



Croatia

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

Name of focal point: Ms Nataša Holcinger
Organization: National Protection and Rescue Directorate
Title/Position: Senior Advisor
E-mail address: natasa.holcinger@duzs.hr
Telephone:

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 12 March 2015
Print date: 23 April 2015
Reporting language: English

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

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

The Republic of Croatia has an obligation to finish the National Risk Assessment by the end of year 2015. The process has started and all planned activities, of those defined in our Risk Assessment Action Plan, have been completed. We have now identified priority risks that need to be analysed, completed the guidelines on how to write the National Risk Assessment and the data gathering process has started.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

The Platform holds yearly conferences and after each conference there is a set of conclusions. In year 2014 the conclusions have been adopted by the Government of The Republic of Croatia and specific tasks and obligations have been given to responsible bodies upon the proposal of the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Committee.

It has also been concluded that after the completion of the National Risk Assessment the Committee will agree on a National Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy that will be adopted by the Government and will be in accordance to the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy that is also in preparation.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

The National Protection and Rescue Directorate (NPRD) works on how to gain understanding for this issue and implements smaller projects on this topic, and some of these projects are in preparation. One of the conclusions adopted by the Government was in regard to this issue and the issue will be raised again on a bilateral level between the NPRD as the DRR coordinator in the Republic of Croatia and the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports as the education coordinator.

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Promoting and educating on the Platform's mandate and adopting a comprehensive risk assessment in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders and sectors creates a starting point for prioritization of risks and developing a Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy thus stepping towards a more effective legislation, policies, sustainable development and planning and programming at all levels and sectors (the water sector already prepared Flood Hazard and Flood Risk Maps, the Flood Risk Management Plan is to be completed and adopted by the end 2015).

Strategic Goal Area 2

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

NPRD, as a leading DRR institution in Croatia, will create a condition in which it will be possible to have a centralised, accessible and user friendly database on hazards and disaster loss. This activity will result from stronger connection and result in and better cooperation between all relevant sectors and stakeholders. Such a database would enable better and faster dissemination of needed information - a cornerstone for meaningful communication between sectors, stakeholders, government and general public.

A precondition to a better cooperation and understanding of the necessity of DRR is capacity building; it is also a goal to enable a learning environment for both population and institution's capacities.

Strategic Goal Area 3

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Developing a two year training and simulation plan, based on lessons learned and organising national table top exercises involving all levels of “command” and coordination with obligatory attendance for the higher management with lessons learned obligations in order to implement those in disaster risk management. Practical experience will be used from the catastrophic flood that has struck Eastern Slavonia in 2014.

Priority for Action 1

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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	No
Poverty reduction strategy papers	No
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	No
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	Yes

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

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

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

The Republic of Croatia is building a system that, through legislative regulations, leads to disaster risk reduction. Key roles and responsibilities and coordination mechanisms are defined by legislative acts. The key legal document regulating disaster management in Croatia is the Law on Protection and Rescue. All amendments to the Law on Protection and Rescue and its subordinate legislation are in accordance with EU standards concerning disaster risk reduction.

All responsible sectors are implementing these into their legislation. For example: Meteorological and Hydrological Service is a national centre of excellence for production, collection and dissemination of high-quality meteorological and hydrological information to provide support to economic development, environment protection, to act towards the preservation of life and material goods from natural hazards and disasters and to mitigate their consequences). Concerning the role of Meteorological and Hydrological Service of Croatia (DHMZ), the key legal document is the Law on Meteorological and Hydrological Activities in Croatia (Official Gazette No 14/78).

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

The key challenge is in the low quality level of cooperation between relevant sectors which results in lack of a needed institutional cooperation. Although many sectors do have risk assessments (such as: partial flood risk assessment) Croatia has yet to establish a functional data flow mechanism in order to have comprehensive understanding of risks in all sectors.

The establishment and efforts have been made in this area by the Risk Assessment Working Group and National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction Committee are a step in the right direction.

Support from two relevant sectors:

Disaster risk reduction is the core of the mission of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), as well as of the Meteorological and Hydrological Service of Croatia (DHMZ). Knowledge about weather, water and climate events and their extremes, and adaptation measures to the climate change, are necessary for sound and sustainable development of national socio-economic and environmental programs in any country.

Thus the future role of DHMZ and its capacity lies on more effectively deliver of meteorological and hydrological products and service outcomes that are of immediate, recognizable value to social and economic needs and protection of the environment, especially in the area of risk management.

Croatian Waters are in the process of implementing the Floods Directive (FD 2007/60/EC) in accordance to its requirements transposed to the Water Act (Official Gazette, No 153/09, 63/11, 130/11, 56/13 i 14/14). Flood hazard and Flood risk maps have been prepared and Flood risk management plans for the river basin districts will be produced based on those maps by the end of 2015.

Key challenges:

- lack of comprehensive risk assessment is a key generator of inadequate legislative and regulatory provisions
- there are still some overlaps between various institutions in the existing legislation
- insufficient financial support for development of rescue and protection system at local level
- lack of strong commitment of the government to financially support DHMZ
- more investment in capacity building and training the staff of relevant institutions and their services

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		

Decentralised / sub-national budget

USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	
--	--

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

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

Insufficient funds have been allocated for disaster risk reduction at both local and national level.

There are limited funds allocated for DRR activities dispersed among the sectors (eg. Croatian Waters has 15 million euros allocated annually for implementation of measures to manage flood risk but improvements are expected when Croatia starts using EU ESI funds for this purpose).

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

Lack of cooperation between sectors and a data collection mechanism for both national and local institutions and governments make it hard to estimate the amount of money invested in DRR as opposed to the resources spent on rescue, disaster relief and recovery.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	No
--	----

Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	No
---	----

Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	
---	--

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator

(not only the means of verification).

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

Local governments are taking more responsibilities in DRR with less support from national authorities.

Local response system is based on local capacities to a greater extent, but there is still a lot of reliance on national assistance in disaster relief and no obligation for local communities to invest in DRR and education is legally prescribed.

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

Limited budget has been obstructing desired development and the necessary preparedness levels. Also, continuous disaster response training should be conducted.

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)	4
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	12
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	1

private sector (specify absolute number)	0
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	4
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	0
other (please specify)	0

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

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

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

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

The National Platform for DRR was established in 2009 and is open for participation to other government, civil society organizations and academia. The National Protection and Rescue Directorate, Civil Protection Sector is the lead coordinating institution for DRM and DRR in Croatia. All relevant sectors are represented in the Platform and are actively participating in its work if invited to.

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

Although progress has been made in promoting the importance of DRR activities, obligations and linking all relevant bodies to the common goal - to reduce disaster risk in Croatia, more has to be done to promote the importance of the National Platform. Media has had appearances in response activities, and DRR Conferences,

but is still not officially represented in the Platform. Also a bigger commitment of some sectors that do not initially see themselves related to the topic, such as the Ministry of Finance, is very much needed.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? No

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	Yes
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	Yes
Risk assessment format customised by user	Yes
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	1

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

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

The Republic of Croatia has an obligation to finish the first National Risk Assessment by the end of 2015. The process is multi-sectorial with sectors sharing responsibility for the final outcome, but most of all each sector for their own designated risk. NPRD is the coordinator of the process. Some sectors (such as water, health, agriculture...) have already completed risk assessments for their own purposes. The institutions have each recognised their risks and taken responsibility and prioritisation of risks, to be analysed in the foreseeable period, was done.

The water sectors' flood risk assessment with a common methodology is available and, in accordance to it, Croatian Waters have prepared Flood Hazard and Flood Risk maps and based on them the first Flood risk management plan will be prepared and adopted by the end of 2015.

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

Other sectors' risk assessments are yet to be completed or have to be modified to be in accordance with procedures described by NRAG and ISO 31000.

There is a time and cooperation challenge due to insufficient data, financial and operational capacities and overall understanding of the process.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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

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

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

There are sectorial databases in place, as is linkage with systems measuring various parameters (radiological, weather, seismologic, air quality) as well as operating procedures for providing data to relevant services. However at the moment Croatia does not have a central database which would systematically collect and analyse disaster loss data. Croatia has a well-organized hazard monitoring and analysing system, especially for hydro-meteorological and geophysical hazards, while other hazards monitoring and analysing has to be upgraded or developed altogether.

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

The process of linking separate databases into a single database and their transfer to GIS is a challenge. The process is time-consuming and requires financial means and appropriate information, equipment and well-trained staff. Not just in NPRD but also in relevant national and local authorities and institutions.

Fragmented, sectorial, disaster loss data collection presents the biggest challenge for Croatia. This has to be changed in a way that all disaster loss and hazard information data is systematically collected and analysed and publicly available.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

The system is being upgraded and modernised but progress is not fast enough due to financial limits.

Croatia has established an early warning system both on national and local level. Information dissemination is performed by posting it on web pages of providing institutions, the National Protection and Rescue Directorate and media (local and national). The Ministry of Culture informs the public using private and public TV broadcasting.

As to water management, water pollution risks are systematically monitored and there is an Early Warning System in place but for flood risk we expect to develop a flood forecast modelling and after that a flood risk early warning system as priority non-structural measures in the first cycle of implementation of the Flood risk management plan in the period 2016-2021.

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

Expensive maintenance of equipment and the overall system have resulted in search of new contemporary solutions based on the information technology development. The biggest challenge that Croatia has encountered so far is controlling the information and action/reaction upon receiving it. After a warning is issued, cyber media usually misinterpret or do not disclose a crucial part of the warning.

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	No
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	Yes
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	Yes

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

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

The Republic of Croatia has an active international cooperation with the neighbouring countries through bilateral agreements as well through regional initiatives and organizations. Croatia has a leading role in the region regarding DRR activities. Lack of a central

database, Croatia compensates with many bilateral and multilateral hazard monitoring agreements (International Commission for the protection of the Danube River, International Sava River Basin Commission, Union for Mediterranean Initiative for the protection of Mediterranean region/basin and Adriatic Sea sub basin...).

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

Strengthening the system on the local level is a precondition for joint operations of neighbouring counties of two states in case of disasters and major accidents in border areas.

The National Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy, with a clear view of the implementation of risk reduction activities in main sectors on the national level and clear obligations and responsibilities of main national institutions and their local partners, is the main task. Every sector will have the task to set up trans-boundary cooperation related to sectorial risk reduction and appropriate prevention activities including exchange of information, knowledge etc.

Priority for Action 3

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

Information is proactively disseminated	Yes
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	Yes
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	No

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

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

National Protection and Rescue Directorate, along with Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture, Meteorological and Hydrological Service, Ministry of Tourism, Croatian Waters, NGO's and other state and public institutions provide data and information about hazards. Since Croatia just recently experienced a major disaster (Slavonia flood, May 2014) no all-inclusive system has yet been established.

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

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

Recent years have shown a need for more active dissemination of relevant information, existing rising awareness programmes provide necessary information, but they are fragmented/sectorial and uncoordinated. To avoid fragmentation and overlapping activities related to raising awareness and disaster information dissemination, collection of relevant information and later information management should be coordinated by one governmental body (working group) to achieve more efficient intersectorial cooperation taking into account understanding of received information in all sectors and general public.

However, Croatia is in the process of improving services for proactive dissemination of information and proactive public information sharing will be a part of the new government portal www.gov.hr that will share in advance all information within involved stakeholders.

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? Yes

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	Yes
university curriculum	Yes
professional DRR education programmes	Yes

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

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

The National Curriculum Framework encompasses preschool education and general compulsory and secondary education. The National Curriculum Framework includes, to a great extent, topics on disaster risk reduction.

For example:

- Measures for mitigating and limiting the adverse impact of natural disasters and threats, in order to create a safe environment.
- The realization that technology can significantly foster the prevention or elimination of damage caused by natural disasters.
- The impact of human activity on the surroundings and the environment and ways in which to act more responsibly towards the environment and to reduce the risk of disasters.
- Particular attention is paid in the curricula to the subject of safety and how to act in the event of a calamity or a disaster, which will be highlighted even more with the adoption of subject curricula.

Areas such as fire protection, civil protection, flood protection, water pollution prevention, draughts prevention and crisis management can be studied as university majors.

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

Hazards and risks are a part of school curricula but it is insufficient and uncoordinated. A project on disaster reduction in schools is one of the priorities of the Croatian National Platform for DRR.

Initiatives for more involvement of disaster risk reduction in school curricula have often failed with reasoning that children are already overloaded with school material, making for difficult entrance of new material into existing curricula.

Core indicator 3

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

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 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	Yes

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

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

For specific segments a good cooperation between state administration bodies and scientific institutions is already in place, and the goal is to make the cooperation even better and more specific especially through the National Platform for DRR. More than 50% of the articles submitted for annual conferences of the National Platform for DRR are from academic institutions.

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

Through the National Platform for DRR academic community is asking for more funding for DRR projects in different areas. Successful researches and inventions have difficulties finding funds and understanding when transformation into practice is due. In an unorganised data collection system it is difficult to obtain quality data.

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? 3

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

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)	No
Guidance for risk reduction	No
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	Yes

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

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

In local communities, Red Cross organizations and volunteer fire departments, organize first aid courses and are particularly active in conducting activities related to fire prevention and calamity and/or disaster prevention procedures. Apart from the aforementioned measures, there are numerous activities that inform the public about what to do in the event of calamities and natural disasters. For instance, the City of Zagreb Office of Emergency Management has prepared the flyers "4 Steps to Safety in case of an Earthquake". However no substantial public awareness raising strategy is yet in place.

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

Although public awareness is a continuous process, public is more interested in this area shortly after an incident. It is difficult to keep this matter in public focus. More effort has to be made to raise public awareness systematically and initiate preventive measures in main sectors.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

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

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

In accordance with spatial plans, for every building in construction, there has to be an environmental impact assessment conducted and environment protection measures prescribed and implemented. EU directive SEVESO III (industrial incidents with dangerous substances) is implemented into national legislation.

Different public and private organizations need specialized weather and climate information services to support their decision making thus reducing disaster risk and

protecting the ecosystem, DHMZ provides these with timely and accurate information.

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

Legislative framework is established but concrete implementation is ahead. Accepting climate changes as risk factors is rather slow and a lot of work lies ahead for the climate change to be considered for what it is – a risk factor. Cases of heavy rains in short periods of time, as well as severe dry periods go in favour of this statement.

In Croatia the national economy depends strongly on weather dependent sectors like agriculture, water management, transportation, construction, growing tourism and on performance of the Disaster Management and Civil Protection. However, the territorial area of the country is small, and also the economy is small and strongly influenced by the present economic crisis.

The value of weather forecasts and climatological studies is actually more than reduction of economic losses. Better weather forecasts and climatological products, and better exploitation of services by end-users also help improve production and promote human well-being.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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 Yes

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

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

Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection is in charge of a comprehensive control system of air and land pollution. National policy in water management has been in place for almost 140 years. Ministry of Agriculture in close cooperation with Croatian Waters has a comprehensive control system of water use and water protection in place with polluter pay principle. Full cooperation is established between National Protection and Rescue Directorate and National Hydro-Meteorological Service.

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

Financial limits to above mentioned projects obstruct the desired development in that area.

The possibility of insuring ones property against droughts does not exist.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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

No

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

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

Costs and benefits analyses of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) are scarcely included as a part of the planning of public investments.

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

The economy of the Republic of Croatia depends upon tourism and natural disasters in the coastal area would cause great economic losses.

Croatia is not uniformly developed and population density greatly varies throughout the country. Therefore, the same unwanted harmful event (for instance: earthquake) has different risk of a disaster, depending on the location of the event, whether it happened near a big city or in some less inhabited area. Consequently, it is necessary to decentralise policies and plans for disaster risk assessment and management.

Sector policies and plans must consider both – advantages and disadvantages, compromise between central government and local authorities, which presents challenges. Often there is interest collision between central and local authorities.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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

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

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

The Building code has been applied since 1964. Rules on technical standards for the construction of buildings in seismic areas have been implemented for many years since year 1981. Croatia accepted National Annex to EUROCODE 8 in year 2011, which contributed to more effective and better earthquake risk management. Since Croatia is exposed to a high risk of earthquakes, seismic risk management is compulsorily integrated in spatial plans and is regularly applied.

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

There is pressure exerted from the part of construction investors to reduce building codes because they increase construction costs. The legislative exists, but implementation of the legislative is sometimes insufficient. It is necessary to emphasize the necessity of more intense inspection of implementation of the

legislative and professional rules, because there are still no effective measures which would force investors or owners to comply with plans and regulations. Croatia became a new member state of the European Union since July 1st 2013 and there have been many legislative changes in the past decade in order to fulfil the requirements imposed by the European Union. The building codes, legislative, rules, directives and regulations are abundant, complex and ever-changing. Therefore, proper implementation is a real challenge for physical planning, construction and building inspection.

There is investment in flood protection infrastructure in flood prone areas, but Flood protection systems have to be completed and somewhere existing flood protection systems have to be upgraded and improved.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	Yes
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	No
Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	No

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

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

Sectors sporadically do have post disaster recovery plans but this is not done systematically. After the flood events the costs for urgent work of recovery measures on the flood protection facilities are explicitly incorporated in the annual budget of Croatian Waters.

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

Financial means at local level are insufficient making the national support necessary in this respect.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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? No

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	Yes

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

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

Generally, planning, designing and construction of the big infrastructural projects take into account risk assessment and management for the risks which occur during execution of such big projects.

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

Disaster risks impact should be constantly updated and taken into account in protection and rescue plans.

In addition, disaster risks during planning, designing and execution of the big infrastructural projects must be constantly reconsidered, assessed and managed, respectively measures must be undertaken in order to reduce risk to acceptable level, which presents a continuous challenge.

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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

No

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? No

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

No

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios

No

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

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

Every education facility must have a Plan and Program for Evacuation and Rescue, which is prescribed by the Fire Protection Ordinance, and as such is a prerequisite for planning and conducting evacuations and rescues in such facilities. Sudden events, which may threaten the lives or well-being of pupils/preschool children, employees and other personnel at a location where a speedy and efficient evacuation must be organized, may arise from internal hazards (fire, explosion, panic) and external sources of danger (lightning, earthquakes, storms, floods, dangerous radiation levels, nuclear or biological hazards). In the Croatian education system, every educational institution organizes an annual evacuation drill and, as part of the school curriculum, conducts activities related to evacuation plans in the event of calamities such as fires, earthquakes, etc.

The Ordinance on conduct on the part of school educational staff in taking measures to protect the rights of students and notify relevant authorities of any violations of these rights (NN, no. 132/13) defines the obligations and procedures for educational institutions in regard to student safety.

A fundamental mission of DHMZ is to contribute to the protection of the lives and livelihoods of people by providing early warnings of meteorological and hydrological hazards and related information to reduce risks. They are crucial support for the National Protection and Rescue Directorate and stakeholders with regard to disaster prevention and preparedness, mitigation of the impacts of disasters, emergency response, recovery and reconstruction.

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

Existing documents, such as the Hazard Assessment, do not provide adequate data to create scenarios containing elements of future/rising risk. Lack of a Risk Assessment, low horizontal cooperation between ministries, other governmental and non-governmental institutions, private sectors, academic and scientific communities pose a great challenge in anticipating future risks and creating a valid preparedness plan.

By completing the Risk Assessment and with a stronger involvement of the members of the National Platform challenges like this can easily be overcome. Strengthening the relevant sectors such as agriculture, industry, energy and activities involving a DRR approach with horizontal support of hydro-meteorological, water management and environmental sector (air quality, nature protection, land protection...), including Governmental decisions and adequate budgetary allocations which must not be seen

as a national expenditure but necessary investment for future sustainable development.

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	Yes
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	Yes

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

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's

ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Croatia has plans, procedures and resources to deal with a major disaster but is lacking in good coordination, disaster risk management, especially human capacity. On Croatian Red Cross (CRC) level contingency plans and procedures are in permanent upgrading process. CRC is trying to use practical experiences either our own or experiences of sister societies in this process. Organisations operations management and coordination is organized on subsidiary level, starting from municipal CRC organization to city, county and national level. Support to the most vulnerable population is always the CRC priority especially to elderly and disabled persons.

Croatian Waters has very well organised Flood defence structure on the national and level of flood defence areas with tradition more than a century old but now efforts are invested to harmonise all the activities in accordance with EU flood risk management directive approach and flood risk management not just on the national and local level but on the trans boundary level supported by flood forecast modelling and early warning responses.

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

Recognition of a responsible agency/organization for different activities in DRR and disaster response is needed in order to economize resources and avoid duplications and lack of coordination.

Establishing a permanent disaster coordination centre with an annual command post exercise would improve coordinating between sectors and effective utilization of all its resources.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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

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

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

They are in place at national and at local level. Insurance of industrial facilities is obligatory by law, but more efforts in the development of insurance are necessary in the private sector.

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

It is not possible to ensure sufficient financial reserves at local level, which is why national support is required.

Civil society depends much more on the support from the national level than they are able to support themselves through insurance companies.

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	No
Identified and trained human resources	Yes

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

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

There are standard operating procedures in place for all relevant actors in case of hazard events and disasters.

Teams are trained and sent by the Ministry of Finance to assess financial losses, but other damages are only rarely assessed.

Currently Croatia has damage methodology (Official Gazette No 96/98) and we are in the process of creating new-one.

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

Loss assessment, needs assessment and assessment teams are something that Croatia needs to develop. Since assessment is a task for combined sectorial effort, new methodology will resolve that challenge.

Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance

No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

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)

Croatia is aware of the significance of a multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction, but so far has created very few policies and strategies on that matter. The National hazard assessment has shown a need for developing such documents. The ongoing process of adopting a National risk assessment, including multi-risk assessment, is a step towards a multi-hazard integrated approach.

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

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

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

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

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

This is the area where all stakeholders in the DRR process need to do much more, in relation to vulnerable individuals, vulnerable communities, general public and communities in general. The approach must be coordinated to avoid confusion and mixed messages.

Although Croatia does not have gender sensitive DRR documents, during all activities and implementation of DRR measures, citizens of Croatia are not treated with regard to their gender, but regarding their needs. In other words, procedures in place enable everyone to fulfil their needs without compromising an individual's dignity.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key 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)

Unfortunately local communities, especially ones with low average income, have little knowledge of risk reduction. Lack of National risk reduction strategy is one of the main reasons for the current state. Inadequate legislative on protection and rescue does not cover DRR issues nor enables local offices to enforce risk reduction regulations. Building codes dealing with seismic and other natural hazards are in force but there is lack of experts at local level to control and enforce it. NPRD is currently conducting educational programs for local government representatives on basic disaster response issues while prevention and recovery are not represented adequately.

Croatian Waters are organised on the national and local level for flood defence activities supported by public and private companies certified for flood protection activities and maintenance of flood protection systems and facilities and local and county governments but are facing challenges in implementing legislation in accordance with EU legislation specifically EU Flood risk management directive, Water Framework directive and at the same time also SEA, EEA and Habitat and Bird Directive. Those have an approach taking in account more non-structural and

preventive measures in addition to structural measures on flood protection systems, respect the integral water management activities and ecosystem services approach at river basin scale during the preparation and implementation of River Basin management Plans and Flood Risk Management Plans as main tools in 6 years planning cycles, involving the main stakeholders in preparing the plans as well as during their implementation. Those Plans with integral water resources management addressing climate change adaptation measures on river basin scale harmonised with relevant sectorial strategies/programmes/plans will allow for sustainable development of the other main sectors in accordance with national strategic goals and priorities.

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

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key 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)

Vulnerability criteria are always the main criteria for Croatian Red Cross (part of Croatian DRR system) activities in all fields from recovery to different social activities. It is very often difficult, because of the lack of resources, to help more and to other people in need. It is very important to put additional efforts in building solidarity between individuals, neighbours, and communities in crises situations as well as in regular situations.

Water management activities, especially Flood protection activities are taking the solidarity concept into account and water revenues which are collected on the state level are spent on solidarity based principle for construction of flood protection systems with aim to protect the most vulnerable populations, cultural heritage, environment, economy and infrastructure.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-

governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

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

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

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

Croatia has a vast number of NGOs and volunteering organisations and other institutions that are working on different DRR areas. Having said that, it is impossible not to notice the lack of coordination and cooperation among them. Recent events show us that coordination and cooperation is possible, but at this moment slow and requires too many resources. An adequate National DRR strategy definitely would have a positive effect on all levels and sectors, including this one.

These organisations however present an important resource of public service thus helping with the development of the public policy and by enforcing their plans they contribute to disaster risk reduction.

The work of these NGO's in Croatia is regulated by a number of acts such as the Association Act (OG No 47/14) and the Act on Croatian Red Cross Which define humanitarian aid, humanitarian aid forms, target groups, and differentiate forms of humanitarian assistance in order to protect and rescue the victims of natural disasters and victims of the crisis caused by human activity. And Humanitarian Assistance Act (OG No 128/10) and Act on Volunteering (OG No 22/13) which complement the work of all associations. Volunteering is one of the strongest elements that contribute to the development and shaping of democratic changes in every modern society, and undoubtedly is one of the most important factors in reducing the risk of disaster.

The Croatian Red Cross is considered to be a leading institution for humanitarian relief and in its work CRC achieves the humanitarian objectives and tasks in the field of protecting and improving the health, welfare and humanitarian education, and is committed to respecting international humanitarian law and protecting human rights.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

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

Recent events forced Croatia to recognise all its resources and institutional capacities, which lead to a stronger commitment of both national and local governments to create a National DRR strategy, further develop human capacities and stronger enforce legislation in place. Furthermore main-streaming disaster risk reduction into plans and programmes, raising awareness about hazards, mitigation and adoption measures start to matter and get their "spot under the sun".

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

Lack of cooperation and communication as well as understanding:

- within institutions
- between institutions
- lack of recognisable and accepted DRR coordinator and leader.

Existing legislation is often not implemented.

Future Outlook Statement

All legislation will have to be adjusted and reviewed to accommodate the DRR Strategy and better definition and coordination of all work related to DRR and response.

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

- Limited funds for DRR activities on the national level
 - Lack of funds for DRR activities on local levels
 - Non-existing public awareness raising strategies (current activities are unorganized, often with low or inadequate quality)
-

Future Outlook Statement

Our future goal will be to develop a legislative framework in which new and, based on recent experiences, much needed obligations would be defined for both the local government as well as national. Define obligatory DRR allocations and, more precisely, strict roles on all levels in order to avoid confusion and unwise waste of resources thus enabling structured capacity building and raising awareness following a comprehensive Public Awareness Raising Strategy involving all relevant stakeholders interests into one substantial programme in order to avoid public confusion.

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

- Post-disaster programmes do not incorporate a budget for DRR for resilient recovery
- Lack of recognition of a responsible agency/organization for different activities in DP/DRR and disaster response
- Loss assessment and needs assessment teams are something that Croatia needs to develop

Future Outlook Statement

Recent events in Croatia (2014 floods in Slavonia) will result in many lessons learnt that should be supplemented by lessons learned from future cooperation and exercises and implemented into legislation and practice in order to economize resources and avoid duplications and lack of coordination of activities in all phases of disaster management.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
National Protection and Rescue Directorate	Governments	Jadran Perinic
Ministry of Agriculture	Governments	
Ministry of Culture	Governments	
Ministry of Defence	Governments	Zrinka Smeh-Martinovic
Ministry of Economy	Governments	
Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection	Governments	
Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Transport and Infrastructure	Governments	
Ministry of Science, Education and Sports	Governments	
Ministry of Social Policy and Youth	Governments	
University of Rijeka	Academic & Research Institutions	
Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts	Academic & Research Institutions	Božidar Lišcic
Croatian Firefighting Association	Non-Governmental Organizations	
Croatian Mountain Rescue Service	Non-Governmental Organizations	
Croatian Red Cross	Non-Governmental Organizations	
Croatian Seismological Survey	Academic & Research Institutions	
Croatian Waters (Hrvatske vode)	Private Sector	

