



Portugal

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

Name of focal point: Ms Patricia Pires
Organization: National Authority for Civil Protection
Title/Position: Head of Unit
E-mail address: patricia.pires@prociv.pt
Telephone:

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

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

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

Portugal subscribed to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in 2005 and has taken, since then, concrete steps to integrate and streamline Disaster Risk Reduction (DDR) into national development strategies and legislation, recognizing the importance of DDR for the promotion of sustainable economic growth and progress, through ministries and institutions.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

The establishment of the Portuguese National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, in May 2010, was a key issue towards better coordination of prevention, preparedness, and response activities. The Platform, created under the auspices of the National Committee for Civil Protection, is chaired by the Minister for Internal Affairs and composed by Delegates of Ministries and other national entities. A consultative Sub-Committee was created also in 2010 within this Platform, chaired by the HFA National Focal Point, to promote DRR activities. This 2014 this sub-committee includes representatives from ministries and from private sector, academic institutions, resilient cities and professional associations (engineers; architects).

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

The planning policy of the territory as is regulated in its Law n^o 48/98, based on a territorial management system organized in three coordinated levels (national, regional and municipal), manifests itself through a set of land use planning instruments, that explicitly considered risks and territorial vulnerabilities in defining the territorial model. The legal regime of the National Ecological Reserve (REN), distinguishes areas of natural hazards which must be taken into account in land use planning.

Portugal had developed various acts to support disaster reduction policy at the sectorial level, namely in forest fires, dam break; Seveso Establishments; floods; Urban fires; radiological emergencies, climate change adaptation and critical infrastructure protection.

Emergency Plans approved can be found at Emergency Planning Information System (SIPE): <http://planos.prociv.pt/Pages/homepage.aspx>

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

Portugal, through the ministries and institutions members of the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, has developed several actions that contribute to ISDR objectives, producing national policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction. The Civil Protection's Law defines the objectives and principles of civil protection, assigning to the National Civil Protection Commission, with representatives of various ministries, the coordination of civil protection issues. The National Civil Protection Commission was constituted formally in May 31, 2010, as National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, and was recognized as such by the UN in April 2011. Law No. 65/2007 defines the institutional and operational framework of civil protection at the municipal level, decentralizing responsibilities and resources for disaster reduction.

The planning policy of the territory as is regulated in its Law nº 48/98, based on a territorial management system organized in three coordinated levels (national, regional and municipal), manifests itself through a set of land use planning instruments, that explicitly considered risks and territorial vulnerabilities in defining the territorial model.

The legal regime of the National Ecological Reserve (REN), distinguishes areas of natural hazards which must be taken into account in land use planning.

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

Portugal subscribed to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in 2005 and has taken, since then, concrete steps to integrate and streamline Disaster Risk Reduction (DDR) into national development strategies and legislation, recognizing the importance of DDR for the promotion of sustainable economic growth and progress. The establishment of the Portuguese National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, in May 2010, was a key issue towards better coordination of prevention, preparedness, and response activities. The Platform, created under the auspices of

the National Committee for Civil Protection, is chaired by the Minister for Internal Affairs and composed by Delegates of Ministries and other national entities. A consultative Sub-Committee was created also in 2010 within this Platform, chaired by the HFA National Focal Point, to promote DRR activities. This sub-committee includes representatives from ministries and from private sector, academic institutions, resilient cities and professional associations (engineers; architects).

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

Portugal had developed various acts to support disaster reduction policy at the sectorial level, namely in forest fires, dam break; Seveso Establishments; floods; Urban fires; radiological emergencies, climate change adaptation and critical infrastructure protection. These acts include preparedness and response phases.

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	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.

Portugal, through the ministries and institutions members of the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, has developed several actions that contribute to ISDR objectives. Main national policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction are presented below.

The Civil Protection's Law defines the objectives and principles of civil protection, assigning to the National Civil Protection Commission, with representatives of various ministries, the coordination of civil protection issues. The National Civil Protection Commission was constituted formally in May 31, 2010, as National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, and was recognized as such by the UN in April 2011. Law No. 65/2007 defines the institutional and operational framework of civil protection at the municipal level, decentralizing responsibilities and resources for disaster reduction.

The planning policy of the territory as is regulated in its Law nº 48/98, based on a territorial management system organized in three coordinated levels (national, regional and municipal), manifests itself through a set of land use planning instruments, that explicitly considered risks and territorial vulnerabilities in defining the territorial model.

The legal regime of the National Ecological Reserve (REN), distinguishes areas of natural hazards which must be taken into account in land use planning.

Portugal had developed various acts to support disaster reduction policy at the sectorial level, namely in forest fires, dam break; Seveso Establishments; floods; Urban fires; radiological emergencies, climate change adaptation and critical infrastructure protection.

Financial constrains compromised the implementation of DRR 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.

See above

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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 Portugal, disaster risk reduction is implemented across multiple stakeholders, namely central administration, local level, private sector, research institutions and ONGs (main activities listed below). With available data is not possible to estimate a total budget allocated in DRR 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.

See above

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	

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.

Law No. 65/2007 defines the institutional and operational framework of civil protection at the municipal level, decentralizing responsibilities and resources for disaster reduction.

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.

See above

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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



Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

civil society members (specify absolute number)	1
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	12
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	10
private sector (specify absolute number)	5
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	2
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	0
other (please specify)	8

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)	Ministry of Internal Affairs

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.

Portugal subscribed to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in 2005 and has taken, since then, concrete steps to integrate and streamline Disaster Risk Reduction (DDR) into national development strategies, recognizing the importance of DDR for the promotion of sustainable economic growth and progress.

The establishment of the Portuguese National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, in May 2010, was a key issue towards better coordination of prevention, preparedness, and response activities. The Platform, created under the auspices of the National Committee for Civil Protection, is chaired by the Minister for Internal Affairs and composed by Delegates of Ministries and other national entities.

A consultative Sub-Committee was created also in 2010 within this Platform, chaired by the HFA National Focal Point, to promote DRR activities. In this sub-committee are included representatives from ministries and from private sector, academic institutions, resilient cities and professional associations (engineers; architects).

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.

See above

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

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

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.

Civil protection; environmnet; private sector; local 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 Legal System of Environmental Impact Assessment and the Legal Regime of the Strategic Environmental Assessment include in risk assessment to perform decion support on land use planning.

The legal regime of the National Ecological Reserve (REN) includes areas of natural hazards to be taken into account when performing decisions about land use planning.

Should be also mentioned the mandatory production, dissemination and risk mapping update sectorial risk analysis.

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) 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.

Information about disaster events and impacts is ensured through open and free access to authorities and general public on central administration websites:
National database on disaster response and losses since 2006 and production of yearbooks of civil protection events:
<http://www.prociv.pt/Pages/detalhe4.aspx?IDitem=58>
Emergency Planning Information System (SIPE);
<http://planos.prociv.pt/Pages/homepage.aspx>
National System for Land Use Information:
http://www.dgterritorio.pt/sistemas_de_informacao/snit/
Forest fire occur events in ICNF webpage;
http://www.icnf.pt/portal/icnf/noticias/gloablnews/copy_of_rlt-if

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.

Link different databases at national and local scale. Considerer small scale incidents in risk assessment.

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.

Early warning systems are mainly applied in situations involving meteorological risks and hydrological events (floods). Partnerships are established with ANPC, IPMA (Portuguese Meteorological and seismological national authority); APA (Portuguese Environmental Agency) and DGS (Health Direction-General). Can be mentioned as good practices in place: warning systems, under adverse weather conditions, monitoring of water resources (droughts and floods), heat waves; the mandatory implementation of warning in affected areas by zones defined dam break.

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.

See above

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	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.

Under the framework of European Commission, Portugal is involved in regional hazard monitoring in European Union, namely in forest fire risk (EFFIS: <http://forest.jrc.ec.europa.eu/effis/>) and meteorological events (Meteoalarm: <http://www.meteoalarm.eu/>)

Under the framework of UNESCO, Portugal is involved in tsunami early warning system NEAMTWS: http://www.ioc-tsunami.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=70:neamtws-home&catid=9&Itemid=14&lang=es)

Protocols are established with Spain in transboundary information sharing and response to disasters, namely in seismic events, floods and forest fires.

Portugal has international protocols with UE, in several fields, and with some countries of Africa.

Portugal has signed cooperation agreements with the following countries:

- Spain (1992 and 2003)
- France (1995, 2006)
- Russia (1999)
- Morocco (1992)
- Cape Verde (1998)

Apart from the countries with which Portugal has actually signed agreements, the country is

also linked on a bilateral basis with other countries, emphasizing the other African Countries

of Portuguese Official Language (PALOP).

Bilateral cooperation agreements aimed at regulating various aspects of joint development

activities of Civil Protection, in particular with respect to the following areas:

- Exchange of training
- Exchange of experts
- Holding meetings and exchange of information and technical-scientific
- Procedures for requesting and providing mutual assistance in emergencies, such as,

financial issues, border crossing, communications and contact points

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.

See above

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.

Information about warnings and information to population area shared in ANPC webpage and by media (television, radio and newspapers).

Mechanisms to share information to population through media are well established, including live declarations to media.

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.

Improve the procedures for sharing information between stakeholders.

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	No
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.

DDR issues area included in several education levels. Universities included DRR issues not only in Civil Protection Master Degrees and BsC Degrees but also in Msc that cover land use planning, engineering, geography, etc.

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.

See above

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.

In Portugal, DRR research is supported by several entities based in financial instruments.

Portuguese Foundation of Science and Technology supports DRR research under several R&D calls (<https://www.fct.pt/apoios>), mainly by universitys and research labs.

European financial instruments, as cohesion funds, were also used to promote DRR in Portugal, namely in risk assessments studies and emergency planning at local and national level.

Several universities have developed MsC thesis in DRR issues.

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

Financial constrains under national budgets reduce considerably the amount available to DRR 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.

Municipalities that are involved in Making Cities Resilient Campaign are very active in public education campaigns to enhanced awareness of risk and protective measures. Besides these local governments, most local authorities develop campaigns to improve resilience and awareness campaign. Major risks considered are forest fires, floods and heat waves.

ANPC developed a national wide educational programme to children, available at <http://www.prociv.pt/clube/>, that is actually implemented in more than 300 schools. Self-protection measures are available on civil protection websites, at local and national level

Schools are an important target in awareness campaigns where activities performed include: exercises and drills to test the internal emergency plans; integration of civil protection content in non-university curricula and accreditation of Portuguese National Authority as a training institution to teachers

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.

See above

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.

The Legal System of Environmental Impact Assessment and the Legal Regime of the Strategic Environmental Assessment include in risk assessment to perform decision support on land use planning.

Portugal has adopted a National Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation, where risks and extreme events are considered for the purposes of civil protection

(<http://www.apambiente.pt/index.php?ref=16&subref=81&sub2ref=118&sub3ref=391>)

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.

See above

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.

Portuguese Insure Association developed flood risk maps under climate change scenarios to support damage assessment in urban areas

(<http://www.apseguradores.pt/CiracMaps/HomePage.aspx>)

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

Financial constrains to relocate population in risk prone areas.
Definition of LUP rules to raise the resilience of risk prone areas

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.

n.a.

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.

National construction codes take in consideration DRR, namely on seismic reinforcement and implementation of urban fires preventive measures. Land use codes restrain the construction in risk prone areas as potential flooded areas defined as 1/100 year probability occurrence.

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.

See above

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	
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.

n.a

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 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.

Legislation addresses those items

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.

See above

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.

n.a.

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 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.

Portugal has emergency plans at, national, district and local levels. Exercises and drills have been done regularly at these three levels.

The strengthening of human and technical capacities through the creation and formation of intervention task forces (Special Force of Fire Protection and Intervention Group and Relief), the upgrading of infrastructure and equipment and bet in the decision support system and communications systems of the various civil protection promote disaster preparedness and response at national level. International drills and exercises are also an important instrument to increase the response skills of national and local response teams.

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.

See above

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	No
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

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.

Emergency funds managed by Portuguese National Authority for Civil Protection are applied to recover of major events, such as forest fires, storms or floods.

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.

See above

Core indicator 4

Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? No

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available	No
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	No
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	No
Identified and trained human resources	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.

Lessons learnt programme implemented, mostly after forest fires events. Briefings after forest fires season with all stakeholders to implement new strategies.

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.

See above

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)

n.a

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)

n.a.

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)

n.a

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)

n.a

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

n.a.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

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

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

Stimulate the involvement of the private sector. Public and private partnerships are important to raise resilience of critical infrastructures and act on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Future Outlook Statement

See above

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

Encourage Local level to be more involved in disaster risk prevention. The success of the Making Cities Resilient Campaign shows that the local level has good practices to implement and share with others. Increase the number of resilient cities, putting risk prevention and resilient communities on the top of the agenda.

Future Outlook Statement

See above

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

Risk information included in all education levels. Until now, at national level, more than 250 (two hundred and fifty) of civil protection clubs are implemented in schools at national level and exercises are mandatory every year. However, should be expect to largely increase this number and address risk awareness activities to the students.

Future Outlook Statement

see above

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Portuguese National Authority for Civil Protection (ANPC)	Governments	José Oliveira, Deputy Director-General