



Building indicators for prevention of flood risk: Worms tools for evaluation, management and regional planning.

B. Barroca (1), J.M. Mouchel (1)

(1) Centre d'Enseignement et de Recherche Eau Ville Environnement (CEREVE), Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, France (barroca@cereve.enpc.fr)

Each event exposes the weaknesses of the prevention system as well as the local weakness to the risks, it questions about the relevance and the effectiveness of the means of prevention. But these experiments also reveal a whole of resistance and adaptation of the exposed territory which shows that effective and adequate local strategies may exist. The evaluation methods are varied but the tendency is to explore better the qualitative dimension of the vulnerability in the approach of the flood risk. Nevertheless, the local actors are often stripped when the question is to evaluate the vulnerabilities of the territory for which they are responsible. The need for making it possible to the local decision makers to have tools in order to as well as possible appreciate the vulnerability of a territory to the floods is an increasing request. Thus, many disparate initiatives aiming to better appreciating the weakness and the resistance of the easily flooded territories develop with various scales. Those are often partial and contextual. The need is to try to establish a support facilitating the evaluation of the vulnerability. Beyond theoretical or conceptual convergences, there are obvious synergies between these dynamic, with regard to the data retrieval and the establishment of adequate information systems to account for the weakness of a territory.

It is initially a question of giving itself a method making it possible to organize in all clearness the choice of the indicators and integrating in this choice the most points of view (of the economists to the town planners, of the experts to the political leaders...). To take up this challenge, three simple orientations were followed:

to break up the total problems of the vulnerability into more homogeneous subsets and manage;

to articulate these subsets around an architecture allowing to present the possible interactions between the factors of weakness

to put in competition, and not to amalgamate, visions of the vulnerability of the various actors likely to seize themselves of this concept.

These orientations led to the choice of a structure where a whole of indicators of vulnerability is integrated, decomposable in several "modules", having each one a certain homogeneity and specificity. Its presentation is carried out in the indicators form of vulnerability, organized and argued within a tool which also characterizes their possible interactions.