



Romania

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

Name of focal point: Mr Francisc Senzaconi
Organization: General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations
Title/Position: Chief of Disaster Prevention Office
E-mail address: senzacof@mai.gov.ro
Telephone: +40 21 208 4838

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 30 July 2015
Print date: 31 July 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

There was adopted a GEO that set up the legal basis for establishment of The National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. But the legislative framework for the National Committee for Special Emergency Situations was changed twice in the last year Therefore, the original structure proposed for The National Platform had to be reanalyzed.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

There was adopted a GEO that set up the legal basis for establishment of The National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. But the legislative framework for the National Committee for Special Emergency Situations was changed twice in the last year Therefore, the original structure proposed for The National Platform had to be reanalyzed.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

Lessons learned are always integrated in the response plans. The project for risk assessment will contribute to integrate the hazards maps into The General Urban Plan. There is still a challenge to motivate citizens to join volunteer services as well as identifying funds for better equipment.

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

1. Establish the new legal framework for National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction according to changes made to the National System for Emergency Situations.
2. Also make The National Platform a functional organism it is priority because it will be the main entity dealing with the disaster risk management.
Develop a flood risk management plan for important areas until the end of 2015.

Strategic Goal Area 2

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

1. Strengthening the prevention component of the volunteer emergency services.
2. Running an institutional analyze to identify the need for dedicated departments in order to implement the disaster risk reduction strategies.
3. Standardizing the information exchange protocols between responsible authorities for management of disasters in order to implement DRR in a unitary way at all levels.

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

1. Develop a methodology for damage and needs assessment in order to facilitate the incorporation of disaster risk reduction into the reconstruction phase.
2. Conducting a risk management capability assessment in order to prioritize investments for raising capacity.

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.

In order to improve the National System for Emergency Situation Management, based upon lessons learnt in the recent disasters, the legal framework has been changed twice in the last year. The National Committee for Special Emergency Situation has been created, with revised responsibilities and structures.

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.

Changing the structure of The National System on the other hand has delayed the adoption of the set of laws establishing the structures responsible with disaster risk reduction and their precise responsibilities.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget	0,0158	N/A
Decentralised / sub-national budget	0.003	0.002
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	N/A	

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

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

At central level there was an increase of investment because of flood hazard and risk maps and flood risk management plan for Prut and Siret rivers.

The intervention budget was lower due to fact that there was no major disaster in the given time frame.

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.

Comparing to the budget for previous two years, in the period of reference a big part of risk reduction and prevention funds, were allocated for investment from the central level and the local funds were reduced. This is due to the fact that Romania must finish the flood risk maps until 2015.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	No
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	No
Estimated % of local budget allocation	N/A

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

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

There is no regular dedicated budget for DRR but there are some local initiatives such as building retrofitting and landslide and risk maps.

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.

These local initiatives are budgeted depending on the priorities of local government and available funds.

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? No

civil society members (specify absolute number)	N/A
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	N/A
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	N/A

private sector (specify absolute number)	N/A
--	-----

science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	N/A
---	-----

women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	N/A
--	-----

other (please specify)	N/A
------------------------	-----

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)	The 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.

The National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction was set up by the same GEO that changed the National System for the Management of Emergency Situations. The new legislative framework for establishing the National Platform is in progress to be adopted.

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

The process is very slow due to a large number of responsible authorities and the frequent changes in the legal and organizational framework

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	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.	Industry, energy, transportation and urban planning

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 2013 GIES has initiated a EU fund project for national risk assessment. This project will develop a common set of tools for assessment: a unitary methodology, data base and WebGIS portal. These instruments will contribute to a unitary assessment of all risks in order for the results to be compared and the investments to be prioritized. The national risk assessment will be coordinated by National Risk Assessment Working Group which is a part of The National Platform.

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.

National Risk Assessment Working Group being a part of the National Platform is not legally established. Moreover there is a need to assign responsibilities for each member of the working group.

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	Yes
---	-----



(from the disaster databases/ information systems)

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.

There are some entities with responsibilities in monitoring, archiving and disseminating hazard data, most of them being research institutes. Some systems are at national level (meteorology, hydrology and seismic) and some at regional/local (landslides, marine pollution and earthquakes in Black Sea area). There is also a transboundary system along the Danube river monitoring seismic activity and it is able to send a warning with several seconds before P-wave strikes.

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 regional/ local monitoring systems are not in place for all the risk prone areas.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

The early warning systems are in place for all the major hazards (floods, earthquakes, landslides, nuclear accidents). Their functionality is periodically tested through simulation exercises.

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

Although responsible authorities make regular drills and information campaigns, a part of the population doesn't know the significance of color codes and various signals of the electrical sirens.

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.

There are several initiatives to develop risk assessments in collaboration with neighbouring countries: Danube Flood Risk, DACEA (Bulgaria), ROBUHAZ-DUN (Bulgaria), ESNET (Bulgaria, Moldavia) and EMERSYS (Bulgaria). Moreover, there has been started RO-RISK project that would develop tools for National Risk Assessment which would include also trans-boundary 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.

Romania doesn't have bilateral agreements with all the neighbouring countries, in particular with Ukraine. Therefore, although common disaster risks are significant, the initiation of a bilaterla project in this area is quite difficult.

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? No

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.

The responsible authorities continued their efforts to provide relevant information on disasters. In addition to these, within the RO-RISK project there will be developed a WebGIS portal which will provide access to the hazard and risk data for both responsible authorities and citizens on different access 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.

There is no coordination regarding the types of information provided via internet. Citizens must search on different sites to collect data for different risks. Moreover, not all the data are available, so must be collected from different entities and from the field. Therefore there is a real effort to create a comprehensive database.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? No

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

Following past experiences GIES and ME decided that the best approach to include emergency situations education in school curricula is to train teachers in order to teach children about emergency situations and therefore to build a culture of safety.

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.

Education for emergency situations is not included in the national curricula and represents only an option for every school either to run the class or not.

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.

RO-RISK project objective is the development of risk and multi-risk assessment tools (methodology, database and WebGIS application). Moreover the Flood-CBA project is an effort of six partners coming from Greece, UK, Romania, Portugal, Germany and Spain to establish a sustainable Knowledge Platform for the use of stakeholders dealing with the Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) of flood prevention measures in the context of different socio-economic environments within the EU.

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.

These being the first projects of this kind, there is little knowledge about the impact on DRR implementation. They represent a basis for the future projects in this area.

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	No
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	No

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

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

The RO-RISK project will develop amongst other a tool to measure the awareness and preparedness of citizens therefore GIES will be able to tailor campaigns for each specific need and area.

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

Being a new tool there will be a challenge to use it at its full potential. The users must be trained in order to use it properly.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	Yes
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	No
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.

A real progress is represented by Flood risk management plans for some river basins.

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

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

There is a challenge to develop risk management plan for all major risks mostly due to the lack of human and financial resources.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	No

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

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

There is no progress to reduce the vulnerability of population through social policies and plans.

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

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

Social programs targeting high-risk prone communities are not a priority.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? No

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	No
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.

Ministry of Regional Development implements several national programmes aiming to build new structures and retrofit, if needed, the old ones. The National Program for Local Development covers infrastructure (roads, bridges, water treatment plants, schools, hospitals, cultural buildings) and a series of smaller programs are dedicated to sport buildings.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the

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

Limited funds is the main constraint for the proper implementation of this programmes.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	No
Training of masons on safe construction technology	No
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	Yes
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	No
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.

There have been major investments in building retrofitting and flood risk management plans for river basins.

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.

Regarding building retrofitting there are some issues with inhabitants trust and their capacity to cover the costs.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

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.

No progress.

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.

Same constraints.

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.	No
--	----

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? Yes

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

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

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

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

The strategies have been continued and improved to address the future risk challenges.

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 lack of funds and equipments leaded to no progress in this area.

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	No
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.

The preparedness and contingency plans are always improved based lessons learned, available hazard maps and international procedures alignment.

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.

Private sector is a proactive partner but it contributes with limited resources. Also their involvement in the preparedness is minimal and not all the private sector actors are interested.

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.

There are dedicated funds for response and recovery.

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 funds for recovery are use to rehabilitate to the previous condition and, especially at local level, the recovery does not take into account the necessary measures to reduce the future risk.

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? No

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	No

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

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

There is a guideline for the assessment of damages caused by floods, but they are not comprehensive and the economical output is not accurate. Also the insurance companies have economical indicators for assessing damages.

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

There is a need for common methodologies to assess damages and people's needs after a disaster in order to get more accurate and close to reality information.

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)

We are in the phase of developing a national risk assessment through a EU project (RO-RISK project 2013-2016). The objective of the project is to offer a set of tools (including GIS) to the authorities in order to have the overall view regarding the risk exposure and to offer a basis for developing sustainable land use planning policies. Specific initiatives on county level are ongoing. An example is RiskCHANGES Spatial Decision Support System (developed within FP7 MC-INT CHANGES project Coordinator, by the Univ. of Twente, the Netherlands, with the contribution of the Institute of Geography of the Romanian Academy) will be implemented for Buzau County, as the basis for a potential national scale.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

Do 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)

Following the new legislation concerning the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, Romania has a responsibility to develop a risk management capability assessment. This assessment will cover all the stages of risk management and will be based upon the Commission's Guidelines.

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

Levels of Reliance

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

Do 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)

Generally speaking, the local communities have not well developed the interest for active participation in disaster risk reduction. However, localities stroked by various disasters in the last years increase their awareness on disaster prevention and response.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

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

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

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

1. the climate changes adaptation integration into the development policies
 2. the global approach instead of a sectorial one
 3. harmonization of different development strategies and legal frameworks
 4. defining acceptable disaster risks levels
-

Future Outlook Statement

1. insufficient resources (human and endowment) at local level for disaster prevention, preparedness and response actions;
2. establishing common protocols / standards for information exchange between all relevant stakeholders;
3. losing know-how practices through personnel migration and insufficient investment into training programs;
4. avoiding to take responsibilities at the local level regarding building resilience to disasters.

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

1. insufficient resources (human and endowment) at local level for disaster prevention, preparedness and response actions;
2. establishing common protocols / standards for information exchange between all relevant stakeholders;

3. losing know-how practices through personnel migration and insufficient investment into training programs;
4. avoiding to take responsibilities at the local level regarding building resilience to disasters.

Future Outlook Statement

The national system for disaster management will be continuously improved through a better collaboration among stakeholders, a better coordination of the resources and a better allocation of the responsibilities at local 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

1. lack of a clear framework regarding the responsibilities of the national system for disaster management components during recovery phase;
2. poor application and implementation into practice of lessons learnt in order to reduce the disasters risk;
3. lack of a methodology for damage/losses assessment in case of disasters;
4. lack of practical application into reconstruction phase of the build back better approach

Future Outlook Statement

Romania is making efforts to develop national/regional risk management plans which will incorporate the risk reduction approaches.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations	Governments	Mr. Francisc SENZACONI (senzacof@mai.gov.ro)
Ministry of Transportation	Governments	Mr. Sorin ZMĂRĂNDESCU (sori n.zmarandescu@mt.ro)
Ministry of Environment, Water and Forests	Governments	Mrs. Olimpia NEGRU (olimpia.negru@mmediu.ro)
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration	Governments	Mr. Bogdan TERPEȘEL (bogdan.terpesel@mdrap.ro)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Governments	Mr. Radu TIMOFTE (centru.operativ@madr.ro)
Ministry of Economy	Governments	Mr. Ion TURLUIANU (turluianu.ion@minind.ro)
Ministry of National Education	Governments	Mrs. Catalina CHENDEA (catalina.chendea@gmail.com)
Romanian Academy – Geography Institute	Academic & Research Institutions	Mr. Mihai MICU (igar@geoinst.ro)
National Institute for Hydrology and Water Management	Academic & Research Institutions	Mr. Marius MATREATA (marius.matreata@hidro.ro)
National Administration for Meteorology	Academic & Research Institutions	Mrs. Florinela GEORGESCU (florinela.georgescu@meteoromania.ro)
URBAN INCERC	Academic &	Mr. Sever

	Research Institutions	GEORGESCU (emilse vergeorgescu@gmail.c om)
National Institute for Earth Physics	Academic & Research Institutions	Mrs. Carmen CIOFLAN (cioflan@infp.ro)
Save the Children	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Leonard ANDREESCU
Habitat for Humanity	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Gabi PASCAL
Red Cross	Non-Governmental Organizations	Mr. Daniel MODOACĂ (daniel.modoaca@cruc earosie.ro)