



МЕЃУНАРОДНА НАУЧНА КОНФЕРЕНЦИЈА
БЕЗБЕДНОСНИ КОНЦЕПТИ И ПОЛИТИКИ - НОВА
ГЕНЕРАЦИЈА НА РИЗИЦИ И ЗАКАНИ



INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE
SECURITY CONCEPTS AND POLICIES - NEW
GENERATION OF RISKS AND THREATS

МЕЃУНАРОДНА НАУЧНА КОНФЕРЕНЦИЈА

**БЕЗБЕДНОСНИ КОНЦЕПТИ И ПОЛИТИКИ - НОВА
ГЕНЕРАЦИЈА НА РИЗИЦИ И ЗАКАНИ**

04 - 05 Јуни 2017, Охрид

Том I

Скопје 2017

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

**SECURITY CONCEPTS AND POLICIES - NEW
GENERATION OF RISKS AND THREATS**

04 -05 June 2017, Ohrid

Volume I

Skopje 2017

Издавачи:

Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“
Битола
Факултет за безбедност – Скопје

За издавачите:

проф. д-р Сашо Коруновски, ректор на
Универзитетот „Св. Климент
Охридски“ – Битола
проф. д-р Оливер Бачановиќ, декан на
Факултетот за безбедност – Скопје

Уредник на изданието:

Доц. д-р Марјан Ѓуровски

Лектор на англиски јазик:

Рози Гроздановска Велеска

Компјутерска обработка:

Оливера Трајанова Ѓорѓијовски
Кемал Рушид

Печати:

АД „Ван Гог“ - Скопје

Адреса на издавачите:

Факултет за безбедност 1000 Скопје
П. Фах 103
тел: 022546211

Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“
1ви Мај б.б. 7000 Битола,
тел: 047223788

Publishers:

University “St. Kliment Ohridski”
Bitola
Faculty of Security- Skopje

For the Publishers:

Sašo Korunovski, PhD Rector of
the University “St. Kliment
Ohridski”- Bitola
Oliver Bačanović, PhD Dean of
the Faculty of Security- Skopje

Editor in Chief:

Marjan Gjurovski, PhD

Lecturer in English:

Rozi Grozdanovska Veleska

Computer Processing:

Olivera Trajanova Gjorgjijovski
Kemal Rushid

Print:

“Van Gog” - LTD Skopje

Address of the Publishers:

Faculty of Security 1000 Skopje
P.O. Box 103
tel: ++389(0)22546211

University “St. Kliment Ohridski”
1 Maj b.b. 7000 Bitola
tel: +++389(0) 47223788

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE:

Dr.Sc. Oliver Bacanovic, Dean of the Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia, Chairman

Bogdan Mirchev, Hanns Seidel Stiftung Foundation

Dr.Sc. Cane Mojanoski, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Tome Batkovski, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Miodrag Labovic, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Zlate Dimovski, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Bogdanco Gogov, Faculty of Security, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Ferenc Banfi, Director of CEPOL (European Union for Law Enforcement Training)

Norbert Leitner, President of the Association of European Police Colleges

Prof. (em.) Dr.Georg Lohmann, Guericke University of Magdeburg, Berlin

Dr.Sc.Taro Tsukimura, Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan

Dr.Sc. Marco Lombardi, University Cattolica, Milano, Italy

Dr.Sc.Vinay Kaura, Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, Rajasthan, India

Dr.Sc. Galit Ben-Israel, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Bar-Ilan University, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Izrael

Dr.Sc. Goran Boskovic, Acting Dean of the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies, Serbia

Dr.Sc. Torje Daniel - Costel, Rector of the Police Academy "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Romania

Dr.Sc. Nedelco Lazarov Stoichev, Rector of the Academy of the Ministry of Interior, Bulgaria

Dr.Sc. Andrej Sotlar, Dean of the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, Slovenia

Dr.Sc. Ivica Radovic, Dean of the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Dr.Sc. Nedžad Korajlic, Dean of the Faculty of Criminalistics, Criminology and Security Studies, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Dr.Sc. Ivan Toth, Dean of the University of Applied Sciences, VVG, Croatia

Dr.Sc. Marta Zorko, Vice-dean of Faculty of Political Science of Zagreb, Croatia

Dr.Sc. Denis Caleta, President of the Council, Institute for Corporate Security Studies ICS Ljubljana, Slovenia

Dr.Sc. Josko Vukosav, Dean of the High Police School, Zagreb, Croatia

Dr.Sc. Mile Shikman, Head of the Administration for Police Education of Republika Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Dr.Sc. Goran Ajdinski, Dean of Faculty of Philosophy, University St. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Mirjana Franceshko, Dean of Faculty of Law and Business Studies Lazar Vrkatic, University UNION, Novi Sad, Serbia

Rajko Pekovic, Director of the Police Academy, Montenegro

Verica Stefanovska Milevska, Chamber of Republic of Republic of Macedonia for private security

Dr.Sc.Urim Vejseli, Crisis management center, Government of Republic of Macedonia

Dr.Sc. Vesna Trajkovska, Secretary of Programme Committee

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:

Dr.Sc Marjan Gjurovski, Chairman

Dr.Sc Boris Murgoski

Dr.Sc Zhidas Daskalovski

Dr.Sc Marjan Nikolovski

Dr.Sc Sashe Gerasimoski

Dr.Sc Snezana Mojsoska

Dr.Sc Nikola Dujovski

Dr.Sc Rade Rajkovcevski

Dr.Sc Tatjana Gerginova

Dr.Sc Natasha Jovanova

Dr.Sc Ice Ilijevski, Secretary of Organizing Committee

CONTENTS:

PREFACE / WELCOME ADDRESSES

SECURITY, SECURITY SYSTEM AND APPROACHES TO RISKS AND THREATS

THEORETICAL GROUNDS FOR RESEARCHING THE SECURITY RISKS IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.....1

SAŠE GERASIMOSKI DR.SC, MARJAN NIKOLOVSKI DR.SC, MARJAN GJUROVSKI, DR.SC

CAUSES OF SUICIDE TERRORISM, ONE OF THE NEW GENERATION'S THREATS (COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SUICIDE TERRORISTS' PERSONALITY)9

ŽARKO ĆULIBRK DR.SC

STATE TROJAN: THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM, SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA OF THE CITIZENS.....18

ANNA LUCIA VALVO DR.SC

TERRORIST ACTS WITH IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICES, THE THREAT TO THE MODERN-WORLD, THE EXAMPLE OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN.....25

MUHAMED RACAJ DR.SC, MIHAJLO MORSKI MA, ZEKIRJA AZIRI

SECURITY ASSESSMENT IN THE FUNCTION OF UNDERCOVER AGENT ENGAGEMENT42

ZELJKO NINCIC

THE SHIFTING MODUS OPERANDI OF THE “LONE WOLF” TERRORISTS.....55

DRAGAN LAZAREVSKI MA

ANALYTIC TECHNIQUES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM.....63

KONSTANTIN KAZAKOV DR.SC

CONTEMPORARY SECURITY CHALLENGES FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF TERRORISM.....74

TATJANA GERGINOVA DR.SC

SECURITY ANALYSIS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO THE AIRPORTS AS CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE86

ICE ILJEVSKI DR.SC, ZLATE DIMOVSKI DR.SC, KIRE BABANOSKI DR.SC

TERRORISM AND THE ROLE OF LAW IN FIGHTING TERRORISM – EXPERIENCES OF THE JUDICIARY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.....99

DRAGOMIR VUKOJE DR.SC

METHODS, TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES IN FINANCING OF TERRORISM IN EUROPE110

ZEYNEP ECE UNSAL DR.SC, SVETLANA NIKOLOSKA DR.SC, IVICA SIMONOVSKI DR.SC

HAWALA'S APPEAL IN TERRORISM FINANCING.....121

TATJANA KOVAČ KLEMAR M. SC, SONJA CINDORI	
OLD AND NEW THREATS. MORAL PANIC AND THE SECURITIZATION OF MIGRATION CRISIS. POLISH CASE STUDY.....	130
KATARZYNA JĘDRZEJCZYK-KULINIAK DR.SC	
MIGRATION AND TERRORISM - THE PROBLEM AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS.....	139
MINA T. ZIROJEVIĆ DR.SC, OLIVER P. NIKOLIĆ DR.SC	
THE MIGRANT CRISIS AND THE AREA OF FREEDOM, SECURITY AND JUSTICE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION	147
HRISTINA RUNCEVA TASEV DR.SC	
CRISIS AND SOCIAL SECURITY	156
MLADENOVIC MILICA, PAVLOVIC SLAVICA, KOMAZEC NENAD	
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT CAPACITIES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL: CHALLENGES AND REQUIREMENTS ACCORDING TO THE SENDAI FRAMEWORK	168
RADE RAJKOVCHEVSKI DR.SC	
HOUSEHOLD SUPPLIES FOR NATURAL DISASTERS: FACTORS OF INFLUENCE ON THE POSSESSION OF SUPPLIES.....	176
VLADIMIR M. CVETKOVIĆ DR.SC, JASMINA GAČIĆ DR.SC, VLADIMIR JAKOVLJEVIĆ DR.SC	
NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS ON THE BALKAN PENINSULA AS CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE	190
ROSE SMILESKE DR.SC, MILE KOSTOSKI	
ANALYTICAL APPROACH ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR PROGRAM	199
MENTOR LECAJ	
DESIGNING SECURITY SYSTEMS AGAINST TERRORIST ATTACKS IN TECHNOLOGICAL PROCESSES AND INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	205
ZORICA SALTIROVSKA DR.SC	
THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS	211
MARINA FILIPOVIC, DEJANA JOVANOVIC POPOVIC, SLAVKO NESIC	
EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF THE PROTECTION AND RESCUE FORCES IN CRISIS CONDITIONS.....	222
MENDE SOLUNCHEVSKI DR.SC, VALENTINA TALEVSKA	
THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF THE CRISIS MANAGEMENT CENTER IN BUILDING SECURITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	231
ALEKSANDAR IVANOV DR.SC	

REFORMS IN THE SECURITY SYSTEM

THE SPECIFIC CONTEXT OF THE SECURITY SECTOR REFORM IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA249

OLIVER BAKRESKI DR.SC, TANJA MILOŠEVSKA DR.SC, LETA BARGIEVA MA

SOURCES FOR INCREASING ACADEMIC MOTIVATION OF STUDENTS IN THE "NATIONAL SECURITY" SPECIALTY256

Maiyana Mitevska-Encheva

FACTORS FOR THE OPTIMUM FUNCTIONING OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN A MILITARY ENVIRONMENT265

GEORGI PETKOV, MAIYANA MITEVSKA-ENCHEVA, PLAMEN TEODOSIEV

THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITY OF PRIVATE MILITARY AND SECURITY COMPANIES ENGAGED IN UN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.....273

VIDA POPOVSKA KOCHISHKA DR.SC, BILJANA KAROVSKA -ANDONOVSKA DR.SC

PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OF THE SECURITY SECTOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA AS A PRECONDITION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY282

SEVILJ MUAREMOSKA ABDULI DR.SC, MUHAMED RACAJ DR.SC

ROAD SAFETY PROTECTION SYSTEM IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA292

MILADIN NEŠIĆ, KRSTO LIPOVAC

CONTRIBUTION OF THE PRIVATE SECURITY SECTOR OF MONTENEGRO IN CONFRONTING THE NEW GENERATION OF SECURITY RISKS AND THREATS303

MARJAN MARJANOVIĆ MA

PROTOCOL AS A PRACTICAL TOOL IN DEFENSE DIPLOMACY.....311

SANDE SMILJANOV MBA

APPLYING S.A.R.A. METHOD IN THE FIELD OF PRIVATE SECURITY319

MARINA MALISH SAZDOVSKA DR.SC MARIO MILEVSKI

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT CAPACITIES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL: CHALLENGES AND REQUIREMENTS ACCORDING TO THE SENDAI FRAMEWORK

Rade Rajkovchevski, Dr.Sc

*Faculty of Security-Skopje, Republic of Macedonia
raderaj@yahoo.com*

INTRODUCTION

Emergency management and disaster resilience in urban areas around the world, regarding the causes and consequences of emergencies and disasters, obviously represent a challenge to the human ability for rethinking how to deal and manage them. The communities in different parts of the world face the same problems due to the fact that the emergency management capacities and the level of implementation of disaster resilience measures are guided and dependant on local budgets and the policy (strategies and guidelines) of local officials. The general trends indicated an intention to place the focus in the next period on investments in human capital and infrastructure for building the local emergency and disaster management resources, and making more efficient plans and procedures as to how these capacities can be deployed (Blanksby, 2013; Platt, 2015; Kapucu, Hawkins, and Rivera, 2013; Hsueh-Sheng and Hsin-Ying, 2013; Coppola, 2006, pp.185-190; and Angjelkovic, 2001). Involving all public institutions and non-state actors as relevant local stakeholders, as well their commitment, goodwill, knowledge, experience and resources are emphasized as a requirement. Although there is a serious step forward in the urban areas; there is still a lot of work to be done in the upcoming period. Apart from the national and local disaster risk reduction (DRR) strategies, there is a general will for following the international trends in this area toward adoption of international documents (conventions, decision, terminology, guidelines etc.) as an appropriate way for a holistic and worldwide approach.

Following the experiences of the UN's Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) - addressed to the period 2005-2015, the UN upgraded it within the Sendai Framework as a successor instrument for building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters in the forthcoming – 2015-2030. The Sendai Framework is a non-obligatory instrument providing a new global approach to disaster risk management policy and operations. Starting from the lessons learnt arising from the HFA, practical issues and barriers for the framework implementation, the UN policy makers invested a lot of energy and time, especially in the part devoted to the development, implementation and promotion of the normative frameworks, standards and plans for disaster risk reduction at the local level. They concluded that it had had little impact on the local scale. Therefore, the Sendai Framework, even as a voluntary and non-binding agreement, besides the role of the State, as primary, in term of reducing the disaster risk, focuses its implementation on sharing the state's role with other stakeholders including the local government, the private sector and other stakeholders.

1. SENDAI FRAMEWORK VS. HYOGO FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION

Analyzing the content of the Sendai Framework, some provisions within framework's priorities focus on the role and importance of the local emergency management capacities. The Sendai Framework within its implementation period is attempting to achieve better effects than HFA, using the lessons learnt and new enrolments within the international community.

The Sendai Framework, as a predecessor of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), follows the HFA's concept and gives empirical data correlated to disaster risk reduction, losses and structure of the affected demography. The Framework builds its own, but also takes into consideration the facts collected in the Hyogo Framework's implementation period. As it is stated into the (par.4 of the) Sendai Framework, it should be taken into account that "over the same 10 year time frame, however, disasters have continued to exact a heavy toll and, as a result, the well-being and safety of persons, communities and countries as a whole have been affected. Over 700 thousand people have lost their lives, over 1.4 million have been injured and approximately 23 million have been made homeless as a result of disasters. Overall, more than 1.5 billion people have been affected by disasters in various ways, with women, children and people in vulnerable situations disproportionately affected. The total economic loss was more than \$1.3 trillion (UNISDR, 2015)".

The Sendai Framework was created as an outcome or custom-made agreement deriving from the 3rd UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (WCDRR) held in Sendai, Japan on 14-18 March 2015. "The Sendai Conference has been a major political and technical [opportunity] for local governments worldwide to strengthen their role and capacities in prevention and reduction of disaster risk," United Cities and Local Governments, a global network, said. "The Sendai Framework recognizes for the first time the crucial role that local authorities play in disaster risk reduction." (As quoted in Biron, 2015). Comparing both frameworks, in addition to their emphasis of the local dimension, the creation of the Sendai Framework mainly comes from the questioning of the efficiency and approaches of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015). Both Frameworks highlight the importance of interagency and international cooperation, involving the wide range of stakeholders affected by the strategies and an inclusive approach to DRR. From an operational standpoint, as most important for practitioners (i.e. emergency management capacities), HFA is more focused on a "proactive approach," while the Sendai Framework is focused more on a "people centered approach." Paralleling with HFA, the Sendai Framework recognizes man-made hazards, biological hazards and increases the scope of action in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction. It represents an advanced change in the policy approach at the global level replacing disaster management with disaster risk management. The objective is to prevent new and reduce the existing disaster risks, through an "all stakeholders and hazards" (all-of-society and all-hazards) risk approach across diversity of areas dealing with economic, social, and environmental policy areas, mainly concentrated on measures to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience. By multiplying the scope of actions and objectives, the Sendai Framework underlines the need for increased (local and national) interagency partnership with government institutions dealing with health and man-made hazards and consistent respect of knowledge sharing by updating the hazard databases and integrating these additional hazards in the risk assessment methods.

The Sendai Framework focuses on disaster risks, while the HFA focuses on disaster losses. In addition, the Sendai Framework focuses more on "the how" while the

HFA focus more on “the what”... The Sendai Framework followed the HFA guidance, where about a quarter to about half of the priorities for action are similar. The Sendai Framework puts more emphasis on the means for implementation as compared to the HFA, with some priorities for action having entirely new sections on regional and global actions elaborated in the Sendai Framework... Both Frameworks highlight the importance of embedding DRR into sustainable development. Both focus on a multi-stakeholder and inclusive approach to DRR, although the HFA focused a lot more on a “proactive approach,” while the Sendai Framework focused more on a “people centered approach.” Both focus on multiple levels of DRR work, from local to international (Velasquez, 2015). Starting from those key differences and similarities, the Sendai Framework contains several clear points dedicated to the local level priorities and activities.

The Sendai Framework puts attention on monitoring its implementation at the local level. It is conceptualized as a very specific issue, taking again the roots from the HFA. The main feature of the new national and local monitoring revolves around the updated national and local strategies and plans on DRR. These are called on to have targets and indicators, with varying time periods and covering the three sub-components of the goal of the Framework - reduce existing risks, prevent future growth of risks and build resilience. States are called upon to report on the status of these strategies and plan publicly and to promote debates on their implementation status. UNISDR is asked to update the HFA monitor, which will likely be updated in the interim period while the new set of indicators are developed through the work of the inter-governmental working group established by the GA. Finally, the national and local plan implementation will be reviewed in sub-regional, regional and Global Platform on DRR (Velasquez, 2015).

2. SIGNIFICANCE, CHALLENGES AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE SENDAI FRAMEWORK CONTENT FOR THE LOCAL LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS

As Sendai Framework accentuates the implantation and contribution of the local community and its authorities, credit is given to the local capacities. Therefore, an impact was made on the draft document in view of tailoring the document according to the local capacities, needs and challenges. “Cities are the first level of governance dealing with disaster risk reduction,” the position that the document stated was agreed upon by a body known as the Local Authorities Major Group. “Central governments must develop strategies together with local governments in order to build their capacities. This can only be done if [the] decentralization process in all countries is strengthened to give the necessary power and competences to local authorities.” (As quoted in Biron, 2015). Determining the global targets of the Sendai Framework, only one of seven - the global target e – covers challenges with local issues and it is quantitative and qualitative in the same time and should be partially measured by indicators. This target is dedicated to substantially increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020.

The Sendai Framework goals stress the role of four priorities at the local level addressing the increase in the number of local strategies and the involvement of the coordination mechanisms. The priorities are as follows: 1) Understanding disaster risk; 2) Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk; 3) Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience; and 4) Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction. Also, the guiding principles identify the value and role of the local level dedicated to the concept and implementation of the Sendai Framework. The analysis and correlation of those priorities

and principles was recently done by two authors (Culleton, 2015; Velasquez, 2015). It determinates suitably the roles of the local stakeholders.

The 1st priority includes the call for application of risk information in all dimensions, the call for collaboration of people at the local level, fostering partnership with the scientific, technological, academia and private sector in terms of sharing good practices and the call for supporting global and regional campaigns for public awareness and education. The Sendai Framework calls for national strategies for public education and awareness raising. The Sendai Framework also calls for an update to the DRR terminology. This priority corresponds with the action at local (and national) level dedicated to (g) Build the knowledge of government officials at all levels, civil society, communities and volunteers, as well as the private sector, through sharing experiences, lessons learned, good practices and training and education on disaster risk reduction, including the use of the existing training education mechanisms and peer learning, dedicated to capacity building within the community with providing education and information. Also, in terms of empowering the community with tools and platforms, the guiding principle (f) While the enabling, guiding and coordinating role of national and federal State Governments remains essential, it is necessary to empower local authorities and local communities to reduce disaster risk, including through resources, incentives and decision making responsibilities, as appropriate; addresses on two actions at local (and national) level: (c) Develop, update periodically and disseminate, as appropriate, location and disaster risk information, including risk maps, to decision makers, the general public and communities at risk of a disaster in an appropriate format by using, as applicable, geospatial information technology; and (f) Promote real-time access to reliable data, make use of space and in situ information, including geographic information systems (GIS), and use information and communications technology innovations to enhance measurement tools and data collection, analysis and dissemination.

The Sendai Framework includes within its 2nd priority calls for assessment and publicly reported progress on national and local DRR plans and promotion of debates on the plans. It calls on Governments to adopt and implement strategies and plans with targets, indicators and time frames, with the three elements of the goal. The Sendai Framework focuses on the assignment of roles and responsibilities to communities. The Sendai Framework promotes local platforms on DRR in addition to National Platforms. It calls for appointment of national focal points. The guiding principle (d) Disaster risk reduction requires an all of society engagement and partnership emphasizing the holistic approach (of whole community through partnership). This principle corresponds with the definition of the 2nd priority at the local (and national) level - (h) Empower local authorities, as appropriate, through regulatory and financial means, to work and coordinate with civil society, communities and indigenous peoples and migrants in disaster risk management at the local level. In that term, the role of non-state local actors (their commitment, goodwill, knowledge, experience and resources) plays an important role within the institutionally organized emergency management system. This holistic approach means huge and rational involvement of the civil society, volunteers, organized voluntary work organizations and community based organizations to participate, in collaboration with public institutions. Their roles, as stakeholders, mainly correspond with the task and duties for development and implementation of normative frameworks, standards and plans for disaster risk reduction; engage in the implementation of local plans and strategies: contribute to and support public awareness, a culture of prevention and education on disaster risk; and advocate for resilient communities and an inclusive, all-of-society

disaster risk management which strengthens the synergies across groups as appropriate. This relationship makes clear that knowledge sharing is the most important issue in DRR cooperation, as well as its emphasis of the need for public debate, multi-stakeholder involvement and democratization of the concepts of the DRR strategies.

The 4th priority is focused on critical infrastructure safety, public awareness and stockpiling for relief, capacity of workforce and volunteers on response, business continuity management, response and recovery exercises and evacuation drills, cooperation by stakeholders for reconstruction, and guidance on reconstruction and fostering learning from past practices. It also added focus on relocation of public facilities outside of the risk range, building capacities of the local authorities for evacuation and development of laws to support international cooperation and relief and recovery procedures. This priority, in terms of the capacity for building within the community by providing education and information, corresponds with two actions at the local (and national) level: (f) Train the existing workforce and voluntary workers in disaster response and strengthen technical and logistical capacities to ensure better response in emergencies...; and (d) ...stimulate a culture of prevention and strong community involvement in sustained public education campaigns...

The issues of voluntarism, as a very important part of citizens' involvement in the emergency management system, although it is highlighted, goes beyond the Sendai framework. The guiding principle (d) ... special attention should be paid to the improvement of organized voluntary work of citizens, treats the cooperation through volunteer groups within two different priorities:

- Priority 1, defined with actions at the local (and national) level: (o) Enhance collaboration among people at the local level to disseminate risk information through the involvement of community based organizations and non-governmental organizations.
- Priority 2, defined with actions at the local (and national) level: (h) Empower local authorities, as appropriate, through regulatory and financial means to work and coordinate with civil society, communities and indigenous peoples and migrants in disaster risk management at the local level;

The development of the voluntarism at the local level depends much more on the system, structuring and organization of the society, history and tradition in terms of organizing the civil protection and crisis management (emergency) systems. Sometimes the development of voluntarism may depend on the political will and seriousness of the local authorities relevant for the implementation of the institutional reforms. Raising the level of voluntarism very often cannot be achieved by incorporating provisions in the legislation, especially in countries that have serious problems with the implementation of legal provisions.

2.1 EU dimension

In order to provide more clear guidelines regarding the understanding, value and implementation of the Sendai Framework at **EU level** (by member states and communities), and following the EU principles and the UN concept of the Sendai Framework, in the middle of 2016 the EU adopted "Action Plan on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030: A disaster risk-informed approach for all EU policies". This approach confirms the position and perspective of the EU, perceiving the Sendai Framework as an opportunity to develop a disaster risk-informed approach for all EU policies.

The 2nd priority is strongly linked to a number of existing EU actions on civil protection (such as risk management planning, capability assessment, peer reviews) and on humanitarian aid (local and community coordination, capacity building). There are also linkages with environmental management and cross border cooperation, including through cohesion and development policies... The 4th priority addresses issues covered by the civil protection policy (such as early warning, training, exercises, sharing response capacities, host nation support and the European Medical Corps), humanitarian aid (EU Aid Volunteers, early action and local responses), environmental protection and development policies (EC, 2016). The Sendai Framework provides an opportunity to adapt EU policies to the EU's interests and purposes, its states and communities, using the current and future EU crisis management instruments as part of the national security policies and the European Union External Action Service (EEAS) conceptualization.

Some supporting UN actions help the implementation of the Sendai Framework, its priorities, guiding principles and targets. It largely aids the document's dissemination and better understanding by the emergency community at the local level. In order to intensify the interagency and international cooperation at all levels in DRR matters, the UN, as the leading party in DRR's area worldwide, solved the recognized need of policy makers and practitioners. Therefore, in 2009 - in the middle of HFA implementation, the UN produced the handbook of DRR terminology (UNISDR 2009). Meanwhile, there is an ongoing attempt (started in 2016) for redefining and upgrading of the preliminary terminology. In addition to this more precise UN terminology, the rest of the terminology is defined within UN documents. The definition¹ of hazard within HFA (UNISDR, 2005) is a good example how terminology started to develop and keeps its continuity as part of its successor - the Sendai Framework.

3. UNDERSTANDING AND PERSPECTIVE OF THE SENDAI FRAMEWORK BY THE PRACTITIONERS

Explaining the implications of a broader scope of hazards in the Sendai Framework, Velasquez gives two perspectives. From a disaster risk management perspective, this would mean increased collaboration with government institutions dealing with health and man-made hazards. From a risk understanding perspective, this would mean an update of hazard databases and an integration of these additional hazards in the calculation of risks (Velasquez, 2015). The practitioners understand much better the so called "operative perspective" of their work. In the Sendai Framework's case, it is addressed in the way how to transform actions defined within each of its four priorities, targets and priorities, into (institutional) standard operative procedures and protocols. In general, the practitioners understand less and believe more that the Sendai Framework mostly refers to the activities aimed to cope with climate change, as well as that it belongs more to the field of environment, rather than security, i.e. crisis management, protection and rescue. Most of them do not know that we have a cross-sectoral approach in this case.

¹ A potentially damaging physical event, phenomenon or human activity that may cause the loss of life or injury, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation. Hazards can include latent conditions that may represent future threats and can have different origins: natural (geological, hydro-meteorological and biological) or induced by human processes (environmental degradation and technological hazards).

Thus, the role and importance of institutional capacity, their development and sustainability is largely relativized.

On the other side, climate is perhaps the paramount new disaster-related concern — one that is faced by poor countries and urban areas in particular, and thus one that has massive potential to influence development gains... Urban areas today are facing most significant losses. Some 80 percent of the world's largest cities are considered vulnerable to severe damage from earthquakes and 60 percent from tsunamis... The impact of a changing climate, meanwhile, has yet to be fully understood (Biron, 2015). Therefore, within local DRR strategies and plans, especially within prevention and mitigation measures, the local policy makers are mainly focused on taking investment (hard) measures, where more relevant is the expertise provided by the environmental, health and civil engineering experts, rather than the expertise in soft measures (as training is) provided by security and public safety specialists.

CONCLUSION

As the Sendai Framework has been adopted recently, it should be subject of critique or evaluation, as it happened with the comprehensive independent evaluations of the Hyogo Framework carried out at the local level (in 2009 and 2011). This is a very important issue, as it is well known that most of the UN processes use “top-down” approaches. It is not the best way to hear the voices of the practitioners of the local emergency management structure.

The concept of the Sendai Framework does not allow an absolute measurability of the seven global targets by indicators - keeping in mind that only the first three are qualitative and the rest of them are quantitative and qualitative at the same time. Only one of them is dominantly addressed to the local level.

Most of the countries and local communities, especially those that are not part of the developed world, have severe challenges to understand the importance and to implement the Sendai Framework targets at the local level. Also, most of them do not consider the Sendai Framework as a cross-sectoral document which emphasizes the need for institutional growth, large citizens' involvement and an increase of the range of cooperation on all levels.

In general, the Sendai Framework opens an opportunity for understanding disaster risk and measures and how to manage them, with clear guidelines for all involved parties. In the upcoming period, beside the problem of understanding the document content, the local emergency capacities will challenge how to transform the Sendai Framework into relevant and concrete actions (tasks and measures) that should be taken in all phases of crisis management.

REFERENCES

- Andjelkovic, I. (2001). Guidelines on Non-Structural Measures in Urban Flood Management (Technical Documents in Hydrology). Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from UNESCO: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001240/124004e.pdf>
- Biron, C.L. (2015). *New disaster-risk framework seen as first step toward sustainability*. Washington DC: Citiscope. Retrieved from Citiscope: <http://citiscope.org/habitatIII/news/2015/03/new-disaster-risk-framework-seen-first-step-toward-sustainability>

- Blanksby, B. (2013). *Flood Resilient City, The development and management of structural and non-structural flood treatment measures*. Sheffield, UK: Pennine Water Group, University of Sheffield. Retrieved from FRC project: <http://www.floodresiliencycity.eu/frc-output/168/2-the-development-and-management-of-structural-and-non-structural-flood-treatment-measures-in-frc>
- Coppola, D.P. (2006). *Introduction to International Disaster Management*. Burlington: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Culleton, E. (2015). *New UN global framework for disaster risk reduction contains social media*. Brisbane: Emergency 2.0 Wiki. Retrieved from Emergency 2.0 Wiki: <http://emergency20wiki.org/20150325/new-un-global-framework-for-disaster-risk-reduction-contains-social-media>
- European Commission (EC). (2016). *Action Plan on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030: A disaster risk-informed approach for all EU policies*. Commission Staff Working Document. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/sendai_swd_2016_205_0.pdf
- Hsueh-Sheng, C. and Hsin-Ying, H. (2013). An exploratory study on land use planning of disaster prevention: A case study of Kaohsiung new town. *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 17, 382 – 391. doi: 10.1016/j.proenv.2013.02.051
- Kapucu, N., Hawkins, C.V., and Rivera, F.I. (2013). Emerging Research in Disaster Resiliency and Sustainability: Implications for Policy and Practice. In N. Kapucu, C. Hawkins, and F.I. Rivera (Eds.), *Disaster Resiliency: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 355-358). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Platt S. (2015). A decision-making model of disaster resilience and recovery (Paper Presented on SECED 2015 Conference: Earthquake Risk and Engineering towards a Resilient World, 9-10 July 2015). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Architectural Research. Retrieved from Cambridge Architectural Research: <http://www.carltd.com/sites/carwebsite/files/CAR%20Platt%20Disaster%20decision%20making.pdf>
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). (2005). *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. Extract from the final report of the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (A/CONF.206/6). Geneva. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/2005/wcdr/intergover/official-doc/L-docs/Hyogo-framework-for-action-english.pdf>
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). (2009). *UNISDR Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. Geneva. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology>
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 - 2030*. Geneva. Available at: <http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/43291>
- Velasquez, J. (2015). *A Guide to Reading the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*. Mountain View, California: LinkedIn. Retrieved from LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/guide-reading-sendai-framework-disaster-risk-jerry-velasquez>