



COLLOQUIUM 3



Project acronym: BuildERS

Project title: Building European Communities' Resilience and Social Capital

Call: H2020-SU-SEC-2018-2019-2020/H2020-SU-SEC-2018



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 833496

Disclaimer

The content of the publication herein is the sole responsibility of the publishers and it does not necessarily represent the views expressed by the European Commission or its services.

While the information contained in the documents is believed to be accurate, the authors(s) or any other participant in the BuildERS consortium make no warranty of any kind with regard to this material including, but not limited to the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

Neither the BuildERS Consortium nor any of its members, their officers, employees or agents shall be responsible or liable in negligence or otherwise howsoever in respect of any inaccuracy or omission herein.

Without derogating from the generality of the foregoing neither the BuildERS Consortium nor any of its members, their officers, employees or agents shall be liable for any direct or indirect or consequential loss or damage caused by or arising from any information advice or inaccuracy or omission herein.



Project no.	833496
Project acronym:	BuildERS
Project title:	Building European Communities' Resilience and Social Capital
Call:	H2020-SU-SEC-2018-2019-2020/H2020-SU-SEC-2018
Start date of project:	01.05.2019
Duration:	36 months
Deliverable title:	D6.9 Colloquium 3
Due date of deliverable:	31.01.2022
Actual date of submission:	08.03.2022
Deliverable Lead Partner :	VTT
Work Package:	WP6 Co-design and co-development with Stakeholders
No of Pages:	21
Keywords:	BuildERS, dissemination, vulnerability, social capital, risk awareness, resilience

Name	Organization
Jaana Keränen (JK)	VTT
Tor-Olav Naevestad (TN)	TOI
Alexandra Olson (AO)	SAL
Maira Schobert (MS)	EKU
Peter Windsheimer (PW)	DRK
Lucia Savadori (LS)	UTR
Kati Orru (KO)	UTA

Dissemination level

PU	Public
----	--------



History

Version	Date	Reason	Revised by
01	18.01.2022	First draft of the deliverable	JK
02	04.02.2022	Contribution from TOI, SAL, EKU, DRK, UTR and UTA	JK
03	17.02.2022	Comments from internal review JK/GEO; MS/EKU; MAB/UI	JK
04	18.02.2022	Final version to be submitted	JK
	04.03.2022	Technical check-up and some modifications	AMH
Final	08.03.2022	Submission	AMH



Executive Summary

During the BuildERS project, three so-called global resilience research colloquia have been planned and organised. They are a part of the implementation of WP6 Co-design and co-development with stakeholders. The aim of WP6 is to support and facilitate interaction between researchers, citizens, volunteer groups, NGOs, authorities, technology providers and other stakeholders throughout the project lifecycle. It also provides the WPs 1-5 critical supportive, facilitation service, and produces iteratively new knowledge from the WPs for the sequential WPs and tasks. The role of the colloquia is particularly to strengthen discussion and offer a place to present the findings of the BuildERS project.

This document provides the results of the BuildERS third online colloquium, which took place on 13 January 2022. The target of the colloquium was to find out what role care organisations play as intermediaries between individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities. The colloquium was divided into three sessions. First, brief presentations of the related BuildERS research were kept in a joint session. Second, facilitated discussions on the intermediary role of care organisations between the individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities were organised in different language sessions. Third, joint discussion and wrap-up of the results of language-based discussion sessions was carried out.

The presentations offered insights of the work done in WP3 and WP4 during the project. Presentation 1 described how care organisations act as advocates of the most marginalised during the pandemic (the work done in WP3). Presentation 2 provided results and compared experiences from the study on flood management and the COVID-19 in Germany (the work done in WP4). Presentation 3 focused on upraising the needs of earthquake survivors in displacement strategies in Italy (the work done in WP4). Presentation 4 clarified ways forward in engaging the needs of diverse society in vulnerability assessment (the work done in WP4).

On the next pages, short summaries of the presentations, discussions in language-based groups, and the joint discussion and wrap-up after group discussions are presented.



Table of Contents

Disclaimer	1
Executive Summary	4
Table of Contents	5
List of Acronyms	6
List of tables	7
1. The BuildERS research colloquia	8
1.1 The target and the agenda of the third colloquium	8
2. Short summaries of the presentations	9
2.1 Social care organisations as advocates of the most marginalised during the pandemic.....	9
2.2 Turning a "blind eye" on vulnerabilities? Managing floods and COVID-19 in Germany	10
2.3 Upraising earthquake survivors needs in displacement strategies in Italy.....	10
2.4 Ways forward in engaging the needs of diverse society in vulnerability assessment.....	11
3. Language-based discussion groups.....	12
3.1 Discussion themes	12
3.2 Discussion groups	13
4. Joint discussion and wrap-up.....	14
4.1 English discussion group	14
4.2 German discussion group	14
4.3 Italian discussion group.....	15
4.4 Finnish discussion group.....	15
4.5 Estonian discussion group	16
4.6 Norwegian discussion group.....	16
5. Wrap-up of discussions.....	17
Appendix 1: Agenda for the event.....	18
Appendix 2: Participants of the third colloquium	19



List of Acronyms

BuildERS	Building European Communities Resilience and Social Capital project
D	Deliverable
DRK	German Red Cross
EKU	Eberhard Karls Universitaet Tuebingen
EU	European Union
GEO	Geonardo Environmental Technologies Ltd
SAL	The Salvation Army
TOI	Institute for Transport Economics
UTA	University of Tartu
UTR	University of Trento
WP	Work Package
VTT	Technical Research Centre of Finland



List of tables

Table 1. The organisations participated in the language-based discussion groups	13
Table 2. Organisations participated in the third colloquium	19



1. The BuildERS research colloquia

During the BuildERS project, three so-called global resilience research colloquia have been organised. They are a part of the implementation of WP6 Co-design and co-development with stakeholders. The aim of WP6 is to support and facilitate interaction between researchers, citizens, volunteer groups, NGOs, authorities, technology providers, and other stakeholders throughout the project lifecycle. WP6 also provides the WPs 1-5 critical supportive, facilitation service, and produces iteratively new knowledge from the WPs for the sequential WPs and tasks. The role of the colloquia is particularly to strengthen discussion and offer a place to present the findings of the BuildERS project.

1.1 The target and the agenda of the third colloquium

The third BuildERS online colloquium took place on 13 January 2022. The target of the colloquium was to find out what role care organisations play as intermediaries between individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities. Social service providers work to mitigate social disadvantage, which may particularly loom during a crisis like the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Social service providers have a close understanding of the needs of their clients. However, BuildERS findings indicate that this knowledge on the diverse life situations is rarely taken into account in tailoring the crisis preparedness and response measures. One of the reasons seems to be that there is a lack of interaction between disaster management authorities and social service providers.

The third colloquium focused on mechanisms of communicating the needs of the diverse society to the disaster managers. The colloquium was divided into three sessions. First, brief presentations of the related BuildERS research were presented in joint session. Second, facilitated discussions on the intermediary role of care organisations between the individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities were organised in different language sessions. Third, joint discussion and wrap-up of the results of language-based discussion sessions was carried out. The agenda of the third colloquium is in appendix 1.

The target groups of the third colloquium were social service providers, for example, representatives of non-profit sector agencies for people with impairment, home care, long-term care and care for marginalised groups like homeless, migrants and drug rehabilitation clients. The focus was on NGOs and private providers serving outside state and local government premises.

There were 42 participants in the colloquium. The organisations from which the participants came from is presented in table 2 in appendix 2.



2. Short summaries of the presentations

The colloquium started with the introduction of the BuildERS project focus areas. The project has specially focused on people in vulnerable situations, such as clients of social care organisations and socially marginalized people and their experiences in crises. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the work has been specialized in these people' experiences with pandemic, but also other types of crises has been studied.

Four short presentations offered the results accomplished so far: 1) Social care organisations as advocates of the most marginalised during the pandemic, 2) Turning a "blind eye" on vulnerabilities? Managing floods and COVID-19 in Germany, 3) Upraising earthquake survivors' needs in displacement strategies in Italy, and 4) Ways forward in engaging the needs of diverse society in vulnerability assessment. The results were based especially on the survey for the clients of social care organisations in 14 European countries focusing on the Covid-19 very relevant hazard, and interviews with the managers of the social care organisations. More information from the presented studies can be found from the BuildERS project public deliverables¹.

2.1 Social care organisations as advocates of the most marginalised during the pandemic

The survey was completed in August 2021 and reached over 300 respondents. One of the particularly prominent aspects of the results was the importance of social care organisations and NGOs, and how vital they were providing services to their clients during the pandemic. Practitioners and social workers were seen as key sources of information by their clients. They were also serving as intermediaries in terms to explaining official guidelines and combatting misinformation and misperceptions. These organisations can identify barriers, which prevent their client populations of receiving services they need as they are very much aware of the needs of their client populations. One example was language barriers. Due to the pandemic, many services made the transition to digital platforms. Lack of digital literacy created a significant barrier to some populations in receiving care and services. The social care organisations were very well positioned to identify this obstacle and provide support for their client populations to alleviate these problems. Social care organisations had very good understanding of the sorts of collaboration and cooperation needed to take place in order to continue to provide services to their clients and to get the needs of their clients to across relevant stakeholders.

In the survey, the risk awareness and trust were measured. Among people living on the street and temporary conditions, risk awareness and trust in authorities and information were the lowest levels. One of the most important sources of information for these groups were social workers at the social

¹ Naevestad et al. 2022 D3.5 Observations for Draft Policy and Other Measures in Building Resilience for the Severely Vulnerable Populations, Savadori et al. D4.2 Vulnerability in post-disaster temporary housing, Orru et al. 2021 D4.4 Reducing social vulnerability by innovative data fusion for more-informed rescue prioritisation, and Schobert et al. 2021 D 4.5 Impacts of Elbe flooding disasters on socially underprivileged groups and lessons for resilience improvement, see <https://buildersproject.eu/>



care organisations they used. This indicates that social workers play a very important role in increasing risk awareness related to protection measures.

2.2 Turning a "blind eye" on vulnerabilities? Managing floods and COVID-19 in Germany

The German case study focused on several floods and the COVID-19 pandemic in the city of Dresden and surroundings. The study included interviews of experts of crisis management, social services and authorities and the survey targeted the population of the city and surroundings. Crisis management often lacks a comprehensive understanding of needs and potentials of diverse populations. Disaster management measures are often based on a certain notion of normality, e.g., people are able to help themselves and understand the German language. This notion of normality does not include the whole diversity of population. In the beginning of the pandemic, people who did not speak German or needed information in an easy language were struggling to stay informed about the current guidelines. Information at the beginning was only available in German, multi-lingual public announcements and more easy language became a new standard as the pandemic progressed. Rules regarding lockdowns and different levels of contact restrictions were changing quite often due to the current situational changes. Social service institutions and their staff did often not know how to instruct their clients. They felt quite left alone. At the same time, there was a high demand of social services, and more problems affected the people already using social services. Initial responses of crisis management are often not planned in an inclusive way, but inclusion is considered later on. The consideration of vulnerabilities has evolved during the pandemic but there are still many gaps. Disaster management needs to consider vulnerabilities and social diversity already in the beginning of relief activities. It is also important to check that crisis management activities do not increase vulnerability, and how they reduce risks. Crisis management should work more closely with social care providers who know more about the needs and capabilities of vulnerable people.

One interesting issue comparing the pandemic and previous floods was that during the pandemic people felt very lonely since they had to stay at home and were asked to physically distance themselves. In floods, people worked together, such as carrying sandbags, to fight the crisis. This influenced how people recovered afterwards psychologically.

2.3 Upraising earthquake survivors' needs in displacement strategies in Italy

The study conducted in Italy focused on people who survived earthquakes but had to leave their homes and live for a certain transitional period in temporary housing. Several people who survived the three main earthquakes that occurred in Italy in recent years were interviewed: 2009 L'Aquila Earthquake, 2012 Emilia Earthquake, and 2016 Central Italy Earthquake. The focus in the interviews was the quality of life of the people housed in the temporary solutions. People that suffered an earthquake received first aid from social care organisations and from the government. If their house was damaged, they were hosted in tents or in gyms or other places that the government was able to provide. As time went on, they were given a more solid solution, namely, a temporary housing solution.



The main finding was that the quality of life of the displaced survivors dropped down during displacement as compared to before and after and did not recover even years after the displacement experience. Living in temporary housing solution does generate a big vulnerability issue for surviving people. The interesting question is what role can the care organisations play as intermediaries between individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities. Most of the social care organizations were present during the immediate aftermath of the event (emergency phase) but after the emergency had passed, their presence was intermittent and unsystematic. Instead, people who are housed in temporary solutions need ongoing assistance because they are the most vulnerable people after the disaster. An interesting issue is to determine what is that added value of continuous support – i.e., support in the post-crisis phase. The presence of social care organisations in the post-crisis phase is needed because it can alleviate the discomfort of being housed in temporary solutions. In contrast, in the cases we examined, people living in temporary housing solutions were left alone. Crisis management is organised in such a way that it is very efficient during the emergency phase but does not cover the time after the emergency, i.e., the post-crisis phase. It is very important to think about the possibility of having a continuous support even after the emergency phase has finished.

We are now facing the COVID-19 pandemic. Looking at the results from the earthquakes survivors and the long-term effects that this critical experience had on their quality of life, it would be possible to learn from these results to better manage crises by giving greater importance to the planning of the post-crisis phase, especially for these vulnerable people.

2.4 Ways forward in engaging the needs of diverse society in vulnerability assessment

In the Estonian case study, a vulnerability assessment tool was developed. The target of the tool is to address the lack of access to social support and social care as one of the sources of vulnerability. The study carried out an overview of different approaches in different European countries on how vulnerability is already addressed in the crisis preparedness and planning phases. The study found out that in most of the analysed countries, the approaches were very much based on pre-determined groups of vulnerability, such as elderly and people with chronic diseases. The approach does not take into account a more situational and dynamic understanding of vulnerability that anyone be affected through vulnerable situation and should be supported to remain self-sufficient. There are many sophisticated statistical analysis methods to understand and predict vulnerability in crises, but they are difficult to understand and interpret in terms of what kind of support is appropriate in a certain situation.

The proposed vulnerability assessment tool tries to address concerns and shift the focus on the individual needs and capacities but also draws attention to the availability and accessibility of the support from the individuals' personal networks and from institutions expected to take care and offer support. Another important aspect of the tools is an attempt to emphasise the intersectionality of vulnerability factors. For example, support such as family or neighbouring community might not be available or accessible due to the movement restrictions or unworkable communication networks. The tool tries also to connect different sources of vulnerability with potential indicators with different registries and databases. Clearly, many of the aspects are not covered by registries. They might help to indicate the support from communities and care organisations but accessibility or functionality of protective circumstances are not covered in any registries.



3. Language-based discussion groups

3.1 Discussion themes

After the joint opening session, the participants of the colloquium split into different virtual language-based discussion groups. The idea of the discussion groups was to give voice to the care organisations that are rarely participated in the disaster management decision-making. The BuildERS project partners acted as hosts or facilitators who asked questions and took notes of the discussion.

Key discussion themes were 1) care organisations' experiences of involvement in disaster management so far, and 2) care organisations contribution to the disaster management in the ideal world. The themes were clarified into more specific questions that were:

Experiences from the pandemic:

- What are the most important sources of help you and your organization have provided to your clients to cope with the pandemic?
- What kind of help/resources/guidance have your organisation received from authorities to cope with the COVID-19?
- What have been your clients' most important challenges needs during the pandemic and what have you and your organisation done to make the authorities aware of your clients' needs during the pandemic?

Ideal world:

- What would your organisation's crisis cooperation with and support from authorities look like, in situations like the pandemic?
- For quantitative measuring agreement on a scale of 1-10: Do you think your client's needs are sufficiently taken into account in crisis preparedness planning?



3.2 Discussion groups

The organisations participated in the discussion groups are listed in the table 1. There are also briefly described the key care services organisations provide to their customers. In addition to these organisations, the discussion groups included researchers from the BuildERS project.

Table 1. The organisations participated in the language-based discussion groups

	Name of the organisation	Key care services provided
English group	The Salvation Army, Loisto Settlement	Housing services, support for individuals with disabilities, support for victims of honor-related violence, support for homeless populations. Social youth work with gender and cultural sensitive approach.
Estonian group	Estonian Association of the Blind, Private home care provider, Estkeer OÜ, Private long-term elderly care provider, Saaremaa Südamekodu, Estonian Association of Associations of Women with Disabilities, Tallinn and Harju County Disabled Women's Association	
Finnish group	Suvanto ry - National organisation which purpose is to prevent and provide information on elder violence, abuse and exploitation.	Personal conversational therapy and peer support groups for the elderly, training professionals on the forms of elder abuse.
Germany group	General Secretariat German Red Cross (GRC), Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund / Workers' Samaritan Foundation Germany (ASB)	Psychosocial care; nursing basic care; ambulant care Voluntary services for Senior citizens; open care and group services; day care; Rescue service for senior citizens.
Italian group	(1) PsyPlus Onlus ETS, (2) Social Emergency Roma Capitale (Social Operations Room), (3) Associazione Psicologi per i Popoli, (4) ESPRI' (Emergency Social Psychological Research Intervention).	(1) provides social solidarity interventions, (2) provides social emergency interventions 24h, (3) provides professional psychologists first aid, (4) Provides psychological and psychosocial first aid.
Norwegian group	The salvation army	Services for active substance users, accommodation for active substance users, services for immigrants, person who is responsible for contact with municipal authorities.



4. Joint discussion and wrap-up

After the discussions in six different language-based groups, joint discussion and a wrap-up session was carried out. There are short summaries of each discussion group highlighting the main topics and a short wrap-up of the discussions below.

4.1 English discussion group

Participants from different countries shared a lot of great stories and experiences, with interesting similarities among their experiences. One of the main concerns that was mentioned by the practitioners was that risks were overlooked and increased unintentionally by the measures taken by the authorities. For instance, the way that information was diffused through official channels did not take individuals with disabilities into account, as it was often not communicated clearly or translated. This exacerbated vulnerabilities for these individuals, as it made things even more difficult and lonely for them. This aspect of communication-related barriers inhibiting coping and preventing vulnerable segments of the population from taking part in crisis management is very much aligned with BuildERS findings.

Local authorities, however, seemed to do a better job helping social care organisations and NGOs to take care of their clients. They were mentioned to be very supportive, and in one particular case it was mentioned that a public health team would visit centres to help them meet official guidelines. Comparatively, national authorities seemed to give quite chaotic information.

Many aspects that were mentioned during this breakout discussion related to the intersectional approach to vulnerability in disasters that BuildERS has taken. For example, it was mentioned for one NGO that 'home' was not necessarily a safe place to be for some segments of the population due to the heightened risk of domestic violence. Another NGO practitioner mentioned how isolation for individuals who were disabled was exacerbated by the onset of the pandemic. These experiences denote the importance of local and national authorities taking the accumulation of different factors and social categorisations into account when seeking to react to, or prepare for, a disaster.

4.2 German discussion group

In the German group, there were a lot of experts from security and disaster research which is interconnected with disaster management. One of the main issue was that information, especially regarding how to behave and what has to be considered when providing social care services during pandemic, were announced (from authorities to social care providers) in very short term. Organisations had to implement guidance to their work in a very short time period. They did not have time to consider what changed guidance means to the services they provide. They also had to translate guidance into different languages. Especially information for the people in migrant centres was very essential to translate because in the beginning of the pandemic information was only given in German. Social care providers had to translate them and give guidance to all clients. There was a lot of frustration coming up because social care providers themselves did not get all information so they could not give their services as they planned to. They got unpleasant responses from the clients



as they were in the front line. This seemed to be especially difficult for the service providers since they wanted to help but got frustrated feedback.

4.3 Italian discussion group

Organisations in the Italian group were especially focused on psychological support. The pandemic has increased the need for psychological support, especially among health workers. There are also a lot of other people in crises because they have lost their job or they are working really long days trying to save lives. Organisations providing psychological support are able to give support especially by phone, obviously not in practice. The system had worked well although organisations providing psychological support were never involved in the planning phase. The work was done because the need has been so evident that the request had to be responded and therefore the organisations were contacted, but after the event, not before it. The odd thing in Italy is that the involvement of volunteer organisations in the planning and first phases of the emergencies is permitted by the law, but the law is not always applied. The situation varies according to the region. In some regions, for example in Central Italy, the system involves voluntary organisations in the planning phase before the crisis occurs. In other regions, this does not happen. The problem of the system is that the health system is managed by the region, but the social services are managed by the local municipal level. These two different management levels make it difficult to work efficiently due to e.g. communication problems.

4.4 Finnish discussion group

The Finnish group discussed about the elderly and how they have coped with the pandemic. One of the main issues discussed was how to secure those vital services that are needed by the elderly. Many elderly were actually left alone if, for instance, home visits of care organisations were not allowed due to movement restrictions. On the other hand, care organisations felt that they did not get clear and consistent information from local and national level authorities. The important role of care organisations could be translating authorities' language into everyday speech and backwards; this way the needs, concerns and thoughts of the care organisations' customers are better shared with the authorities. Another important issue discussed was the significance of social relations. BuildERS -project has emphasised both positive and negative sides of close relationships. According to the estimations, domestic violence has increased during the pandemic. Close relatives may say to the person that it is not allowed to go outside due to movement restrictions. The pandemic can then be used as an excuse to act violently. On the other hand, social relationships may strengthen people's sense of safety.



4.5 Estonian discussion group

Experience from care organisations' side was that authorities took very slowly account impairments in their measures. At the same time, care organisations tried to consult state organisations to give more accessible information. For example, visually impaired people's accessibility to information needed to be taken into account; guidance on disinfection practices should be accessible to the blind. Comments regarding the relationships with authorities or state organisations were rather critical. Particularly, lack of material resources and material support from central authorities was a critical issue. Care organisations had relied on authorities help. The need of help or care was increasing but care organisations could not offer enough help. Understanding of the needs of different groups and people who are already in vulnerable situation and the clients of care organisations needs to be better and proactively mapped so that the needs do not come as a surprise during the crisis. The pandemic, which is a rather slow ongoing crisis, has highlighted the importance of well-established collaboration links. We need to build the preparedness together and better understand what we need to be prepared for. Connections between care organisations, authorities and state organisations need to be established already during normal times before the crisis breaks out.

4.6 Norwegian discussion group

As in other countries, services that social care organisations offer had to shut down or change to digital services during the pandemic. Providing information was a challenge. The most important source of help the organisations provided was to stay open during the crisis and to try to provide services. All the innovations that were required to manage this challenging situation were quite an accomplishment. One example of services provided was shower opportunities for homeless people. That was a need not many actors provided although there was a huge demand. The opinion of collaboration with authorities was not very favourable. New guidelines from the authorities on how to act was given quite fast to municipalities, but at the same time care organisations got the information, for example, from TV. They had to adapt to new situation and get new information across their clients. That was a big challenge. The situation and guidance changed all the time and at the same time, there was a question whether these rules are understandable. To get the necessary information, one needs to be able to read and write, have internet access, and have a computer to communicate. A lot of the clients do not have all these opportunities. They are very dependent on social care organisations to get the information. The role of intermediaries covers several aspects, and especially communication and information sharing social care organisations provided was crucial. In conclusion, the role of intermediaries is very demanding.



5. Wrap-up of discussions

Common for all countries was the challenge that care organisations needed to adapt to a new challenging situation, and use both official and unofficial ways of working to meet their customers' needs. During the Covid-19 pandemic it has been important to keep facilities open and maintain the provision of services. Organisations had to implement authorities' guidelines on short notice; they did not have much time to consider these new guidelines and needed to improvise very innovative ways of working to provide help and aid for their customers.

One of the main challenges was that the information shared by the authorities changed very quickly: rules regarding lockdowns, social distancing and movement restrictions were constantly changing. Care organisations and their staff often did not know how to instruct their customers. At the same time, there has been a high demand of social services. Thus, we can say that the long-lasting crisis situation has highly affected those people who were already before the pandemic in a vulnerable situation.

Another challenge was that the authorities' guidelines did not always reach all care organisations. Sometimes the organisations had to request advice and share it with their clients. Furthermore, rules were not always easy-to-understand. There has also been a digital divide: many customers have not had access to information through internet and they have been highly dependent on care organisations to get the information.

The role of care organisations covered several aspects, but communication and information sharing were especially crucial. Care organisations also translated guidance into different languages and shared it with the migrant communities and asylum seekers living in reception centres. At the beginning of the pandemic information was available only in native language(s) in many countries.

Another universal experience was that care organisations had to play several roles, requiring great versatility in their tasks. Many societal services (e.g., pharmacies and medical centres) were not given the same way as in a normal situation. The staff of care organisations found themselves being medical workers, digital technicians, and interpreters. They found all these different roles very challenging and exhausting but they tried to keep their services going since they felt they did not have any other options.

Disaster management needs to consider people's vulnerabilities and social diversity from the beginning of relief activities. It is also important to make sure that crisis management activities do not increase vulnerabilities but rather reduce risk of becoming vulnerable. One concern was that the risks of causing harm were overlooked by the authorities. Colloquium participants shared examples of cases where the situation of homeless and people with disabilities was worsened do to some disaster management actions authorities.

Crisis management should work closer with social care providers who know more about capabilities and needs of vulnerable people. The pandemic, that is a rather slow ongoing crisis, has highlighted the importance of well-established collaboration links. There is a clear need to prepare together and to understand better what preparation measures need to be taken. Connections between care organisations, authorities and state organisations need to be established already during normal times before the crisis brakes out.



Appendix 1: Agenda for the event



Let's get together to hear and discuss about the care organisations role in disaster management

Thursday 13 January 2022
11 – 12.45 CET online

What role care organisations play as intermediaries between individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities?

Target group: social service providers, for example, representatives of unions for people with impairment, home care, long-term care and care for marginalised groups like homeless, migrants and drug rehabilitation clients. We will focus on NGOs and private providers serving outside state and local government premises.

Rationale: Social service providers work to mitigate social disadvantage, which may particularly loom during a crisis like today's pandemic. Social service providers have a close understanding of the needs of their clients. However, our findings indicate that this knowledge on the diverse life situations is rarely taken into account in tailoring the crisis preparedness and response measures. One of the reasons seems to be that there is a lack of interaction between the disaster management and social service providers. The Colloquium focuses on mechanisms of communicating the needs of the diverse society to the disaster managers. At the meeting we will first present brief accounts of the related BuildERS research. Second, we will invite discussion on the intermediary role of care organisations between the individuals in vulnerable situations and authorities.

Agenda for the event:

Introduction and short pitches on BuildERS studies (15 min)

Social care organisations as advocates of the most marginalised during the pandemic **Tor-Olav, Alexandra**

- Turning a "blind eye" on vulnerabilities? Managing floods and COVID-19 in Germany **Maira, Peter**
- Upraising earth-quake survivors needs in displacement strategies in Italy **Lucia**
- Ways forward in engaging the needs of diverse society in vulnerability assessment **Kati**

Breakout to language-based discussion groups (45 min)

Key discussion themes:

- What are the care organisations' experiences of involvement in disaster management so far?
- How could care organisations contribute to the disaster management in the ideal world?

Joint discussion and wrap-up (20 min)

The participation is free of charge and is held via Teams.

Register [here](#).

Warmly welcome!

The H2020 BuildERS (Building European Communities' Resilience and Social Capital) team includes researchers and NGOs representatives of various disciplines, backgrounds and competences from ten countries. Please find more about our findings and solutions that we propose: <https://buildersproject.eu/>



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 833496



10000000-2021-123456789



Appendix 2: Participants of the third colloquium

The third BuildERS colloquium assembled 42 participants. Table 2 below shows the organisations from which the participants came from.

Table 2. Organisations participated in the third colloquium

Organisation	Country
Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Region Düsseldorf e.V.	Germany
Eesti Pimedate Liit	Estonia
ESPRI	Italy
For Safe Age-Suvanto ry/ VoiVa coop.	Finland
Frelsesarmeen (Migrasjonssenteret)	Norway
Frelsesarmeens rusomsorg	Norway
Frelsesarmeens rusomsorg	Norway
Frelsesarmeens rusomsorg, Fagerborg	Norway
German Red Cross	Germany
German Red Cross	Germany
German Red Cross Headquarters	Germany
German Red Cross Headquarters	Germany
Institute of Transport Economics, TOI	Norway
Institute of Transport Economics, TOI	Norway
Italian Civil Protection Department	Italy
journalist	Italy
Loisto Settlementti/ Bahar-Project	Finland
Loisto settlementti ry/ Honor related violence	Finland
Police University College	Finland
Police University College	Finland
PsyPlus ETS	Italy
Stockholm University	Sweden
Suomen Pelastusarmeijan Säätiö	Finland
The Salvation Army	Belgium
The Salvation Army	U.K.
The Salvation Army	U.K.
The Salvation Army	U.K.
The Salvation Army	U.K.
The Salvation Army	U.K.



Universitas Indonesia	Indonesia
University of Stavanger	Norway
University of Stavanger	Norway
University of Tartu	Estonia
University of Tartu	Estonia
University of Tartu	Estonian
University of Trento	Italy
University of Trento	Italy
Università di Trento	Italy
University Tuebingen	Germany
University of Tübingen	Germany
VTT	Finland
--	Finland



CONTACT US



www.buildersproject.eu



[@BuildERS_EU](https://twitter.com/BuildERS_EU)



<https://www.facebook.com/Builders-2762442730463980/>



<https://www.linkedin.com/company/builders-h2020>

