



Poland

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

Name of focal point: Dr Tomasz Walczykiewicz
Organization: Institute of Meteorology and Water Management, National Research Institute
Title/Position: Chief of the Division
E-mail address: Tomasz.Walczykiewicz@imgw.pl
Telephone: +48 12 6398136

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 8 January 2015
Print date: 23 April 2015
Reporting language: English

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

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

The problem of hydrometeorological and technological hazards, requires to take into consideration also other serious threats resulting from the civilization development (technical catastrophes, technological breakdowns and synergic threats whose number increases). These problems should be considered jointly. In this scope some works have already began and they will be continued. The good example is the IT ISOK project (.IT System of Country Protection against Extreme Hazards). The ISOK project is co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund as a part of the Innovative Economy Operational Programme – Priority Axis 7 - Information Society. Its implementation is planned for till 2015. The system will be used to increase the national safety and reducing losses caused by natural, technological and synergistic hazards. The main use of the system is then supporting the protection of the society, economy and environment against extreme hazards; another is to aid decision making, should the extremes occur. Besides, the ISOK will posses tools (applications) allowing to support routine and incidental tasks required for managing, updating and processing data (for example giving information on the status of a given threat; carrying out analyses using geospatial information; generating reports). The IT ISOK project fulfill the general requirements raised in a Communication of the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – the EU Internal Strategy in Action , major challenges for the European Union safety to be fulfilled until 2014 . One of them is the increase of Europe’s resilience to crises and disasters. The Communication stresses the importance of better risk assessment and risk management at EU level of all potential hazards.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

In Poland we consider civil readiness as pragmatic, legally normalized responsibility for realization of certain tasks and duties, beginning from the Parliament and finishing at individual inhabitants. The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels can be achieved by improving cooperation continuing education at all levels. The basis of any cooperation with the society is access to information, which can support every activity.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

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 should be implemented in conjunction with interested parties. Access to information is essential to achieve these goals. The way of informing both the units responsible for emergency management and the society about possible consequences of risk can be represented by the Aarhus Convention on collection and dissemination of environmental information. Article 5 of the Convention states that 'In the event of any imminent threat to human health or the environment, whether caused by human activities or due to natural causes, all information which could enable the public to take measures to prevent or mitigate harm arising from the threat and is held by a public authority is disseminated immediately and without delay to members of the public who may be affected.'

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

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

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Disaster and environmental risk management policies are being integrated into development plans at the national, sub national and local levels (through existing public policies, mechanisms for coordinating DRR actions at various levels, budgetary assignments or others). The integration of information to help local, regional and national planners is under way with projects integrating information on hazards.

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

Strengthened institutions with adequate capacities at national and sub-national level for coordinated and coherent action in reducing risk and building sectoral resilience. Strengthened support routine and incidental tasks required for managing, updating and processing data (for example giving information on the status of a given threat; carrying out analyses using geospatial information; generating reports).

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

Mechanisms and tools are being adopted for the implementation of environmental management and post-disaster recovery programmes and institutionalized at the various levels. Regarding IT ISOK project it is possible in future to incorporate into the system other elements of the critical infrastructure as follows:

- energy, energy resources and fuels supplies;

- telecommunication;
- information and communications technology networks;
- finance;
- food security;
- health care;
- transportation;
- emergency services;
- securing permanence of public administration;
- production, storage, safe keeping, and use of chemical and radioactive substances, as well as dangerous goods pipelines.

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.

Large scale policy framework in Poland includes current works on Climate Change Adaptation. KLIMAT Project „The impact of climate variability on the environment, economy and society (changes, effects and methods of their limitations, conclusions for science, engineering practice and economic planning)” was carried out in the Institute of Meteorology and Water Management National Research Institute (IMGW PIB) within the frame of Innovative Economy Operational Programme (PO IG). The results of the project cover the whole territory of Poland. One of the tasks of this project concerns the prospects of sustainable management of water resources.

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 Poland the attitude towards hazard problems was changed in recent years. Now it can be

characterized by integrated and unanimous approach towards natural disaster problem:

- integrated approach means that research, legislation, control and measurement, economic,

technical, educational, social and insurance problems relating to hazards are developed

parallel and they are equally treated,

- unanimous approach to natural disasters relates to inseparable consideration of the extreme event, which may be caused by both natural as well as anthropogenic phenomena.

For victims or degraded environment followed by those events it makes no difference whether it was formally qualified as an extreme event caused by natural powers, or as a

result of technical catastrophe. In both cases assistance is essential.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

reconstruction?

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

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

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

Specific allocation within the national budget is not only the one source of financing DRR activities in Poland. Taking into account the wide definition of DRR activities actions are also financed by other sources including National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management and foreign funds. Post disaster reconstructions are in many cases financed from the reserve of the national budget. Taking into consideration above mentioned aspects it is difficult to estimate total budget designated for DRR.

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.

Sources of financing are diffused and allocated on different levels.

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of

authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

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

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

Community participation is ensured within specific but not all areas of DRR. For example flood zones elaborated by water administration have to be incorporated into local urban development plans. The principle of public participation in management, as it is at present, may not be fully implemented, as the society will not be included in planning, decision-making matters in the practical manner.

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 activities are in general financed by the government. It should be underlined the systemic problem of limiting the public participation only to informing, and not aiming at full participation in DRR management (e.g. joint planning or searching for solutions together).

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)	
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	13
private sector (specify absolute number)	
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	3
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	
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	Yes
In a civil protection department	No
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	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 Government Centre for Security is designed for coordination of the risk assessment process. The National Platform organized by the Institute of Meteorology and Water Management National Research Institute has been transformed from the former Polish National IDNDR Committee. This Committee initialized research programs regarding risk of natural disasters ,publications regarding risk analysis, monographs about great flood event in 1997 and schools and conferences on natural and technological disasters. The membership is voluntary. Institute of Meteorology and Water Management - National Research Institute (IMGW-PIB) is a research-development unit constituted by resolution No. 338/72 Cabinet of 30 December 1972 on merging State Hydrological Institute with the Institute of Water Management, operating in compliance with the Act of 25 July 1985 r. on research and development units. The purpose of the Institute is satisfying the needs of the society, national economy and the State's defense, within the scope of its statutory duty. The Institute realizes this duty through conducting research, development and implementation operations as well as by maintaining observations and measurement network, carrying out observations and measurements, developing forecasts and expertise.

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.

Polish National Platform for DRR and HFA is focused on information exchange and improvement of existing solutions. Each ministry is responsible for preparing emergency plans within its responsibility areas. The Government Centre for Security is designed for coordination of the risk assessment process in Poland. Discussion about form and area of common activities as well as functioning and source of financing of National Platform is in such case crucial. The most important point is to avoid duplication of activities already performed by existing authorities.

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? 3

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

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)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No

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

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

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

The risk concept is mainly focused on meteorological and flood hazards problems. New approach regarding technological risks was developed in the IT ISOK project mentioned before. The risk assessment is supported by forecasting accuracy of time and location as well as intensity of unfavorable or severe natural phenomena with such lead time, that prevention activities eliminating or reducing threat to life and property could be possible. Advanced protection system, which is modern both in methodology and equipment, takes also into consideration the subjects resulting from international cooperation programmes within the structures and programmes of the World Meteorological Organization at regional and global levels.

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.

Results of ISOK project (mentioned earlier) conducted by National Water Management Board and Institute of Meteorology and Water Management National Research Institute allow in future to create the base for multi-hazard risk assessment for local planners.

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	No
--	----

regularly updated

Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)

Yes

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

Yes

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

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

Disaster loss data base is not dedicate to the private possessions but only to losses in infrastructure within government and self governments. Humanitarian and reliefs organizations have data concerning needs of sufferers.

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.

Improvements are required in the field of effective actions to reduce risk.

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.

Universality of the hydrometeorological protection system in Poland is proved by meeting information needs, which may appear in government and society, as individual, collective, governmental and municipal ones. The Polish hydrological and meteorological protection system deals in a comprehensive, effective and universal way with extreme natural events, which pose the most severe threat to life and inhabitants' property. Comprehensive means that the system covers integrated essential physical processes in the atmosphere and hydrosphere, which are linked by various cause-effect relationship. Each of them separately or some joined together may affect society and economy. System is comprehensive, what can be seen in integrated forecasting methodology, in integrated observation-measurement system as well as in integrated and efficient technology of transmitting, processing and collecting data and in many other parts of the protection system. Data are derived from our own observation-measurement system, from international data exchange system, from ground, satellite and radar teledetection systems (domestic and international ones) and even from the outputs of meteorological and hydrological models, which verify and complete each other.

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.

Additional activities are required to implement widely local warning systems which are important in specific situations when time for decision making is very short. Preparedness to DRR at local community level should be improved

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.

Continuous and increasing international co-operation is conducted. It involves:
-legal, organizational, technical aspects, transboundary and regional research co-operation,
and

-international agreements which are realized under the auspices of the United Nations.

Common activities which aim to prevent every dangerous situation include, among others:

-identification of institutions, structures and people responsible for rescue services in the

neighbouring countries;

-identification and exchange of information about threat in border-areas;

-identification and exchange of information concerning relief and recovery measures of the

effects of extreme hazards;

-preparation of effective and simple procedures, which can enable to ask assistance and

precisely define the extent of a catastrophe (event);

-organization of communication;

-agreement of conditions enabling to quickly cross a border by services from countries which

can help and regulation of cases concerning possible transportation (in the EU countries this

case is simplified).

The cooperation is carried out under the auspices of the Ministry of the Interior and the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs involving main participation of the National Headquarters of the State Fire Service of Poland and the Institute of Meteorology and Water

Management. The cooperation is realized both in

the form of bilateral and multilateral agreements (between neighbouring countries) as well as

within such organizations as:

-United Nations Economic Commission for Europe,

-Council for the Baltic Sea States,

-Central European Initiative,

- The Visegrad Group (V4),

-Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (which includes INSARAG

–International

Search and Rescue Advisory Group).

The international cooperation is also carried out within the Central European Disaster Prevention Forum Platform (CEUDIP), European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction

and

European Network of National Platforms (ENNP). Within ENNP activities two small projects

regarding DRR were submitted to the EC. One large project have been submitted by the consortium with DKKV (Germany) and IMGW PIB (Poland).

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.

Cooperation on the community level is facilitate by EU funds including research funds. The role of stakeholders including community representatives is crucial for the further cooperation on DRR.

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? 3

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

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	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 Information System for protection against natural and man-made hazards – acronym

ISOK is just before finalization. The main goal of the project is to give citizens assurance that

they are safe and to limit the losses caused by technological and natural disaster.

Information on DRR is diffused. Works in this field are carried out. Good example of such

works is web page dedicated to early warning established by Institute of Meteorology and

Water Management-National Research Institute.

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.

Taking into account already existing information there is a need to improve disaster information system.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

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

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

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

Despite of not comprehensive and only substantial achievements good examples of activities within the area of education already exist due to Institute of Meteorology and Water Management National Research Institute, local and regional self governments. Research programmes for risk reduction and mitigation are conducted also by the

Main School of Fire Service.

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.

Good examples of education activities should be widely disseminate. There is a need of financial support of such activities specially within the area of "training of trainers".

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

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	No
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	Yes

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

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

In 2012 the National Research Fund established call for projects related to the DRR. There are examples of research activities financed by EFRD as well as VII th Framework

Programme and also national research sources. One of the examples is project conducted by Institute of Meteorology and Water Management :“Impact of the climate change on environment, economy and society”(changes, impacts, ways of limitation, proposals for

science, engineering in practice and economy planning)

Source of financing: Operational Programme 2007-2013 -Innovative Economy (IE OP),

financed from the EFRD.

Key tasks of the project:

- Climate change and its impact on environment in Poland and estimation of economical effects
- State of atmospheric pollution in Poland and its impact on the quality of life –possible solutions
- Sustainable management of water, natural and forest resources
- Natural disasters, civil protection, internal public safety
- Development of the new methods of forecasting, warning systems
- The Baltic Sea - element of the climatic system and its role in creation of risk conditions
- Determinants, risks and possibilities of realization of water supply program in view of climate change
- Preventing of degradation of the artificial reservoirs (technical aspects, sediments)
- The development plan of the Vistula basin

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 important for future success will be dissemination of results of already realized as well as next research projects focused on DRR.

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? 2

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

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	No
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes
Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	No
Guidance for risk reduction	Yes
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 great importance of civil readiness to face extreme threats is clear. We consider civil readiness as pragmatic, legally normalized responsibility for realization of certain tasks and duties, beginning from the Parliament and finishing at individual inhabitants. In such case there is a great need to improve strategic approach regarding comprehensive action dedicated to the public awareness in Poland.

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 basis of any co-operation with the society is access to information, which can support

every activity. In the civil readiness system, a media information policy must be included. In this field we still have much to do in our country.

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)	No
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

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

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

EIA procedures as well as CBA assist individual investments

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.

Wider scope in planning process including Water Framework Directive requirements is needed to avoid risk of conflict among different policies.

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? No

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	No
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.

National insurance system is now under discussion in Poland. Systematic support does not exist.

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 of the program which should include , among others:
 -financial policy in this scope (insurance, possibilities of financial support for local projects to improve protection);
 -identification of losses origins;
 -methods to decrease losses;
 -level of inhabitants' hazard preparedness

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

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

Sectoral or company policies are usually prepared separately without coordination. Flood hazard consists of two inseparable elements: risk and vulnerability to losses. Risk

assessment made during planned endeavors connected with flood protection should consider economic calculation.

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.

Wider analysis are needed to avoid risk of conflict among different policies

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	Yes
Training of masons on safe construction technology	Yes
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	Yes
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	No
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.

Some investments have been realized in the past. New developments are coming very slowly due to financial problems and long lasting EIA procedures. From the planning point of view flood risk zones are incorporated into local planning

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 decision related to flood zone incorporation into local plan is taken by local government. Sometimes such decisions are difficult to made because of political or economical reasons (for example after such decision the value of endangered terrain within flood zone is falling).

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? 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-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning

Yes

Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery

No

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

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

Need of incorporation in post disaster recovery programmes DRR activities is raising

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.

Two important solutions are needed:

- comprehensive program of training of trainers in DRR,
- financial support of such activities.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

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

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.

Procedures are include on the level of planning process

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.

Impacts of disaster risk are taken into account in SEA and EIA

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? 2

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

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	No
--	----

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.

Some research and local projects has been implemented in recent years

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.

Key challenges are programmes for schools and municipalities.

Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

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

Key Questions and Means of Verification

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

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	Yes
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	Yes
Operations and communications centre	Yes
Search and rescue teams	Yes
Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes

Shelters	Yes
Secure medical facilities	Yes
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	Yes
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	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.

On each level of administration exists DRR operational plan

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 main parts of DRR operational plans are dedicated to action during event-"preparedness part" is usually the weakest part as well as" lessons learned part".

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.

Financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster exist but usually are not sufficient

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.

Insurance part of funds is weak and generally not popular within overall society

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	No
---	----

and capacities available	
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	Yes
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.

New procedures have been developed

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

Need of trained human resources is evident.

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)

Information regarding multi hazard analyses is diffused (landslides, floods, strong winds, historical heavy rains). There is a need of integration of such information to help local planners. Integration of such information by administration on the governmental level will be

a key aspect in future. The ISOK project will assure such integration.

One of the objectives of the IT System is elaboration of the maps hazards. The hazards maps will present a scale of occurrence of a hazard and potential risk calculated based on the analysis of historical and current materials. The maps for the following hazards and risk will be generated:

- Maps of meteorological hazards;
- Flood hazard and flood risk maps;
- Map of a hazard to health and life of people due to meteorological conditions and social sensitivity to a hazard;
- Maps of surface water and ground water intakes in the areas exposed to a flood hazard
- Map of air pollution due to meteorological hazards
- Map of a risk of a serious industrial failure due to meteorological hazards

The map will be an element of a system of geographical information which will enable quick and efficient performance of advanced spatial analyses in the area of a hazard of serious industrial failures. Static and operational maps will be generated under this map.

- Map of a risk of interference in electric power network due to meteorological hazards

Map of a risk of interference in electric power network due to meteorological hazards

is to reflect a level of risk so probability of occurrence of undesired events – interferences in industrial and distribution power electric networks which may occur as a result of extreme meteorological phenomena which may cause breaks in transfer and delivery of electric energy to recipients and/or losses in technical infrastructure.

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)

No specific gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized
but those aspects are respected. This should be a future task of ministries responsible for health and social affairs

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)

Capacity for risk reduction already identified in the part of Polish regions and include in regional plans. Raising level will be a key driver.

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)

Operational plans on each level assures human security and social equity.

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)

Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors partly assure. Raising number of civil society and private sector will be key indicator regarding improvement of participatory approaches

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

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

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

No important driver to add

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

We are trying systematically to improve the knowledge about extreme events, their mechanisms (origins), protection and recovery (relief) methods. Various initiatives and many activities are undertaken, but, unfortunately, they are still insufficient. Direct education of adults is difficult, but its efficiency improves every year. In the organized form it can be done only at courses and workshops. In adult education, influence of young people on their parents and adults through undertaking common flood prevention activities were carried out.

Future Outlook Statement

The important area of activity will be stimulation of exchanges between experts and organizations to formulate recommendations that would be relevant for research, for authorities at, national or local level.

Various training programmes for stakeholders should be conducted.

Such programmes should include:

- classes (special didactic materials created in the form of ready-to-use lesson outlines, exercises, films and internet services);
- meeting with people professionally coping with disasters;
- site workshops and interviews with inhabitants
- preparation and organization of exhibitions

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

It is still valid to strengthen education system for regional and local leaders and for people who are responsible for concrete tasks like representatives of companies, press etc.

Future Outlook Statement

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, should be considered jointly. In this scope some works have already began and they will be continued. They cover:

- assessment of threats occurring in the country, including identification of threat sources,
- break down of extreme threats and their characteristics;
- definition of the state of extreme threats protection systems, taking into account prevention actions (including solutions applied abroad).

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

Organizational emergency system should be improved according to hazards character and new challenges.

Future Outlook Statement

Lack of collective insurance program leads to “ad hoc” assistance actions. Works in this field should be carried out in future as well.

Stakeholders

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

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Institute of Meteorology and Water Management National Research Institute	Academic & Research Institutions	Tomasz Walczykiewicz , +48 12 6398 136; tomasz.walczykiewicz@imgw.pl,, 30-215 Krakow, Borowego st. 14,
National Headquarters of the State Fire Service	Governments	Dariusz Kadukowski, Senior Expert, +48 22 523 30 07 International Cooperation Department ,dkadukowski@kgpsp.gov.pl ,00-463 Warszawa Podchorążych st.,. 38