Towards more resilient flood risk governance

Final Conference
4-5 February Brussels
STAR-FLOOD

STrengthening And Redesigning European FLOOD risk practices: towards appropriate and resilient flood risk governance arrangements

Interdisciplinary research:
A combined legal and public administration approach
Countries and cases

NL: Rijnmond-Drechtsteden
    Nijmegen
    Zuidplaspolder
E: River Thames, London
    Hull
    Leeds
B: Antwerpen
    Geraadsbergen
    Lessines
S: Gothenburg
    Kristianstad
    Karlstad
P: Slubice
    Poznan
    Wroclaw
F: Nice
    Nevers
    Le Havre
Key assumption of the project

Urban agglomerations and regions vulnerable to flooding will be more resilient, if multiple flood risk management strategies are implemented simultaneously and are aligned.
EU Floods Directive and EU Research Projects

**FP6**
- FLOODsite: Integrated flood risk analysis and management methodologies
- WATCH: Water and global change
- Enhanced knowledge of CC impacts on extreme floods
- An integrated approach at regional level
- IMPRINTS: Preparedness and risk management for flash floods and debris flow events
- CIRCE: Climate change and impact research in the Mediterranean Environment
- CORFU: Collaborative research on flood resilience in urban areas

**FP7**
- FLOODPROBE: Technologies for the effective flood protection of the built environment
- STARFLOOD: Towards resilient flood risk governance

Source: Philippe Quevaouviller
### Conference Programme – Thursday afternoon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mathilde</th>
<th>Fabiola</th>
<th>Brussels</th>
<th>Fabiola II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.00-13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-14.30</td>
<td>Plenary session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffeebreak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-16.00</td>
<td>Session 1: To a</td>
<td>Session 2: The role of spatial</td>
<td>Session 3: Flood preparations: lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definition of flood</td>
<td>planning, insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>defense and risk</td>
<td>and compensation in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mitigation</td>
<td>promoting and enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flood resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffeebreak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.15-17.45</td>
<td>Session 4: Implementation</td>
<td>Session 5: Design-oriented</td>
<td>Session 6: The challenge of public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Floods Directive</td>
<td>framework for Flood</td>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in International (or</td>
<td>Risk Management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interregional) River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basin Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00-19.00</td>
<td>Drinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00-21.30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key note speakers

Zbigniew Kundzewicz
Flood risks in Europe

Aziza Akhmouch
Water governance principles: an application to the case of floods

Marleen van Rijswick
Improving flood risk governance in Europe
## Conference Programme – Friday morning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Mathilde</th>
<th>Fabiola</th>
<th>Brussels</th>
<th>Fabiola II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30-9.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.30-9.45</td>
<td>Session 7: Coordinating different levels of governance</td>
<td>Session 8: Stability and change of arrangements</td>
<td>Session 9: How to work with the Practitioner’s Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffeebreak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-11.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00-11.15</td>
<td>Session 10: Balancing between Prevention and Recovery: Dealing with liability and compensation to achieve a fair distribution of burdens.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Session 11: Principles on water governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coffeebreak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.30-12.30</td>
<td>Plenary session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.30-14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants final expert panel

- Sarah Hendry – University of Dundee
- Ioannis Kavvadas - EC, DG Environment - Water Unit
- Carina Keskitalo – University of Umea
- Sandro Nieto Silleras - EC, DG Climate Action
- Roland Nussbaum – CEO of Mission Risques Naturels
- Régis Thépot – EPTB Seine Grands Lacs
Some practicalities

• Three meeting rooms: Fabiola I, Fabiola II and Brussels

• Coffee/thee in room Mathilde and room Brussels

• Drinks at 18:00; diner starts at 19:00 (room Mathilde)

• Start Friday morning at 8:30 (!)

• After closing plenary on Friday, lunch will be served
Research context

Denis PETER
European Commission
Directorate General for Research and Innovation
Unit Sustainable management of natural resources
e-mail: denis.peter@ec.europa.eu
CALL FP7 2012: Improving the resilience of society to catastrophic natural hazards through new risk-management partnerships

Two projects selected:

- **STAR-FLOOD**

- **ENHANCE** (Enhancing risk management partnerships for catastrophic natural disasters in Europe, Coord: Univ. Amsterdam, [www.enhanceproject.eu](http://www.enhanceproject.eu))
From FP7 to H2020

New philosophy: invest in solutions

- Solution driven research
- Demonstration projects, living labs
- co-design, co-implemented (multi-stakeholders)
- Portfolio beyond science/technological innovation: social, governance, finance and business
- Leverage of investment (private&public)
- Replicable and scalable towards market opportunities
The overall approach for a new EU Research and Innovation policy agenda

- Stakeholder & civic engagement
- Proof of concept
- Demonstration initiatives – solution testing
- Innovative Nature-based solutions
- Public and private sector engagement
- Other policies

R&I
Diverse & multiple co-benefits that make a difference (at landscape & city level)

- Climate change adaptation
- Enhancement of natural capital
- Carbon sequestration
- Disaster risk prevention
- Stabilisation of regional climate
- Health and well-being
- Water and soil protection
- Sustainable livelihoods

Nature-based solutions
Lessons learned, guidance, recommendations from STAR-FLOOD

EU level
- Science–policy interactions

International level: e.g.
- Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction
Thank you
Find out more...

HORIZON 2020:
http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020

European Research Area
http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/index_en.htm
Final Conference of the STAR-FLOOD Project
Brussels, 4 February 2016

Flood risks in Europe

ZBIGNIEW W. KUNDZEWICZ
Institute of Agricultural and Forest Environment, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poznan, Poland
In last 25 years, many floods with high material damage and fatalities have been recorded in Europe, with the costliest one in August 2002 affecting many countries. Dramatic floods also hit Italy in November 1994 and October 2000; the UK in October 2000, summer 2007 and winters 2013/2014 and 2015/2016; Central Europe in July 1997, summer 2010, and June 2013; and the Balkan region in May 2014.
Fig. 2 Overall annual aggregated losses from flood disasters in Europe since 1971 with linear trend (—), and ten-year (—) and five-year (— —) moving averages (in 2010 values).

The number of large floods in Europe 1985-2009

\[ y = 0.3123x + 2.46 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.4339 \]

\[ y = 0.2608x + 0.33 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.6012 \]

Flood hazard  
Exposure to floods  
Vulnerability to floods  

Flood risk
Exposure to floods: (left) number of people exposed to floods (per year) in terms of absolute numbers and relative proportions; (right) total assets and GDP exposed to floods (per year), absolute and relative.

Projections show increase of intense precipitation.

Source: IPCC SREX
Changes in Flood Risk in Europe

Edited by Z. W. Kundzewicz

IAHS Press / CRC Press
(Taylor & Francis)

IAHS Special Publication 10
(April 2012)
516 + xvi pages
(WATCH, FLORIST projects)
Improving Flood Risk Governance in Europe (and beyond)
A combined social science and legal analysis

STARFLOOD final conference
Brussels, Husa President Park Hotel
February 4th, 2016

Marleen van Rijswijk

Utrecht University  H.vanRijswick@uu.nl  photo's APL Broekhuijsen
Today it’s about the power of water and the power of cooperation

And about how the EU can enable innovative approaches
The STAR-FLOOD project 2012-2016

- Search for **appropriate** and **resilient** Flood Risk Governance Arrangements (FRGAs) for dealing with flood risks in vulnerable urban regions;

- In the context of broader debates on the need to **diversify Flood Risk Management Strategies** (urbanisation/climate change);

- and prominent **policy initiatives** (e.g. EU Floods Directive)

![Figure 1: Location of selected case studies (18 in total)]
Why spend time and money on comparative research?

Mutual learning to improve national and transboundary flood risk management
What are we heading for?
Resilient societies that can deal with floods
Meet the STAR-FLOOD team: get inspired and discuss their results

Luleå
Sweden
June 2015
Starting assumption: we need multiple strategies to increase resilience
Starting assumption: resilient flood risk management should be appropriate

Appropriateness
“A successful implementation of resilient FRM requires that the strategies and their coordination are properly institutionally embedded given the opportunities and constraints of their physical and social context”

legitimate  effective  efficient

Cumbria, UK
Researching multiple strategies

Combining law, policy, economics

Looking at the interaction between actors, rules, resources and discourses

No narrow view but an integrated approach
Developing workable methodologies

Staying at the right track
Every country deals with different floods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Types of flooding possible</th>
<th>Actual flood events</th>
<th>Some measure for the country’s vulnerability (climate change projections, geographical factors including urbanisation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fluvial, pluvial, tidal</td>
<td>1999, 2010</td>
<td>Low flood awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Fluvial, pluvial</td>
<td>1997, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Fluvial, pluvial, dam break</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every country has its own legal and administrative context (which should be respected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Legal system</th>
<th>Fragmentation Or Multiple Flood Risk Management Strategies?</th>
<th>public/-private divide</th>
<th>Implementation and impact floods directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Decentralized unitary state</td>
<td>Civil law</td>
<td>Yes, but focus stays on defence</td>
<td>Mostly public, shift towards more private responsibility No insurance</td>
<td>Low: no real changes except for risk approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Centralisation, shift to decentralisation</td>
<td>Civil law</td>
<td>Fragmented flood risk governance</td>
<td>Mostly public, Mandatory insurance</td>
<td>Low: no real changes except for risk approach But some opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Centralisation</td>
<td>Civil law, Communist legacy (vested economic interests, behavioural routines, claimed responsibilities of the state etc.)</td>
<td>Flood prevention strategy Shift from defence to preparation strategy Flood risk management rather than vulnerability management</td>
<td>Mostly public</td>
<td>High: opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Decentralisation, shift to centralisation</td>
<td>Common law</td>
<td>Highly fragmented flood risk governance</td>
<td>Private &amp; public Voluntary insurance</td>
<td>High: risk maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Federal state</td>
<td>Civil law</td>
<td>Fragmented flood risk governance</td>
<td>Mostly public Mandatory insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Decentralisation</td>
<td>Civil law</td>
<td>Fragmented flood risk governance</td>
<td>Mostly public, Municipalities and private persons as main actors</td>
<td>Low: Floods Directive implemented through Ordinance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding, discussing and learning from flood risk management in different member states and different cultures: a long and winding road

BUT NECESSARY
Field visits: trying to really understand what it’s about
Dissemination to get feedback on preliminary results:

workshops, expert meeting, international conferences, YouTube movies, OECD, China, practitioners guide

Visit session 9 (practitioners guide) and 11 (OECD water governance principles) on Friday morning
A integrated approach looking at multiple strategies, multi-sectors, multi-levels and multi-actors

Including
- water management,
- infrastructure
- spatial planning
- building requirements
- warning systems
- evacuation
- recovery
- role of public and private parties
- public awareness
- participation

And how these sectors, strategies and related actors interact
Flood Risk Management Strategies

1. Risk Prevention
   - Proactive spatial planning, allocation politics

2. Flood Defence
   - Dikes, dams, embankments, sand suppletion

3. Flood Mitigation
   - Urban green infrastructure, flood retention, urban management

4. Flood Preparation
   - Warning systems, disaster planning, evacuation plans

5. Flood Recovery
   - Rebuilding areas, insurance systems

All strategies will be discussed in separate sessions this afternoon and tomorrow
Strategies: Prevention

keeping people away from the water may be more easy in one country or region then another
Strategies: Defence
a dominant strategy in many countries: dikes, storm barriers, room for the river
Discussion on Strategies
Water storage: Defence or mitigation?
Visit session 1 today
Strategies: Mitigation
a strategy growing in importance
floating houses, water squares and parks as solution?
Strategies: Preparation

does everyone needs a boat or is testing evacuation plans enough?

Visit session 3 today
Strategies: Recovery
large differences between the countries preferably in a way that the recovery strategy stimulates prevention
## Differences in instruments and measures in Flood Risk Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Risk Management Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spatial planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-allotment policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expropriation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing strategies

England: Flood Risk Management Strategies

- All FRMs are implemented and embedded in national flood risk governance
- Efforts to broaden FRM measures within these strategies are evident

Table 1: Example of measures currently employed in FRM, England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Preparation &amp; Response</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Spatial planning to influence location and layout of future development</td>
<td>Tidal surge barriers and sluices</td>
<td>Flood storage areas</td>
<td>Flood forecasting and warning</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tidal surge barriers and sluices</td>
<td>Embankments</td>
<td>Green infrastructure</td>
<td>Emergency management</td>
<td>Bellwin Scheme to support financial recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poland: The strategies

- Sectoral type of flood risk management system
- Domination of flood defence strategy
- Criticism of flood defence strategy
Conclusion after comparing strategies

- We see several diversifications of Flood Risk Management Strategies
- All countries have more or less all strategies in their flood risk policies, but their importance and way of implementation and the use of legal instruments differ.

- Limited in terms of actual application
- More pronounced in terms of shifts in discourses
- Focus of discursive shift differs per country
Lessons learned:
Innovative approaches: Combining water storage, drainage and nature protection
Comparing Flood Risk Governance Arrangements in the 6 STAR-FLOOD countries

**England: Flood Risk Governance Arrangement:**
- 8 sub-FRGAs
- Intersection with multiple policy domains
- Different modes of governance adopted in each sub-FRGAs (including aspects of centralised, decentralised, public-private, interactive and self-governance)

**France: Flood Risk Governance Arrangement:**
- Fragmented, strong recovery mechanism which may hamper innovation

**Poland: Flood Risk Governance Arrangement**
- Sectoral type of flood risk management system
- Domination of flood defence strategy
Evaluating the findings at the EU, national and local level:

How future proof and resilient are we? Do we chose the most appropriate strategies and arrangements?

### Belgium: Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Broadening of strategies + Increased coordination - FL: Community resilience  (✓ in W)</td>
<td>- Implementation gap: complex decision procedures + lacking enforcement - W: lack of resources + Reforms: DIWP simplification + insurance scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ FL: CBA + innovative instruments - Large No of actors + lack of inter-regional coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- FL: Actual participation rather low + W: River Contracts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poland: Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Capacity to buffer • Capacity to adapt</td>
<td>• Goal attainment more than problem-solving • Effects achieved in one sector diminished by other</td>
<td>• Lack of valuable data • Environmental issues difficult to be measured</td>
<td>• New construction sites on flood plain areas • Public consultation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanatory factors

• Drivers of **stability** and **dynamics** come from **within** and **outside**
• flood relevant policy domains

- **Influence of privatisation/localism in England**
- **Flooding Directive, has different impacts in different countries**
- **Large investments in infrastructure lead to path dependancy**
- **Effective prevention and defence leads to an awareness gap**

Visit session 8 this afternoon
Diversification is not enough and may lead to fragmentation
Bridging Mechanisms: just as important as diversification

Humber bridge, Hull, England
STAR-FLOOD provides a wealth of good practices to coordinate and align strategies and arrangements.

Visit session 5 to find out what are good practices and what policy recommendations can be derived from this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Concrete examples</th>
<th>Builds bridges between?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>Delta Programme (NL)</td>
<td>Different governmental actors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Water test (NL/BE)</td>
<td>Water management/spatial planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>PAPI (F) (local action plans); Flood Risk Management Plans</td>
<td>Sub-FRGAs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal arrangements</td>
<td>Duty to cooperate in spatial planning and emergency management (EN)</td>
<td>Builds bridges within sub-FRGAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Joint construction of debates about Flood hazard/flood risk maps (all countries?)</td>
<td>Water management, planning, emergency management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary concepts</td>
<td>Resilience (UK, European level)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-FRGAs that cross multiple strategies</td>
<td>Water system management (e.g. BE/NU)</td>
<td>Prevention, mitigation, defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different fora</td>
<td>International river commission; Regional coordination committees (BE)</td>
<td>Countries, strategies, actors...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cooperation</td>
<td>Poland/Sweden</td>
<td>actors, strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flood risk management in transboundary river basins: does the FD increase transboundary cooperation and how?
Discussion & Lessons learned:

DISCOURSES (based on PAA indicators) (I)

Do not only focus on climate change, also on soil subsidence and other causes

Explicit political/societal debate on Flood Risk Management issues

Safety levels, normative principles (e.g. solidarity vs. private interest, public/private responsibilities)

Focus on opportunities

(building with nature, integrated management, social resilience, inclusiveness, citizenship)

Do not only focus on economic approaches and instruments

(Cost benefit analysis and insurances)
Discussion and lessons learned

ACTORS AND RESOURCES (based on PAA indicators) (I)

- Stimulate cooperation participation and awareness
- Enable flexible funding
- Stimulate learning (research/practice)
Discussion and lessons learned

RULES (based on PAA indicators) (I)

Enable local solutions (fits already in EU Floods directive and EU adaptation strategy)

Take care of distributional effects

Enable mixes of policy instruments

Enable mainstreaming of flood risk policies in other policy domains (agriculture, nature conservation, energy, disaster risk reduction)

Include relevant decision making frameworks, protection goals, coordination mechanisms, enforceable instruments, recovery mechanisms in the EU legal framework
Don’t forget the EU citizens, the vulnerable groups and those living in countries that fail to implement successful flood risk policies. Provide them with enforceable EU based flood risk policy instruments in their national legal system.
Thanks for your attention and thanks to all who cooperated with us and supported us in the last 4 years

I wish you on behalf of the STARFLOOD team an inspiring conference