



# NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR ALERTING AUTHORITIES AND POPULATION CONCERNING NATURAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL RISKS IN BALKAN COUNTRIES

COORDINATING CENTRE: ECRP Sofia, Bulgaria

PARTNER CENTRES: ECPFE Athens, Greece

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OBTAINED WITHIN THE COORDINATED  
PROJECTS FOR 2015

## ECRP

In accordance with the decision adopted during the meeting of directors of the centers of European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA) of the Council of Europe that took place in 2013 in Strasbourg (France) - European Centre for Risk Prevention, Sofia, Bulgaria coordinated Project “**National Strategies for alerting authorities and population concerning natural and technological risks in Balkan countries**” with participation of European Centers: ACPFE, Athens, Greece; ECBR, Bucharest, Romania; ECILS, Skopje, FYROM; AFEM, Ankara, Turkey ( Time for realization: 2014 - 2015).

**Associated activities (Appendix IV):** On the basis of results achieved under the project in 2014 and the analysis of responses of partners in a specialized questionnaire in 2015, to asses the actual situation related to the issues of prevention and mitigation of disasters and to develop and disseminate a report, informing and supporting the Balkan countries with regard to problems of the Strategy and trends in this field.

The following activities had been performed in 2015 (second year of the project) by the European Centre for Risk Prevention (ECRP), Sofia within the implementation of the project:

- Development and dissemination of a questionnaire on the issues of mitigation of disasters impact. (parallel questionnaire was sent by the Ministry of Interior also);
- Collecting and analyzing the responses to the questionnaire;
- Drafting and dissemination of a report on the actual situation related to the issues of mitigation disaster risk and trends in the countries of the Balkan region;
- Dissemination of the finale variant of the sample Structure of the National Strategy of the base of the proposals received from European Centers on 2015.

The project objective in 2015 is to present what has been achieved on National platforms and National strategies in accordance with the UN Hyogo Framework for action 2005-2015 “Building resilience of nations and communities to disasters”. Another goal of the project is to develop a structure for a national strategy, which is to help member States.

### 1. Basis for the examination.

From a total of twelve countries in the Balkan region take part in the project five countries. The participating countries, three members of the European Union and the other two countries are negotiating for membership or candidate for negotiations for membership. Proposals about structure of National Strategy were received from Ukraine.

#### In the analysis were used:

- The results of the project in 2014;
- Responses to a questionnaire developed by the coordinator and by the Ministry of Interior in the development of the national strategy of Bulgaria (to all countries of the Balkans and another);

## 2. Partial Analysis of actual situation

Of course of base limit budget it have possibility for Partial Analysis of some of the base Problems in system for Crisis Management in Balkan region.

### Base for comparison:

Project SEEDRMAP – 2008. Results of the project SEEDRMAP (The South Eastern Europe Disaster Risk Mitigation and Adoption Programme) with participation of EUR-OPA Major Hazard Agreement.

The objective of SEEDRMAP had to reduce the vulnerability of the countries of South Eastern Europe to the risk of disasters in the context of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters.

Final results from Project was undertaken in the context of the coordination of disaster mitigation, preparedness and response but had a lot of information and for creation of risk prevention culture.

The research project aimed to show the major changes occurring in the countries involved in the project since 2008 in the following areas:

- Is there a change in the traditional hazards on the basis of which it was created and the National platform;
- Changes in legislation;
- Changes in the structure of institutions for protection;
- International cooperation;
- Activities in the field of Prevention Culture.

### 2.1. The Traditional dangerous.

The main dangers on which is built the system of protection are preserved.

It can specify the following changes:

#### Climate change:

- There is increasing danger of flooding and the consequences of significant growth, increasing financial costs to levels requiring aid from the EU (Serbia, Bulgaria and other);
- Increasing the number of landslides resulted in a significant increase in financial costs for liquidation of the consequences;
- Increasing the number and extent of forest fires.

#### Migratory pressure:

Of course this “new” danger indirectly puts tasks of the structures of Civil Protection.

It is necessary to pay attention to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Additional Protocols of 1977. Of course the conventions and protocols are for wartime. But the reason for the wave of refugees now is precisely the war.

Probably pending further improvement of National Platforms and National Strategy for managing this type of crisis after discussion in framework of EUR-OPA.

The situation at the moment require discussion in framework of EUR-OPA.

#### Terrorism

The structures of Civil Protections aren't basic player but this structures every time took participation for liquidation of consequences.

Terrorism in many cases began to be reported as a risk to be included in national plans, this type of threat is definitely influences of the National Platforms and in near future in the National Strategies.

## **2.2. The legislation**

There are no significant changes in the legal framework in the field of crisis management in the countries involved in the project, except that related to structural changes.

The legal framework in the field of crisis management of the member states of the European Union is aligned with the requirements / Bulgaria, Greece, Romania /.

The legal basis of Turkey, which is negotiating to join the European Union is also aligned with the requirements.

Countries negotiating or waiting for a call for negotiations continue to adapt legislation on crisis management / FYROM, Moldova /

## **2.3. The Civil Protection structures.**

The Project make registration of the change in the structures at the participant countries and don't including the level of preparedness and ability.

Compared with the survey of the European Union in 2008 made structural changes had occurred in the following countries:

### **-Bulgaria:**

Removed Emergencies Ministry and its functions were transferred to the Ministry of Interior.

The structure of the Civil Protection flows into the service of firefighters in the Ministry of Interior. It was established General Directorate "Fire Safety and Preparation of the Population."

Generally the National Platform of Bulgaria not changed since the place of Civil Protection was placed General Directorate "Fire Safety and preparation of the population."

### **-Romania:**

The National System for Emergency Situations Management did update in 2014.

- At National level, there is a National Committee for Emergency situation, headed by the Prime-minister and of Minister of Internal Affairs;

- The General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations (IGSU), subordinated by to the Ministry of Internal Affairs is the main governmental organization with attributions for disaster awareness, emergency preparedness and mitigation of the effects of natural hazards. IGSU has units in all of the 41 administrative divisions of Romania.

### **-Turkey:**

In Turkey Agency "Disaster and Emergency Management Authority" (AFAD) – under the Prime Minister is responsible for coordination.

Disaster and Emergency Supreme Board chaired by Prime Minister or Deputy Prime Minister.

Disaster and Emergency Coordination Board chaired by Undersecretary of the Prime Ministry.

The Civil Protection sector in Turkey is composed of three main structures established at:

- The General Directorate of Turkish Emergency Management, under direct control of the Presidency of Ministers;

- The General Directorate of Civil Defense within the Ministry of Interior;
- The General Directorate of Disaster Affairs was established within the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement.

## **2.4. The Risk Prevention Culture**

The study can't cover all issues related to civil protection and public.

All Balkan countries give information that they plan to work or working in area for creation of Culture of Prevention.

### Direction for creation of Risk Prevention Culture:

- School level
- University level
- Medias
- Edition
- INTERNET

It is striking that all countries mentioned direction of risk prevention training at school level and University only.

Don't mention other ways to achieve this goal, where have to focus efforts also (medias, editions and cet.).

Exceptions are Greece and Romania that offer specific activities for learning about earthquakes, forest fires and floods - Moldova.

Special attention is paid to the use of training programmes in schools to encourage an awareness of risk and risk reduction concepts. Analytical training programmes and special materials have been developed on every type of disaster to build a culture of safety.

## **2.5. International Negotiation – Bilateral Agreements**

All countries indicated that they had a least one Bilateral Agreement signed.

### Existing Bilateral Agreements

- Bulgaria with Romania and Russian;
- Greece with Albania and Turkey;
- Romania with Bulgaria;
- Croatia with Hungary, Slovenia, Poland, Austria, France and Montenegro;
- Bosnia and Herzegovina with Croatia, Montenegro, FYROM;
- Albania with Greece and Italy;
- Serbia with Russian;
- FYROM with Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Montenegro with Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia;
- Turkey with Greece;
- Slovenia with Croatia.

All countries from Balkan region give information that they continue to work for bilateral agreements with neighbor and another countries.

Completely same situation we have and in 2008.

## **3.0. Conclusions and recommendations.**

### National platform and National strategy.

All twelve countries in the Balkans / Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Greece, FYROM, Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Serbia, Turkey, Croatia, Montenegro/ indicate the presence of the National platform for crisis

management decipher its functioning. But a National Risk Assessment Working Group being part of the National Platforms of not really established yet.

Two of the countries involved in this project / Bulgaria, FYROM / say that they have formally adopted by the governments National strategies to reduce the impact of disaster /2015-2020 /.

Of course time limit gave from UN is end of 2015 but we have after Sendai new time limit – 2020.

### **Civil Protection structure**

The ongoing process of decentralization among the twenty countries of the Balkan region is seen best in the service of firefighters, which is an essential element of Civil Protection / as the sum of functions /.

Almost fully centralized system 25 years ago now six countries indicate that the forces of firefighters is position in municipalities and in the majority are under the authority of regional governors. Three of the countries indicate the existence of inspectorate of fireman in the relevant ministries.

Six countries / Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Croatia, Moldova, Serbia / indicate the presence of DGs or fire service directorate of the Ministry of Interior. Directorate General of firefighters in Albania is managed by the Department for Civil Emergencies Planning and response.

In Greece there and the Directorate General of Civil Protection. The Directorate for Civil Protection in FYROM Council of Ministers.

Directorate of Civil Protection has in all surveyed countries except Bulgaria. It's have General Direction "Fire Safety and Protection of the Population" with centralize system.

In Turkey Fire Brigade are in Municipality and the Governors are on duty for coordination.

Exist trend for decentralization of the tasks and structures for Risk Prevention in all Balkan countries.

**Financing** activities to reduce the consequences of disasters in each country is divided into two parts:

- The first part is the annual funding of civil protection through national budgets;
- The second part is usually a special fund for carrying out rescue and restoration activities.

In the Member States and candidate countries of the European Union second part from this fund is complemented by the European Commission.

The disadvantages of this method of financing consists in this:

- Usually the funds are not enough and are mainly for salaries;
- Special fund (second part) is formed through annually national budgets and don't accumulate the remainder and therefore not sufficiently effective;
- A big problem is that in most of the surveyed countries insurance has slight upward trend but still not become a serious source of budget.

### **The process of decentralization**

- Civil Protection / institution or as a sum of functions / has established centralized management structures in all the countries surveyed;

- Occurs see the process of decentralization of the governance structures of the office of the fire and the forces of fire and rescue (this process is fully completed in Romania);

The advantages of this process is that approaching forces of fire and rescuers to the site of impact and reduces response time.

A disadvantage of this process is that during financial crisis-forces or shortened or combined, in which they again move away from the site of impact.

There is significant progress in the protection of critical infrastructure. However, this applies only to countries that during the financial crisis have the opportunity to implement large infrastructure projects. These are the countries of the European Union and Turkey.

### **Monitoring system.**

The monitoring system at all levels in a largely outdated and requires its modernization in all countries.

Monitoring of preventive actions to reduce the impact of disasters in countries not at the required level. The conclusion is that this is the main part of the reason for the big losses after the occurrence of disasters / floods especially at /.

This mean that control system (auto monitoring) have problems.

Of course exist monitoring systems at high level of condition – for river Danube and for Nuclear Power stations.

### **Relationship between academics and sectors of Civil protection.**

There are many collaborative initiatives between the academic community and national and local research involved in crisis management and disaster prevention.

Along with the activities implemented by the Agreement (EUR-OPA) in various research institutes are developing various projects in the areas of: Vulnerability information, Trans-boundary monitoring systems, Trans-boundary early warning systems, Strengeting of capacity and another.

The received information show that a lot of University have projects in the field of crisis management by INTERNET technologists. Promising direction is the development of a system for crisis management in the first four hours of the occurrence of the event also based INTERNET technology. The advantage of such projects is that they can be implemented quickly since it does not require large financial resources and can be implemented within annual budgets.

Someone has to coordinate this work and to disseminate the positive practice.

### **International cooperation.**

The surveyed countries in the Balkan region /except Turkey/ are small countries and after a major disaster can't cope alone in the rescue and recovery activities. It is very important to build a system of mutual assistance on the basis of signed bilateral agreements. It is necessary to intensify the process of signing such contracts since 2008 to now no one.

So far signed contracts for the most countries, provide for the injured countries to pay the costs of the country that provides the aid of rescuers and firefighters. It is necessary to provide for more flexibility.

It is better to be in the future assistance to the countries. This assistance may be provided by Agreement (EUR-OPA) through the development and dissemination of sample detailed structure of a Bilateral Agreement. By displaying the best practices in this area. By enabling access to the contracts of member states of the Agreement.

### **Building a Culture of Prevention.**

The focus in the field of education in risk prevention at school level.

Of course the agreement is a huge contribution in this field both by the European center in Cyprus and conducted by three international conferences and numerous seminars and workshops.

The countries have developed and presented different methods of training at school level for the prevention of various types of hazards:

- Earthquake / Greece, Romania /;
- Floods / Moldova /;
- Wildfires / Greece /.

The main players in the process for forming a Culture of Prevention are of different structures until now could not specify an effective organization of training on risk prevention at school level in a country to which to aspire. Could not be given such an organization of educational process in schools, which developed methods to combine into a single efficient system.

Of course, the culture of prevention is determined by several factors. Among them, however, is that of basic training at school level.

For example in the media as a key direction of forming a culture of prevention is not indicated for the existence of a special TV program on prevention and training of base existing dangerous (except Romania).

Proposed methods only occasionally solve any of the problems of teaching but not bring orderliness.

Forget the main conclusions of the conference held from Agreement earlier, and especially this conclusion that organizational training in risk prevention at school level need not necessarily be implemented through the introduction of a separate subject.

During the first three conferences in this area organized by the Agreement is concluded that the correct and effective approach is to work for the inclusion of specific topics and educational issues in different subjects throughout the curriculum in schools. And there has to seek the application of different methods of training for a given disaster.

To restore the practice of agreement for international conferences and seminars in the field of creating a culture of prevention. During these initiatives to demonstrate and disseminate best practices.

Agreement is the international organization which first raised the issue of creating a Culture of Prevention (1997) and began to develop up within the framework of the UN strategy for reducing the consequences of disasters. To implement this initiative were developed and began work on the projects:

- Risk prevention education to school and preschool levels;
- Be safe net;
- The practice of competitions in the field of prevention of disasters in schools;
- The annual international exhibition of drawings by children in the disaster;
- Euro-Mediterranean protocol for risk prevention in schools through which began to implement a package of projects;
- Euro-Mediterranean network of schools to enhance the culture of risk in accordance with the protocol.

Culture of Prevention is very wide concept and for its develop and real result is need long time.

EUR-OPA Conferences and seminars (1997-2002) was develop one practical classification of directions witch have to use in area of Risk prevention training at school level of base answer of next tree questions: What is possible? What is effective and chipper? Who will realize "training of trainers"?

**Results:** First place of direction: To use combination among: - to diffuse this problems in all subjects in primary and secondary school - and develop National company for specific dangerousness at territory of the countries and to use INTERNET.

Second place: To work for develop of independent subject.

**"Training of trainers"** by University and Schools of Civil Protections

These issues will be discussed during the workshop which will be held in Sofia, Bulgaria on 9-11 December 2015 on the theme: "Building a Culture of prevention through improving the disaster risk awareness among children and adolescent"

UN conference in Sendai adopted a strategy and framework for reducing disaster risk / 2015-2030 / focus on people. Planned activities in four main priorities:

- Understanding the risk of disasters;
- Strengthening the management of disasters;
- Invest in reducing disaster risk and sustainability;
- Improving disaster preparedness.

Important for our project is the decision from Sendai to continue until 2020 work on the establishment of national strategies and local strategies to mitigate the effects of disasters. So the results of this project can be to help countries and during this period.