



Romania

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

Name of focal point: Eugen Visan
Organization: General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations
Title/Position:
E-mail address: eugen.visan@mira.gov.ro
Telephone:
Fax:

Reporting period: 2011-2013
Report Status:
Last updated on: 1 March 2013
Print date: 07 March 2013
Reporting language: English

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/europe/rou/>

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:

1. Establish the legal framework for National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.
2. A national policy and a plan for implementing disaster risk reduction measures at all levels and also a system to monitor the progress in this field are in place.

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:

1. Disaster risk reduction strategies and plans are based upon national risk assessment.
2. Local emergency volunteers' services are strengthened with a focus on prevention and preparedness.
3. Local authorities have responsibilities in implementing disaster risk reduction plans at community level.

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:

1. Lessons learned are integrated in response plans.
2. Local authorities ensure permanent update of General Urban Plan, taking into consideration the hazard maps.
3. Local emergency volunteers' services have sufficient personnel and better equipment.

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	Yes
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:

The legislation concerning the management of emergency situations (crisis management) is put in place, each central and local authority having specific responsibilities on this issue. On the other hand, risk management is focused more on disaster prevention and mitigation rather than on risk reduction as a whole.

There are medium and long-term strategies covering the risk of floods, dangerous weather phenomena and earthquakes (Romania’s major hazards), but there is a need for bringing together these separate efforts.

Context & Constraints:

The main shortcoming in implementing disaster risk reduction at all levels is that the responsibility for risk management is divided between 8 different central authorities, only some of them having local representatives. This separation leads to the overlapping of efforts or to areas that are not covered by either of these authorities.

Moreover, there are unclear issues concerning the responsibilities for disaster prevention. This is a consequence of the fact that originally the legislation was focused on disaster response and recovery. The following adjustments lead to the uneven update of the legislation. This problem is even more important, having in mind the structural changes within the organizations.

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

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	0.002 %	NA
Decentralised / sub-national budget	1%	2.5%
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	NA	

Description:

Important amounts of money were invested in prevention activities and in disaster risk reduction measures, especially in the flood risk field. These funds are from the local councils, decentralized public services, central authorities and European programs. The investments in disaster risk reduction made by central authorities are easily identified (hydrotechnical works, hazard and risk maps, the program for the reduction of seismic risk of the buildings). At the local level, there are also current investments in disaster risk reduction (capacity building of the local emergency situations services, public awareness campaigns, the maintenance of ditches and dikes), investments covered by the emergency situations dedicated funds. These funds are dedicated for all prevention, response and recovery actions. Local authorities spend 0-4% of the local budget for disaster risk reduction measures and 0-10% for response and recovery, depending on the existing situation.

Context & Constraints:

There are no funds dedicated for disaster risk reduction measures. The investment in response and recovery leads to limited/no budget left for disaster risk reduction measures. Most of the times, local authorities have to face many and various challenges with a limited amount of money and some of the emergency situations funds are used to cover more urgent needs.

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: 2

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

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	0%

Description:

Local authorities have important responsibilities in emergency situations management. There are annual funds allocated in this field. Most of the times, if the community isn't facing disasters at that moment, these funds are redirected to other areas.

Context & Constraints:

The absence of legal pressure for investments in disaster risk reduction measures, on one hand, and the lack of interest and knowledge from the local authorities, on the other hand, leads to the easy reallocation of funds initially dedicated to disaster risk reduction measures.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

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)	0
National finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	0
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)	

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	No
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No

Other (Please specify)

Description:

The National Committee for Emergency Situations was designated to fulfill National Platform's role. Because this committee is focused more on disaster response and recovery and it lacks civil society representatives, the national authorities decided that a National Platform should be put in place. This platform would include National Committee for Emergency Situations members, but also civil society representatives, NGOs, professional associations, charity organizations, scientific and religious institutions, media representatives etc. Therefore, a Government Decision draft was developed.

Context & Constraints:

In order to adopt the Government Decision mentioned above, the national authorities have to make important changes in the basic laws concerning the National System for Emergency Situations Management. The decision-making process is laborious and it involves a large number of entities.

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? No

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% 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)	No
Common format for risk assessment	No
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.	Industry, energy, transportation, urban planning

Description:

Risk assessment and mapping process is laborious and requires important amounts of money. Efforts have been made towards the risk mapping for the major hazards Romania is facing – floods and earthquakes. The main focus was on high risk areas – hydrological basins for floods and important urban settlements for earthquakes.

The national risk assessment is a laborious process, having in mind the fact that each central authority has its own methodology and methods for assessing risks. Therefore, there is a need for developing a national methodology that will ensure comparability and the integrability of risk assessment results. In order to achieve this, the national authorities had recently initiated a project involving risk assessment experts and scientific institutions.

At local level, authorities own databases containing the elements exposed to major hazards and risk vulnerability elements. Vulnerability data are sometimes not complete or up-to-date. The causes of this problem are the fact that not all high seismic risk buildings were technically assessed and the ongoing process of updating and finalizing the flood maps.

Context & Constraints:

Public building administrators have no legal pressure to ensure the disaster risk assessment of the building. These buildings are assessed at the administrator's request. The problem is the administrator's awareness regarding the high degree of risk for his building and the lack of proper funding. Most of the times, administrators are local authorities who are overwhelmed by the financial situation.

National risk assessment was not a priority until now, mostly because there are more central authorities dealing with risk management and there is no appointed organism to coordinate the process. At local level, authorities use the risk assessment and contingency plans. These documents are not sufficient for disaster risk reduction planning and there is a need for a regional or national overview of the risks.

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: 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

Yes

Reports generated and used in planning by

Yes

finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/information systems)

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

Yes

Description:

There is a number of research institutions who have responsibilities in monitoring, archiving and disseminating data related to hazards, some subordinated directly to the ministries (National Meteorological Authority, National Administration ‘Romanian Waters’, National Institute for Earth Physics). These entities are constantly developing programs for the improvement of the existing monitoring systems.

Context & Constraints:

The institutions dealing with the major hazards in Romania had a proactive attitude towards constant improvement of monitoring systems. However, the things are different for the other hazards. A part of the problem is the fact that for these particular hazards there is no national authority to coordinate the local efforts.

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

No

Communication systems and protocols used and applied

Yes

Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination

Yes

Description:

The early warning systems are put in place for the major hazards. The information dissemination is made through the communication and information system owned by the General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations, media and outdoor video advertisement panels (in the main cities). The General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations signed collaboration protocols with telephone operators, national/local media and the owners of the street advertisement panels.

In the near future the System for the Integrated Management of Emergency Situations will be in place. This system will ensure information exchange between central and local authorities.

Context & Constraints:

Some systems can be improved, but there are no available funds for the moment.

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:

Central authorities are aware of the cross-border risks and that only the international cooperation can lead to a good management of risks. Romania and the neighbouring states were involved in disaster prevention and response projects, such as Safe-Quake, DACEA or Geomarine-hazard. These projects improved the international cooperation in the region. The Danube Floodrisk project involved 9 countries and the final result was hazard and risk maps for the entire river. This project brought added value to the national efforts for flood maps.

Context & Constraints:

The cooperation between states is sometimes hindered by language barriers, institutional changes and lack of collaboration protocols. Moreover, some projects may not have access to particular European funds. This is a consequence of the fact that some neighbouring countries are not EU members.

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? No

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

Description:

All authorities with responsibilities in emergency situations management provide relevant information to the public, through official websites, social networks, instant messaging systems and public campaigns (radio and TV messages, posters, brochures, flyers). The General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations has a website dedicated to disaster prevention, www.informarepreventiv.ro.

Context & Constraints:

Each authority provides information concerning only the risks they are legally responsible for. Although The General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations has the role to integrate and coordinate these efforts at national level, it lacks an overview of all the existing information at all levels and, therefore, the information posted on its website is not complete. The population has to access different websites in order to obtain the information they need.

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: 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? No

Primary school curriculum	No
Secondary school curriculum	No
University curriculum	No
Professional DRR education programmes	No

Description:

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated in the emergency situations training programs, having as target the pupils and students and encompassing periodic classes and drills and dedicated activities (the programme “A different kind of school”). The trainings are conducted by teachers and the personnel of County Inspectorates for Emergency Situations, sometimes in collaboration with other authorities (for example the Ministry for Regional Development and Tourism) or NGOs (Save the Children).

Some university masters ensure the improvement of disaster risk reduction knowledge for certain types of professions. For example, the Technical University for Civil Engineering Bucharest - Seismic risk reduction of buildings and Landslides risk reduction, Police Academy – Emergency Situations Management.

Context & Constraints:

Including disaster risk reduction in school curricula is a difficult task, having in mind the busy school curricula and the little time dedicated to extracurricular activities. Although some NGOs initiated projects in this field, their activities were hindered by the lack of proper funding and legal provisions.

Also, access to specific disaster risk reduction knowledge for certain professional categories is limited. For example, a civil engineer needs to follow a master course in order to learn about seismic risk reduction.

Priority for action 3: Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved: 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? No

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:

Research institutions with clear responsibilities in disaster prevention and disaster risk reduction are constantly developing dedicated projects. Besides these institutions only few are interested in disaster risk reduction projects. This lack of interest is determined by the higher importance given to immediate and concrete result (for example, a detection system for the victims of an earthquake using mobile phones) compared to the analyses that cannot be used alone but in combination with other elements (risk maps, cost-benefit analysis).

Context & Constraints:

These projects can be supported by providing legal provisions (sectorial strategies) or advocacy (campaigns in order to raise awareness of the decision-makers). A system that will use the results of these projects should be put in place.

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	No
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	No

Description:

General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations and local partners had a proactive attitude towards public education for emergency situations. Besides the national campaigns, General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations and County Inspectorates for Emergency Situations promoted building disaster resilience at all levels using brochures, posters and flyers and participating to scientific conferences and meetings.

General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations also was involved in various projects having as primary/secondary outcome the improvement of public behavior in case of a disaster. For example, SAFE- QUAKE "Improvement of the population's post-disaster behavior living in urban areas with high seismic risk", DACEA - DANube Cross-border system for Earthquakes Alert Project.

General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations, in cooperation with local authorities and NGOs, had recently initiated a project in order to assess and monitor public awareness concerning disaster risks and disaster risk reduction. This project will allow the authorities to assess the efficiency of public campaigns and the training needs.

Context & Constraints:

Although there are no dedicated campaigns for disaster risk reduction, the disaster risk reduction measures the population can implement are part of the knowledge obtained through public education campaigns conducted by General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations. The disaster risk reduction term must be defined and clearly differentiated from existing notions. Public campaigns must be focused and adapted to specific risks the community faces.

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: 2

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

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)	Yes
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	No
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Description:

Disaster risk reduction issues are not well-determined in the environment policies and programs. Most of the disaster risk reduction measures are included in wider notion of the sustainable development.

Context & Constraints:

Environmental policies and plans have sustainable development as a target; this situation, combined with the insufficient advocacy and legislative action, result in overlooking some disaster risk reduction measures from the very beginning. Sectorial strategies having as a secondary target disaster risk reduction would ensure a better integration and would complement existing efforts.

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: 2

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

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	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	No

Description:

The government developed important social programs for particular social categories and rural population, but neither of them has as a primary target high-risk prone communities. The government provides financial support for the people most affected by disasters through the Solidarity National Fund. The government also adopted a dedicated law in order to raise disaster resilience through compulsory home insurance.

Context & Constraints:

Social programs targeting high-risk prone communities are not a priority. This is a consequence of the low level of awareness concerning the importance of building disaster resilience, on one hand, and limited funding, on the other.

There are real problems concerning crop / property insurance and microfinancing, some enhanced by the economic insecurity. The people's trust in banks, insurance companies and microfinance institutions is low. This is determined by the people's lack of specific knowledge and the unpleasant personal experiences determined by the limited transparency regarding taxes and commissions. Moreover, the companies that have encountered important problems with a large number of customers have limited their activities and became more intolerant to risk.

Although the owners have the legal obligation to insure their home, some of them choose not to pay for it, due to low income. These owners would benefit from microinsurance facilities.

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: -

not complete --

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? -- not complete --

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	No
---	----

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

Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals	No
--	----

Description:

-- not complete --

Context & Constraints:

-- not complete --

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: -

not complete --

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	No
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	Yes
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	No
Regulated provision of land titling	Yes

Description:

Central and local authorities invest in projects concerning risk reduction. The local authorities are interested in reducing the risk of floods and landslides, because they are facing these risks more frequently. Also investments in slope stabilization and drainage infrastructure require a smaller amount of money.

The major investments are the subject of national programs, such as retrofitting high buildings vulnerable to earthquakes, or regional programs, such as management plans for river basins.

Context & Constraints:

There are funds provided by the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration to local administrations to support retrofitting projects, therefore the issue is not the lack of money but the reluctance of owners. Formal legal aspects of bidding, contracting and surveying are a source of delays. Many owners are afraid of apartment mortgaging, most of them are rather old, low-income, absentees or just do not want to be disturbed by evacuation and noisy works.

Some owners and even some lawyers and court judges were confused in their decisions concerning the balance between private property apartment's inviolability and risk reduction needs in condominiums. The ministry mentioned above proposed that buildings that represent a first class of seismic risk and require compulsory retrofitting were to be subjected to urgent City Major Decision. This may become a Court ruling against owners who obstruct retrofitting works. Other legal penalties are addressed to employees and/or owners for delay of decisions, or deadlines of 2 years for design and 2 years for works. But the pace of works is still too slow.

There is also a legal base to provide safe lands for households vulnerable to floods or landslides. Most of the times, the owners refuse to move because they are reluctant to leave their lands and crops.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved: -

not complete --

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	No
Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	No

Description:

The regulations governing the way the disaster risk reduction policies and the land use practices are incorporated in the building rehabilitation process are put in place. The design of the new buildings is in compliance with the European buildings codes.

Context & Constraints:

The development of new projects means higher costs and undetermined delays in the projected completion date, due to the bureaucracy. A simplified procedure for obtaining a building permit is required.

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: -

not complete --

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? -- not complete --

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	No
By international development actors	No

Description:

The National Strategy for Sustainable Development governs the incorporation of disaster risk reduction elements into all programs concerning populated areas. The current development plans and programs for cities, industry and infrastructure take into account the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment and the Strategic Environmental Assessment. Moreover, the Seveso Directives underlines the country's responsibility to maintain appropriate safety distances between establishments and residential areas, buildings and areas of public use, recreational areas, and, as far as possible, major transport routes.

Context & Constraints:

The main challenge is the potential change regarding the activity of the establishments. For example, if a factory is closed, then the local authorities have no reason not to allow people to build houses in the nearby area. The problem occurs when the factory is reopened and houses are already built within the safety area of the establishment.

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? No

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety	No
---	----

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 emergency situations Romania had to face in the last years determined an increased awareness of the decision makers concerning the importance of disaster risk reduction. A strategy for prevention of the emergency situations, regulations for the management of emergency situations and contingency plans are in place. General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations coordinates the national public education campaigns for disasters. The mechanism for rapid resource mobilization is in place, but it was never put in motion and the behavior of stakeholders was never tested. The risk analysis and contingency plans take into consideration future risks, by developing possible risk scenarios. These plans are constantly updated, and the changes are immediately included in the drills and specific trainings of the population and local authorities.

Context & Constraints:

Political changes have determined a lack of correspondence between legal provisions and real on-site situation. The response efficiency is low because limited/no budget was allocated for the disaster prevention measures and for better equipment and training of response units. The necessary funding was allocated mainly after a disaster and only for mitigation actions.

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	No
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	No
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	No

Description:

General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations owns 4 mobile command and control centers dedicated for complex and lasting emergency situations, having responsibilities in receiving and disseminating information and in providing technical and operational solutions for decision makers. In the near future, the System for the Integrated Management of Emergency Situations will be in place, providing data bases, maps, response plans and communication means for emergency situations management. Annually each institution develops specific plans in order to ensure the human, material and financial resources needed in case of an emergency situation.

Context & Constraints:

General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations had in plan to acquire other 4 mobile center, but the action was stopped for financial reasons. In most cases, periodic drills are replaced with a simple review of the response plan. Some stakeholders are unwilling the spend money and time to involve their resources in these drills, overlooking the fact that regular training improves the coping capacity and response time. Last years' experience shows that there are real problems when a disaster occurs and the resource plans mentioned above must be implemented.

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	No
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

Description:

The Government has access to a national fund dedicated only for urgent measures concerning disaster mitigation and rehabilitation. In case of emergency, this fund can be supplemented from the Supplementary Budget Fund.

Context & Constraints:

Financial restraints are the main challenge of the government when facing a major disaster.

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: 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

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	Yes
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	No
Post-disaster needs assessment	No

Description:

According to the law, during and after a disaster damages and losses are evaluated and the results are disseminated through operational reports (during a disaster) and final reports (30 days after the disaster). For the final reports, the loss assessment is made by a commission nominated by the prefect, comprising experts from the decentralized public services.

Damages and losses are assessed in 2 stages. In the first stage, there is an on site assessment made by the commission mentioned above. The second assessment is more complex, it requires specific studies and it is made in order to develop reconstruction plans.

Context & Constraints:

The damage and loss assessment is conducted by experts, each for its area of expertise, but there is no national methodology put in place.

The complex assessments necessary for reconstruction planning are fully paid by the local authorities. Therefore, sometimes local authorities are reluctant to spending money on this kind of studies instead of directly investing in rehabilitation.

A possible solution is loss assessment made by insurance companies.

Section 8: Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: -- not complete --

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

The central authorities have invested in hazard and risk mapping for floods, earthquakes and landslides. Until now, there are hazard maps for floods (the entire country), earthquakes and landslides (4 counties). The process is ongoing and the Floods Directive puts a lot of pressure on this particular area.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs initiated a project in order to develop the national risk assessment. The final result will be a national map comprising all information regarding hazards, exposure and risks.

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

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

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):

NA

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

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

-- not complete --

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: -- not complete --

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

Risk reduction regulations are enforced by local authorities and agencies, but most of the times they lack the proper personnel. There is a need for an improved legislation to support their activity and also for a tool for a coherent implementation.

All the stakeholders involved in local response are well trained. Each year, General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations develops a national training plan and a program for local authorities and population.

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

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: -- not complete --

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: -- not complete --

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

NA

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

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: -- not complete --

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

General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations fosters public-private partnerships at national and local level. Moreover, the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction will comprise also representatives from the private sector and the main NGOs.

Most of these partnerships were made in order to develop projects for enhancing preparedness and response, supported from European Funds.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance:

-- not complete --

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

-- not complete --

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 process of updating existing legislation is slow and it involves a large number of entities. Until the entry in force of the new laws, the integration of disaster risk reduction considerations into policies and plans is not coherent and its impact is minimal.

Future Outlook Statement:

Raising the awareness of central authorities regarding the importance of integrating disaster risk reduction measures into sectorial policies and plans is imperative. The General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations will further develop its expert network and will make full use of it to advocate disaster risk reduction at national and local level.

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:

The existing legislation doesn't cover explicitly disaster risk reduction measures, therefore local authorities are neither motivated nor supported to take action in this area. A legal framework with specific responsibilities and measures for the local authorities should be in place.

Future Outlook Statement:

The process of developing a new set of laws and updating the existing ones in order to support local authorities in this area is ongoing. Universities, research institutes or NGOs, in partnership with local authorities, have developed a number of projects that contribute to building resilience at community level, most of them still ongoing. The central and local authorities encourage this proactive attitude providing as much support as possible, taking into consideration financial restraints.

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 General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations and the National Emergency Management System undergo continuous changes, in order to best fit the needs of the society. Therefore, strategic approaches and multiannual programs are a real challenge. There is a need for stability and proper structure based upon an in-depth analysis of the system.

Future Outlook Statement:

The new structure of the National Emergency Management System will be based upon the results of the national risk assessment. Thus, disaster management will be more efficient and based upon real on-site information.

The General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations makes every effort to support the local emergency volunteers' services. A new set of law governing volunteers services and financial support for better equipment is needed.

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).:

Strengthening local authorities and establishing decentralized responsibility are the key elements in proper implementation of disaster risk reduction measures at community level.

Section 10: Stakeholders

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

Organization	Type	Focal Point
Ministry for Information Society	Gov	Mr. Valentin Bugariu e-mail: valentin.bugariu@mcsi.ro
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Gov	Mr. Radu Timofte e-mail: radu.timofte@madr.ro
Ministry of Economy	Gov	Mr. Ion Turluianu e-mail: ion.turluianu@minind.ro
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change	Gov	Mrs. Livia Nedelcu e-mail: Livia.Nedelcu@mmediu.ro
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration	Gov	Mrs. Monica Calin e-mail: monica.calin@mdrt.ro
National Institute for Earth Physics	Acad & Research	Mr. Bogdan Zaharia e-mail: bzaharia@infp.ro
National Institute for Hidrology and Water Management	Acad & Research	Mrs. Elisabeta Cserwid e-mail: elisabeta.cserwid@rowater.ro
National Meteorological Administration	Acad & Research	Mrs. Florinela Georgescu e-mail: florinela.georgescu@meteoromania.ro