## **EPA 1361\_DEBATE**

**Topic**: Designing a robust long-term policy solution to manage flood risk on the Ijssel river.

**Group 15 Role:** Analysts for the Delta Commission > Political actor

**Receive mandate from Simon.** ‘The mandate given to you is secret and you cannot show it to other groups!’ Read through your mandates, devise a (preliminary) strategy and start any alliance building and negotiating with relevant parties in whatever format you find appropriate.

*Student groups not assigned to represent one of these actors will be ‘analyst’ groups*

*employed by one of the main actors. As such, analysts do not really have a political agenda*

*and are mainly motivated by customer satisfaction. That said, the actor that hired the analyst*

*can try and use them however they like (for example by allowing another actor to make use*

*of the analyst as a bargaining chip or as a way to illustrate the impartiality of analysis). Should*

*ethically unsavoury, illegal, or heavily political dilemmas arise, it is up to the analysts to*

*decide how far they are willing to go in service of their client.*

1. Political reflection: describe how your proposed solution interacts with the dynamics of political decision making and what can you do to make it impactful
2. We are involved in High-level strategy meeting: Rijkswaterstaat (host), Delta Commission, Transport company, Environmental interest group (room 3.48)
3. As a group you can commit only some members (2) to these debates – rest of the team can be working on analysis or behind-closed-door negotiation with other parties.

**Final Debate**

Individual actors will be given three minutes maximum to make a point, following which other actors can respond. The purpose of the final debate is to convince the minister to either adopt the policy as is, adopt it with changes (that Rijkswaterstaat needs to approve those on the spot),

or not adopt the policy.

**Any visual aids to be used in presentation (figures, maps, plots) need to be submitted to s.vydra@tudelft.nl by midnight of June 12.** Analysts can be running models during the final debate and then submit new figures for this 10 minute slot, but it is unlikely that the new policy can be fully evaluated under such time constraints.

**Assessment**:

You are required to submit a short reflection (one paragraph to one page) before midnight on

June 12th, reflecting on a) your actual goals for the policy solution (as specific as possible),

b)who you think are your allies and why, c) who you think will oppose you and why, d) what

is your strategy to achieve your goals in the final debate. If you are an analyst reflect instead

on a) how you were utilised in the political process, b) what should your employer do

differently to make best use of you and why, c) what do you think of their chances going into

the final debate.

This short reflection will not be graded, but it is compulsory for you to submit one. Needless

to say, writing a good short reflection will provide you with a strong foundation for reflecting

on the political feasibility in the final assignment. Submit your reflections by e-mail to s.vydra@tudelft.nl

## **EPA\_1361 FINAL ASSIGNMENT**

Final assignment

The final assignment is to develop a plan for the IJssel river case study to cope with flood risk,

using the provided simulation model.

The final report should contain two parts: a model based analysis resulting in an advice, and a reflection on this advice.

10-20 pages, or 5000-7500 words (excluding figures and tables)

**Part 1: Model based analysis and advice**

The aim of the assignment is that you show that you can structure a messy decision problem,

analyze it using carefully selected exploratory modelling techniques, and on the basis of these

analyses render advice to policy makers. The report should be written for a technically

minded audience. A rubric that is used in grading is given in Table 2. In short, I expect at least

the following:

1. A structuring of the policy problem

2. A well-argued selection of analysis steps, grounded in literature

3. Clear communication of results and their meaning within the policy context

4. Explicit policy advice, for a self-chosen actor within the context of the case study (see

debate instructions for the actor constellation)

5. All code and data as appendix (may be a link to a repository on github or a zipfile

shared using a file transfer service).

<in progress>