Norway

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) - Interim

Name of focal point:	**Dag Olav Høgvold**
Organization:	**Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DSB)**
Title/Position:	**Senior adviser**
E-mail address:	**dag.hogvold@dsb.no**
Telephone:	**(+47) 33412773**
Fax:	

Reporting period:	**2011-2013**
Report Status:	**Interim**
Last updated on:	**22 October 2012**
Print date:	**31 October 2012**
Reporting language:	**English**

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/europe/nor/

Section 1: Outcomes 2011-2013

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcome Statement:

Disaster and environmental risk management policies and measures have been integrated into existing planning systems at local and regional level through societal and land-use planning. Key instruments are the Plan and Building Act and the Civil Protection Act, making risk and vulnerability analyses mandatory for municipalities. The Civil Protection Act gives the municipal level the responsibility to prevent and manage risks within all sectors, including exiting buildings, installations and infrastructure.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcome Statement:

Disaster risk reduction is organized in accordance with the principles of responsibility, similarity, proximity and cooperation - meaning that disaster risk reduction should be managed with no changes in organization or responsibility, and as locally as possible with the best and most relevant resources.

Capacities at municipal regional level is strengthened and vulnerability reduced through systematic work to assess risks, creating awareness, mitigating and manging risk. The 19 county governors play a key role in monitoring and guiding the municipal level and to ensure that plans and strategies take existing and future risks into consideration, including climate change adaptation.

The NGO sector plays a key role in disaster risk management, interacting with local and regional authorities, and the police in emergency management.

The principle of Minister Responsibility is strenthened. Each minister is fully responsible towards the Parliament for all activity within his/her sector. The Ministry of Justice has a coordinative role within the field of civil contingencies

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcome Statement:

Risk reduction is an integrated part of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes to achieve a holistic approach with the aim to strengthen resilience.

A cross-sectoral national risk assessment (NRA) is being carried out annually as a common tool for awareness raising and resilience planning in all sectors. A national program for climate change adaptation was established in 2007 and is closely integrated with national work on disaster risk reduction.

Section 2: 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:

Disaster and environmental risk management policies are being integrated into existing planning systems in all relevant sectors at local, regional and national levels with particular focus on societal planning and land-use planning. Municipalities are conducting risk and vulnerability analyses on a regular basis, including present and future hazards (all-hazard approach).

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:

Resilience is strengthened at all levels of society towards existing and potential disaster and environmental risks of local, sub-national, national, and international concern. Good interaction, information sharing, organisational culture, priorities and focus among stakeholders is improved.

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:

Risk reduction is integrated in emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes to achieve a holistic approach in which vulnerabilities are reduced and resilience is strengthened.
Capacities at community level is strengthened through systematic work to identify, monitor, mitigate and manage risks. Major natural hazards such as landslides and flooding are identified at national level. Resilience is built into housing and social and technical infrastructure.

Section 3: Priority for action 1

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

Priority for action 1: 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

Description:

Plan and Building Act (2008) empose municipalities to ensure that risk and vulnerability analyses are carried out prior to development of new areas.
Civil Protection Act (2010) gives municipal level the respinsibility to ensure that disaster risk is taken into consideration in all relevant sectors and areas, including existing buildings and

infrastructure.
National guidelines for integrating societal safety into land-use planning is in place. Guides and planning tools are being developed and disseminated through county governors for use at municipal level.
County governors monitor and guide municipalities in taking disaster risk into account in planning and strategy processes.
A national risk assessment on 'possible worst case scenarios' has been carried out and is being updated regularly, a national assessment (green paper) on climate vulnerability has been carried out (white paper expected 2012).
Funding available for protection against floods and landslides through the Water and Energy Directorate.

Context & Constraints:

There are funds available for reconstruction after events, but it is based on the insurance principle - to build back to the same standard as before the event, not for 'building back better'. Limited funding for general prevention measures; some funds available to protect against floods and landslides.

Related links:

- Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme
- Urban Development
- Municipal Planning
- Plan and Building Act

Priority for action 1: 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)	-

Description:

DRR is integrated in planning processes in many different sectors at national and local level. Estimating a total budget would not be relevant.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 3

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

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? Yes

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	Yes
• Civil Protection Act (In Norwegian only) (2010)	
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	Yes
Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	0

Description:

The 431 municipalities in Norway are the local fundament of national disaster risk reduction. The municipalities are responsible for the functioning of key public services and the coordination of these before, during and after emergencies (e.g. local infrastructure, health services, care for the elderly and other vulnerable populations, and information to the public). In accordance with the principles of responsibility and of proximity, the main responsibility for preventive planning and disaster management within their territorial borders lies with the municipalities. Risk- and vulnerability analysis, physical planning, emergency plans and exercises are the cornerstones of disaster risk reduction at the local level. All muncipalities are required to have an operational fire- and rescue service, and from 2010 they are required by the Civil Protection Act to establish systems for emergency prevention, preparedness and response. According to the Plan and Building Act, they are required to carry out risk & vulnerability analyses in connection to new physical developments. According to the Civil Protecion Act, they are required to carry out overall risk & vulnerability analyses, covering both existing and future risks (including climate change impacts), and covering both existing and planned buildings, installations and infrastructure.
A new white paper on civil protection was presented in 2012. It highlights the need to include climate change adaptation in DRR efforts.
The Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme highlights the role of the municipalities in including adaptation into all levels of planning. The programme offers courses, guiding materials, a website disseminating research and sharing good practices, as well as practical tools and services. A green paper (NOU) on adaptation was published in 2010 and a white paper is expected in 2013.

Context & Constraints:

Many small municipalities - planners and decision-makers need guidelines and tools to follow up the requirements in the Civil Protection Act.

Related links:

- Green Paper on Adaptation

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 4

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

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 civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? Yes

Civil society members (specify absolute number)	1
National finanace and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	9
Sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	0
Private sector (specify absolute number)	0
Science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	0
Women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	0
Other (please specify)	3

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	Yes
In a civil protection department	Yes
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	

Description:

The National Platform was established 1 September 2012. Members are nine governmental agencies, three county governors and The Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS), representing the municipal level. The platform consists of a steering group, meeting once a year, and a working group, meeting twice a year. The mandate of the platform follows the priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action and it aims at coordinating DRR efforts (including climate change adaptation) between govermental agencies and in cooperation with county/municipal level.

Context & Constraints:

The National Platform is still in a starting phase.

Section 4: Priority for action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Priority for action 2: 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	0
Schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	0
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)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	Yes
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
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.	-- not complete --

Description:

The first national risk assessment was carried out in 2010 (published 2011). It is updated annually. The 2012 national risk assessment includes analyses of 16 scenarios in three different categories: Natural hazards, technical hazards, and man-made disasters. Since 2006, the Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning (DSB) has presented a national vulnerability and preparedness report (NSBR), with a thematic focus. For 2012, focus in on municipal preparedness for loss of electricity supply.

Context & Constraints:

-

Related links:

- National Risk Assessment (pdf) (In Norwegian only)

Priority for action 2: Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved: 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

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	Yes
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	No

Description:

There are several systems established to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards. The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) maps and monitors flooding and landslide risks throughout the country. In case of an event, they issue warnings to the areas affected.
The Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning (DSB) maps and monitors forest fires. DSB also offers thematic maps showing different types of risks for selected areas.
There are also local systems for monitoring hazards and disseminating risks to the public. Examples are associated with landslide risks in Western Norway, and industrial risks in the Grenland area.One example of dissemination is the work on climate change adaptation, where a dedicated secretariat disseminates and coordinates across sectors and administrative levels.

Context & Constraints:

-

Related links:

- DSB: Thematic maps (In Norwegian)
- Statistics on natural hazards - economic costs since 1980
- Landslide/avalanche risk: Skrednett.no

Priority for action 2: 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

Description:

It is a continuous process to assess capacity of the four elements of early warning (risk knowledge, monitoring and warning services, dissemination and communication, and response capabilities) to empower the communities threatened by hazards.
The National Risk and Vulnerability Analysis (NSBR) 2010 highlights the importance of early warning systems. There are many systems in place, both at national and local level, and there is a need to streamline and simplify warning systems.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 2: 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

Description:

There is improved cooperation with the neighboring countries, for instance a separate Arctic agreement on disaster risk reduction. Relevant EU work is also improving. The ministers of the five Nordic countries signed an agreement in 2009 to strengthen Nordic cooperation in disaster preparedness; it has been followed up by a project on cross-border cooperation for disaster preparedness and response. In 2010, Norway initiated a Nordic network for ISDR, the network meets annually. There have also been a number of cross-border excercises, such as Barents Resque (every second year) involving Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway and exercise SkagEx held in the Oslo Fjord 2011.

On the regional level the counties make cross-sectorial risk- and vulnerability assessments. This is followed up in the counties cooperation with other regional authorities and municipalities.

Context & Constraints:

-

Section 5: Priority for action 3

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

Priority for action 3: 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	No
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	No
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	No

Description:

Kriseinfo.no is the official Norwegian website providing valid and secure information to the general public before, during and after a crisis. The website presents updated and coordinated information from relevant Norwegian authorities and emergency actors.

There are also different information systems available for different types of risk, for example the website skrednett.no showing landslide/avalance risk. Met.no and the Norwegian Water and Energy Resources Directorate (NVE) also distributes warnings for extreme weather, floods and landslides. Through different networks and other information sharing systems information on disaster risks and
protection options for local authorities in high risk areas is easily available and understandable to enable for them to take actions to reduce risk, and build resilience. The national Emergency Planning College provides courses to teach citizens and local administration different aspects of disaster risk reduction. The college is organized under The Directorate for Civil
Protection and Emergency Planning (DSB).

The website for the Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme presents research results,

examples of good practices, guiding material, maps, etc.

Context & Constraints:

The development of information and communications technology over the past 15 years has had a dramatic impact on how organisations, working life and society work and approach disaster risk. Having good ICT solutions for communications, information sharing and analysis has become a prerequisite for ensuring good interaction and knowledge-based leadership.
The use of social media give disasters an unique simultaneity. Mobile phones, social media and swift news broadcasting means that information spreads quickly from the crisis to large parts of the world. More sophisticated use of ICT has a substantial potential for improving efficiency and quality. This is a key to better disaster risk management in future.

Related links:

- Met.no
- Skrednett.no
- Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme
- Kriseinfo.no

Priority for action 3: 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	Yes
Secondary school curriculum	Yes
University curriculum	Yes
Professional DRR education programmes	Yes

Description:

There are several initiatives for teaching children about disaster-risk related issues, both in school curricula and in the media. There is an ongoing work to coordinate and develop this further in a more coherent way. Teaching in primary/secondary school mainly focuses on safe behaviour, through fire drills, first aid, swiming skills etc.

Universities and colleges offer bachelor and master studies which include DRR elements - for example, courses in land-use planning. The University of Stavanger provides a master degree in societal safety and also offer a range of relevant courses at bachelor level. The National Emergency College (NUSB) provides a series of relevant courses; some as part of university studies at University of Stavanger, some as part of studies at Buskerud College.

Context & Constraints:

-

Related links:

- Buskerud University College
- University of Stavanger
- National Emergency Planning College

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 3

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

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

Description:

The former 'SamRisk' programme (Norwegian Research Council) has expired and has not yet been replaced. However, significant research on disaster risk is carried out by the University of Stavanger, and by other public and private research institutions including governmental agencies. The National Risk Assessment makes use of research knowledge in developing scenarios as well as when analysing them. The Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme disseminates climate research carried out by a number of research institutes.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 3: 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 vulnerability)	Yes
Guidance for risk reduction	Yes
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	Yes

Description:

There are several countrywide public awareness programmes with the aim to integrate disaster risk reduction into every-day life. The Planning and Building Act aims to decrease disasters through risk reduction in planning. The Civil Protection Act highlights the role of the municipality level in disaster risk reduction. Both acts impose the use of risk and vulnerability in connection with land-use planning and new area developments. According to the Civil Protection Act, annual exercises have to be held at municipality level in order to strengthen emergency preparedness at local level. The Civil Protection Act also empose municipalities to carry out overall risk and vulnerability assessments, including current and future risks.

Context & Constraints:

-

Section 6: Priority for action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Priority for action 4: 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

Description:

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. Both the Civil Protection Act and the Planning and Building Act takes this into account.

The Directorate for Nature Management is responsible for implementing the Government's environmental policy, and for identifying, preventing and dealing with environmental problems. The Norwegian Nature Inspectorate is a separate unit that is responsible for control and inspection to protect the environment and prevent environmental crime, and for other practical management tasks.

The Norwegian Coastal Authority is responsible for coastal installations etc, while it is the municipality's role to manage coatal zone ecosystems.

The Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme supports the sectors and municipalities on

issues related to a changing climate. A white paper on adaptation is expected 2013.

Context & Constraints:

There are more than 26 public entities responsible for preparedness and/or prevention in Norway, in addition to 430 municipalities and 19 county governors (and some inter-municipal enities). There are also several major NGOs playing a crucial role. This might lead to a fragmentation and a great need for coordination for effective resilience.

Related links:

- Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme
- Norwegian Coastal Authority
- Norwegian Directorate for Nature Managment

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 2

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

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 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

Description:

There are different plans on local and national level that addresses issues of food secuirty, public health,risk sharing mechanisms, protection of critical public infrastructure etc.

Most households have insurance covering potential losses, including compensation in case of injuries or loss of lives. The Norwegian Natural Perils Pool covers losses that cannot be covered by insurance.

Context & Constraints:

-

Related links:

- Norwegian Natural Perils Pool

Priority for action 4: 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	
Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals	Yes

Description:

All sectors are focusing on the protection of the society'€™s most vulnerable economic activities and
productive sectors. The Ministry of Justice and the Police has taken a visible role coordinating across sectors which will lead to better resilience in infrastructure and societal functions.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 4: 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	Yes
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

Description:

The 'Cities of the Future' project, consisting of the 13 largest municipalities in Norway, has worked systematically to promote more sustainable urban areas, focusing both on reduced emissions of greenhouse gases and on climate change adaptation. They have included adaptation aspects into all levels of planning, including land-use planning, and are now in the

process of developing and assessing concrete measures, especially on flood prevention. The cities have also focused on sea level rise (storm surges) and extreme weather and have developed tools and methods to address these in cooperation with the Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme.

The plan and building act ensures that 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. The Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) has an overall coordinating role for prevention of floods and landslides/avalanches and can give directives and support to land owners, dam owners, etc. to take the necessary steps to prevent serious events.

Context & Constraints:

-

Related links:

- Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme
- Cities of the Future

Priority for action 4: 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	0
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	No
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	Yes

Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	No

Description:

Disaster risk reduction principles is considered when designing post disaster recovery and rehabilitation. However, funds for reconstruction only cover rebuilding or retrofitting into the same standard as before the event took place, not for 'building back better'.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 4: 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)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	Yes
By international development actors	No

Description:

The Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning is leading a project on risks connected to critical infrastructure.

According to the Planning and Building Act, risk and vulnerability analyses must be carried out prior to new developments.

The Norwegian Road Authority has carried out a four year project 'Climate and Transport' adressing the issue of climate change adaptation in connection to road construction. The project included participation of the Water and Energy Resources Directorate (NVE), Met.no and the Norwegian Railway Authority. A new project, 'Natural Hazards, Infrastructure, Floods and Slides' (NIFS) is in the starting phase.

Context & Constraints:

The Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning is leading a project on risks connected to critical infrastructure.

According to the Planning and Building Act, risk and vulnerability analyses must be carried out prior to new developments.

The Norwegian Road Authority has carried out a four year project 'Climate and Transport' adressing the issue of climate change adaptation in connection to road construction. The project included participation of the Water and Energy Resources Directorate (NVE), Met.no and the Norwegian Railway Authority. A new project, 'Natural Hazards, Infrastructure, Floods and Slides' (NIFS) is in the starting phase.

Related links:

- Norwegian Public Roads Administration

Section 7: Priority for action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Priority for action 5: 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: 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 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

Description:

The policy and capacity for disaster risk reduction is continuously reviewed and improved. The former Civil Defence Act from 1953 was in 2010 replaced by a new act on local emergency planning, civil protection and civil defence (Civil Protection Act). The act gives the municipal level a key role in disaster preparedness and response, including DRR planning. A new white paper on societal safety (2012) also provides a good foundation for the work on disaster risk reduction and is instrumental in strengthening the institutional capacities and mechanisms for risk management. Other legislation also highlights emergency prevention and preparedness in schools and health facilities, including fire prevention, health protection in schools and kindergardens, and preparedness in the health and social service sector.

Context & Constraints:

The evaluation of the emergency preparedness and resque operations during the terrorist attacks in Oslo and Utoya island, 22 July 2011, points to some severe weaknesses in the national disaster preparedness system. Failures were primarily due to:
– The ability to acknowledge risk and learn from exercises has not been sufficient.
– The ability to implement decisions that have been made, and to use the plans that have been developed, has been ineffectual.
– The ability to coordinate and interact has been deficient.
– The potential inherent in information and communications technology has not been exploited well enough.
– Leadership's willingness and ability to clarify responsibility, set goals and adopt measures to achieve results have been insufficient.

The report gives the basis for improving and strengthening the system, to be followed up by relevant governmental agencies.

Related links:

- 22 July Commission

Priority for action 5: 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: 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 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

Description:

The Civil Protection Act (2010) provides the legal framework for disaster preparedness and contingency planning.
Preparedness plans are made on all levels, and include a variety of local and national NGOs. A more systematic approach to exercises is managed through a civil-military planning catalogue. The plans on local level are constantly reviewed through audits from the higher level. The county governors have a coordinating role at the regional level, while the municipality level is obliged to have or to establish systems for disaster preparedness at local level.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 5: 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	No

Description:

There are already recovery-funds available through the damage fond, and responding resources and municipalities can apply for reimbursement of their expenses.

Context & Constraints:

-

Priority for action 5: 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? Yes

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available	Yes
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	Yes
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	Yes
Identified and trained human resources	Yes

Description:

The routines for exchanging information during hazard events are developed and tested regularly.
Post-disaster evaluations contributes to a systematic lessons learned programme.

A new Emergency Network has now been established in the central parts of Eastern Norway, and in summer 2012 the parliament approved the extension of the network to the rest of mainland Norway. The new emergency network will allow better communication between the police, the fire service and medical personnel, and thereby quicker assistance to the public in the event of accidents and crises.

Context & Constraints:

The 22 July Commission's review of the terrorist attacks on the Norwegian Government Complex and on the Norwegian Labour Party Youth camp on Utøya Island is an important and ongoing challenge in the efforts to improve Norway's ability to manage the next crisis – even though it will probably put society to entirely different tests. The review points out a number of circumstances worthy of criticism and a serious need for change.

Section 8: 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):

On local (municipal), regional (county) and national level multi-hazard analyses are an important tool for the planning process. The
multi-hazard approach involves translating and linking knowledge of the full range of hazards into risk management approaches, strategies, assessments and analysis, leading to greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.
At national level, the National risk assessment is based on scenarios covering a range of natural, technical and man-made disasters. County governors are responsible for regional assessments. According to the Civil Protection Act, the municipal level are responsible for carrying out local risk and vulnerability analyses covering all relevant hazards.

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?: -- not complete --

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: -- not complete --

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

Gender equality is described in law in Norway.

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):

Through audits, courses and exercises the capacity is strengthened. Capacity development includes sustainable technology transfer, information exchange, network development, management skills, professional linkages and other resources. The National Emergency Training College (NUSB), universities, colleges and other institutions provide training and capacity building through courses and educational programmes. County governors play an important role in providing guidance to municipalities.

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):

There is an effort to ensure that the most vulnerable are protected 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?: -- not complete --

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

The Norwegian DRR- and disaster management system is reliant on a good public-private-voluntary partnership. Effective disaster risk reduction requires effective community participation.
In its guide on climate change adaptation, the Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme highlights the need to include local knowledge in risk and vulnerability analyses, including knowledge on previous events.

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):

International cooperation:
The Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning, through the Norwegian Climate Adaptation Programme, has established a set of bilateral partnerships with other European countries (Slovakia, Hungary, Portugal, Latvia) and in other regions (Cuba and possibly Uganda). The aim is partly to contribute to sharing of experiences, working methods, etc. with the partner country, and partly to use international cooperation as a source of capacity and competence building for our national work, including in Norway's National Platform.

Section 9: 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 Civil Protection Act (2010) is still unknown to to many of those responsible for land-use planning and municipal planning processes. Ensuring that DRR becomes a stronger element in all levels of planning, and in all sectors, is an ongoing effort.

Future Outlook Statement:

A survey on climate change adaptation in Norwegian municipalities was carried out in 2008, and repeated in 2011. It shows growing interest in adaptation, and that roughly half of Norway's municipalities have included adaptation - and thus DRR elements - in parts of their planning process. We hope to see an increase in this number in the years to come.

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:

Due to the high number of municipalities, there are many small municipalities in Norway and the capacity for planning is limited. It is essential to provide planners and decision-makers with tools and examples of best practices which can simplify the integration of DRR in local planning.
Long travel distances also make it necessary to provide courses and training locally. The county governors play a key role.

Future Outlook Statement:

DRR efforts have so far been targeted to municipal planners and decision-makers, and not so much to the general public. The website kriseinfo.no provides information to the public before, during and after an event, but it does not provide information about prevention. Finding ways to disseminate knowledge and example of prevention efforts to the public is an ongoing challenge.

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 Civil Protection Act (2010) provides tools and mechanisms that have not yet been fully utilized. The Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning (DSB) continues developing guidelines and tools to enable municipal planners to fully utuilize the tools provided.
Planners require detailed information on disaster risk in order to fulfill their requirements for risk and vulnerability analyses in the development of new areas. Mapping flood and landslide risk in Norway is time consuming and requires expertice and resources. The Norwegian Water and Energy Resources Directorate follows a prioritized list for such mapping, but there are long waiting lists.

Future Outlook Statement:

We expect that tools and mechanism provided in the Civil Protection Act will be more known at local level in the years to come. Risk mapping will continue and improve the knowledge base for planners and decision-makers.

Future Outlook Area 4

The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 66/199, requested the development of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. A first outline will be developed for the next Global Platform in 2013, and a draft should be finalized towards the end of 2014 to be ready for consideration and adoption at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2015

Please identify what you would consider to be the single most important element of the post-2015 Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2025).:

The current Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) as been successful in setting DRR on the agenda on local, national and international levels. As a framework for awareness raising HFA has probably been successful. We believe that a post 2015 post 2015 framework should provide very hands-on recommendations for local communities and other stakeholders (more hands-on than the current HFA). In the end, disaster risk, including those emerging as a consequence of climate change impacts, must first and foremost be dealt with by those affected, and the more practical advice they can get, the better are the possibilities to define and implement relevant measures. Measures can be linked to land-use planning, building codes, agricultural and ecosystems management, water management, drainage, etc. Key instruments for defining measures are risk and vulnerability analyses, taking both past experiences (local knowledge) into account as well as research based knowledge about future risks.

Section 10: Stakeholders

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

Organization	Type	Focal Point
County Governor of Møre og Romsdal	Gov	
County Governor of Oppland	Gov	
County Governor of Troms	Gov	
Directorat for Cultural Heritage	Gov	
Directorate for Civil Protection DSB	Gov	Dag Olav Høgvold - Senior adviser; Erling Kvernevik - Senior adviser
Directorate for Nature Management	Gov	
National Office of Building Technology and Administration	Gov	
Norwegian Agricultural Authority	Gov	
Norwegian Climate and Pollution Agency	Gov	
Norwegian Coastal Administration	Gov	
Norwegian Mapping Authority	Gov	
Norwegian Meteorological Institute	Gov	
Norwegian National Rail Administration	Gov	
Norwegian Public Roads Administration	Gov	
Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate NVE	Gov	

Geological Survey of Norway	Acad & Research	
Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities KS	NGO	