



Norway

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

Name of focal point: Mr Erling Kvernevik
Organization: Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning, Ministry of Justice and Public Security
Title/Position: Senior Advisor
E-mail address: erling.kvernevik@dsb.no
Telephone: +4790047415

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 5 December 2014
Print date: 23 April 2015
Reporting language: English

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

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

The Act relating to Municipal Emergency Preparedness, which entered into force on 1 January 2011, states that the "municipalities are required to survey the disruptive events that may occur in the municipalities, assess the probability of these events occurring and how their possible occurrence may affect the municipalities. The results of this work must be assessed and collated in a comprehensive risk and vulnerability analysis."

The Gjørsvik Report (NOU 2012: 14, Rapport fra 22. juli-kommisjonen) is a report that was ordered by Norway's parliament, as a consequence of the 2011 Oslo bombing and the following Utøya massacre. The report was delivered to Norway's prime minister on August 13, 2012, one year after the establishment of a fact finding commission. The report revealed serious shortfalls in society's emergency preparedness and ability to avert threats. The commission came up with 31 recommendations ranging from better preparedness to limiting the availability of semi-automatic weapons and improving police helicopter capacity.

A white paper on climate change adaptation (Meld.St. 33 (2012-2013)) was prepared and adopted by the Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget) in June 2013. The White Paper outlines actions to be taken at various governmental levels and within sectors in order to adapt to a changing climate.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

Disaster risk reduction is organized in accordance with the principles of responsibility, similarity, subsidiarity and cooperation. According to these principles, disaster risk reduction is integrated into all levels of planning and in all sectors, at the most effective way. The municipality level has a key role in implementing disaster risk reduction policies, as they have the main responsibility for emergency preparedness as well as prevention through land use planning.

Interaction among actors at national level is still a challenge due to a strong tradition of Ministerial management. To improve the coherence and organisational culture at national level, the capacity for this at the Prime Minister office has been strengthened. Several incidents (floods, fires, landslides) has also increased the attention on improved resilience at all levels.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

A new instructions for public security in the ministries was adopted by a Royal Decree of 15 June 2012. The instruction state that the ministries, "based on an overview of the risk and vulnerabilities in their own sectors and on DSB's National Risk Analysis, (must) assess the risk, vulnerabilities and robustness of critical social functions in their own sectors as a basis for continuity and emergency planning". The National Risk Assessment (NRA) is published annually and describes serious hazards and threats and presents results from risk analyses conducted on a selection of disruptive events with disastrous consequences for society.

According to the municipal survey 2014, 85% of the municipalities have conducted such a comprehensive risk- and vulnerability (RVA) assessment. This is an increase by 5% compared to 2012. However, controlled for minimum standards for RVA, only 36% meets the standards.

91% of all the municipalities have a comprehensive preparedness plan, an among 50% this plan is revised annually. However, only 30% have a preparedness plan that meets the minimum standards for such a plan.

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

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

Strategic Goal Area 2

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

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

Strategic Goal Area 3

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

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

level. Resilience is built into housing and social and technical infrastructure.

Priority for Action 1

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National development plan	No
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
· Samfunnssikkerhet	
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
· Klimatilpasning i Norge	
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.

Plan and Building Act (2008) impose municipalities to ensure that risk and vulnerability analyses are carried out prior to development of new areas. The Civil Protection Act (2010) gives municipal level the responsibility to ensure that disaster risk is taken into consideration in all relevant sectors and areas, including existing buildings and infrastructure. National guidelines for integrating societal safety into land-use planning is in place. Guides and planning tools are being developed and disseminated through county governors for use at municipal level. County governors monitor and guide municipalities in taking disaster risk into account in planning and strategy processes.

A national risk assessment on 'possible worst case scenarios' has been carried out and is being updated regularly, a national assessment (green paper) on climate vulnerability has been carried out, and a White paper on climate change adaptation was adopted in 2013. Funding is available for protection against floods and landslides through the Water and Energy Directorate.

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 Ministry of Justice and Emergency preparedness has got a more vital role and is the "lead" ministry for disaster risk management. However, several ministries is responsible according to the principles of disaster management, which makes coherence and overall coordination challenging.

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

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	Not available	Not available
Decentralised / sub-national budget	Not available	Not available
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	Not available	

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.

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

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.

N/A

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.

The 428 municipalities in Norway are the local fundament of national disaster risk reduction. The municipalities are responsible for the functioning of key public services and the coordination of these before, during and after emergencies (e.g. local infrastructure, health services, care for the elderly and other vulnerable populations, and information to the public). In accordance with the principles of responsibility and of proximity, the main responsibility for preventive planning and disaster management within their territorial borders lies with the municipalities. Risk- and vulnerability assessment (RVA), physical planning, emergency plans and exercises are the cornerstones of disaster risk reduction at the local level. All municipalities are required to have an operational fire- and rescue service, and from 2010 they are required by the Civil Protection Act to establish systems for emergency prevention, preparedness and response. According to the Plan and Building Act, they are required to carry out RVA in connection to new physical developments. According to the Civil Protection Act, they are required to carry out comprehensive RVA, covering both existing and future risks (including climate change impacts), and covering both existing and planned buildings, installations and infrastructure. A new white paper on civil protection was presented in 2012. It highlights the need to include climate change adaptation in DRR efforts. A green paper (NOU) on adaptation was published in 2010 and a white paper in June 2013.

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.

Many small municipalities - planners and decision-makers need guidelines and tools to follow up the requirements in the Civil Protection Act. The planning capacity in many municipalities are insufficient. The overall coordination at national level was changed from January 2014, and the mechanism and modality for improved coordination at national is still to be finalised.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

civil society members (specify absolute number)	
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	8
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	1
private sector (specify absolute number)	
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	
other (please specify)	3

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

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

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

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 National Platform is still in its inception phase, and its role is still to be developed and determined.

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
National Risk Analysis	
% of schools and hospitals assessed	0
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	N/A
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	Yes
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	Yes

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

programming.

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 first national risk assessment (NRA) was carried out in 2010 (published 2011). It is updated annually. The 2013 national risk assessment contains one new scenario analysis, in addition to the 16 that have been presented in earlier editions of this document. The state budget for 2013 states in accordance with Report no. 29 (2011–2012) to the Storting on Civil Protection that the "Government has decided that DSB's National Risk Analysis should form the basis for a common planning foundation across the sectors and sectoral authorities in society. [...] The establishments should base their planning on this, as a supplement to the overview of risk and vulnerabilities that the establishments have within their own areas of responsibility. All actors must therefore evaluate what the risk analysis may mean to their area of responsibility." The NRA is also included in the European compilation of risk assessments.

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 National Risk Analysis will be a crucial element of risk management at the national level in the future. Work on the risk analysis is a dynamic process, and the National Risk Analysis will be expanded to include additional risk areas and scenarios in the future. However, the document will never be able to provide a complete overview of the risk of disaster in Norway. Experience shows that many serious events are completely unexpected. If we are prepared to meet the challenges described in the National Risk Analysis, we are, however, convinced that Norway will also be well-equipped to manage many other events that are not described in this document. The greatest challenge of serious disruptive events today is the fact that their consequences and the management of them cuts across areas of responsibility and administrative levels in society. The dependencies between functions in a modern society are so great that if a single important function is put out of action, problems often propagate to completely different areas.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated	No
Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)	No
Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries	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 several systems established to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards. The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) maps and monitors flooding and landslide risks throughout the country. In case of an event, they issue warnings to the areas affected. The Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning (DSB) maps and monitors forest fires. DSB also offers thematic maps showing different types of risks for selected areas.

There are also local systems for monitoring hazards and disseminating risks to the public. Examples are associated with landslide risks in Western Norway, and industrial risks in the Grenland area.

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.

As different hazards are the responsibility of different ministries, there is no overall disaster loss database. Several institutions at different level have data, but there is no compilation.

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.

It is a continuous process to assess capacity of the four elements of early warning (risk knowledge, monitoring and warning services, dissemination and communication, and response capabilities) to empower the communities threatened by hazards. In principles everyone can be reached through different early warning systems, and there is ongoing work to develop new technology for this.

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 some cases we have experienced that new technology can be fragile in pre-disaster and disaster situations. Communication between emergency agencies can also be a challenge. Formerly, Norway had three separate systems for telecommunications within the police, fire departments and paramedics, all based on analog radio. The new Norwegian Public Safety Radio (Norwegian: Nødnett) is a public safety network system based on Terrestrial Trunked Radio (TETRA) which is being implemented by the Directorate for Emergency Communication and will be fully implemented nationwide in 2015. The new system allows functionality such as authentication, encryption, higher reliability and additional functionality.

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? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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.

There is improved cooperation with the neighboring countries, in particular the Nordic countries and EU. There are several agreements on cooperation (Nordic, Arctic et.c.) and a new EU legislation on civil protection. In 2010, Norway initiated an informal Nordic network for ISDR, the network meets annually. There have also been a number of cross-border exercises, such as Barents Resque (every second year) involving Russia, Finland, Sweden and Norway.

At the regional level in Norway the counties make cross-sectorial risk- and vulnerability assessments, these might in some cases also be trans boundary (i.e. rivers crossing borders).

Through the EEA agreement/ Norway grant there are many projects related to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

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.

N/A

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

· [Kriseinfo](#)

· [Skrednett](#)

· [Varsom.no](#)

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.

Kriseinfo is the official Norwegian website providing valid and secure information to the general public before, during and after a crisis. The website presents updated and coordinated information from relevant Norwegian authorities and emergency

actors. The different police districts are increasingly using twitter as communication channel, and so are other public institutions.

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

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.

Most of the information is related to crisis information for an imminent threat/hazard. Less information is provided on how to reduce vulnerability and improve capability on a longer timescale (pre-emptive) to improve resilience.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

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

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 several initiatives for teaching children about disaster-risk related issues, both in school curricula and in the media. The NGOs also play an important role in the basic education. There is an ongoing work to coordinate and develop this further in a more coherent way. Teaching in primary/secondary school mainly focuses on safe behaviour, through fire drills, first aid, swimming skills etc. Universities and colleges offer bachelor and master studies which include DRR elements -for example, courses in land-use planning. The University of Stavanger provides a master degree in societal safety and also offer a range of relevant courses at bachelor level. The National Emergency College (NUSB) provides a series of relevant courses; some as part of university studies at University of Stavanger, some as part of studies at Buskerud College.

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.

As Norway is considered to be a relatively safe and resilient country, the need for such education might get less priority than other subjects.

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.

The Research Council of Norway has established a new research programme on societal security. The new programme aims at increasing the knowledge about threats, dangers and vulnerability, about how unwanted events can be prevented and crises management be strengthened, whilst respecting basic human rights and privacy. The NORKLIMA/KLIMAFORSK programme primary objective is to generate vital new knowledge as a basis for adaptive responses by human society. The main focus is on the climate system; climate trends in the past, present and future; direct and indirect impacts of climate change on the natural environment and society.

In addition to this, there are several national research programmes with elements of risk assessments. Norway has also access to EU programme Horizon 2020 and other European research programmes.

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 are several programmes with linkages to disaster risk reduction. One of the main challenges is to utilise the research in local and/or national decision making processes, and also guide the researchers to more applicable research.

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.

There are several countrywide public awareness programmes with the aim to integrate disaster risk reduction into every-day life. NGOs are important in dissemination of information to the general public.

The Planning and Building Act aims to decrease disasters through risk reduction in planning. The Civil Protection Act highlights the role of the municipality level in disaster risk reduction. Both acts impose the use of risk and vulnerability in connection with land-use planning and new area developments. According to the Civil Protection Act, annual exercises have to be held at municipality level in order to strengthen emergency preparedness at local level. The Civil Protection Act also impose municipalities to carry out overall risk and vulnerability assessments, including current and future 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.

The greatest challenge of serious disruptive events today is the fact that their consequences and the management of them cuts across areas of responsibility and administrative levels in society. The dependencies between functions in a modern society are so great that if a single important function is put out of action, problems often propagate to completely different areas.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

Through various international agreements, Norway has committed to a number of goals and strategies related to management of the natural environment. At the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya in 2010, a Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 with 20 global biodiversity targets goals was adopted, and Norway is developing national target goals, as a follow-up. In

this work, climate adaptation and the capacity of ecosystems to counteract effects of climate change on society will be included. The OSPAR Convention (Oslo/Paris Convention) for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the north-east Atlantic regulates the marine environment in the north-east Atlantic, especially with regard to pollution of the sea and protected marine areas. Marine fish resources are also managed at an international level. The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) plays an important role here.

The Ministry for local Governments and modernisation is the main planning authority in Norway. The Norwegian Environment Agency is supporting the Ministry for climate and environment in implementing the Government's environmental policy, and for identifying, preventing and dealing with environmental problems. The Norwegian Nature Inspectorate is a unit responsible for control and inspection to protect the environment and prevent environmental crime, and for other practical management tasks. The Norwegian Coastal Authority is responsible for coastal installations etc, while it is the municipality's role to manage coastal zone ecosystems.

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 coordination and alignment of policies in DRR and CCA is still a challenge as a reflection of many stakeholders involvement and insufficient clarity of priorities.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	Yes

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

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 Insurance Act, which came into effect in 1967, provides old-age pensions, rehabilitation allowances, disability pensions, widow and widower pensions, and survivor benefits to children. These separate programs were combined into the National Insurance Scheme in 1971. Membership is obligatory for all residents of Norway, including noncitizens, and for Norwegian foreign-service employees. Pensions begin at the age of 67. Benefits are graded according to the individual's previous income and years of employment. Workers' compensation covers both accidents and occupational diseases. Compensation is paid to a widow until she remarries, and to children up to the age of 18 (or for life if they are unemployable). Dependent parents and grandparents also are eligible for life annuities. Family allowance coverage, in force since 1946, is provided for children under the age of 16.

The law mandates equal wages for equal work by men and women, although economic discrimination persists. An Equal Rights Ombudsman addresses complaints of sexual discrimination. A provision protecting against sexual harassment is outlined in the Working Environment Act. A shortage of day-care facilities has hampered the entry of women as full-time wage earners. Violence against women persists but is seriously investigated and prosecuted by authorities. Victims assistance programs and battered women's shelters are available.

Provisions exist to protect the rights and cultural heritage of minority peoples. The Sami (Lapps) located in the northeast are entitled to schooling in their local language, and also receive radio and television broadcast subtitled in Sami. The Sami also have a constituent assembly that acts as a consultative body on issues that affect them.

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

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.

Over the last few years, most people in Norway have experienced a great increase in personal wealth as well as living conditions. From an international perspective, poverty is considered a minor problem in Norway. However, the acceptable standard of living in a society is determined by its most “common” level of welfare among the population at a given time, and in most western societies poverty is defined relative to their respective common levels of welfare. In this context, The National Audit Office presented a report that concludes that the number of children in low-income families has increased from five to eight percent between 2002 and 2010. The report states that there were 78 000 children in Norway living below the poverty line in 2012.

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.

The Government Pension Fund Global (Norwegian: Statens pensjonsfond Utland, SPU) is a fund into which the surplus wealth produced by Norwegian petroleum income is deposited. The fund is commonly referred to as The Oil Fund (Norwegian: Oljefondet). As of the valuation in June 2011, it was the largest pension fund in the world, although it is not actually a pension fund as it derives its financial backing from oil profits and not pension contributions. The purpose of the petroleum fund is to invest parts of the large surplus generated by the Norwegian petroleum sector, generated mainly from taxes of companies, but also payment for license to explore as well as the State's Direct Financial Interest and dividends from partly state-owned Statoil. The Petroleum Fund was established in 1990 after a decision by the country's legislature to counter the effects of the forthcoming decline in income and to smooth out the disruptive effects of highly fluctuating oil prices.

Working conditions are regulated by both legislation and agreements. An agreement sets out normal pay and working conditions. The most important of these agreements is the collective pay agreement concluded between the central confederations of employees and employers. There are also agreements that apply to individual workplaces, concluded between the employer and the employees' representatives. Legislation regulating working conditions applies to all employees. Two of the most important Acts that apply to employees are the Working Environment Act and the Holidays Act.

The Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority is the public body responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the Working Environment Act are complied with.

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.

N/A

Core indicator 4

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

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 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 Norwegian building regulation, TEK 10, from the Directorate for Building Quality (DIBK) came into force on 1st July 2010 and regulates the minimum standards for buildings in Norway. The regulation includes safety levels for different natural hazards (floods, storm surge landslides) for buildings in different safety classes.

The plan and building act ensures that disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use, natural resource management and adaptation to climate change. The Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) has an overall coordinating role for prevention of floods and landslides/avalanches and can give directives and support to land owners, dam owners, etc. to take the necessary steps to prevent serious events.

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 need for assessing flood risk, and taking preventive measures is increasing. The resources and capacity available for this is not meeting this demand, in particular for smaller creeks/rivers.

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? No

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	0
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	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.

According to the Planning and Building Act, risk and vulnerability analyses must be carried out prior to new developments, and for changes in land use.

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

The natural hazard, infrastructure, flood and landslide project is a research programme including the main public owners of infrastructure in Norway. There are 7 projects in this programme, including one related to the full cycle of disaster management (including recovery).

Objects and property in Norway that are insured against damage caused by fire, are also insured against natural disasters, unless the damage to the object or property in question is covered by other insurances. Norway has two arrangements for compensation for damage due to natural disaster:

- The Norwegian National Fund for Natural Damage Assistance was established by the Act on Natural Damage of June 9th 1961 by the Government.

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.

As many older buildings are built in what has become areas at risk, there is a need for new approaches to land use planning and risk transfer, including the possibility for relocation. The economic losses related to natural hazards is increasing.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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.

All development actors must follow Norwegian laws and regulations, and there is a good system for control and audit in place. There is also an increased understanding for the cost-efficiency of preventive measures.

The county Governors office is an important role in controlling the municipalities, and in accordance with the Plan and Building act he has the possibility to veto land-use plans. Such cases will get their final decision in the Ministry of Local Governments and Modernisation.

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.

N/A

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

Yes

based on future risk scenarios

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

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 evaluation of the emergency preparedness and rescue operations during the terrorist attacks in Oslo and Utoya island, 22 July 2011, points to some severe weaknesses in the national disaster preparedness system. Failures were primarily due to:

- The ability to acknowledge risk and learn from exercises has not been sufficient.
- The ability to implement decisions that have been made, and to use the plans that have been developed, has been ineffectual.
- The ability to coordinate and interact has been deficient.
- The potential inherent in information and communications technology has not been exploited well enough.
- Leadership's willingness and ability to clarify responsibility, set goals and adopt measures to achieve results have been insufficient.

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

Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative

levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

8 of 10 municipalities have conducted a comprehensive risk- and vulnerability assessment, and 9 of 10 have a preparedness plan. However, only 3 of 10 meet the minimum standards for such plans (Municipal self-survey 2014).

The Government Emergency Support Unit is a unit in the Ministry of Justice and Public security, and the permanent secretariat for the Government Emergency Management Council, and supports the Norwegian Government and Ministries in their crisis management. The Emergency Support Unit supports the Ministries and the Crisis Council, the highest coordinating body at administrative level, in emergencies. The civilian situation centre is located in the Emergency Support Unit.

Norwegian rescue services are carried out through cooperation between government agencies, voluntary organisations and private companies who have resources appropriate for rescue services. The Joint Rescue Coordination Centres have the overall operational responsibility during search and rescue operations. The operations are coordinated either directly from one of two Joint Rescue Coordination Centres (JRCC) which are situated in Bodø and in Sola near Stavanger, or through one of 28 rescue sub centres.

Several exercises of different scale and at different level is conducted annually. County Governors are auditing the municipalities disaster preparedness plans, and lessons identified from exercises and incidents are regularly evaluated.

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.

Only 3 of 10 meet the minimum quality standards for risk- and vulnerability assessment and preparedness plans (Municipal self-survey 2014). Lessons learnt from exercises and incidents needs more focus.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
--	-----

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

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

Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	Yes
--	-----

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

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

Objects and property in Norway that are insured against damage caused by fire, are also insured against natural disasters, unless the damage to the object or property in question is covered by other insurances. The Government are considering additional financial support to disaster affected areas on a case-by-case basis.

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.

With the increasing economic losses, the liability of municipal planning is a open question, and there has been cases where insurance companies request regress by municipalities for planning infrastructure in risk areas. There is also a risk that the damage fund might run out of funds, hence the premium has to be increased.

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

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.

The routines for exchanging information during hazard events are developed and tested regularly. There are several platforms and tools for communication, including web, twitter and other social media. There is also an improved system for post-disaster evaluations, contributing to systematic lessons identified. A new Emergency Network will be fully operational by the end of 2015 to allow for better and safer communication between the emergency responder.

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.

Lessons learnt from exercises and incidents should be improved, and there are several initiatives to do so.

Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

On local (municipal), regional (county) and national level multi-hazard analyses are an important tool for the planning process. The multi-hazard approach involves translating and linking knowledge of the full range of hazards into risk management approaches, strategies, assessments and analysis, leading to greater effectiveness and cost efficiency.

At national level, the National risk assessment is based on scenarios covering a range of natural, technical and man-made disasters. County governors are responsible for regional assessments. According to the Civil Protection Act, the municipal level are responsible for carrying out local risk and vulnerability analyses covering all relevant hazards.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Gender equality is regulated by laws. According to UN Development reports, Norway is ranked as no.1 for gender equality.

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)

Relevant and adequate laws and regulations is in place. Local level, and in particular small municipalities, are reporting insufficient capacity and resources to comply with these laws and regulations. There is an ongoing municipal reform in Norway which probably would lead to larger and more robust municipalities.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most

vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

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

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

Through the normal social network system, people affected by disaster can receive support from the state. Insurance for damages on buildings/houses are mandatory.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

The Norwegian DRR- and disaster management system is reliant on a good public-private voluntary partnership. Effective disaster risk reduction requires effective community participation. NGOs are mainly local based and a important conveyer of local and traditional knowledge.

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)

N/A

Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

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

Overall Challenges

The Civil Protection Act (2010) is still unknown to many of those responsible for land-use planning and municipal planning processes. Ensuring that DRR becomes a stronger element in all levels of planning, and in all sectors, is an ongoing effort. The national coordination needs to work more cross-sectoral in order to improve prioritisation of preventive actions.

Future Outlook Statement

Due to increased exposure, the attention on disaster prevention and resilience will increase. We expect stronger signals from central Governments to regional and local level to improve the preventive work, and hopefully resources will follow.

Future Outlook Area 2

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

Overall Challenges

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

Future Outlook Statement

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

Finding ways to disseminate knowledge and example of prevention efforts to the public is an ongoing challenge.

Future Outlook Area 3

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

Overall Challenges

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

Future Outlook Statement

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

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
same as previous report	Governments	
Directorate for civil protection	Governments	Erling Kvernevik, Senior Adviser