

United Nations Development Programme



DISCUSSION PAPER

The Social Construction of Systemic Risk: Towards an Actionable Framework for Risk Governance

June 2021



Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this Discussion Paper do not represent those of the member countries of the United Nations, UNDP Executive Board or of those institutions of the United Nations system that are mentioned herein. Their content is the full responsibility of the individual authors. The designations and terminology employed and the presentation of material do not imply any expression or opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authority, or of its frontiers of boundaries.

June 2021
Copyright © UNDP
All rights reserved

Cover Photo: *Madalin Olariu on Shutterstock*

Authors: *Andrew Maskrey, Garima Jain and Allan Lavell (Associates of the Risk Nexus Initiative – RNI)*

Recommended citation: *Maskrey, A., Jain, G., Lavell, A. (2021), "The Social Construction of Systemic Risk: Towards an Actionable Framework for Risk Governance", United Nations Development Programme, Discussion Paper.*

Keywords: *Systemic risk, actionable risk governance, social construction of risk, extensive risk, Sendai Framework.*

Contact Information: *Angelika Planitz, Global DRR Team Leader, Disaster Risk Reduction and recovery for Building Resilience Team, UNDP Crisis Bureau, angelika.planitz@undp.org*

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
ABBREVIATIONS	4
GLOSSARY OF PRINCIPLE TERMS	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
INTRODUCTION	13
CHAPTER 1: CHARACTERIZING SYSTEMIC RISK	16
1.1 Basic Definition of Systemic Risk and Resilience	16
1.2 Hazard Triggers, Scale and Complexity	17
1.3 Systemic Risk in Interdependent Systems	18
1.4 Systemic Risk in Global Supply Chains	20
1.5 Simultaneous Crisis from Compound Hazards	22
1.6 Existential Risk in Global Systems.....	25
1.7 The Quotidian or Everyday Experience of Systemic Risk	27
1.8 The Social Construction of Systemic Risk.....	28
CHAPTER 2: THE PREVAILING PARADIGM FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF RISK	31
2.1 Risk Governance and Risk Management.....	31
2.2 The Regulation of Risk	32
2.3 Institutional Systems for Risk Governance	33
2.4 Implicit Risk Governance	34
2.5 Systemic Risk Governance	36
CHAPTER 3: TOWARDS THE NEW PARADIGM FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF SYSTEMIC RISK	38
3.1 Governance for Sustainability and Resilience	38
3.2 In Search of a Political and Economic Imperative	42
3.3 Elements for an Actionable Approach to the Governance of Systemic Risk.....	46
3.4 UNDP Support for the Governance of Systemic Risk.....	51
REFERENCES	53
ENDNOTES	58

BOXES ON COUNTRY CASE STUDIES:

Box 1: Dominica and systemic risk in Small Island Developing States	19
Box 2: Urban risks in Bangladesh affecting its macroeconomy and global supply chains	21
Box 3: Migration, internal displacement and systemic risk in Colombia	23
Box 4: Food insecurity in Zimbabwe	24
Box 5: Uzbekistan and the tragedy of the Aral Sea	26
Box 6: Governing urban risks in Bangladesh	40
Box 7: Governance of massive immigration in a context of multi-dimensional risk in Colombia	42
Box 8: Uzbekistan and the challenge of governing transboundary risk	43
Box 9: Dominica on the search to become the first climate resilient country	46
Box 10: Implicit risk governance in Zimbabwe	50

ABBREVIATIONS

AAL	Average Annual Loss
ASBP	Aral Sea Basin Program
CDRI	Coalition for Disaster Resilient Infrastructure
CCRI	Coalition for Climate Resilient Investment
CCRIF	Caribbean Catastrophe Risk <i>Insurance</i> Facility
CREAD	Climate Resilience Execution Agency of Dominica
CPP	The Cyclone Preparedness Programme, Bangladesh
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GAR	Global Assessment Report
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction of the World Bank
GSPS	Growth and Social Protection Strategies in Dominica
ICAB	Interstate Council for the Aral Sea Basin
IFAS	International Fund to Save the Aral Sea
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRGC	International Risk Governance Council
LDC	Least Developed Country Category
LMIC	Low- and Middle-Income Countries
MPHSTF	Multi-Party Human Security Trust Fund in Uzbekistan
NDMA	National Disaster Management Authority
NRDS	National Resilient Development Strategy in Dominica
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCRIC	Pacific Catastrophe Risk Insurance Pilot - GFDRR
PML	Probable Maximum Loss
RMG	Ready-Made Garment Industry
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SFDRR	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
SIDS	Small-Island Developing States
SINIGERD	National Information System for Disaster Risk Management in Peru
SNET	National System for Territorial Studies in El Salvador
TFCD	Task Force for Climate-related Financial Disclosures
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDRR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

GLOSSARY OF PRINCIPLE TERMS

The key process and management definitions used in this paper are as follows:

- **Conventional or idiosyncratic risk:** The probable direct impacts that can occur such as injury and death, loss or damage to physical assets and economic losses associated with existing stocks and provisions.
- **Disaster Risk:** *“The potential loss of life, injury, or destroyed or damaged assets which could occur to a **system**, society or a community in a specific period of time, determined probabilistically as a function of **hazard, exposure, vulnerability and capacity**”.* (United Nations)
- **Extensive Risk:** The risk of low-severity, high-frequency hazardous events and disasters, mainly but not exclusively associated with highly localized hazards. Extensive disaster risk is usually high where communities are exposed to, and vulnerable to, recurring localized floods, landslides, storms or drought. Extensive disaster risk is often exacerbated by poverty, urbanization and environmental degradation. (UNDRR terminology)
- **Intensive Risk:** The risk of high-severity, mid- to low-frequency disasters, mainly associated with major hazards. (UNDRR terminology)
- **Resilience:** *“The ability of individuals, households, communities, cities, institutions, **systems** and society to prevent, resist, absorb, adapt, respond and recover positively, efficiently and effectively when faced with a wide range of risks, while maintaining an acceptable level of functioning and without compromising long-term prospects for sustainable development, peace and security, human rights and well-being for all.”* (United Nations, CEB).
- **Risk governance:** *“The actions, processes, traditions and institutions by which authority is exercised and decisions are taken and implemented. Risk governance applies the principles of good governance to the identification, assessment, management and communication of risks”* (IRGC). Disaster Risk Governance refers to the way in which the public authorities, civil servants, media, private sector, and civil society coordinate at community, national and regional levels in order to manage and reduce disaster and climate related risks. This means ensuring that sufficient levels of capacity and resources are made available to prevent, prepare for, manage and recover from disasters. It also entails mechanisms and processes for citizens to articulate their interests and exercise their legal rights and obligations. (UNDP Issue Brief, 2013).
- **Sequential, synchronous and simultaneous crisis:** Sequential crisis has been used to refer to the impact of a hazard event in one system, that then produces cascading and non-linear impacts and ripple effects in other systems, which may be geographically and temporally discontinuous. Synchronous failures refer to breakdowns in multiple interlocking systems, which interact to generate compound impacts. Simultaneous crises refer to situations where different risks are realized simultaneously and produce a magnified impact in interconnected and interdependent systems that is greater than the sum of the parts (UNDRR, 2011).
- **Systemic:** An adjective: *“relating to or affecting the whole of a **system**, organization etc. rather than just some parts of it”* (Cambridge English Dictionary)
- **Systemic risk:** The ripple-effects of direct loss and damage, indirect impacts and wider effects, such as the disruption of infrastructure systems and essential services; failure of economic, financial or social systems; effects on employment and income; national and family debt profiles and ecosystem collapse.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our thanks to all UNDP colleagues and others who collaborated in this study and in discussion and comment on report drafts, especially Ronald Jackson, Angelika Planitz, Rajeev Issar, Sanny Jegillos, Armen Grigoryan and Samuel Akera. We would also like to extend gratitude to Cecilia Aipira, Walid Ali, Peter Batchelor, Pedro Conceicao, Jeannette Fernandez-Castro, Shani Harris, Thomas Pitaud, Sarah Rattray, Katy Thompson, Sarah Lister and Rita Missal for providing critical inputs and feedback during internal consultative workshops.

The study greatly benefited from the discussions during the Expert Panel in March 2021 on “Governing Systemic Risk: Exploring Governance Arrangements that are fits for purpose in the 21st Century” during the UNDP’s Development Dialogue Series with George Conway (UNDP), Jenty Kirsch-Wood (UNDRR), Ortwin Renn (Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies), Laurel Patterson (UNDP), Katy Thompson (UNDP) along with Ronald Jackson and Angelika Planitz.

A very special thanks to all interviewees from the different case study countries for taking the time out to provide deep insights from their vast experiences: Bangladesh – Aminul Arifeen, Shaquib Quoreshi, Rezaur Rahman, Tanvir, Mohammad Iftekar Hossain, Raquib Ahsan, Khurshid Alam and Arif Abdullah Khan; Colombia – Carlos Parra, Johanna Saenz, Maybelys Avila, Adriana Padilla, Juan Vilorio; Dominica – Gloria Joseph, Denise Edwards, Lizra Fabien, Luis Francisco Thais Santa Cruz; Uzbekistan - Jusipbek Kazbekov, Uktam Abdurakhamov, Vadim Sokolov, Bakhadur Paluaniyazov, Ravshan Yunusov, Gaukhar Khudaybergenova, Elvira Izamova, Alexandr Merkushkin, and Murodjon Ismoilov; and Zimbabwe - Edson Munsaka, Emmanuel Mavura, Calvine Matsinde, Tapiwa Chadoka, Kudzai Ndidzano, Solomon Mutambara, Diego Matsvange, Mercy Sasula, Tiri Shuru, Shadreck, Cecilia Aipira, Reshmi Theckethil, Gareth Horsfield and Decide Mabumbo. They are also listed in the annexure, country by country. And Khurshid Alam and Arif Abdullah Khan UNDP Bangladesh; Alejandro Pacheco, Deputy Resident Representative and Jairo Alberto Matallana Villareal, Program Officer at UNDP Colombia; Luis Francisco Thais Santa Cruz, UNDP Dominica; Elvira Izamova and Bakhadur Paluaniyazov UNDP Uzbekistan; and Solomon Mutambara, Gareth Horsfield and Decide Mabumbo for their invaluable support in organizing interviews and guidance in country cases.

The authors would also like to thank Ben Wisner, Ilan Kelman, and Steve Bender for their detailed comments in the early stages of this study and Chris Lavell and Amrita Chattopadhyay for providing key inputs at various stages.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This document is a “thought piece” on systemic risk governance for the 21st century commissioned in January 2021 by the Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery for Building Resilience Team (DRT) within the Crisis Bureau at United Nations Development Program (UNDP). It aims to contribute to the understanding and discussion of systemic risk and the actionable ways of promoting governance at local and national levels, while also offering a guide or path for promoting cross thematic (health, population migration, infrastructure, conflict, disaster risk management and climate change adaptation) collaboration within UNDP itself on risk reduction and prevention, and in its support to countries in their search for low risk, sustainable and resilient development. This study also contributes to the 2022 Global Assessment Report of the United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR).

The paper examines systemic risk within the context of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) adopted in 2015. The concept of disaster seen as a severe interruption of the routine functioning of a society, or economy, that condenses the risk accumulated in a system or systems is an appropriate frame for considering and studying systemic risk¹. This is particularly so because the SFDRR encompassed a broader range of hazard events² than those previously considered to be components of risk or triggers of disaster and crisis, including physical (for examples, earthquakes, floods or drought), biological (for example, virus and other pathogens), technological (for example, a nuclear accident) and social and economic (for example, financial, crime, insolvency or price spikes).

For the *governance of systemic risk to be useful and effective*, it must be framed in a way that is understandable and actionable for national and local stakeholders. This a primary objective of the present paper.

The paper is based on an extensive review of the specialized literature on the theme and a generic analysis informed by five case studies that examine distinct aspects and expressions of systemic risk (Bangladesh, Colombia, Dominica, Uzbekistan and Zimbabwe). These case studies were developed through stakeholder consultations and review of relevant literature specific to risk contexts in the respective countries.

The Concept of Systemic Risk

Since the turn of the century in particular, the term has been used to refer to physical, biological, social, environmental or technological hazard events triggering not only direct loss and damage but also spiraling, cascading or ripple effects within one or more interdependent social, economic or environmental systems, often associated with feedback loops and non-linear effects (IRGC, 2018; Renn, 2016; UNDRR, 2019).

Systemic risk has always existed. Local and national expressions of systemic risk, common throughout history, are now complemented by increasing manifestations of global systemic risk. Events since the turn of the 21st century would seem to indicate that the compression of time and space³, as a defining characteristic of economic globalization, is consistent with increasing system interdependency, complexity and uncertainty and hence magnified systemic risk. A recent survey by the OECD highlighted that while many countries had strategies to manage risks in some critical infrastructure sectors, few map interdependencies across sectors and only half have the capacity to identify new, unforeseen and complex crisis (OECD, 2018).

The triggers of systemic risk and risk in general can be varied including those with physical, biological, technological, environmental, socio-political, and economic/financial origins. They may occur as single and separate occurrences or in more complex, compound, multiple, concatenated or cascading and sequential ways. Systemic risk, characterized by high levels of interdependency, non-linearity, feed-back loops and uncertainty may be expressed and realized as sequential, synchronous or simultaneous crises and failings.

To illustrate the differing possible expressions of systemic risk the paper analyzes the following types:

Systemic risk in interdependent infrastructure systems: Systemic risk is not limited to single systems, but rather is associated with synchronous failures in multiple interdependent systems, associated with factors such as physical proximity, functional interdependence and economic integration. The impact of Hurricane Maria in Dominica and Hurricane Sandy on the New York metropolitan area are used to illustrate destruction and damage to assets and infrastructure and failure in diverse systems due to the primary impacts of the hurricanes.

Systemic risk in global supply chains: The series of fires in the Bangladesh ready-made garment industries in 2012-13 triggered sequential impacts in geographically discontinuous regions of Europe and North America, transmitted through global supply chains. The risks associated with sequential failure have long been anticipated by the OECD (OECD, 2003) which stated “*If a system is assumed to be self-contained in space (physical or operational) and time, then it is likely the long-term consequences and impacts outside the system studied will be neglected. Only by understanding its complexities will it be possible to understand, and so be ready for, the long-term consequences of damage to a system – including the potential domino effect of harm to other systems*”.

Simultaneous crisis from compound hazards: Multiple hazards may also be associated with simultaneous crisis, where risk manifests in different systems at the same time, further magnifying and compounding the impacts, for example in Zimbabwe, Syria or Sudan (macro-economic crisis compounded by COVID-19, conflict-driven refugee crises, drought, floods, and epidemics).

Existential risk in global systems: Nine critical and interdependent earth systems have been identified with thresholds or boundaries, that when breached represent existential risk. Non-linearity in these systems mean that small incremental changes in any one system may lead to a catastrophic breakdown in another. It is not only earth systems, however, that can potentially breakdown. Growing social and economic inequality at all scales, a generalized crisis of governance in many countries, difficulties to plan and manage urban growth and to provide land and essential services, point to the interdependence of social and economic systems with earth systems. Such interdependencies are well-illustrated in the case of the drying of the Aral Sea in Central Asia (Hoskins, 2014).

The quotidian or every-day experience of systemic risk: Most people in LMIC experience systemic risk through the failure of local infrastructure systems, the interruption of local supply chains and the degradation or collapse of local ecosystem services, largely associated with extensive risk. Local infrastructure systems provide essential services, such as water and sanitation, power, telecommunications, health and education to urban centers and their economies. Local supply chains depend on road, rail, or river networks. Whereas in OECD countries (OECD, 2018), this problem is described as one of *significant pockets of vulnerability*, in LMIC it is a much more generalized challenge. In these countries it would be more appropriate to describe *significant pockets of resilience* against a general backdrop of vulnerability. Addressing the quotidian

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_11496

