



Austria

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

Name of focal point: Mr Michael Staudinger
Organization: Central Institute for Meteorology and Geodynamics
Title/Position: Director
E-mail address: michael.staudinger@zamg.ac.at
Telephone: +43 1 260362001

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 17 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/>

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

Austria will continue to foster the integration of disaster risk reduction into development policies making best use of various policy instruments which are available for this field. In 2013 the Austrian Government adopted the new Security Strategy “Security in a new Decade-Shaping Security” which will give further guidance for work in the field of safety and security and the well-being of the country also with regard to further reducing the exposure and vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters. The strategy stresses particularly the need to increase the resilience of the public and the private sector when faced with natural or man-made disruptions. It calls for maintaining a livable environment as part of a comprehensive environmental protection and minimizing the negative effects of natural or technological disasters. The 2020 National Crisis and Disaster Protection Management Strategy highlights the necessities of technological innovation, improvement of training and education and the optimization of cooperation between relevant stakeholders. The Austrian climate adaption strategy also refers to a better management of natural hazards and the improvement of disaster response capabilities. The Austrian forest development plan is one of the relevant policy instruments. It provides a comprehensive framework for maintaining and enhancing special functions of forests in the public interest including inter alia the storage of drinking water, clean air, protecting soil resources and protection against natural hazards.

References:

Austrian Security Strategy “Security in a new Decade-Shaping Security”
Austrian climate adaption strategy

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

Austria´s resilience to hazards builds mainly on the integrated management of

natural hazards and a strong local response and recovery capacity due to a dense network of response facilities which are provided by municipalities and voluntary organizations. Within the framework of Austria's financial policy the Austrian Disaster Fund will remain a strong financial instrument to fund the building of preventive infrastructure in order to reduce the vulnerability of settlements and livelihoods especially in the alpine zones. The implementation of the next phases of the EU flood management directive, especially the development of risk management plans for areas with significant flood risk will also be a major contribution. These measures will be complemented by providing opportunities for research under national research programs like the security research program "Kiras" and programs related to climate adaptation. Many municipalities especially in alpine zones have started to carry out local risk assessments which will be extended in the upcoming years

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

Emergency preparedness, response and recovery are mainly guaranteed by voluntary response organizations, a large number of voluntary civil protection personnel, well prepared local municipalities and district administrative authorities as well as financial capacities for preparedness and recovery. Training and education for local leaders in the field of incident response, risk analysis and emergency plan as well as risk and crisis communication at the Security Academy of the Ministry of the Interior will be enhanced.

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
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.

In Austria a comprehensive legal framework for disaster risk reduction is in place which governs this field on all administrative levels. Due to the distribution of powers under constitutional law no single authority is called upon to enforce all necessary measures alone. The constitution assigns responsibilities for legislation and implementation to all levels of government from municipalities to district administration, the nine federal provinces and the national government. Thus, subsidiarity is an inherent principle of disaster risk reduction. There is no single act which would govern all aspects of the HFA. The legal framework for DRR spreads over a number of national laws and laws of the provinces.

The sharing of the financial burdens for prevention against floods and avalanches is regulated under the National Flood Engineering Act which determines that municipalities, governments of the provinces and the Ministry for Agriculture, Water Engineering and Environment shall jointly plan, carry out and finance the implementation flood protective measures. Funding is to a large extent provided under the Disaster Fund Act which guarantees that certain percentages of tax revenues are dedicated to disaster risk reduction. Hazard and risk maps have to be set up for flood and avalanche risk areas according to the Water management act and Forest Act. During the first phase of the implementation of the EU flood management directive a nationwide preliminary assessment of flood risk was completed. Phase two and three which requires risk management plans for areas with significant risk will be implemented until 2015. Land use planning is a responsibility of the nine federal provinces and regulated by their land use planning acts. The acts contain inter alia provisions on construction bans within hazard zones.

Austria has no national civil protection law that would regulate the responsibilities of all state and non-state actors and their actions with regard to preparedness and intervention. Provisions for disaster preparedness and disaster response therefore lay primarily within the responsibilities of the Federal Provinces, which includes, first and foremost, the establishment of response capacities and civil protection and the provision of the necessary resources for disaster relief. All Federal Provinces have adopted laws which govern the duties of fire brigades and emergency medical services. Furthermore disaster relief laws of the provinces define particularly the preparedness for and the management of disaster relief operations on the community, district and regional levels. This includes provisions for training and education of civil protection staff and warning and alerting of the public if necessary.

National laws define extraordinary powers to assure supply of energy and essential goods in times of crisis. The national defence act mandates the armed forces to provide assistance to all civil authorities.

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.

Distribution of competences and funding for DRR in Austria is located on country, county and community level.

This will also in the future be a challenge for efficient use of resources

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? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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	45	15
Decentralised / sub-national budget	20	20

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

500 mio p.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 responsibility for disaster risk reduction is shared between municipalities, provinces and the federal government. All three levels of government contribute to the provision of appropriate resources. The municipalities are obliged to maintain and finance local rescue services and fire brigades. Support comes from the government of the provinces and the federal government. A disaster fund at federal level assures

the funding of investments for the prevention of natural disasters. After the floods in 2013 the government mobilized additional budgetary funds to speed up flood protection. It is one of the key elements of the Austrian DRR system that it is to a large extent based on voluntary contributions of the public.

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.

Above figures are rough estimates, as definitions are not always applicable

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

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	2-5

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 Austrian Constitution delegates responsibility for disaster prevention,

preparedness, response and recovery to a very large degree to provinces and municipalities. Civil society participation and voluntary contributions have a long tradition in Austria. All in all more than 300.000 citizens are registered in voluntary response organizations. Risk analyses and risk prevention starts at the local level and follows the principle of subsidiarity.

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.

Above figures are rough estimates, as definitions are not always applicable

Permanent and long term commitment to voluntary organization might decrease in the future. It is easier to organize volunteers activities after disasters, but many measures require long term commitments.

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)	4
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	4
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	6
private sector (specify absolute number)	2
science and academic institutions (specify	3

absolute number)	
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	1
other (please specify)	

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

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

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.

Austria has not yet established a national platform for DRR but work is well under way. An expert group under the framework of the national crisis and disaster management board was set up and tasked with the preparation of a platform. Austria already has a national ISDR focal point. The national crisis and disaster management which was established in its origin in 1986 has so far coordinated disaster management and disaster risk reduction at national level. It comprises stakeholders like all federal ministries, all provinces the Red Cross and other response organizations. The platform will have additional members from the private sector and academia.

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 planning process for the National Platform is well under way and had already very positive effects on the collaboration of the different partners, but administrative hurdles have yet to be overcome.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	Yes
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	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.

Flood management uses standardized methods for the assessment of local risks as a precondition for the implementation of protective infrastructure. Many local communities have carried out systematic risk assessments using standardized risk assessment methodology under the guidance and support of regional governments.

At national level a risk assessment expert group was established in 2013 which is developing an nationwide methodology for risk assessment, e.g. a common risk matrix. EU guidelines for risk assessment and ISO 31000 are used as model for national methodology.

Risk assessments were also carried out for critical infrastructures and industrial installations.

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

Natural hazards are well documented. Technical or multi-hazard situation need to be investigated in more detail.

A systematic and coherent approach for the investigation of future possible hazards is lacking for some sectors

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

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, district administrations and provincial governments are obliged to establish disaster management plans on the basis of hazard assessment. Each disaster management plan on municipal, district and provincial governmental level thus contains a section on key hazards and vulnerabilities.

The preliminary flood risk assessment was completed in 2011, hazard and risk maps have been developed for all areas with potential risk of flood until the end of 2013.

Furthermore hazard plans are available for floods, torrents and avalanches. The risks resulting from installations falling under the Seveso III directive are evaluated and build the basis of external emergency plans. Hazard and risk maps are publicly available in the internet and in local governmental offices. They are also subject to public consultation before adoption.

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.

A general overview for loss and damage is lacking at the moment

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

Austria maintains a siren based nationwide warning system. A real life test of the warning system is carried out once a year to check the reliability of the system and to familiarize the public with the meaning of the signal. Warnings can be disseminated locally, regionally and countywide.

The Meteorological Institute runs a weather warning system with a highly specialized nowcasting system for short-term warnings. Additional warning systems like avalanche flood warnings are in place.

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

Use of social media is only in its initial phase and will be used more in the future

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.

Austria coordinates the EUMETNET Meteoalarm project, putting the meteorological and hydrological warnings of 33 countries on one single platform.

Protocols and early warning procedures also exist for technical hazards like nuclear plant incidents

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.

Communication and harmonization is not always straightforward, as e.g. different warning procedures and alert levels are used between neighboring Germany and Austria

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.

Several publicly accessible website exist for potential and actual natural dangers and hazards, like for meteorology, avalanches, floods, earthquakes etc.

All hazards maps a published after an elongated public consultation procedure and are accessible for all citizens

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.

Public attention for disaster types, which occur only rarely is difficult to gain, therefore multi-hazard systems have the advantage to draw attention also to these disaster types.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	Yes
university curriculum	No
professional DRR education programmes	Yes

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

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

The "Austrian Civil Protection Association (ÖZSV) " is a collective term comprising ten associations – one federal organisation and nine regional offices –, whose task is to inform the population on civil defence in Austria, particularly on the adequate behaviour in emergency situations. According to the association´s statutes of 1993, the ÖZSV-Federal Association has the following purpose: to promote the idea of self-protection through events, presentations and the dissemination of information to the population, to coordinate of collaborate with the regional offices of the ÖZSV, . to

train and advise the population in matters of civil defence, collaboration with the responsible authorities and intervention organisations, to prepare and assess proposals for the creation of legal regulations within the framework of civil protection, to exchange experience with foreign civil protection organisations.

The ÖZSV is, unlike the fire brigade and rescue organisation, not an intervention organisation active on an operational level, but one whose main task is to disseminate information to the population. The Federal Association of ÖZSV acts, in this matter, on behalf of the Federal Ministry of the Interior and forwards all information on self-protection to the public through two different channels: general public information on civil protection, the organisation of safety and security information centres (SIZ) at a local community level.

Among other initiatives the Austrian Civil Protection Association offers the “children’s Safety Olympics -SAFETY-Tour as a model for effective and lasting preventative work in the area of self-protection. With support of school authorities, classes can take part in this country-wide event year by year. Run up games with cups and prizes, provincial and national finals are to be organized with the aim to publicise civil protection awareness to children and youth. This concept is offered to other countries as well (Start workshop, planning, arrangements).

Safety Information Centres are designed to develop awareness and initiative of the citizens to acquire self protection-knowledge. In the SICs the population learns important safety measures in order to behave in dangerous situations and survive these critical phases with a minimum of harm and without major injuries until organized relief arrives. The Austrian Civil Protection Association (ACPA) is responsible for the organisation of SICs. At present there are more than 1.900 SICs out of 2.359 municipalities in Austria. The aim is to establish a SIC in all of them. A mobile exhibition managed by the Federal Ministry of Education, Sciences and Culture and by the Austrian Association for National Defence and Security Policy is presented all over the country in public buildings (city halls etc.)

In close co-operation with organisations like the Austrian Civil Protection Association, the Ministry of Interior provides information for stocking up for emergencies, reaction after nuclear accidents, civil engineering sheltering measures, first aid, warning and alerting, etc.

Once a year the alarm system is tested nationwide.

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.

A university course for DRR is at present still lacking but planned for the second half of 2015

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Several sectors provide funding for DRR related research 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.

Given the challenges climate change will pose to Austria, having encountered already a warming in the decaded twice as large as the global mean, more substantial research on the effects of climate change will be necessary

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.

Various information channels are used for the dissemination of risks communication. Several brochures have been published by different information providers.

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.

Social media will have to be used more professionally in the future to reach all parts of the society

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	Yes
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

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

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

In Austria flood and avalanche protection is done via land use planning
A programme for climate change adaptation is in place

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular,

highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The conditions for e.g. floods and avalanches will change due to the stronger than otherwise change in climate around the alps.

Therefore these plans will have to be updated continuously according to the latest results in research.

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	No
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.

A special public fund for larger catastrophes is designated to support victims, enterprises and communities.

A number of funding opportunities are in place to support victims of disasters through

provision of loans at low interest rates and subsidies.

In certain disaster occasion the state renounces or postpones tax requirements, or provides tax exemptions

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 the economic value of exposed property increases permanently some rare disaster types (e.g. larger earthquakes in populated areas) might require financial resources at present not foreseeable

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	public infrastructure
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.

A well planned hazard mapping and planning is the basis for all (not just public) investments.

Examples: public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets

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.

Climate change will effect also the planning for the economic and productive sectoral policies and require updates of these policies in due time

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	No
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	Yes

Regulated provision of land titling

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.

Regulation and laws on land use planning have to contain provisions to ban settlements in disaster prone areas

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.

Land prices are relatively high in Austria and all zoning measures have large economic impacts

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	
---	--

DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	Yes
---	-----

Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-	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.

All disaster recovery measures are aimed at further reduction of disaster 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.

In the long run the incorporation of disaster risk reduction principles when designing post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes is economically sensible and efficient, in the short run the necessary funding might pose problems in some cases.

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 Yes

Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	Yes
By international development actors	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.

A dedicated programme is run by the chancellery for the most critical infrastructures and their protection under disaster conditions

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

some of the disasters in consideration occur only very rarely and the estimation of the consequences of these disaster is connected with a certain degree of uncertainty.

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? 5

Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies

Yes

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

Yes

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? No

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

No

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Yes

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? No

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

Yes

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios

Yes

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

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

Response plans are established on national and community level. These plans are based on hazard and risk assessment in the respective area. Austria has a very dense network of response capacities comprising more than 5000 fire and rescue services stations.

The campaign “Making cities resilient” had so far more than 200 participating communities in Austria.

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.

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety have yet to be developed

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	No
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.

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 programs

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 gender perspective has yet to be developed yet more in detail

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

A large amount of resources are dedicated for the consequences of disasters and available within short time in case of need. The government is entitled to provide additional means in case of necessity without the usual budgetary procedures.

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.

Some disaster types (e.g. large earthquakes in populated areas) might require financial means not foreseeable at present

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	No
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.

A national crisis and disaster management board is in place and is managed by the ministry of interior

One of its key functions is the exchange of information between the different stakeholders. Similar structures exist on local and county level.

Damage and loss assessments are in place on a municipal level, but a systematic nationwide assessment is only carried out in case specific needs for harmonized data.

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.

Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects have yet to be developed

Drivers of Progress

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

Levels of Reliance

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

Do 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)

Detailed studies and reports with corresponding atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in Austria for all counties

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

Gender disaggregated data are at present not available and are not being applied to

decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities.

Gender concerns would inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way. This will be done in a more structured way in the near future.

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)

Responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level do have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulation.

Local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers and urban resident welfare associations are more than properly trained for response.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

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

The initiative “making cities resilient” and the Austrian flood management plans do have a special focus on the most vulnerable groups, according to the local risk profile of people concerned.

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)

In Austria identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction are implemented in several programs and activities.

They are integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a workable and meaningful way.

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)

The Program of “Austrian critical infrastructures” has started several years ago and is well under way, but it needs full accomplishment in the coming years

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 Austrian first climate assessment report highlighted future challenges related to climate change impact and has shown that several features are substantial for the Austrian economic development.

The aging of the population is further problem which will require long term planning in all relevant sectors

Future Outlook Statement

The Austrian Security Strategy calls for a national resilience program to enhance the capacity of public and private stakeholders and withstand potential impacts of future disasters.

This will be supported by continuing research activities training and education like a new academic postgraduate program.

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

Climate change, urbanization and aging society will be the main challenges for the future

Future Outlook Statement

The so far extremely successful initiative “making cities resilient” will have to be continued in the future to increase resilience on a community level.

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

It will be a challenge to keep the high level of engagement of volunteers in Austria.

The budgetary situation is at present still sufficient for the necessary measures.

In case of a decrease of funding opportunities the consequences will not lead to visible immediate deterioration of the current level of protection due to the rare occurrence of disasters, but in the long run this will cause significantly higher losses in cases of disasters. The momentary lack of visibility of insufficient measures poses a problem to many sectors in times of budgetary restraints.

Future Outlook Statement

Austria has started a national risk assessment process as required by the EU civil protection mechanism. This will lead to more coherence across all sectors and also across borders between European regions.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management;	Governments	Maria Patek; head of department
Ministry of Interior	Governments	Siegfried Jachs, head of department
Central Institute for Meteorology and Geodynamics	Governments	Michael Staudinger, Director