systems fail to pursue inclusive social learning and socially sustainable transformation, or build resilience at all levels of society. As the L'Aquila case shows, the command-and-control institutional and financial arrangements are vulnerable to elite capture, corruption, and organised crime infiltration. Instead of building a *glocal culture of resilience*, they facilitate a culture of disaster capitalism. Too often, as in the L'Aquila case, these arrangements do not require the conception, decision, design and implementation of disaster management and development interventions to be implemented through a proper recognition of local community needs, desires, capacities, knowledge, narratives, and positive individual and collective feelings (i.e. empathy), attitudes (i.e. social responsibility, caring), actions, and behaviours (i.e. mutual aid and cooperation) that lead people to build resilience at the local community level. Nor do they provide any protocol to, for example: (i) conduct a proper community needs assessment; (ii) manage

disaster rubble; (iii) respect human rights issues that may arise from planned interventions; (iv) assess the environmental and social impacts and the environmental and social sustainability of planned interventions; and (v) recognise and prevent local pre-disaster vulnerability, the root causes of disaster, or other social risks (e.g. rent-seeking, elite capture, organised crime infiltration, disaster capitalism and corruption) from being reproduced or even exacerbated.

Overall, the command-and-control approach to resources (e.g. financial resources, natural resources, the built environment and associated land use, environmental, social protection and planning approaches), the use of disaster myths, emergency powers and procedures, and top-down physical planning provide some national and local leaders with emergency powers, but, however, resoundingly fail to: understand risk in all its multiple dimensions (*key priority 1*, see *Chapter 5*); strengthen governance towards better DRR and resilience outcomes, (*key priority 2*, see *Chapter 6*); facilitate the efficacy of investments in disaster risk reduction for resilience (*key priority 3*, see *Chapter 7*); or enhance disaster preparedness for effective response, and to build back better in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction (*key priority 4*, see *Chapter 8*). Extrapolating from the L'Aquila situation, top-down civil protection systems tend to: (1) understand disaster risks only in terms of the likelihood of the hazard, while considering the assessment and reduction of local vulnerabilities irrelevant for a proper disaster risk assessment and the sharing of the knowledge concerning risk as a source of collective anxiety and alarmism that need to be controlled or avoided; (2) build a command-and-control governance of resources through emergency powers, state secrecy provisions and derogations all of which undermine strengthening of the local governance towards better DRR and resilience outcomes; (3) facilitate and protect rent-seeking, elite capture and disaster capitalism, rather than efficient investment to enhance DRR and resilience; (4) worsen local inequity and social exclusion, exacerbating pre-disaster vulnerability and associated disaster risks and impacts, instead than building back better more sustainable and resilient societies.

Extrapolating from the L'Aquila situation, it is clear that socially-sustainable transformations are required in the way disaster management and strategic national development interventions are conceived, decided, designed and realised, especially in the institutional and financial strategies, physical planning, risk management and community participation approaches the states use to orient the implementation of planned interventions in times of crises and disasters. In order to fully accomplish their declared commitment to the Key Priority Areas of investment and intervention recommended by the United Nations, states should: (1) overcome the constraints of a techno-scientific knowledge and understand that risks have social dimensions and can be reduced only if local vulnerabilities and social risks and the root causes of disasters are reduced too (*key priority 1*, *Chapter 5*); (2) build inclusive and socially sustainable governance of disaster management and development at all levels of social organization, avoiding the adoption of a military-type command-and-control approach to resources and the use of emergency powers (*key priority 2*, *Chapter 6*); (3) design and implement effective financial strategies through which orienting investments to strengthen community resilience (social learning and transformation), rather than disaster capitalism and corruption (*key priority 3*, *Chapter 7*); (4) design and implement physical planning and risk management approaches that would prevent environmental and social impacts, respect human rights, foster inclusive social learning and socially-sustainable transformations and build resilience, rather than facilitating rent-seeking, elite capture, and organized crime infiltration or creating second disasters (*key priority 4*, *Chapter 8*).

On the other hand, to enable the various United Nations principles and declarations about DRR and resilience to be more effectively respected and implemented in practice, the international community must pay more attention to the mechanism by which states conceive, decide, design and implement disaster management interventions. The Key priority Areas of investment and intervention recommended by the United Nations, together with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda, are solid

base for the formulation of national and local strategies to enhance social development outcomes in planned interventions, such as building more resilient and sustainable societies (UNECOSOC, 2018). Achieving social development outcomes requires the building of goal-oriented governance of social-ecological systems at all scales, which demands an inclusive goal-setting process (Biermann et al., 2017; Kanie and Biermann, 2017).

Building governance to achieve shared social development outcomes requires sharing and strengthening empathy, caring and social responsibility among all actors towards the most vulnerable and those over-exposed to risks and impacts. It also requires enacting effective social and institutional learning processes that can help all actors to cooperate to collectively learn from past failures and transform towards better outcomes in the future. Enhancing DRR and resilience at all levels of society requires a closer link between knowledge and action, which demands that scientific practices become more oriented towards the societal arenas in which sustainability problems, including disaster risks and impacts, are tackled. Understanding knowledge through the concept of 'knowledge systems' helps in visualising how Science can support societies to address sustainability. By being problems that affect societies at all levels, sustainability issues (including DRR and resilience) require learning processes where the more the members of society are included within the knowledge system, the more people can better know, act and learn towards achieving desired social development outcomes and building resilience and social sustainability at all levels of society. The common purpose of achieving social development outcomes, including enhanced DRR and resilience, demands opening-up knowledge systems at all levels of society to allow a broader constituency to participate in the processes of knowledge production, the implementation of actions (i.e. prevention, mitigation, monitoring and enhancement), and in learning and transformation. Ensuring that knowledge systems are open means enabling all members of society, especially the most vulnerable, to participate in better knowing, acting, and in learning from actions and transform towards better outcomes in the future. To effectively engage local communities within the governance of disaster management and development, and of knowledge production processes, the DRR and resilience paradigm demands a paradigm shift from protecting vulnerable, affected communities to engaging and empowering their capacities to learn and transform; and thus from centralized, civil protection systems to inclusive, decentralized community empowerment systems capable of orienting investments and interventions towards reducing local vulnerabilities, and environmental and social risks and impacts; enabling and empowering social learning and socially-sustainable transformations; and building resilience at all levels of society before and after disasters

Recent advances in disaster and development studies have emphasized the need for SIA to accompany post-disaster interventions (Benson and Twigg, 2007; Jah et al., 2010), in order to "understand the social and economic context, incorporate the perspectives and interests of those whom the project is intended to assist, anticipate the project's social impacts (both positive and negative), and prepare to mitigate them, when necessary" (Jah et al., 2010, p.74). However, until now, little attempt has been made by international and national disaster and development agencies, governments, or other public and private organizations to adopt the Social Impact Assessment philosophy and process and apply its methodology in any planned intervention both before and after disasters. The SIA community has also made little effort to extend the theoretical and practical domain of SIA from being a regulatory or techno-scientific assessment tool for large scale projects, especially deployed in the extractive industry sector, to being a process of enhancing social development outcomes and of empowering local communities for building community resilience and achieving the SDGs.

SIA has traditionally developed as a tool to manage the intended and unintended social impacts of development projects. Despite evolutionary progresses in thinking and practice, too often SIA keeps being considered as only a sub-field of environmental impact assessment (EIA), resulting in its being merely an add-on to pre-determined projects (O'Faircheallaigh, 2009; Suopajarvi,



2013). Traditional understandings and practices of SIA still are ingrained within the institutional environmental licensing procedures and arrangements, or within top-down social protection measures, which too often are focused only on post-hoc remedies, such as job creation, compensation, or grievance procedures strategies (Aucamp and Lombard, 2018). This undermines the potential of SIA to be an effective process capable of orienting the decision, conception, design and implementation of any disaster management and development policy, plan, and project towards positive social development outcomes before any intervention gets conceived, designed, funded and implemented in the field (Aucamp and Lombard, 2018). Although there have been advances in the SIA field in the conceptualization of social changes and impacts and of the multiple dimensions of local community wellbeing (Slootweg et al., 2001; Vanclay, 2002; Smyth and Vanclay, 2017), still little is said about how SIA can enhance *prevention* (DRR), or about how SIA can develop effective tools and processes to reduce local vulnerabilities and social risks, enhance resilience and prevent negative social risks and impacts in advance.

The current understanding of SIA emphasises the need to see SIA not only as a mitigation approach to the impacts of development, but also as an enhancement strategy that can support development policies, plans, programs, and projects to better achieve social development outcomes and the SDGs. Current advances in SIA are: human rights impact assessment (Götzmann et al., 2016; van der Ploeg and Vanclay, 2017, 2018); Free, Prior and Informed Consent (Vanclay and Esteves, 2011; Hanna and Vanclay, 2016;); community-based agreement making and deliberative democracy (Nish and Bice, 2011; Hartz-Karp and Pope, 2011); social license to operate (Dare et al., 2014; Bice and Moffat, 2014; Jijelava and Vanclay, 2014 and 2017); and risk assessment and resilience (Mahmoudi et al., 2013; Esteves et al., 2017; Imperiale and Vanclay, 2016a , 2016b). However, how to build a socially sustainable governance and orient such SIA advances towards reducing local vulnerabilities, risks, impacts and the root causes of disaster, enhancing inclusive learning and socially sustainable transformation, and building resilient landscapes and communities, must be further explored. The 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the New Urban Agenda, and the key priorities areas of investment and intervention recommended by the United Nations in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, they all require understanding of resilience and how it can be strengthened at the local community level and be built at all levels of society. However, there is still lack of conceptualization of resilience and how it comes into action at the local community level and other levels of society, and lack of investigation on effective methodologies that would be able to strengthen resilience at the local community level and build it at all levels of society, thus better aligning human efforts to the international paradigm of DRR and resilience and the 2030 Agenda (Berkes and Ross, 2016).

The conceptualisation of the cognitive and interactional dimensions of resilience at the local community level and other levels of society; of the counterproductive actions to avoid (i.e. counterproductive learning, counterproductive transformation and the mechanism of disaster capitalism); and of the SIA Framework for Action provided in this PhD thesis have the potential to enhance understanding of resilience in society and how to enhance inclusive social learning, empower socially sustainable transformations and build resilience at multiple levels of social organization. The SIA Framework for Action is oriented to co-produce transformative knowledge about local vulnerabilities, risks, impacts and the root causes to reduce, and about the desired social development outcomes to achieve together with the affected local communities. It can be used to recognise local community needs and desires and engage and strengthen the positive individual and collective feelings, attitudes, knowledge narratives actions and behaviours local people develop to build resilience at the local community level in times of crises and disasters.

The SIA Framework for Action can also enact effective community engagement strategies that orient local communities towards building a common vision about: the multiple dimensions of

community wellbeing that need to be enhanced; the local vulnerabilities, risks and root causes of disasters that need to be reduced; and the capacities that need to be strengthened. All this contributes to enhancing inclusive social learning and building socially sustainable transformations, resilience and a glocal culture of resilience at all levels of society.

Through the SIA Framework for Action, SIA will become an effective process that would lead external actors to co-conceive, co-decide, co-design and co-implement any planned intervention to build resilience at all levels of society before and after disasters. To be effective, SIA and the SIA Framework for Action should lead the building of sustainable knowledge systems that orient the governance of disaster management and development interventions, before and after disasters. To create such sustainable knowledge systems, the paradigm shift evoked by the DRR and resilience paradigm from managing disasters to reducing the risks of disasters should be fully implemented in practice. This paradigm shift should lead development and impact assessment fields to a similar paradigm shift from managing the impacts to reducing the risks from any planned intervention. This paradigm shift should be accompanied by a cultural revolution from the mythology of command-and-control to social learning and transformation, and from a top-down social protection culture, to a glocal culture of resilience. The greater focus on the risks of development, rather than on its impacts, would thus pursue the states to carefully know how to reduce these risks, enhance social learning from past failures and transformation towards sustainability, and achieve desired development outcomes beforehand any planned intervention is conceived, decided, designed and implemented.

To realise all this, several crucial shifts are required in the way states typically conceive their institutional and financial strategies, and in the physical planning, risk management and community participation approaches through which they orient planned interventions before and after disasters. A crucial shift should be fostered in the institutional strategy from a command-and-control approach to a coordination-and-comanagement approach to resources; from facilitating rent-seeking and elite capture to pursuing equity, mutual aid and cooperation in the financial strategy; from typical top-down planning to socially sustainable planning capable to prevent environmental and social impacts, respect human rights and build resilience; and from a top-down civil protection culture to a glocal culture of resilience that will foster transformative and co-produced knowledge, inclusive social learning and socially sustainable transformations in risk management, physical planning and in community participation approaches of every planned interventions. Overall, the DRR and resilience paradigm requires a crucial paradigm shift from considering vulnerable, affected communities unable to learn and act, to considering them as people who have individual and collective needs, feelings, desires, attitudes, capacities, knowledge, beliefs, values, and narratives; and from protecting them to empowering their capacities to learn and transform. Overall a crucial shift is needed from centralised civil protection systems to more inclusive and decentralised community empowerment systems.

Community resilience outcomes (i.e. equity, participation, social inclusion, mutual aid, cooperation, disaster risk reduction, social sustainability and community wellbeing) should become the principles, means and outcomes by which the institutional and financial strategies, physical planning, risk management and community participation approach are designed and implemented in order to empower local communities and build resilience at all levels of society. In this way, community empowerment systems would: enhance empathy, caring, social responsibility for and respect and recognition of the most vulnerable and those most in danger rather than only of the elite; enable the building of mutual aid and cooperation rather than rent-seeking and elite capture; and facilitate equity, social inclusion, cohesion, and awareness for community wellbeing and social sustainability rather than rent-seeking, elite capture, organised crime infiltration and corruption. All this would help external actors and local communities build a glocal culture of resilience rather than a culture of disaster capitalism, and transform affected landscapes into landscapes of affect, rather than carcasses to exploit.

## References

- Adger, W.N., Hughes, T., Folke, C., Carpenter, S.R. and Rockstrom, J. 2005. Social-ecological resilience to coastal disasters. *Science* 309, 1036-1039.
- Adger, W.N. 2000. Social and ecological resilience: Are they related? *Progress in Human Geography* 24(3), 347-364.
- Alberts, D. and Hayes, R. 2006. *Understanding Command and Control*. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Command & Control Research Program. [http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Alberts\\_UC2.pdf](http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Alberts_UC2.pdf) (accessed 15 January 2019).
- Alberts, D. and Hayes, R. 2003. *Power to the Edge: Command...Control... in the Information Age*, Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Command & Control Research Program. [http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Alberts\\_Power.pdf](http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Alberts_Power.pdf) (accessed 15 January 2019).
- Alexander, D. 2007. Misconception as a Barrier to Teaching about disasters. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine* 22(2), 95-103.
- Alexander, D. 2010. The L'Aquila earthquake of 6 April 2009 and Italian Government policy on disaster response. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 2(4), 325-342.
- Alexander, D. 2013. An evaluation of medium-term recovery processes after the 6 April 2009 earthquake in L'Aquila, Central Italy. *Environmental Hazards* 12(1), 60-73.
- Armitage, D., Berkes, F. and Doubleday, N. eds. 2010. *Adaptive co-management: collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance*. UBC Press.
- Arnold, M., Mearns, R., Oshima, K. and Prasad, V. 2014. *Climate and Disaster Resilience: The Role for Community-Driven Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank, Social Development Department. Online resource available at: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2014/02/19127194/climate-disaster-resilience-role-community-driven-development-cdd> [accessed 3 February 2016].
- Aucamp, I. and Lombard, A. 2018. Can social impact assessment contribute to social development outcomes in an emerging economy? *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 36(2), pp.173-185
- Augenti, N. and Parisi, F., 2010. Learning from construction failures due to the 2009 L'Aquila, Italy, earthquake. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 24(6), pp.536-555.
- Bailly, F. and Longo, G. 2008. Extended critical situations: the physical singularity of life phenomena. *Journal of Biological Systems*, 16(02), pp.309-336.
- Bailly, F. and Longo, G., 2003, February. Objective and epistemic complexity in biology. In *Invited lecture, International Conference on Theoretical Neurobiology, New Delhi*.
- Bakema, M.M., Parra, C., McCann, P., Dalziel, P. and Saunders, C. 2017. Governance in Shaky Societies: Experiences and lessons from Christchurch after the earthquakes. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 27(4), pp.365-377.
- Barabino, P., Sansa, F. 2019. *L'Aquila, in 10mila nelle new town. Quartieri dormitorio senza servizi e socialità, tra cedimenti e infiltrazioni*. Il Fatto Quotidiano, online

<https://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2019/04/03/laquila-in-10mila-nelle-new-town-quartieri-dormitorio-senza-servizi-e-socialita-tra-cedimenti-e-infiltrazioni/5077961/>

- Barberi, G., Bertolaso G., Boschi, E. (2007), “Difendersi dai Terremoti: la prevenzione sismica in Italia”, in Barberi F. (eds), *Dall'emergenza alla ricostruzione*, Regione Umbria, 2007. Available at: [http://speciali.espresso.repubblica.it/pdf/Difendersi\\_dai\\_terremoti.pdf](http://speciali.espresso.repubblica.it/pdf/Difendersi_dai_terremoti.pdf) (accessed 30 July, 2018)
- Barca F, Casavola P, Lucatelli S (eds) 2014. *A Strategy for Inner Areas in Italy: Definition, Objectives, Tools and Governance*. Materiali Uval Series 31. Rome: Public Investment Evaluation Unit.
- Barkin, D. 2010. Incorporating indigenous epistemologies into the construction of alternative strategies to globalization to promote sustainable regional resource management: The struggle for local autonomy in a multiethnic society. In: Esquith, S. and F. Gifford. eds. *Capabilities, Power and Institutions. Towards a More Critical Development Ethics*. University Park, PA Penn State University Press:142-161.
- Bates, F.L. 1982. Disasters, social change and development. *Recovery, Change and Development: A Longitudinal Study of the 1976 Guate-malan Earthquake, 1*, pp.1-36.
- Benson, C. Twigg, J. and Rossetto, T. 2007. *Tools for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction: guidance notes for development organisations*. ProVention Consortium.
- Berkes, F. and Ross, H. 2016. Panarchy and community resilience: Sustainability science and policy implications. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 61, pp.185-193.
- Berkes, F. and Ross, H. 2013. Community resilience: Toward an integrated approach. *Society & Natural Resources* 26(1), pp.5-20.
- Berkes, F., Colding, J. and Folke, C. 2003. *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bice, S. and Moffat, K. 2014. Social licence to operate and impact assessment. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 32(4), pp.257-262.
- Boschi, 1995;
- Biermann, F., Kanie, N. and Kim, R.E. 2017. Global governance by goal-setting: the novel approach of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 26, pp.26-31.
- Boschi, E. 2013. L'Aquila's aftershocks shake scientists, *Science*, Vol. 341, No. 6153, pp. 1451-1451.
- Boschi, E., Gasperini P., Mulargia, F. (1995), “Forecasting where larger crustal earthquakes are likely to occur in Italy in the near future”, *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, Vol. 85 No. 5, pp. 1475-1482,
- Bouwen, R., and Taillieu, T. 2004. Multi-party collaboration as social learning for interdependence: Developing relational knowing for sustainable natural resource management, *Journal of community & applied social psychology* 14(3), pp.137-153.
- Brown, K. and Westaway, E. 2011. Agency, capacity, and resilience to environmental change: lessons from human development, well-being, and disasters. *Annual Review of Environment & Resources* 36, 321-42.

- Burger, A., Oz, T., Kennedy, W.G. and Crooks, A.T., 2019. Computational Social Science of Disasters: Opportunities and Challenges. *Future Internet*, 11(5), p.103.
- Calandra, L.M. (2016), Between perception and reality: towards an assessment of socio-territorial discomfort in L'Aquila (Central Italy) after the earthquake. *Epidemiologia e prevenzione*, 40(2), 72-81.
- Carpenter, S.R. and Gunderson, L.H. 2001. Coping with Collapse: Ecological and Social Dynamics in Ecosystem Management: Like flight simulators that train would-be aviators, simple models can be used to evoke people's adaptive, forward-thinking behavior, aimed in this instance at sustainability of human–natural systems. *BioScience*, 51(6),pp.451-457.
- Cartlidge, E. (2012), “Aftershocks in the courtroom”, *Science*, 336 (12 October 2012), 184-188.
- Cavaye, J., Ross, H. 2019. Community resilience and community development: What mutual opportunities arise from interactions between the two concepts?. *Community Development* 50(2), p.81-200.
- Choudury, M., Haque, E. (2016) ‘We are more scared of the power elites than the floods’: Adaptive capacity and resilience of wetland community to flash flood disasters in Bangladesh, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 9, pp.145-158.
- Church, J.A., Clark, P.U., Cazenave, A., Gregory, J.M., Jevrejeva, S., Levermann, A., Merrifield, M.A., Milne, G.A., Nerem, R.S., Nunn, P.D. and Payne, A.J. 2013. *Sea level change*. PM Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Contreras, M.C., Blasche, T., Hodgson M. (2017), Lack of spatial resilience in a recovery process: A case L’Aquila Italy, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 76-88
- Cornell, S., Berkhout, F., Tuinstra, W., Tàbara, J., Jäger, J., Chabay, I., de Wit, B., Langlais, R., and Otto, I. 2013. Opening up knowledge systems for better responses to global environmental change, *Environmental Science & Policy*, 28, pp.60-70.
- Dale, A., Vella, K.J. and Cottrell, A. 2015. Can social resilience inform SA/SIA for adaptive planning for climate change in vulnerable regions?. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research*, 7(1), pp.93-104.
- Dare, M., Schirmer, J. and Vanclay, F. 2014. Community engagement and social licence to operate. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 32(3), pp.188-197.
- Davidson, D. (2010), The applicability of the concept of resilience to social systems: Some sources of optimism and nagging doubts. *Society & Natural Resources*, 23(12), 1135-1149.
- De Luca, G., Marcucci, S., Milana, G. and Sano, T., 2005. Evidence of low-frequency amplification in the city of L’Aquila, Central Italy, through a multidisciplinary approach including strong-and weak-motion data, ambient noise, and numerical modeling. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 95(4), pp.1469-1481.
- Denhart, H. (2009) Deconstructing disaster: Psycho-social impact of building deconstruction in Post-Katrina, New Orleans. *Cities*, 26(4), pp.195-201 Di Pasquale et al, 1999).

- Drabek, T. and McEntire, D. 2003. Emergent phenomena and the sociology of disaster: lessons, trends and opportunities from the research literature. *Disaster Prevention and Management* 12(2), 97-112.
- Drexler C, Braun C, Christie D, Claramunt B, Dax T, Jelen I, Kanka R, Katsoulakos N, Le Roux G, Price M, Scheurer T, Weingartner R. 2016. Mountains for Europe's Future—A Strategic Research Agenda. Bern, Switzerland, and Innsbruck, Austria: The Mountain Research Initiative and Institute of Interdisciplinary Mountain Research.
- Eachus P. Community Resilience: Is it greater than the sum of the parts of individual resilience?. *Procedia Economics and finance*. 2014 Jan 1;18:345-51.
- EASAC [European Academic Science Advisory Council]. 2019. *The imperative of climate action to protect human health in Europe: Opportunities for adaptation to reduce the impacts and for mitigation to capitalize on the benefits for decarbonization*. Schaefer Druck und Verlag GmbH: Teutschenthal, Germany.
- EC [European Commission] 2017. The New European Consensus on Development. Our world, our dignity, our future. Joint statement by the Council and the representatives of the governments of the member states meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the European Commission. [accessed 27 June 2019]  
[https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/european-consensus-on-development-final-20170626\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/european-consensus-on-development-final-20170626_en.pdf)
- EC [European Commission] 2014. The post 2015 Hyogo Framework for Action: Managing Risks to achieve Resilience. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. [accessed 27 June 2019]  
[http://www.preventionweb.net/files/37514\\_37514ecposthyogomanagingrisksen1.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/37514_37514ecposthyogomanagingrisksen1.pdf)
- EC [European Commission] 2013. Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020. Commission Staff Working Document. [accessed 27 June 2019]  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com\\_2013\\_227\\_ap\\_crisis\\_prone\\_countries\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2013_227_ap_crisis_prone_countries_en.pdf).
- Ellerman, D. 2006. *Helping people help themselves. From the World Bank to an Alternative Philosophy of Development Assistance*. Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press.
- Escaleras M., Register, C. 2016. Public Sector Corruption and Natural Hazards. *Public Finance Review* 44(6), pp.746-768.
- Escaleras M., Anbarci, N., Register, C. 2007. Public Sector Corruption and Major Earthquakes: A Potentially Deadly Interaction. *Public Choice* 132, pp.209-230.
- Esteves, A.M., Factor, G., Vanclay, F., Götzmann, N., Moreiro, S. 2017 Adapting social impact assessment to address a project's human rights impacts and risks. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 67, pp.73-87.
- Esteves AM, Franks D, Vanclay F. 2012. Social impact assessment: The state of the art. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 30(1), pp.35-44.

- Esteves, A.M., Vanclay, F. 2009 Social Development Needs Analysis as a tool for SIA to guide corporate-community investment: Applications in the minerals industry. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 29(2), pp.137-145.
- FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization]. 2011. Why Invest in Sustainable Mountain Development? Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: Rome
- Finocchiaro, A. 2017. Relazione sullo stato di avanzamento della ricostruzione post-sismica nella Regione Abruzzo, April  
<http://www.senato.it/service/PDF/PDFServer/DF/331078.pdf> (accessed 15 January 2019).
- Fois, F. and Forino, G. 2014. The self-built ecovillage in L'Aquila, Italy: community resilience as a grassroots response to environmental shocks. *Disasters* (38)4, 719-739
- Folke, C. 2006. Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analysis. *Global Environmental Change*(16) pp.253-267
- Forino, G. and Carnelli, F., 2019. Introduction to the special issue "The L'Aquila earthquake 10 years on (2009-2019): impacts and state-of-the-art". *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*.
- Forino, G. 2015. Disaster recovery: Narrating the resilience process in the reconstruction of L'Aquila (Italy), *Geografisk Tidsskrift – Danish Journal of Geography* 115(1), 1-13.
- Frisch G.J. (2010), *L'Aquila. Non si uccide così anche una città?* Clean, Naples
- Gunewardena, N. and Schuller, M. eds. 2008. *Capitalizing on catastrophe: Neoliberal strategies in disaster reconstruction*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman Altamira.
- Harvey, D.C. 2017. Social Policy as Secondary Violences in the Aftermath of a Disaster: An Extension to Naomi Klein's Disaster Capitalism. *Humanity & Society*, 41(3), pp.333-354.
- Hoffman, S.M. and Oliver-Smith, A. eds., 2002. *Catastrophe & culture: the anthropology of disaster* (p. 113). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- IDNDR, 1994. Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation. [accessed 27 June 2019].  
<http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/idrl/I248EN.pdf>
- Franks D, Vanclay F. 2013. Social Impact Management Plans: Innovation in corporate and public policy. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 43, pp.40-48.
- Frisch G.J. (2010), *L'Aquila. Non si uccide così anche una città?* Clean, Naples
- Future Earth. 2014. Strategic Research Agenda 2014: Priorities for a global sustainability research strategy. Paris, France: International Council for Science.
- Gabrielli, F. and Di Bucci, D. (2015). Comment on "Communicating earthquake risk to the public: the trial of the 'L'Aquila Seven'" by David E. Alexander, *Natural Hazards*, 75(1), 991-998.
- Gall, M., Cutter, S. and Nguyen, K. 2014a. *Transformative Development and Disaster Risk Management*, IRDR AIRDR, Publication No. 4, Beijing: Integrated Research on Disaster Risk.

- GFDRR, [Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery]. 2014. *Inclusive Community Resilience: A Strategy for Civil Society Engagement, Community Resilience and Gender 2015-2017*. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery: Washington DC.
- Götzmann, N., Vanclay, F. and Seier, F., 2016. Social and human rights impact assessments: what can they learn from each other?. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 34(1), pp.14-23.
- Guéhenno, J-M. and Sherman, J. 2009. *Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*.  
[http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/4998~v~Command and Control Arrangements in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.pdf](http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/4998~v~Command_and_Control_Arrangements_in_United_Nations_Peacekeeping_Operations.pdf) (accessed 15 January 2019).
- Gunewardena, N. and Schuller, M. eds. 2008. *Capitalizing on catastrophe: Neoliberal strategies in disaster reconstruction*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman Altamira.
- Gurung A, Von Dach S, Price M, Aspinall R, Balsiger J, Baron J, Sharma E, Greenwood G, Kohler T. 2012. Global change and the world's mountains – research needs and emerging themes for sustainable development: A synthesis from the 2010 Perth II Conference. *Mountain Research and Development* 32(S1):S47-S54.
- Hall, S. (2011), “Scientists on trial: At fault?”, *Nature News*, Vol. 477, No. 7364, pp. 264-269.
- Hallegatte, S., Rentschler, J., Walsh, B. 2018. *Building back better: Achieving Resilience through stronger, faster, and more inclusive Post-Disaster Reconstruction*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Hallegatte, S., Vogt-Schilb, A., Bangalore, M., Rozenberg, J. 2017. *Unbreakable: Building the Resilience of the Poor in the face of Natural Disasters*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Hanna, P., Vanclay, F., Arts, J. 2016. The communication and management of social risks and their relevance to corporate-community relationships, in Crichton, J., Candlin, C., Firkins, A. (eds) *Communicating Risk*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.171-188.
- Harris, S.G., 1994. Organizational culture and individual sensemaking: A schema-based perspective. *Organization science*, 5(3), pp.309-321.
- Hartz-Karp, J. and Pope, J. 2011. 15. Enhancing effectiveness through deliberative democracy. *New directions in social impact assessment: Conceptual and methodological advances*, 253.
- Houck, J. 1993. The command and control of United Nations forces in the era of ‘peace enforcement’. *Duke Journal Comparative International Law* 4(1), 1-70.
- IDNDR, 1994. *Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation*.  
<http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/idrl/I248EN.pdf> (accessed 15 January 2019).
- IFRC and OCHA. 2015. *Shelter After Disasters* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Lyons, France.  
[http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Documents/Secretariat/201506/Shelter After Disaster 2nd Edition.pdf](http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Documents/Secretariat/201506/Shelter_After_Disaster_2nd_Edition.pdf) (accessed 15 January 2019).



- Illich, I. 1978 *Toward a History of Needs*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Illich, I. 1976 *Medical Nemesis: The Expropriation of Health*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Illich, I. 1972 *Tools for Conviviality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- IOM [International Organization for Migration]. 2008. *Migration, Environment and Climate Change: Assessing the Evidence*. IOM: Geneva.
- [IPBES] Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. 2019 *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science- Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Bonn: IPBES Secretariat.
- IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change]. 2019. *Special report on Climate Change, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Green House gas fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, WMO [World Meteorological Organization]: Geneva
- Jha, A.K., Barenstein, J., Duyne, P., Priscilla, M., Pittet, D., Sena, S. 2010. Safer Homes, Stronger Communities: A Handbook for Reconstructing after Natural Disasters. Washington DC, World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2409>
- Jijelava D, Vanclay F. 2014a. Assessing the social licence to operate of the work of humanitarian and development cooperation organizations: A case study of Mercy Corps in Samtskhe-Javakheti, Georgia. *Social Epistemology* 28(3-4), pp.297-317.
- Jijelava D, Vanclay F. 2014b. Social Licence to Operate through a gender lens: The challenges of including women's interests in development assistance projects. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal* 32(4), pp.283-293.
- Kanie, N. and Biermann, F. eds. 2017. *Governing through goals: Sustainable development goals as governance innovation*. MIT Press: Cambridge.
- Kelly, C., Ferrara, A., Wilson, G., Ripullone, F., Nolè, A., Harmer, N. and Salvati, L. 2015. Community resilience and land degradation in forest and shrubland socio-ecological systems: Evidence from Gorgoglione, Basilicata, Italy. *Land Use Policy* 46, 11-20.
- Kelman, I. 2017. Linking disaster risk reduction, climate change, and the sustainable development goals. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal* 26(3):254-258.
- Kelman, I., Gaillard, J.C., Lewis, J., Mercer, J. 2016. Learning from the history of disaster vulnerability and resilience research and practice for climate change. *Natural Hazards* 82(1): 129-143.
- Khailani, D.K. and Perera, R. 2013. Mainstreaming disaster resilience attributes in local development plans for the adaptation to climate change induced flooding: A study based on the local plan of Shan Alam City, Malaysia. *Land Use Policy* 30(1), 615-627.
- Khakee, A. 2009. *A Comparative Analysis of Emergency Powers in Europe*. Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.

[https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/99550/pp30\\_anna\\_khakee\\_emergency\\_powers.pdf](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/99550/pp30_anna_khakee_emergency_powers.pdf) (accessed 15 January 2019).

- Klein, N. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, Metropolitan Books, NY.
- Kyriacou, A.P., Muinel-Gallo, L. and Roca-Sagalés, O. 2015. Construction corrupts: empirical evidence from a panel of 42 countries. *Public choice*, 165(1-2), pp.123-145.
- La Cecla, F. 2000. *Perdersi: L'uomo senza ambiente*, Laterza: Bari.
- La Cecla, F. 1993. *Mente locale*, Eleuthera: Milano.
- Lewis, J. 2017. Social impacts of corruption upon community resilience and poverty. *Jàmbá Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 9(1), pp.1-8.
- Lewis, J. 2011. Corruption: The hidden perpetrator of under-development and vulnerability to natural hazards and disasters, *JÀMBÀ: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 3(2), pp.464-475
- Libera, (2010) Dossier Abruzzo. Crepe 6 Aprile 2009 ore 3.32. La fine dell'isola felice, in Site.it, [www.site.it/le\\_testate/notes/DOSSIER%20LIBERA%20web.pdf](http://www.site.it/le_testate/notes/DOSSIER%20LIBERA%20web.pdf) (accessed 8 August 2018).
- Longo, G. and Montévil, M. 2013. Extended criticality, phase spaces and enablement in biology. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 55, pp.64-79.
- Longo, G. and Montévil, M. 2012. The inert vs. the living state of matter: extended criticality, time geometry, anti-entropy—an overview. *Frontiers in physiology*, 3, p.39.
- Lowenstein, A. 2015. *Disaster Capitalism: Making a killing out of catastrophe*, Brooklyn: Verso.
- Magis, K. 2010. Community resilience: An indicator of social sustainability. *Society & Natural Resources* 23(5), pp.401-416.
- Mahmoudi, H., Renn, O., Vanclay, F. Hoffmann, V., Karami, E. 2013. A framework for combining Social Impact Assessment and Risk Assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 43:1-8.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D., Trejos, B., Qin, H., Joo, D. and Debner, S. 2017. Conceptualizing community resilience: Revisiting conceptual distinctions. *Community Development*, 48(1), pp.105-123.
- McManus, P., Walmsley, J., Argent, N., Baum, S., Bourke, L., Martin, J., Pritchard, B. and Sorensen, T. 2012. Rural Community and Rural Resilience: What is important to farmers in keeping their country towns alive?. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28(1), pp.20-29.
- Mitchell, A. 2013. *Risk and Resilience: From Good Idea to Good Practice*, OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers No.13, Paris: OECD. Online resource available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3ttg4cxcbp-en> [accessed 3 February 2016].
- Mora, C., Counsell, C.W., Bielecki, C.R. and Louis, L.V. 2017. Twenty-seven ways a heat wave can kill you: deadly heat in the era of climate change. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*, 10(11), p.004233.

- Murphy, K. 2012. The social pillar of sustainable development: A literature review and framework for policy analysis. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy* 8(1), 15-29.
- Nish, S. and Bice, S. 2011. Community-based agreement making with land-connected peoples, in Vanclay, F. and Esteves, A.M. (eds) *New directions in social impact assessment: conceptual and methodological advances*. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, pp.59-77.
- Norris, F., Stevens, S., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. and Pfefferbaum, R. 2008. Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 41, pp.127-150.
- Nosengo, N. (2010), "Italy puts seismology in the dock", *Nature*, Vol. 465, No. 7301, pp. 992-992.
- Nosengo, N. (2012), "New twists in Italian Seismology Trial: Californian scientist testifies against defendants in quake manslaughter case", *Nature*, 16 February 2012
- O'Brien, K.L. 2016. Climate change and social transformations: is it time for a quantum leap?. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 7(5), pp.618-626
- O'Brien, K. 2012. Global environmental change II: from adaptation to deliberate transformation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(5), pp.667-676.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. 2009. Effectiveness in social impact assessment: Aboriginal peoples and resource development in Australia. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 27(2), pp.95-110.
- O'Hare, P. and White, I. 2013. Deconstructing Resilience : Lessons from Planning Practice. *Planning, Practice and Research* 28(3), pp.275-279.
- OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] 2013. Policy Making after Disasters: Helping Regions become Resilient – The case of post-earthquake Abruzzo. Paris, France: OECD.
- OECD, [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development]. 2011. OECD Regional Outlook 2011: Building Resilient Regions for Stronger Economies. OECD, Paris.
- Oliver-Smith, A., Alcántara-Ayala, I., Burton, I. and Lavell, A. 2017. The social construction of disaster risk: Seeking root causes, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, Vol. 22, pp.469-474.
- Olsson, P., Folke, C. and Hahn, T. 2004. Social-ecological transformation for ecosystem management: the development of adaptive co-management of a wetland landscape in southern Sweden. *Ecology and Society*, 9(4).
- Oliver-Smith, A., Alcántara-Ayala, I., Burton, I. and Lavell, A. 2017. The social construction of disaster risk: Seeking root causes, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, Vol. 22, pp.469-474.
- Oliver-Smith, A. 1990. Post-disaster housing reconstruction and social inequality: a challenge to policy and practice. *Disasters*, 14(1), pp.7-19.

- Oliver-Smith, A. and Goldman, R.E. 1988. Planning Goals and Urban Realities: Post-Disaster Reconstruction in a Third World City. *City & Society*, 2(2), pp.105-126.
- Oliver-Smith, A. 1977. Disaster rehabilitation and social change in Yungay, Peru. *Human Organization*, 36(1), p.5.
- Owen, G. (2011) 'After the flood: Disaster capitalism and the symbolic restructuring of intellectual space, Culture and Organization, 17(2), pp.123-137.
- Özerdem, A. and Rufini, G. (2013), L'Aquila's reconstruction challenges: has Italy learned from its previous earthquake disasters? *Disasters*, 37(1), 119-143.
- Pahl-Wostl, C. 2007. Transitions towards adaptive management of water facing climate and global change. *Water resources management*, 21(1), pp.49-62.
- Pahl-Wostl, C. 2006. The importance of social learning in restoring the multifunctionality of rivers and floodplains. *Ecology and society*, 11(1).
- Parra, C. and Moulaert, F. 2016. The governance of the nature-culture nexus: lessons learned from the San Pedro de Atacama Case Study. *Nature and Culture*, 11(3), pp.239-258.
- Parsons, M. and Nalau, J. 2016. Historical analogies as tools in understanding transformation. *Global environmental change*, 38, pp.82-96.
- Paton, D. and Johnston, D. 2001. Disasters and communities: Vulnerability, resilience and preparedness. *Disaster Prevention and Management* 10(4), pp.270-277.
- Paton, D., Millar, M. and Johnston, D. 2001. Community resilience to volcanic hazard consequences. *Natural hazards*, 24(2), pp.157-169.
- Patterson, J., Schulz, K., Vervoort, J., Van Der Hel, S., Widerberg, O., Adler, C., Hurlbert, M., Anderton, K., Sethi, M. and Barau, A. 2017. Exploring the governance and politics of transformations towards sustainability. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 24, pp.1-16.
- Patterson J., Schulz K., Vervoort J., Adler C., Hurlbert M., van der Hel S, Shmidt A., Barau A., Obani P., Sethi M., Hissen N., Tebboth K., Anderton K., Börner S., Widerberg O. 2015. 'Transformations towards sustainability': Emerging approaches, critical reflections, and a research agenda". Earth System Governance, Working Paper No. 33. Lund, Sweden, and Amsterdam, Netherlands: Earth System Governance Project, July, 2015
- Pelling, M., O'Brien, K. and Matyas, D. (2015), Adaptation and transformation. *Climatic Change*, 133(1), 113-127.
- Pelling, M. 2011. *Adaptation to Climate Change: From Resilience to Transformation*. London: Routledge.
- Perry, R.W. and Quarantelli, E.L., 2005. *What is a disaster?: New answers to old questions*. Philadelphia: Xlibris Corporation.
- Pohl C, Rist S, Zimmerman A, Fry P, Gurung GS, Schneider F, Speranza CI, Kiteme B, Boillat S, Serrano E, Hadorn GH, Weismann U. 2010. Researchers' roles in knowledge co-production: experience from sustainability research in Kenya, Switzerland, Bolivia and Nepal. *Science and Public Policy*, 37(4), pp.267-281.

- Price MF. 2003. Sustainable mountain development in Europe. Regional Sustainable Development Review: Europe, Encyclopedia of Life-Support Systems (EOLSS). Oxford, United Kingdom: EOLSS.
- Price MF, Kim EG. 1999. Priorities for sustainable mountain development in Europe. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 6, pp.203-219.
- Pyles, L/, Svistova, J., Ahn, S. (2017) ‘Securitization, racial cleansing, and disaster capitalism: Neoliberal disaster governance in the US Gulf Coast and Haiti’, *Critical Social Policy*, 37(4), pp.582-603
- Quarantelli, E.L. 1995. What is a disaster. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 13(3):221-229.
- Quarantelli, E.L. (ed.) 1998. *What is a Disaster? Perspectives on the Question*. London: Routledge.
- Quarantelli, E.L. ed., 2005. *What is a disaster?: a dozen perspectives on the question*. Routledge
- Rodriguez, H., Dynes, R.R., Quarantelli, E.L. (eds.). 2007. *Handbook of Disaster Research*. New York: Springer.
- Ross, H., Cuthill, M., Maclean, K., Jansen, D. and Witt, B. 2010. *Understanding, enhancing and managing for social resilience at the regional scale: opportunities in North Queensland*. Report to the Marine and Tropical Sciences Research Facility. Reef and Rainforest Research Centre Limited, Cairns, pp.186.
- Ross, H. and Berkes, F., 2014. Research approaches for understanding, enhancing, and monitoring community resilience. *Society & Natural Resources*, 27(8), pp.787-804.
- Rigaud, K. K., de Sherbinin, A., Jones, B., Bergmann, J., Clement, V., Ober, K., Schewe, J., Adamo, S., McCusker, B., Heuser, S., Midgley, A. 2018. Groundswell: Preparing for internal climate migration. World Bank: Washington DC.
- Rodriguez, H., Dynes, R.R., Quarantelli, E.L. (eds.). 2007. *Handbook of Disaster Research*. New York: Springer.
- Saviano, R. (2009) La ricostruzione a rischio clan ecco il partito del terremoto, in La Repubblica.it, 14 April, 2009. <http://www.repubblica.it/2009/04/sezioni/cronaca/sisma-aquila-5/saviano/saviano.html> (accessed on 8 August 2018)
- Galullo, R. (2009) Abruzzo/ Le fessure nel muro che le mafie possono far diventare un nuovo terremoto: bandi di gara, corruzione e Massimo ribasso, in Il Sole 24 Ore, online, 17 April, 2009. [http://robertogalullo.blog.ilsole24ore.com/2009/04/17/abruzzo-le-fessure-nel-muro-che-le-mafie-possono-far-diventare-un-nuovo-terremoto-bandi-di-gara-corruzione-e-massimo-ribas/?refresh\\_ce=1](http://robertogalullo.blog.ilsole24ore.com/2009/04/17/abruzzo-le-fessure-nel-muro-che-le-mafie-possono-far-diventare-un-nuovo-terremoto-bandi-di-gara-corruzione-e-massimo-ribas/?refresh_ce=1) (accessed 8 August 2018).
- Schouten, M., Opdam, P., Polman, N. and Westerhof, E. 2013. Resilience-based governance in rural landscapes: Experiments with agri-environment schemes using a spatially explicit agent-based model. *Land Use Policy* 30(1), 934-943.
- Scott, M. 2013. Resilience: A conceptual lens for rural studies? *Geography Compass* 7(9), 597-610.

- Skerratt, S. 2013. Enhancing the analysis of rural community resilience: Evidence from community land ownership. *Journal of Rural Studies* 31, 36-46.
- Sharpe, B., Hodgson, A., Leicester, G., Lyon, A., Fazey, I. 2016. Three horizons: a pathways practice for transformation. *Ecology and Society* 21(2):47.
- Slootweg, R., Vanclay, F., van Schooten, M. 2001. Function evaluation as a framework for the Integration of social and environmental impact assessment. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal* 19(1), pp.19-28.
- Smyth, E., Vanclay, F. 2017. The Social Framework for Projects: A conceptual but practical model to assist in assessing, planning and managing the social impacts of projects. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal* 35(1):65-80.
- Tierney, K., Oliver-Smith, A. 2012. Social dimensions of disaster recovery. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies & Disasters* 30(2):123-146.
- Smyth, E., Vanclay, F. 2017. The Social Framework for Projects: A conceptual but practical model to assist in assessing, planning and managing the social impacts of projects. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal* 35(1), pp.65-80.
- Solnit, R. 2009. *A Paradise Built in Hell: The Extraordinary Communities that arise in Disaster*. Viking:New York.
- Søndergaard, S. 2013. *Feedback Report on the Fact-Finding Mission to Italy*, 2013 Online resource available at:  
[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009\\_2014/documents/cont/dt/1007/1007699/1007699en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/cont/dt/1007/1007699/1007699en.pdf)
- Suopajarvi, L. 2013. Social impact assessment in mining projects in Northern Finland: Comparing practice to theory. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 42, pp.25-30.
- Tengö, M., Brondizio, E.S., Elmqvist, T., Malmer, P. and Spierenburg, M. 2014. Connecting diverse knowledge systems for enhanced ecosystem governance: the multiple evidence base approach. *Ambio*, 43(5), pp.579-591.
- Tierney, K. and Oliver-Smith, A. 2012. Social dimensions of disaster recovery. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies & Disasters* 30(2), pp.123-146.
- Tierney, K. 2012. Disaster governance: Social, political, and economic dimensions. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 37, pp.341-363.
- Tierney, K. 2007. From the margins to the mainstream? Disaster research at the crossroads. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33, pp.503-525.
- Tierney, K., Bevc, C. and Kuligowski, E. 2006. Metaphors matter: Disaster myths, media frames and their consequences in Hurricane Katrina. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 604(1), pp.57-81.
- Tierney, K. 2003. Disaster beliefs and institutional interests: Recycling disaster myths in the aftermath of 9-11. In Clarke, L. (Ed.), *Terrorism and Disaster: New Threats, New Ideas*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp.35-51.
- Tobin, G. 1999. Sustainability and community resilience: The holy grail of hazards planning? *Environmental Hazards* 1(1), pp.13-25.

- Twigg, J. and Calderone, M. 2019. Building livelihood and community resilience.
- Twigg, J. 2007. *Characteristics of a disaster-resilient community: a guidance note*. Department for International Development (DFID).
- UNDP [United Nations Development Plan]. 2014. *Human Development Report 2014. Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*, United Nations Development Programme, New York.
- Stucchi, M., Pinho, R. and Cocco, M. (2016), “After the L’Aquila Trial”, *Seismological Research Letters*, Vol. 87, pp. 591-596.
- Tribunale di L’Aquila (2012), *Sentenza nella causa penale contro Barberi Franco, De Bernadinis Bernardo, Boschi Enzo, Selvaggi Giulio, Calvi Gian Michele, Eva Claudio, Dolce Mauro*. Tribunale di L’Aquila, L’Aquila, Italy. Available at: <https://iononfaccioniente.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/sentenza-grandi-rischi-completa.pdf> (accessed 30 July 2018).
- UNDP [United Nations Development Plan]. 2014. *Human Development Report 2014. Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*, United Nations Development Programme, New York.
- UNDP [United Nations Development Plan]. 1997. *Human development report*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDRO (1982), ‘Shelter After Disaster: Guidelines for Assistance’, Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-Ordinator. Geneva. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/shelter-after-disaster-guidelines-assistance>
- UNDRR [United Nations for Disaster Risk Reduction]. 2019. *Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*. Geneva: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. [https://gar.unisdr.org/sites/default/files/reports/2019-05/full\\_gar\\_report.pdf](https://gar.unisdr.org/sites/default/files/reports/2019-05/full_gar_report.pdf)
- UNECOSOC [United Nations Economic and Social Council]. 2018. From Global to Local, supporting sustainable and resilient societies in urban and rural communities: Transformations towards sustainable and resilient societies. New York: United Nations Economic and Social Council, E/HLS/2018/1. [accessed 27 June 2019] [https://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=E/HLS/2018/1&Lang=E](https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/HLS/2018/1&Lang=E)
- UN General Assembly. 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 21 October 2015, A/RES/70/1. Available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html>
- UNDPKO, 2008. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines*. New York: United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. [https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/capstone\\_eng\\_0.pdf](https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/capstone_eng_0.pdf) (accessed 15 January 2019).
- UNISDR. 2018. Annual Report: 2017, United Nations, Geneva. Available at: [https://www.unisdr.org/files/58158\\_unisdr2017annualreport.pdf](https://www.unisdr.org/files/58158_unisdr2017annualreport.pdf)
- UNISDR. 2015. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. Available at: [http://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291\\_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf)

- UNISDR and UNDP. 2007. 'Building Disaster Resilient Communities: Good Practices and Lessons Learned', Global Network of NGOs for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva, June, 2007. Available at: [https://www.unisdr.org/files/596\\_10307.pdf](https://www.unisdr.org/files/596_10307.pdf)
- UNISDR. 2007. Building Disaster Resilient Communities: Good Practices and Lessons Learned. Geneva: United Nations Development Program. Available at: [http://www.unisdr.org/files/596\\_10307.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/596_10307.pdf)
- UNISDR. 2005. Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/2005/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf>
- Vanclay, F. 2019. Reflections on Social Impact Assessment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *Impact assessment and project appraisal*, DOI:10.1080/14615517.2019.1685807
- Vanclay, F. 2017. Project-induced displacement and resettlement: from impoverishment risks to an opportunity for development?. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 35(1), pp.3-21.
- Vanclay, F. 2015 The potential application of qualitative evaluation methods in European regional development: Reflections on the use of Performance Story Reporting in Australian natural resource management. *Regional Studies* 49(8):1326-1339.
- Vanclay, F., Esteves, A.M., Aucamp, I., and Franks, D. 2015 *Social Impact Assessment: Guidance for assessing and managing the social impacts of projects*, International Association for Impact Assessment:Fargo ND.
- Vanclay, F. 2014. Developments in Social Impact Assessment: An Introduction to a collection of seminal research papers, in Vanclay, F. (ed.) *Development in Social Impact Assessment*, Edwards Elgar Publishing, XV-XXXIV
- Vanclay, F. and Esteves, A.M. eds. 2011. *New directions in social impact assessment: conceptual and methodological advances*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vanclay, F. 2003. International principles for social impact assessment. *Impact assessment and project appraisal*, 21(1), pp.5-12.
- Vanclay, F. 2002 Conceptualising social impacts. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 22(3):83-211.
- van der Ploeg, L. and Vanclay, F., 2017. A human rights based approach to project induced displacement and resettlement. *Impact assessment and project appraisal*, 35(1), pp.34-52.
- Venice Commission (1995), *Emergency Powers*, Science and technique of democracy No. 12, Strasbourg: European Commission for Democracy to Law, CDL-STD(1995)012. Available at: [http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-STD\(1995\)012-e](http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-STD(1995)012-e) (accessed 1 November 2019).
- Wallemacq, P. and House, R. (2018), Economic losses, poverty & disasters: 1998-2017. Centre for research on the Epidemiology of Disasters and United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). Available at: [https://www.unisdr.org/files/61119\\_credeconomiclosses.pdf](https://www.unisdr.org/files/61119_credeconomiclosses.pdf) (accessed 1 November 2019).