



Denmark

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2015)

Name of focal point:	Mr Morten Korslund
Organization:	Danish Emergency Management Agency
Title/Position:	Head of Section
E-mail address:	mtko@brs.dk
Telephone:	45906229

Reporting period:	2013-2015
Report Status:	Final
Last updated on:	17 December 2014
Print date:	23 April 2015
Reporting language:	English

A National HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

With the National Risk Assessment as inspiration (published in 2013) local and regional governments are encouraged to produce their own customised risk assessment and employ it as departure point in their preparedness planning. The use of risk assessments, alongside other practical tools for preparedness planning, is to be further disseminated into all areas of public administration, as well as to the commercial operators working in particularly critical domains.

Municipalities are conducting risk and vulnerability analyses on a regular basis, including present and future hazards.

Strategic Goal Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Resilience against hazards is strengthened by promoting a strong preparedness culture throughout communities and organisations. A strong preparedness culture does not only require strong institutions, mechanisms and capacities, but also a thorough mutual understanding among stakeholders of their individual roles in prevention and mitigation.

This is partly attained by through consulting and education activities, but also by providing a common terminology for preparedness planning that allows any organisation to plan in concordance with others.

Strategic Goal Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

All Danish municipalities have been tasked with drafting a climate adaptation strategy. This identifies the most relevant current and imminent hazards for the specific municipality, and maps out a mitigation strategy for the future. An online portal has also been established in order to share best practices between municipalities and regions (www.klimatilpasning.dk).

Following the 2011 torrential rain storm over the greater Copenhagen area, a separate plan for mitigating the effects of torrential rainfall has been drawn for the capital.

The Emergency Management Act, revised in June 2014, requires all central administrative bodies to ensure disaster risk management and contingency planning for their relevant sector(s). While preparedness planning has also previously been a formal requirement at all administrative levels, this will henceforth be implemented in a more stringent manner. This will, among other things, provide a better basis for cross-sectoral coordination of preparedness and contingency plans.

Priority for Action 1

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

Core indicator 1

National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions? Yes

National development plan	No
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	No
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	No
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	Yes

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk? Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Following the amendments to the Emergency Management Act adopted in 2014, more specific requirements are posed to contingency planning in the central administrative bodies.

The 2013 revision of the Planning Act ("Lov om Planlægning") strengthens climate adaptation efforts at the local administrative level. Among other things, it facilitates the revision of district building plans citing climate adaptation purposes as grounds.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 2

Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget	-	-
Decentralised / sub-national budget	-	-
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	-	

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

In Denmark, disaster risk reduction is a combined effort, which spans across multiple sectors. DRR considerations and initiatives are integrated into various planning processes at national and local levels. Consequently, estimating a total budget is not possible.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? No

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)

No

Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government

No

Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR

-

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Implementation of DRR measures is very much a local task, since risks vary between municipalities and regions. Following the publication of the “Danish strategy for adaptation to a changing climate”

(http://www.klimatilpasning.dk/media/5322/klimatilpasningsstrategi_uk_web.pdf) and the cloudburst action plan

(http://en.klimatilpasning.dk/media/590075/action_plan.pdf) all Danish municipalities have been tasked with drafting their own climate adaptation strategy. The City of Copenhagen adopted a Climate Change Adaptation Plan in 2011. (<http://subsite.kk.dk/sitecore/content/Subsites/CityOfCopenhagen/SubsiteFrontpage/LivingInCopenhagen/ClimateAndEnvironment/ClimateAdaptation/CopenhagenClimateAdaptionPlan.aspx>)

In 2010 a survey was carried out among the 98 Danish municipalities to gain information on the local knowledge and experience in terms of climate change adaptation. The Survey indicated that climate change adaptation is quite high on the municipal agenda.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 4

A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

Level of Progress achieved? 2

Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? No

civil society members (specify absolute number)	-
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	-
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	-
private sector (specify absolute number)	-
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	-
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	-
other (please specify)	-

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	No
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	No
In a civil protection department	Yes
In an environmental planning ministry	Yes
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Denmark has not established a national platform for DRR specifically, but pursues the goals of DRR through existing disaster response organisations and through the climate adaptation initiatives. As per tradition, disaster reduction is a highly collaborative effort in Denmark. Therefore, several relevant fora for coordination and cooperation are already in place.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? Yes

Multi-hazard risk assessment	Yes
% of schools and hospitals assessed	-
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	-
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	No
Common format for risk assessment	Yes
Risk assessment format customised by user	Yes
Is future/probable risk assessed?	Yes
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	Municipal fire & rescue services, the electricity and natural gas sectors, the transport sector

(e.g. the national rail authority , municipal port authorities and several other critical infrastructure operators), the health sector (e.g. regional health au

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The current edition of the National Risk Assessment was published in 2013. Revisions will be made periodically.

The National Risk assessment describes and analyses the likely implications following from selected incident types divided between the four subcategories of extreme weather events, severe outbreaks of infectious disease, large-scale accidents, and security threats.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 2

Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed?
Yes

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated

No

Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)

No

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Large-scale incidents undergo a written evaluation in order to uncover learning elements. The focus is usually on the response operations, but prevention elements are also addressed where applicable.

Currently, no database exists.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 3

Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events? Yes

Early warnings acted on effectively	Yes
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Early warning systems have been tried and tested over the course of several decades. In Denmark this is mainly applied in situations involving heavy storms and/or extraordinary degrees of precipitation. Well-established partnerships exist with the meteorological service and public transportation operators.

The Danish Insurance Association has produced an application for mobile devices, which allows personalized forecasting and local warnings for private house owners who may feel especially prone to weather related incidents.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 4

National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? Yes

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	Yes
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	Yes
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	Yes
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Denmark engages in active partnership with its Scandinavian neighbours, the Nordic countries, in context of the European Union, and within the Arctic region. Cooperation includes information sharing, sharing of best practices, sparring on analysis frameworks, as well as joint exercise activities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Priority for Action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

Core indicator 1

Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

Information is proactively disseminated	Yes
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	Yes
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

In Denmark, this mostly applies to weather related incident, in which case the Danish Meteorological Institute forecasts and informs in conjunction with the Danish Emergency Management Agency (DEMA). A specific agreement exists between DEMA and two separate media outlets with national coverage that allows for quick and broad information sharing, when circumstances require it.

In later years, several informative smartphone applications have been developed by the individual emergency response stakeholders. These also make available knowledge on preventive measures to a broad segment of the population.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 2

School curricula , education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

primary school curriculum	No
secondary school curriculum	No
university curriculum	Yes
professional DRR education programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Universities and colleges offer studies that include DRR elements - for example, courses in risk management, land planning, and disaster research.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities

and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 3

Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? Yes

Research programmes and projects	Yes
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	Yes
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Several institutions within research- and education contribute to the area of DRR, including the Technical University of Denmark, Metropolitan University College, Danish Institute of Fire and Security Technology, the Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS), and University of Copenhagen.

Copenhagen Center for Disaster Research (COPE) is a transdisciplinary research centre founded by Copenhagen Business School and University of Copenhagen. COPE's aim is to facilitate multidisciplinary disaster research by (1) supporting and promoting collaborative studies, (2) sharing results from this research and (3)

circulating the results of these projects, thus advancing knowledge in the field.

The Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS) is active numerous research and capacity building projects on the effects of climate change and on climate adaptation. Several of these projects are collaborative European or Nordic efforts, such as CATALYST, ANDROID, NONAM and NORDRESS.

<http://cope.ku.dk/>

<http://www.phmetropol.dk/Uddannelser/Risikomanager>

<http://www.dtu.dk/english>

<http://en.dbi-net.dk/>

<http://www.geus.dk/geuspage-uk.htm>

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 4

Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.

Yes

Training of local government

Yes

Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)

Yes

Preventative risk management (risk and

Yes

vulnerability)

Guidance for risk reduction

Yes

Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Areas with a particular proneness to flooding have been appointed and are drawing up their own risk reductions plans locally. These include campaigns to improve homeowners' resilience towards storms, storm surges, torrential rain, groundwater flooding, and the like.

The Danish Insurance Association has produced an application for mobile devices which, aside from allowing for personalized local forecasting, instructs home owners on how best to prepare themselves and their homes for extreme weather events.

A collaborative effort of Nordic researchers and experts from the Nordic insurance industry has created <http://visadapt.info/> - a webplatform tool to help home owners prepare for weather and climate related events.

The association of Danish Regions has launched an application for mobile devices which provides a quick overview of emergency response contacts. The application also helps the user prepare for emergencies by keeping relevant health data, geodata, and general advice at hand.

<http://www.regioner.dk/in+english>

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) Yes

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	No
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

In 2008 the Danish government published "Danish Strategy for Adaptation to a Changing Climate". The Danish Nature Agency is the lead organisation in the implementation of the strategy. As part of the implementation, an online portal with information on cases, issues, technology, and best practices has been established. Refer to <http://en.klimatilpasning.dk/> for more information.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 2

Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? Yes

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	Yes
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	No
Micro insurance	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A minor levy on property insurance premiums funds The Storm Council (Stormrådet), an independent body affiliated with the Danish Ministry of Business and Growth. The Storm Council determines whether, and specifically in which areas of the country, an event can be officially classified as disaster (applies only to storm surge, freshwater flooding, and damages caused storm as a result of storm). In some instances, where

victims have no regular insurance coverage, the Council will cover loss and property damage.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 3

Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? Yes

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.

Yes

Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets

Transportation sector, public transport (e.g. Copenhagen metro expansion project), coastline maintenance projects, etc.

Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

-

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 4

Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas

Yes

Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas

No

Training of masons on safe construction technology

Yes

Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities

Yes

Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development

Yes

Regulated provision of land titling

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Building Act and additional building regulations (current version in force since 2010) ensure that new building projects meet minimum requirements concerning health and safety:

<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=133389>
http://w2l.dk/file/155699/BR10_ENGLISH.pdf

Retrofitting efforts are underway as part of the Climate Change Adaptation strategy:

<http://en.klimatilpasning.dk/sectors/buildings.aspx>

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 5

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? No

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR

-

DRR capacities of local authorities for

Yes

response and recovery strengthened

Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning

No

Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery

No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Disaster risk reduction measures are taken in the post disaster/recovery phase. Physical designs are improved if possible and, following an incident evaluation, the involved parties identify lessons learned from their respective crisis response.

<http://en.klimatilpasning.dk/>

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 6

Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? Yes

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

No

By national and sub-national authorities and institutions

Yes

By international development actors

No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Building Act and additional building regulations (current version in force since 2010) ensure that new building projects meet minimum requirements concerning health and safety.

Local authorities sanction any land development as well as individual construction projects, hereby ensuring proper consultation procedures and coherent planning.

<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=133389>
http://w2l.dk/file/155699/BR10_ENGLISH.pdf

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies

Yes

The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support.

Yes

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? Yes

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

Yes

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Yes

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

Yes

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Legal framework and organisational structures for disaster risk management are continuously being developed and adapted. Following major incidents and training exercises a formal evaluation is drafted, identifying lessons learned and thereby providing new inputs to future disaster risk assessments, risk management, and risk reduction.

The Emergency Management Act, revised in June 2014, requires all central administrative bodies to ensure disaster risk management and contingency planning for their relevant sector.

The National Risk Assessment, first published in 2013 by the Danish Emergency Management Agency, will be published in future revised editions periodically. Large public and private sector organisations are encouraged to employ it as a departure point for their own preparedness planning.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major

disaster? Yes

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	No
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	Yes
Operations and communications centre	Yes
Search and rescue teams	Yes
Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Shelters	Yes
Secure medical facilities	Yes
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	Yes
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Emergency Management Act, revised in June 2014, requires all central administrative bodies to ensure disaster risk management and contingency planning for their relevant sector. While preparedness planning has also previously been a formal requirement at all administrative levels, this will henceforth be implemented in a more stringent manner. This will, among other things, provide a better basis for cross-sectoral coordination of preparedness and contingency plans.

One major nationally coordinated crisis management exercise is held every other year.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Training drills are held at the discretion of each individual administration, sector, and organisation. Organisations that do not consider themselves exposed, often avoid allocating resources to drills and exercises due to general budgetary concerns.

Core indicator 3

Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	Yes
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A minor levy on property insurance premiums funds The Storm Council (Stormrådet), an independent body affiliated with the Danish Ministry of Business and Growth. The Storm Council determines whether, and specifically in which areas of the country, an event can be officially classified as disaster (applies only to storm surge, freshwater flooding, and damages caused storm as a result of storm). In some instances, where victims have no regular insurance coverage, the Council will cover loss and property damage.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the

country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

-

Core indicator 4

Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? No

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available	No
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	No
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	No
Identified and trained human resources	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

All major incidents and training exercises are evaluated, resulting in a written report.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the

country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

In their 2014 report on the status of Danish emergency preparedness, the National Audit Office recommended that all major incidents and training exercises be evaluated in writing.

Drivers of Progress

a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

All-hazards analyses are an important tool for the planning process at local, regional, and national levels. The National Risk Assessment is based on scenarios covering a range of natural, technical and man-made disasters.

b) Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Gender equality considerations are mainstreamed into all legal structures and is widely anchored in society.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?: Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Building and supporting capacities for preparedness planning and crisis management in major organisations across the country's public sector remains an on-going process. At all administrative levels this is achieved through consulting activities, training courses, training exercises, audits, and evaluations.

The Danish Emergency Management Agency continues to develop and disperse ready-to-use concepts for contingency planning and crisis management.

Following the 2014 report on the status of Danish emergency preparedness, drafted by the National Audit Office, organisations within the central administration are required to present a general preparedness plan by December 1st 2015, and revise it at least every four years.

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Due attention is given to the protection of vulnerable groups from existing and emerging risks.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

The Danish system for Disaster Risk Reduction, preparedness, and response relies heavily on partnerships across the public and private sector, as well as with non-profits and volunteers.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

-

Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Overall Challenges

The message that all organisations – also those that have no traditional role in response, safety, or security – have a part to play in DRR, is occasionally difficult to convey effectively.

Future Outlook Statement

Several instances of unusually heavy torrential rains within the past four years have highlighted the need for DRR initiatives by all sectors of society. While having been costly, these events may have created a momentum for the implementation of wider, stronger, better coordinated, and more prescient DRR efforts in the future. The relevant authorities will continue to encourage and facilitate this development.

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges

DRR and preparedness planning is still not given adequate attention by parts of the central administration. Allocating due resources ahead of time, in order to maintain a momentum in preparedness planning, remains a central challenge to many organisations.

Future Outlook Statement

The 2014 audit of Danish emergency preparedness, undertaken by the National Audit Office, drew attention to the area. Notably, the level of general planning, and the coordination of plans between organisations and sectors, was among the themes highlighted for potential improvement. The audit coincided with a revision of the Emergency Management Act that, among other things, stipulates clear requirements and deadlines for the central administrative authorities, when it comes to planning. The renewed focus on planning will hopefully help reveal to the individual sectors and organisations, what they can do to build better hazard resilience.

Future Outlook Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges

The adverse effects of a changing global climate continue to be felt, also in Denmark. A higher frequency of extreme weather events over the past years has presented severe challenges, mainly related to water level management.

Future Outlook Statement

Although the challenges related to extreme weather incidents are not new, they appear to have increased in both frequency and magnitude. This has highlighted the need for a more integrated approach to DRR. Initiatives such as the climate adaptation portal (<http://en.klimatilpasning.dk/>) will help to mainstream solution plans and adaptation strategies into more local level city planning and construction projects.

Stakeholders

Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Danish Disaster Management Agency - DEMA	Governments	Morten Korslund, Head of Section