



Finland

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

Name of focal point: Mr Taito Vainio
Organization: Ministry of the Interior
Title/Position: Ministerial Adviser
E-mail address: taito.vainio@intermin.fi
Telephone: +358 29 548 8423

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 29 June 2014
Print date: 23 April 2015
Reporting language: English

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

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

Finland has continued comprehensive work to ensure national security, functions vital to security and effective crisis management. Finland has started to improve the coordination by establishing a working group to prepare the common grounds for national risk assessment for the whole society and aiming at the assessment of the significant national risks. Even though this work has been done before by the different authorities the aim is to make this work more systematic and give common grounds for all the authorities. This work is done by the Ministry of the Interior and Security Committee together. This network has prepared the security strategy of Finland where the possible risks has been identified but now the goal is also to assess and prioritize those risks that have been identified. The HFA peer review done to Finland was also affecting to the decision that this work should be started immediately.

Finland has also continued work according to 46 concrete actions set by the National platform.

The multi-hazard early warning system for natural disaster, LUOVA, has been in operative use from the beginning of 2012. In addition to this the Finnish Flood Centre was established together by the Finnish Meteorological Institute and the Environment Institute. The aim is to improve the flood forecast and warning systems and to improve the quality of the situational picture by combining the meteorological and hydrological expertise. Service of the Flood Center is based on close cooperation with the Centres for Environment and the Rescue departments. This working model was found effective e.g. in the UK peer review where Finland participated.

An introduction to DRR in multilateral and bilateral co-operation has been included as a standing topic in the MFA basic training curricula for development co-operation experts since 2010. The new project design and implementation guidelines of 2012 include a DRR analysis tool as a part of climate proofing tool. It is recognized, however, that resilience building covers all sectors from social development to infrastructure development. In practice this means that reduction of natural disaster risks will be taken into consideration in the identification and design of all development co-operation interventions, including budget and sector support, bilateral co-operation programmes and projects, NGO projects, as well as local co-operation projects. DRR will be considered as a tool for risk management and an important indicator reflecting aid quality.

A more detailed training package on the use of the tool is under way and its

implementation has begun in 2012.

The challenge remains how to mainstream disaster risk management in all development co-operation interventions and policy dialogues. This in spite of the fact that according to the on-going (2012) OECD/DAC Peer Review (quote) Finland has made great progress in the area of risk reduction and resilience, and now has one of the most comprehensive approaches to disaster risk reduction in the OECD/DAC (unquote)". To measure progress made better in the future, a MFA in-house base-line study on how DRR is currently being taken into consideration in development co-operation interventions has been carried out

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

The relevant legislation concerning disaster risk reduction is relatively new. In 1st of September 2013 the new law on improving the distribution of electricity came into force. According the new law the electricity network will be secured gradually so that half of the households will be covered by 2019, three fourths by 2023 and 100 percent by 2028. The goal is that in the city areas the electricity cuts are not supposed to exceed 6 hours and in rural areas 36 hours. In addition to this law also the decision in principle on national emergency supply was issued by the government in December 2013.

In a challenging economic situation of the public sector as well as the private sector which will call for structural change in municipalities it will be taken care of that the disaster risk reduction will remain in the focus of local level. The declining economic situation will cause new challenges to this work.

Finland will continue paying more emphasis to the household level and in particular towards new kind of natural hazards caused by more extreme weather patterns than before, which are still not very common in Finland.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

In the local level the mayor of the municipality is responsible for general coordination of the different sectors of municipality and also in this level the municipal sectors themselves are responsible coordinating their own sector. In Finland the local level i.e. the municipalities have strong self-governance. Municipalities take care of most of the responsibilities and also finance them (e.g. health care, social services, education, building activities, environment, rescue services) in their own municipality or in cooperation with other municipalities.

The possible administrative change at the local level i.e. the number of municipalities will most probably be reduced will mean bigger municipalities. The risk assessment work will be done more coherent way because the risks are assessed at the local level in Finland. Also the work that has been started i.e. national risk assessment mentioned before will help the local level to assess the risks in mire systematic way.

The municipal reform is not finished. There still are 320 municipalities in Finland. However reform of one major municipal service i.e. health and social service is moving forward but is still going on.

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

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.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry is responsible for the coordination of climate change adaptation at the national level. Finland has been a pioneer in the implementation of climate policies. The National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change was adopted in 2005 as an independent element of the wider National Energy and Climate Strategy.

The aim of this adaptation strategy is to build up Finland's capacity to adapt to climate change and reduce the costs to the society where possible. The strategy describes the impacts of climate change and potential adaptation measures for each sector for a period extending until 2080. Measures have been outlined for 15 sectors.

The most important measures to be taken by 2015 are:

- 1) The integration of climate change adaptation into routine planning, implementation and development processes
 - 2) Preparations for extreme events and assessments of the impacts of climate change incorporated into the planning of long-term investments
 - 3) Improvement and establishment of existing and new observation and warning systems
 - 4) Implementation of the Climate Change Adaptation Research Programme 2006-2010 (ISTO)
 - 5) Preparations for forthcoming changes in the international operating environment.
- Finland will maintain and develop a high level disaster risk reduction work by making sure that the prevention, early warning systems, fast and effective response and sufficient recovery measures are in place at all levels.

The first evaluation report on the implementation of Finland's adaptation strategy was published in 2009.

National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change has been updated and it will be published soon.

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

The relevant legislation and strategies concerning disaster risk reduction are relatively new and Finland will continue to update legislation and strategies concerning disaster risk reduction continuously.

In a challenging economic situation of the public sector as well as the private sector which will call for structural change in municipalities it will be taken care of that the disaster risk reduction will remain in the focus of local level.

Finland will continue paying more emphasis to the household level and in particular towards new kind of natural hazards caused by more extreme weather patterns than before, which are still not very common in Finland.

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

In the local level the mayor of the municipality is responsible for general coordination of the different sectors of municipality and also in this level the municipal sectors themselves are responsible coordinating their own sector. In Finland the local level i.e. the municipalities have strong self-governance. Municipalities take care of most of the responsibilities and also finance them (e.g. health care, social services, education, building activities, environment, rescue services) in their own municipality or in cooperation with other municipalities.

The possible administrative change at the local level i.e. the number of municipalities will most probably be reduced will mean bigger municipalities. The risk assessment work will be done more coherent way because the risks are assessed at the local level in Finland.

Priority for Action 1

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	Yes
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.

Finnish action plan has been completed in the spring 2012. There are 46 actions defined that are related to disaster risk reduction. The Finnish national platform is following up and reporting yearly about the development of these 46 actions. In addition the national platform will list key research projects as far as DRR is concerned.

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.

Even though the climate change scenarios have been made and people are more and more familiar with them Finland is still a relatively low risk area as far as natural disasters are concerned. Cost benefit analysis are done in different projects and it can be said that most often the costs are very high related to possible risk.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

In Finland there are not allocated funds for disaster risk reduction as such but the budget is included to the total budget. In legislation different sectors are obliged to assess the risks and make the necessary measures in order to protect their functions in all situations including normal times as far as exceptional conditions.

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

In Finland the number of casualties are very low. Usually nobody dies when we talk about natural disasters. Also the economic damage is very low in Finland.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	Yes
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	Yes
Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	N/A

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.

Finland has 22 rescue regions that are in charge of the emergency situation, unless the event exceeds the geographical responsibility of the local authority. Also other regional authorities are obligated to support rescue services. Support is given from regional and national authorities including voluntary agencies/ NGOs if there is a need for that. Rescue services are obliged to assess the accident risks in their own area and to make decisions on service level that base on risk assessment.

The service level of the rescue services corresponds to the accident threats present in the region. The regional rescue service ascertains and assesses the threats present in the region and determines, on the basis thereof, the service level of the rescue services comprising the personnel and equipment of the fire brigade as well as the full-readiness time of the fire brigade. The service level also covers planning, prevention of accidents, civil defence as well as support measures necessary for rescue activities. Also other regional authorities that participate to the rescue work are obliged to make the necessary action plans.

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 issues related to natural hazards and disaster risk reduction are not prioritized as high as desired by the emergency authorities in some municipalities because the risk is relatively low.

Resource needs at the municipal level are difficult to justify because of the low risk. However the climate change considerations are changing the situation gradually.

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)	1
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	10
private sector (specify absolute number)	0
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	1
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 network has got three extra member organisations after the establishment 7th of May 2010.

The network has completed the Finnish national platform for disaster risk reduction. In this action plan there are 46 actions defined which will be followed by the network yearly.

In the network there are the following organisations:

1. Ministry of the Interior, (sectoral org.)
2. Ministry for Foreign Affairs (sectoral)
3. Prime Minister's Office (sectoral)
4. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (sectoral)
5. Ministry of the Environment (sectoral)
6. Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (sectoral)
7. Ministry of Transport and Communications (sectoral)
8. National Emergency Supply Agency (sectoral)
9. Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities (civil society)
10. Finnish Meteorological Institute (sectoral)
11. Finnish Environment Institute (sectoral)
12. Institute of Seismology of the University of Helsinki (science and academic institution)
13. Finnish Red Cross (civil society)
14. Finnish National Rescue Association (civil society)
15. Federation of Finnish Financial Services (civil society)
16. Finnish Association of Fire Officers

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 only a minimal budget for the network as such. All the participating organisations are paying their own costs.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Multi-hazard risk assessment	Yes
% of schools and hospitals assessed	100
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	0
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	Yes
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?	Yes

Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.

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 risk assessments are done at local, regional and national level. Government Resolution and the related document (Security Strategy for Society) define society vital functions and establish targets and development policies that will guide each administrative branch of the government in dealing with its strategic tasks in all situations. Ministries are also designated responsibilities for co-ordinating these functions. In this Resolution, strategic tasks refer to tasks which are needed to secure the functions vital to society in all situations. They are based on current legislation and the existing division of powers between the different authorities.

All the ministries, sector organizations, Statistics Finland and Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities support the municipalities by collating statistics and providing data for risk analyses.

National level authorities are commissioned to perform risk and vulnerability analysis within their area of responsibility and also take care that the risk assessments are done regionally and locally.

Rescue plans are done in each school and hospital. Local level authorities (fire inspectors) control in fire inspections that these plans are in place and that they are up to date. In addition to this, schools are required to have a safety and security folder where all the relevant safety and security threats are identified and terms of reference are given for security or safety incidents.

By the end of 2015 the accident risks that have national importance should be assessed. The work has been started in order to give national guidelines to assessment of the national risks.

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.

At the national level the negative impacts of climate change are being studied for national risks and vulnerabilities. The municipal and regional levels are not yet able to address climate change issues and the potential consequences with the same focus.

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

Yes

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

Yes

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

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

The Finnish Meteorological Institute produces high-quality observational data and research findings on the atmosphere and seas. The Institute uses its expertise to provide services that promote public safety and enhance wellbeing among people and in the environment.

At the beginning of 2012 the multi-hazard early warning system for natural disaster (LUOVA) has been taken into operative use. LUOVA system is based on an expert network, which monitor various data sources, produce analyzed information rapidly and issue warnings of natural hazards for the use Finnish government and safety authorities on 24/7 bases.

The Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) supports water protection and water resources management by multidisciplinary research, by collecting information and

by developing assessment tools and sustainable solutions to issues of water supply, wastewater treatment especially in scarcely populated areas, hydraulic construction, and utilization of water resources. SYKE is also responsible for the monitoring and assessment of the quantitative variations of water resources, the status of surface and ground water bodies and various biological variables.

Changes in the status of waters are examined from a holistic perspective. The results of our research are used in socioeconomic evaluations of water-related issues and in making decisions concerning these issues. Among the most frequently used information services of SYKE are the nation-wide hydrological reports, forecasts and warnings which are based on extensive database material and on hydrological models.

The Accident Investigation Board investigates all major accidents regardless of their nature, including all aviation, maritime and rail accidents or incidents. Investigation report is prepared each time. The report also presents the recommendations, based on the conclusions of the investigation. All reports are written in Finnish with English summaries. An English version is prepared from significant reports.

In the beginning of 2014 the Finnish Flood Centre started its activities. The Flood Centre is a joint service of Finnish Meteorological Institute and the Finnish Environment Institute and it is responsible for nation-wide flood forecasting, flood warning for all forms of flooding in Finland.

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 greatest challenge is to introduce the new technology to be used in the warnings. This means the intelligent systems used by mobile phones and computers.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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.

At national level, people are warned of an emergency over the radio and TV. Emergency announcements are simultaneously transmitted via all radio stations and free TV channels nationwide. An emergency announcement interrupts all programmes irrespective of channel.

In the event of an emergency, people are warned at local level by the sound of the public warning signal. Outdoor siren system covers more than 80 percent of the population. The fixed outdoor siren system is supplemented by mobile loudspeakers and of course by TV and radio broadcasting system (RDS). Siren system with TV and radio broadcasting system makes it possible to warn a lot of people at the same time.

The siren system can be activated from the emergency response centers. A new emergency response centre system connects different safety authorities together and makes their flexible cooperation possible. Centralising the handling of urgent emergency calls for the police, rescue, social, and health services in joint emergency response centres (ERCs) has proved an efficient and economical way of providing versatile, high-quality ERC services. All the emergency calls are received in all-European number 112.

Finland built the world's first digital national radio network based on the TETRA standard for use by the safety authorities. The network enables top quality sound, data and moving image transmission even in extreme conditions. The primary users of the public authority network in Finland are the authorities responsible for public safety on both national and municipal level.

Finnish Meteorological Institute (FMI) together with Finnish Environment Institute and Institute of Seismology is developing a new early warning system for natural hazards

called LUOVA. The system has been operational from the beginning of 2012.

At the same time systems and services for weather and flood observations, forecast and warnings are being developed.

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.

Even though the Finnish warning system is very good communications need to be further developed to ensure that all responsible parties get early information in time of their specific responsibilities, including the general public.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

Finland has a long lasting and very close co-operation with Sweden and Norway in several areas. For example rescue services function over the border and the basic rule is that the closest and fastest unit handles the rescue work regardless of nationality. There are also frequent trainings between the Nordic countries.

Finland has also agreements on co-operation with Russia and Estonia. With regards to transboundary river basins, Finland has agreements with Russia (1965), Sweden (1971) and Norway (1980). Also, the implementation of EU's flood directive will advance flood risk management of transboundary river basins.

A satellite based Fire Alarm system for forest fires has been developed in Finland. The Satellite fire observation system has been designed to work continuously, and to automatically send alerts within 30 minutes after a fire has been detected. This satellite alarm system is unique in the world and it detects Finland and the border areas around Finland.

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

In the border areas there is co-operation especially in operative response. However the visa requirements in the border of Finland and Russia make the co-operation more bureaucratic and slower than with Sweden or Norway.

Priority for Action 3

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

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

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

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

A national transmission system for official notifications and emergency announcements via the radio and television network is in place in Finland. The Ministry of Transport and Communications has the duty to support the building and maintenance of electronic warning and alert systems. These systems work via the public service radio and TV channels (Yleisradio Oy) and on the most important commercial radio and TV channels.

For example, notifications may be issued when the country is threatened by an exceptionally violent storm or other dangerous weather event that develops rapidly.

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 general information number has been started. People can call to this information number if the matter is not urgent.

All the emergency alarm calls go to the emergency response centre (112).

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	Yes
university curriculum	No
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.

Every year over 400 schools and around 35 000 pupils participate to a Nou HATA -campaign for 8th grade pupils. The campaign aims at improving readiness to function in accident situations. Campaign is executed together with schools and fire brigades.

Natural hazards are not systematically included in the national educational curriculum. The different types of hazards are covered in primary and secondary school curriculum, but the focus is on the mechanism of how these hazards are created, not so much on what could be done to prevent and reduce the losses.

Depending on the University degree, the natural hazards may be covered quite profoundly, or not at all. There is a culture of safety and resilience what comes to prevention of traffic accidents or fires, but not on natural hazards. Again, this has to do with the fact that Finland is not prone to natural hazards.

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.

Considering the low prevalence of natural hazards in Finland, the current education does cover the needs. However, realizing that families travel to disaster prone countries and that there have been more severe storms in Finland, there might be a need to consider the inclusion of more DRR related education material to school curricula.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Research programmes and projects	Yes
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	Yes
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	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.

Academy of Finland has also launched a multidisciplinary research programme on climate change (FICCA). The budget of the programme is aprox. 12 million euros in 2011 - 2014.

The strategy for climate change adaptation which originally was adopted in 2005 is going to be renewed by 2014.

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 and low risk of natural disasters.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.	Yes
Training of local government	Yes
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes

Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	Yes
--	-----

Guidance for risk reduction	Yes
------------------------------------	-----

Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	Yes
--	-----

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.

More emphasis is needed on public education. The awareness among the general public is mostly related to recent major emergencies abroad, such as earthquakes, and the humanitarian needs, or domestic emergencies, such as the storms, not on disaster risk reduction efforts.

In the Rescue Act there is the obligation on self-preparedness. The aim is to make people recognize their own responsibility for developing and maintaining a safe environment.

Owners and occupants of buildings, business entrepreneurs, government offices and agencies, and other organisations are obliged to prevent adverse incidents. The obligation to prevent accidents and adverse incidents applies to both the care of buildings and operations conducted in them. Readiness must also be maintained for protecting persons, property and the environment and undertaking rescue operations in the event of an adverse incident.

Households are required to make provision for various types of adverse incidents and for rescue operations for which they are independently capable. The aim is that people know how to take precautions and act at home and work in the event of a protracted disorder affecting society, such as a failure in the power, heating or water supply, or storm devastation. Homes should be stocked with several days' supply of food, any medication taken regularly, and other daily necessities. It is also a good idea to keep batteries readily available for use in the event of a power failure.

Each person should act responsibly in situations where there is a risk of fire or other accident. The Rescue Act specifically mentions open fires, prescribed burning, fire safety in peat production areas, and the risk of forest fires. Each individual is obliged to take part in rescue operations in the event of a fire or other accident. Persons in danger should be warned and an emergency call made, and everyone should undertake rescue operations to the best of his or her ability. Smoke detectors are compulsory for each dwelling. Each occupant should install a smoke detector in the home. A smoke detector will detect a fire that is starting, at the earliest possible

moment, and alert those in the living space. The exits and access routes of buildings must be kept serviceable and free of obstructions. Rescue routes intended for emergency vehicles must be usable, free of obstructions, and appropriately indicated.

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.

People are highly vulnerable to cuts of electrical power. Rural areas are slightly more prepared than urban areas (however in urban areas electricity cuts are shorter), but in general there is a need to increase people's awareness of what can be done in advance to ensure that they will survive without electricity at least for a few days. According the new legislation there is obligation to the power companies to improve the reliability of the electricity distribution.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	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 the last few years, Finland has reformed its land use planning system. The new system has three levels of land use plan with a clear division of labour between them: the regional land use plan, the local master plan and the local detailed plan. In addition, the Government defines national land use guidelines, which should be taken into account throughout the country in all land use decisions and land use planning. The land use planning system is hierarchical; higher level plans steer lower

plans. The national land use guidelines are implemented mainly through regional plans. Regional and local plans are drawn up through participatory planning procedures, which give local residents the chance to get involved in the planning processes that affect them.

Construction in Finland is controlled by the Land Use and Building Act. More detailed regulations and controls on construction are included in the Land Use and Building Decree. The Building Code of Finland contains technical regulations and instructions referring to building. The objective of building guidance is to promote:

- creation of a good living environment that is socially functional and aesthetically harmonious, safe and pleasant and serves the needs of its users,
- building based on approaches which have sustainable and economical life-cycle properties and which are socially and economically viable, and create and maintain cultural values,
- continuous care and maintenance of the built environment and building stock.

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 because of the low risk. One of the problems is also that people want to build nearer and nearer to the shoreline without actually realizing that the flood risks will increase in the future. This increases the pressure to the local land use planners to allow building to these areas.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	Yes

Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	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.

The property is insured by private insurance if the owner has taken one. The property insurance is very common in Finland and usually people have property insurance. With regards to natural hazards the system has been changed so that the private insurance companies cover the insurance formerly covered by the government. In this context the coverage of insurance was also extended so that the insurance covers exceptional river flooding and exceptional flooding caused by heavy rain and sea level rise.

The Finnish welfare policy system is good. The education, health services as well as security and safety services are free of charge for the citizens. There is also a highly developed system in case of unemployment or sickness.

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 possible public sector budget cuts.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	Yes
Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets	
Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals	Yes

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 Finland the schools and hospitals are built in safe places. This is ensured by the Construction Act and the legislation on land use planning. The climate change issues have been taken into account also so that possible flood would not affect to the new buildings.

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 climate change and how it actually affects to the situation.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	Yes
Training of masons on safe construction technology	Yes
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	Yes
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	Yes
Regulated provision of land titling	Yes

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.

Finnish legislation on land use and building defines quality requirements for residential environments and the spatial structure of communities. Good residential environments must be healthy, safe, pleasant, and socially functional. The environmental administration provides valuable information on the significance of environmental quality for residents, and also helps local authorities to adopt participatory planning procedures. Built-up areas in Finland typically use much more land per inhabitant than built-up areas in other western countries, or even in the other Nordic countries. One strategic aim of the environmental administration is to integrate the spatial structure of communities better, in order to reduce traffic and emissions, and to improve the aesthetic aspects and functioning of communities.

Revised national land use guidelines take storms, heavy rainfall and floods into account more in detail than previously. In addition, responsibilities and management of stormwater and drainage will be further developed in the near future.

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.

Natural hazards such as storms, heavy rainfall and flooding have been taken into

account more than before. One of the challenges is winter conditions when e.g. to reach the damaged power line area could be difficult causing delays for fixing the fault.

Core indicator 5

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

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 post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? Yes

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	N/A
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	Yes
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	Yes
Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	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 the repairing and rebuilding of local electricity networks, the measures to secure the networks (cabling, trenching) have been taken to reduce the risk of power failures in possible new storms. The Accident Investigation Board investigates all major accidents regardless of their nature, including all aviation, maritime and rail accidents or incidents. Investigation report is prepared each time. The report also presents the recommendations, based on the conclusions of the investigation. All reports are written in Finnish with English summaries. An English version is prepared from

significant reports.

The budget is included to the total budget and DRR is not separated from it as such.

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 natural hazards are rare and there are financing instruments for disaster recovery.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	Yes
By international development actors	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.

Finnish legislation in the Act on Environmental Impact Assessment Procedure applies to all projects that may be expected to have considerable negative environmental impacts. The related Decree on Environmental Impact Assessment Procedure lists the types of projects that must always be subjected to EIAs, such as motorways, airports, large harbours, and major poultry- and pig-farming facilities. In EIA also the accident risks should be assessed. New legislation covering environmental assesment of authoritie's plans and programmes came into force in Finland on 1.6.2005. The new legislation aims:

- to ensure that environmental impacts are assessed and duly considered during the preparation and approval of authoritie's plans and programmes,
- to improve the availability of information, and provide more opportunities for public participation in planning and
- to promote sustainable development.

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.

Low risk of natural hazards.

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? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies	Yes
--	-----

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

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

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety	Yes
---	-----

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness	Yes
--	-----

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

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections	Yes
--	-----

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios	Yes
--	-----

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.

According to Rescue Act all buildings where there are more than 2 apartments have to make so called rescue plans. This is called self-preparedness which means that owners and holders are responsible for making necessary plan according the risks.

In 2013 over 447 schools and 34 500 pupils participated to a Nou HATA -campaign for 8th grade pupils. The campaign aims at improving readiness to function in accident situations. Campaign is executed together with schools and fire brigades. So called fire safety week was arranged 23.11.2013 - 1.12.2013 and in this context there was an event called a day in a fire station where in 281 fire stations gathered altogether 73 000 people.

Considering the safety of health facilities in emergencies, there is dedicated training for nurses. Over 6 000 nurses have completed a security card training. This is a one day training that aims at giving basic skills to act in accident situations.

Specific training and exercises are arranged every year in schools and hospitals. 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.

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 trainings and campaigns do not take into account natural hazards in appropriate way and they focus more on everyday accidents.

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.

The government resolution on securing strategy for society is tested every four years by national level exercise and according to result of this exercise the functions are developed.

The rescue authorities as well as the other authorities and organizations that are responsible for tasks belonging to rescue services or for executive assistance tasks shall be liable to draw up the necessary emergency plans in cooperation with each other.

Municipalities with a nuclear plant referred to in section 3, subparagraph 5 of the Nuclear Power Act (1987/990) or a plant causing a danger of a major accident as

defined separately in a Decree shall draw up an emergency plan for an accident taking place in the plant. The population exposed to the danger shall be heard when drawing up the plan and informed thereof.

The owner or holder of a building, an industrial or commercial entrepreneur, an agency, institution or other organization to be provided for in a Decree shall draw up a plan on the measures to protect people and property as well as the environment in danger situations as well as to prepare for rescue measures which they can take at their own initiative.

Finnish Red Cross disaster preparedness plans for national, district and local levels to support authorities as per its auxiliary role towards the Government. Finnish Red Cross conducts simulation exercises for different scenarios, last one in February 2013 for potential major storm. The exercise was national exercise where 10 000 people participated 129 events nationwide.

National emergency supply agency is arranging training to the private companies as well as the ministry of the transport and communication to the telecommunication companies.

In Finland sexual equality is the starting point to all activities.

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

The possible budget cuts may affect to the relatively good level of training.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National contingency and calamity funds

Yes

The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	Yes
--	-----

Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
---	-----

Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No
--	----

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.

Government based compensation systems exist for both flood damage to properties and agricultural yields. The compensation system for flood damages has been changed so that the insurance companies cover the risks instead of government when it is a question of exceptional flooding (river flooding, flooding caused by heavy rain, flooding caused by sea level rise).

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 mechanism is in place and it is in the acceptable level.

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? Yes

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

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 Action Plan for Gender Equality 2012–2015 of the Finnish government collates the most important measures by which the government promotes equality between women and men and combats gender-based discrimination. The Action Plan is an instrument to coordinate the government's gender equality policy, and it incorporates measures for all the government ministries. The Action Plan is based on the Government Programme and the first Government Report on Gender Equality drawn up in 2010. The Action Plan also aims to implement the policy outlines incorporated in the said report.

The action Plan contains objectives and actions in several theme areas. These priority areas include gender equality legislation, working life and reconciliation of work and family life, decision-making and promotion of women's careers, education and research, promotion of democracy and integration policy, economic policy, promotion of men's and women's inclusion and health, and combating intimate partner violence and domestic violence, violence against women and sexual violence. In addition, the Action Plan underpins organising and developing the work for gender equality.

Insurance companies and the state assess the damage and loss using a certain method.

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

In Finland sexual equality is the starting point to all activities.

The system fits to Finnish risks.

Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

In Finland especially the multi hazard approach is important. This is because of the fact that natural disaster risk is relatively low and this is why it is very important to assess all kind of risks when the risk assessment is done. According to Rescue Act Regional rescue services decide on the standard of service after hearing the opinions of the municipalities. The decision shall specify the threats in the region and assess the risks arising from them, and also determine the objectives of the operations, the available resources and services and the standard of service.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

The Action Plan for Gender Equality 2012–2015 of the Finnish government collates the most important measures by which the government promotes equality between women and men and combats gender-based discrimination. The Action Plan is an instrument to coordinate the government's gender equality policy, and it incorporates measures for all the government ministries. The Action Plan is based on the Government Programme and the first Government Report on Gender Equality drawn up in 2010. The Action Plan also aims to implement the policy outlines incorporated in the said report.

The action Plan contains objectives and actions in several theme areas. These priority areas include gender equality legislation, working life and reconciliation of work and family life, decision-making and promotion of women's careers, education and research, promotion of democracy and integration policy, economic policy, promotion of men's and women's inclusion and health, and combating intimate partner violence and domestic violence, violence against women and sexual violence. In addition, the Action Plan underpins organising and developing the work for gender equality.

Insurance companies and the state assess the damage and loss using a certain method.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

More efforts are needed for building and maintaining the ability of people, organizations and societies to manage their risks successfully, with necessary financial resources. The general public is not sufficiently prepared for natural hazards, such as major storms or floods. The potential negative effects of climate

change make this a higher priority than previously.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

The level of social security in Finland is high and the whole society is quite equal in general. Today there are more and more discussions about social exclusion of the young people which right now appears to cause social malaise.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Finland is a country of associations and to integrate all the relevant associations to the disaster reduction is the challenge in the future.

In Finland there is also a strong tradition of civil society organisations and volunteer local people participating to the rescue work.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

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

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

In the field of development policy and co-operation continued training of Ministry staff and experts in DRR issues is a necessity.

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 most important overall challenge in Finland is the possible effects of climate change in the long run. However it is plausible to believe that Finland will face the extreme weather conditions more often and harder than before. Disaster risk reduction competes at local and regional levels with many other important issues. The resources are not adequate to place sufficient attention to DRR and climate change related issues because the risk is so low right now.

Future Outlook Statement

Finland's National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change was prepared in 2005. Its aim is to enhance and increase our ability to adapt to climate change and to reduce the costs caused by climate change to society. It describes the impacts of climate change and possible adaptation measures in 15 sectors. The proposed measures run as far as until 2080, and they are divided into immediate, short-term and long-term actions. The general objective is that detailed analysis of the impacts of climate change and specifying adaptation measures will be mainstreamed as part of ordinary planning, implementation and monitoring in various sectors. The strategy will be updated in 2014. With the new climate change adaptation strategy it should be possible to promote DRR's mainstreaming into sustainable development policies. DRR should not be considered as an additional burden but rather as integral part of thinking and working at all levels, to ensure that disaster risks are considered, reduced and that development efforts would not increase the risk.

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

Disaster risk reduction competes at local and regional levels with many other important issues. The resources are not adequate to place sufficient attention to DRR and climate change related issues because the risk is so low.

Future Outlook Statement

Although DRR has not been focused traditionally, there are some interesting and important developments. As one example, there is a special programme of municipal security development under the umbrella of Internal Security Programme. 15 of the biggest cities in Finland participate and develop practices that aim at developing resilient cities in Finland. With the Third Internal Security Programme it should be possible to strengthen the development to many other municipalities also as far as DRR is concerned.

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 challenge is to improve the overall disaster reduction work. In a small country this means a very close co-operation of all the relevant actors i.e. government and municipality authorities as well as organisations, companies and associations.

Future Outlook Statement

There is a strong tradition of co-operation between authorities in Finland and this tradition can be made even stronger using e.g. national platform.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Ministry of the Interior	Governments	Taito Vainio, Ministerial Adviser