DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT CONCEPT IN REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA,
CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE
By
Metodi Hadji-Janev and Vlatko Jovanovski

Abstract

Contemporary Macedonian disaster risk management concept follows the idea promoted by the UN and the Hyogo Framework of Action for 2005 – 2015. It has been envisioned to have three core functions: disaster risk reduction, disaster response and disaster recovery.
Paper aims to identify the issues from the operational design of the Macedonian model for disaster risk management and accordingly to propose solutions. Based heavily on the concept of civil defense Macedonian concept preserved the top-down approach, centralized planning and execution with emphasized Government role during execution. However, the process of decentralization and fiscal empowerment of the municipalities in combination with the growth of the private sector, are current trends that poses significant challenges to the overall philosophy and system's operational success. These present trends must be recognized and addressed accordingly first of all with legislation reform but more important with presenting vision and leadership for the process. The paper analyses national legislation with logical and observational criteria of disaster risk management model in Macedonia.
We examine "real-life" relations between the central and local authorities in Macedonia, identify legal constraints of the system and then analyze the discrepancy between formal and functional in the Macedonian disaster risk management. Bearing in mind that most of the Balkan states share similar if not equal legacy we believe that recommendation for improvement of Macedonia' disaster risk management could serve as background that will be applicable to the rest of the Region.

        Key words: risk, disaster management, Macedonia, decentralization,

1. Introduction

Existing disaster risk management concept in Republic of Macedonia is built on the idea promoted by the UN and the Hyogo Framework of Action for 2005 – 2015. Nevertheless the existing concept, like in rest of the South East European countries is highly influenced by the concept of civil defense approach with emphasized Government role during execution. Precisely closer view to the operational design of the concept of Macedonian disaster risk management will exemplify centralized planning and execution. The issue rises further from the fact that according to the existing legislation the two main authorities Crisis Management Center (CMC) and the Protection and Rescue Directorate (PRD) do not share the same conceptual and methodological approach. We argue that this could cause serious consequences if disaster risk management has to be fully employed.

Therefore to fully understand existing challenges regarding the actual disaster risk management in Macedonia we will first explore it legacy. Notion that the current disaster risk management is inspired by the UN and the Hyogo Framework of Action, the article will first address general trends in this field and link them to the Macedonian case. Specifically we will debate the influence of globalization and the process of transition to disaster risk management. Then the article will get in to the in-depth analysis of the existing legislation regarding the disaster risk and reduction. Finally we will explore operational issues and propose appropriate recommendations.

2. From civil defense through civil protection toward disaster risk management: the evolution of concept and its influence to practice

Modern understanding of disaster risk management traces its roots in the early ages of last century. Although early writings were focused on human behavior (dominance of the social science influence) during natural disasters much of the interest sank under the military projects trying to find solution for better civil defense (Quarantelli, 2000). Gradually the concept of civil defense evolved into management of civilian populations in the face of actual or potential aggression (Alexander, 2002). The golden age of the civil defense is the Cold War era when massive infrastructure was build first of all to protect key government officials and the population from nuclear attack. Due to the fact that it was a concept that emerged from the idea to protect people in cases of war (nuclear or conventional), it was logically that military and paramilitary methods for its management were utilized. Consequently this meant creating strict hierarchical structures, usually under the Ministry of Defense, imposing culture of secrecy excluding any form of public participation in the decision making process.

Even though tensions between the two major power blocks were decreasing in the 70's of the past century, the number of natural and technological disasters was increasing. Accordingly the casualties, material damages and economic losses were significant. Soon it became clear that the concept of civil defense alone could not produce appropriate response. Existing challenges along with the dominant influence of social sciences had urged greater public participation in dealing with the disasters. Hence greater public participation meant lessening hierarchical structures, increased information shearing and coordination which in fact borne civil protection concept gradually different from the concept of civil defense (Alexander, 2002).

According to some views concept differentiations is also geographically determined. Quarantelli (2000) argues that as civil protection emerged from the concept of civil defense in the early 70's it is more used in Europe today than in USA. On the other side of the Atlantic the shift from civil defense was towards emergency management or disaster planning. On the other hand Baldi (1995) claims that emergency management has a wider meaning than civil protection. It encompasses all of the four main activities: mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery while civil protection implies interest mainly on response and recovery and not so much on preparedness and mitigation activities.

Today we speak about disaster risk management, promoted by the UN and the Hyogo Framework of Action for 2005 – 2015 as a concept that gives attention to risk reduction by focusing on five priorities. Those priorities are: ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority; identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning; use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels; reduce the underlying risk factors, by "mainstreaming" activities into many development sectors and program areas and strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

This short overview was given with one intention and that is to show that the field of disaster management is in constant shift and development. The point of understanding of the above mention concepts largely influence practice on the ground as well as policy development. Former is especially important to the countries from South East Europe (SEE) for two reasons. First, like the rest of the world SEE's countries have been largely influenced by the process of globalization and technological development. Second, ideological transition has unique effects over the SEE countries' disaster management. We argue that among other these two processes in particular have contributed to the existing organizational structure and challenges that exist in the Macedonian disaster management system.

For the purpose of this paper the term crisis management mentioned further done in the text should be seen trough the lenses of disaster risk management meaning disaster risk reduction, response and recovery to natural and technological disasters.

3. Evolution of Macedonian civil defense and civil protection in to crisis management system in the age of globalization and the process of transition

3.1. Influence of globalization

The end of the Cold War and the collapse of communism have opened the door for the process of globalization. Supported by technological development globalization as "*One Big Thing*" became a driving force in international affairs (Friedman, 2000: xxi). Soon after the end of the Cold War it became obvious that this tectonic shift is in fact an international system with its own rules and logic that influences the geopolitics and economics of virtually every country in the world.

Top down and bottom up character of globalization have both influence Macedonian society like the rest of the World. Horizontal collaborations across geographical, political, and cultural boundaries were soon established thanks to considerably lowered costs of communication associated with new technologies. As a result the new cheaper collaborations have destroyed hierarchical structures predominantly organized and run by state. Thus many of the critical lever that where previously owned and run by state are now owned by the private sector. Like anywhere in the World this has led either to improvement of existing systems or towards development of modern systems and services that improve our life (Wolf, 2004:317). Nevertheless many of these systems and services were largely modernized or like in the rest of the World developed in security vacuums.

The architects of reconstructed (renewed) or developed networks and infrastructures were mainly concerned with profit. In fact, the cost reduction and efficiency was their highest priority. At the same time the growing dependence on these networks had not been matched by parallel focus on their security. On a contrary as Flynn (2004: x) argues "…security considerations have been widely perceived as annoying speed bumps in achieving their goals". Arguably to the certain degree this is true for Macedonia too and had especially affected the crisis management system. Shift in ownership of many firms did not go together with the obligations towards the state and national security. However, what had far more significantly affected crisis management system in Macedonia like in the rest of the SEE was the process of transition.

3.2. The process of transition and security management

The process of transition has shaken all levels of society. The former civil defense and civil protection along with the public corporate organizational structures build to respond in time of emergency remained unattended. During the early days of transition the old recruiting and mobilization systems were not updated and did not reflect the reality. Transition has also affected former state organized corporate security in the context of critical infrastructure. In this context corporate security and centralized system of protection of the critical infrastructure built under the overall defense system umbrella simply vanished.

Process of democratization in Macedonia along with the transition introduced civil control inside security sector following the western liberal and democratic patterns. This caused an earthquake inside the security sector for two reasons. *First*, it meant transition in the approach and the mentality of the security sector. Centralized security system ran by military and police professionals in specific parts and supported by strategic reserve and territorial defense, switched to decentralized, civilian control type security sector. *Second*, moving to the opposite extreme, the new civilian leaders (ministers) without experience in the security sector and without any strategic planning dramatically cut-off the funds for security and introduced inappropriate defense and security budget and logistic management. These early mistakes made as a result of inexperience, dried out some of the existing infrastructure and created security and legal vacuums.

Nevertheless the process and the crisis management system had begun to heal after the overall transition in security and defense system had stabilized. Improvements have been made in legislation and in organizational design. Today following the political decision and Euro-Atlantic waves civil defense and civil protection in Macedonia flow under the crisis management system. Although this expansion on conceptual and organizational bases marks success in legal context there serious challenges that rises from the practice on the ground. Therefore we will first address legal framework and than the discussion will expand on the conceptual and operational challenges.

4. Macedonian legal framework of the crisis management system

Macedonian legal framework for crisis management resides on a concept that reconciles both the old socialist responsive type approach and the new comprehensive approach. Thus the effects of the processes of transition and globalization could arguably be recognized here too. Following the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005) and the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN ISDR) Macedonian Government has decided to comply with the UN oriented disaster risk reduction process.

A closer view to the existing Macedonian legislation shows that legal framework of disaster management consists of two groups of laws and regulations. First, laws and regulations that directly regulate this area and second, laws and regulations that indirectly locate responsibilities and describe appropriate actions.

4.1. The laws and regulations for disaster management with direct applicability

The Law on Crisis management (The Official Gazette of R.M no.29 /05) and the Law on Protection and Rescue (The Official Gazette of R.M no.36/04,49/04,86/08,18/11) contain provisions that directly regulate disaster management.

4.1.1. The Law on Crisis management

The Law on Crisis Management-(TLCM) introduces the terms "crisis" defined as an event that threatens basic values, long term and vital interests and goals of the state jeopardizing the constitutional order and security of the Republic of Macedonia. TLCM stipulates:

- Organization and functioning of the crisis management system;
- Decision-making and resource utilization;
- Communication, coordination and cooperation;
- Planning and financing and
- An assessment of the security risk to the Republic of Macedonia.

TLCM comprehensive approach comes from the fact that it locates responsibilities over crisis management in different stakeholders. The crisis management system include: State administrative bodies and authorities (the Assembly, President and Government), Armed Forces, protection and rescue forces, municipalities and the city of Skopje. TLCM also assumes that that public enterprises and institutions as well as private companies can take part in prevention, early warning and handling of crises.

According to the Law Macedonian crisis management concept has three circles. Steering Committee and the Assessment Group constitutes the first circle. Steering Committee is composed

of the respected ministers for Interior, Transport and Communications, Foreign Affairs, Health, Defense, and the Head of the Assessment Group. Since modern crisis can be complex in nature TLCM permits flexibility so other heads of relevant State administrative bodies and experts can also be included in the work of the Steering Committee.

The Assessment Group is permanent governmental body that performs constant assessment of the risks and dangers to the security of the Republic of Macedonia. According to the assessment this body proposes measures and activities for prevention, early warning and management of possible crisis. The Group delivers its works, recommendations and conclusions to the President of the Republic, Prime Minister, President of the Assembly and the Steering Committee.

Second circle according to the TLCM starts with the Crisis Management Centre-(CMC). The Centre has both strategic planning and operational functions. CMC holds the strategic position within the Macedonian crisis management system. As independent governmental agency CMC is in charge of coordination of crisis management activities upon declared crisis situation. This includes inter-departmental and international cooperation and consultations for the purpose of crisis management.

Furthermore, the CMC is in charge of the preparing and updating of a unified assessment of all risks and hazards that pose a threat to the security of the state, and proposing of measures and activities for preventing and resolving future crisis. Beside strategic role CMC is dual headed since TLCM gives the CMC operational role in the national crisis management system again upon declare crisis situation by the Government. Within the CMC, there is General Headquarters (HQ) activated in those situations with mandate to coordinate single state response.

The operational role of CMC fully comes to light when according to the Law it delegates crisis management responsibility by establishing further 35 regional crisis management centers. These centers serve as an extended body of CMC and through them CMC monitors situations, exchange information and data, make and prepare assessments. According to TLCM these centers inform and broadcast alerts to the population accordingly. For further command and control regional centers have Regional HQs. Finally, the regional crisis management centers are grouped into eight major CMS regions.

In the event of a major emergency a crisis situation can be declared if there is a significant threat to the life or health of the people or the animals, danger to material goods or the security of the Republic as a whole or a part of it. The formal decision to declare a crisis situation is made by the Government, which also determines the specific area of intervention and activates the mechanisms for crisis solving. Once such a decision is adopted, the Government informs the Assembly and the President of the Republic of Macedonia. Maximum duration of declared crisis is 30 days. If the situation is not improved the Government asks approval from the Parliament to extend the period of crisis or declare state of emergency or war.

Additional responsibility according to TLCM for CMC is the issue of timely information and early warning. To appropriately deliver necessary information-alert, the CMC establishes a cooperation network with a number of institutions and crisis management system stakeholders. In that regard, there is particularly close cooperation with wide range of national institutions responsible for monitoring hydro-meteorological, seismic and radiological hazards.

4.1.2. The Law on Protection and Rescue

Law on Protection and Rescue (TLPR) establishes the system for protection and rescue of people and material goods against natural and technological disasters in peace time, state of emergency or war. This system is realized true interlinked activities of planning, financing, coordination, mitigation of consequences, preparedness and response to natural and technological disasters. Protection and Rescue Directorate (PRD) is leading governmental body with authority to organize and implement this system. TLPR indicates how responsibilities are divided between the participants in protection and rescue activities, including the State, local authorities, private companies, and public enterprises, facilities and services. The law regulates the division of responsibilities in accord with the provisions in the Local Self-Government Law which further gives responsibilities and obligations for protection and rescue to the municipalities.

In the system of protection and rescue in Republic of Macedonia, the citizen has the central role. In that direction, there are three levels of protection that are provided. On the first level protection is secured and organized by the local municipalities. The main responsibilities of the local municipalities are planning and developing risk assessments and response plans and establishing firm structure for effective and efficient response in any time and to any situation. The main pillars, available to the local municipalities in that direction are the Territorial Firefighting Units-TFFU, local police, ambulances and public enterprises.

The second level of protection is organized and performed by the Government with the PRD as responsible authority. In the process of performing its duties, the PRD, uses its republic units for protection and rescue. These units have active and reserve component. The active component is composed by the employees of the PRD and the fast response teams. The reserve component is made by citizens enlisted by the Ministry of defense, dominantly mail population with basic military training gained in the previous system when army obligation was mandatory. This level of protection is activated in cases when the local municipality's resources are overwhelmed and the mayor is asking for additional assistance. On this level key role is played by the 35 local offices of the PRD which serve as facilitator of the local level preparedness activities. As part of the prevention strategy specialized Department for inspection is functioning within PRD responsible for monitoring the implementation of the legal framework of the system for protection and rescue, authorized to sanction any misbehavior. Similar to the crisis management system established with the TLCM, whenever PRD engages its units for dealing with a certain situation HQ for protection and rescue is activated. On state level there is the Main HQ and on level of local municipalities there are Local HQs.

Third level of protection is the one offered by the international community. According to the TLPR in cases of major disasters when all the national capacities are exhausted, the Head of PRD as commander of the Main HQ for rescue and protection can suggest to the Government to ask for international assistance.

In order the above mentioned functions of the system to be performed successfully preparation and planning activities are necessary. In that direction TLPR operates with several strategic documents:

1. National Strategy for rescue and protection- adopted by the Parliament every 5 years
2. National Risk Assessment – adopted by the Government and
3. National Plan for rescue and protection – adopted by the Government.

These strategic documents are the pillars of the protection and rescue system. They give vision for the future development of the system, they allocate resources and they promote participation and ownership of the process.

4.2. The Laws and regulations that indirectly regulate the crisis management system in Republic of Macedonia

Network of laws regarding the indirect regulation of responsibilities and duties for effective crisis management system in Republic of Macedonia gravitate over the, Ministry of interior (The Official Gazette of R.M no.92/09), Ministry of defense (The Official Gazette of R.M no.8/92, and no.5/03, 06 and 08), Ministry of transport and communication (The Official Gazette of RM", No. 40/07, and No. 92/07, No.114/09, No. 83/10, No. 140/10, No. 55/07, No.26/09, No. 22/10, No.14/07, No.55/07, No.98/08, No.83/10 No.48/10, No.24/07, No.103/08, No.67/10), Directorate for protection of classified information (The Official Gazette of RM", No.9/04). All of these documents include acts defining the responsibilities of the government authorities in case of emergencies as well as legislation dealing with issues (such as technical IT security for example).

International legislation further facilitates legal background for the crisis management system in Republic of Macedonia. This is understandable since cyber-security and environmental protection are on the security agenda in most of the international organizations to whom Republic of Macedonia is party. In this context many international organizations are dealing with this challenge and have taken steps to raise awareness, establish international partnerships, and agree on common rules and practices. European Union (EU), the Forum of Incident Response and Security Teams (FIRST), the G8 Group, NATO, the OECD, the United Nations (UN), and the World Bank Group. See for example: UN Resolution 57/239 of December 2002, where the UN General Assembly outlined elements for creating a global culture of cyber-security, inviting member states and all relevant international organizations to take account of them in their preparations for the summit. In December 2003, UN Resolution 58/199 further emphasized the promotion of a global culture of cyber-security and the protection of critical information infrastructures.

One could observe this legislative in two directions. First, obligations incorporated from Macedonian's membership of these organizations (or willingness to join). In this context further legislative support comes from the fact that almost all critical infrastructures rely on energy and telecommunications for support. Second, most of the services that provide this support in Macedonia are owned or operated on a commercial basis (foreign private enterprises).

Consequently, all bilateral and multilateral agreements in this regards have to be considered. Since these corporations in Macedonia run their security based on Macedonian private security agencies from legal point of view, one should also take into account the Act for security of property and personnel.

5. From theory to practice: Macedonian disaster management in context

In the attempt to make an analysis of the present legal framework of the model for disaster management in Republic of Macedonia we limited ourselves in this paper only on the main laws, one for crisis management and the other for protection and rescue. The objective of the analysis is to identify crucial aspects in the legislation, explain their consequences and propose possible way forward.

In that context we have identified two main issues. The first one is the aspect of integration understood as implementation of consistent and achievable policies (McEntire, 2004). We will exemplify this concept regarding the obligation for developing risk assessment stipulated in both of the laws. Risk assessment is the first step and probably the crucial function in contemporary disaster risk management. The process usually ends up with a document from where the decision maker can understand: What can happen in a certain community? How likely is that to happen? What are the possible consequences? Based on the risk assessment mitigation and preparedness activities are planned and performed. Both, TLCM and TLPR are prescribing the obligation for risk assessment. However there is a conceptual difference between the two approaches that reflects negatively in the implementation phase on the ground while employing crisis management system. To simplify it, TLCM asks for all hazard risk assessment, conducted by special methodology and the obligation is exclusive only for local municipalities. On the other hand TLPR requests development of risk assessment for natural and technological hazards, conducted by different methodology and the obligation lies to all public and private institutions including local municipalities. The situation is getting more complicated in the industry sector with the obligation to implement the EU SEVESO directive that requires quite complex process of planning and preparedness activities in the area of industrial accidents. For the rest of the private sector the legislator didn't succeed to give specific guidelines about how this process of risk assessment should be conducted. Therefore we end up in a situation where a small bookshop with 2 employees is obligated to develop risk assessment and according to that emergency plan as well as an Information Technology company with 100 employees. This legal misfortune of the disaster management model inevitably hinders the process of performing risk assessments in practice and clearly shows the remains of the previous system where these matters were dealt with authoritarian style unwilling to see changing reality.

The remedy of the situation is of course one risk assessment, conducted by one accepted methodology and intended mainly for the public sector and the local municipalities and exempting the private sector (this doesn't imply to SEVESO). The obligation towards the private sector should be transformed towards business continuity planning. Business continuity plans (BCP)

should build capacities of a certain private company in order to tackle pressing needs with maximum efficiency and speed but with scarce resources and in the absence of necessary information. BCP ultimate goal are to improve resilience of organization's business to interruptions. In that direction disaster management authorities should offer training and guidelines to the private sector on the benefit of preparing the business for unwanted events. Memories are still fresh from 9/11 when Morgan Stanley investment in reserve office location turned to be crucial for the business to survive those horrible moments. Deutsche Bank in Germany in the moment is also very active on developing its business continuity program striving to protect the franchise, its reputation and safeguard revenues from different risks mainly terrorist threats. COSMOTE in Greece is also receiving a lot of international credit for its business continuity programs. Although these examples are referring to big companies business continuity plans are more essential to small and medium companies due to limited capacities to bounce back after an emergency. Translating disaster management to the private sector using their language of money, interest is a good tool to reduce their apathy towards planning for future calamities. However BCP are only semi useful if there are no community emergency plans. The idea is that they should complement each other. Additionally, business continuity as a concept can also be applied to local municipalities preparedness planning. Just because there is an emergency in the municipality it doesn't have to mean that citizens should be exempt from receiving basic services.

The second issue is organizational and mainly addresses the aspect of parallel structures for command and control of operations during major emergencies. According to TLCM if a crisis is declared the overall responsibility lies with the HQs' developed for the needs of the crisis management system. In case of emergency but still not declared as crisis and when the local municipality capacities are overwhelmed TLPR stipulates that the operational lead is with the HQs' of the protection and rescue system. What will happen if an emergency occurs, the protection and rescue HQ is activated and than a crisis is declared? There are no guidelines for this situation or standing operating procedures that will demystify the roles and responsibilities of the main actors. The irony of this solution is that the composition of institutions/people in both of the different HQs is the same.

We see the remedy in establishing unified system for incident management. The concept of Incident Command Systems is widely known and proven as efficient. It is based on the principle of "lead-agency" and "support function" principle (Alexander, 2008). The "lead agency" means that during an emergency there is one main source of coordination on the ground. It is usually represented by the police, but firefighters and medical services are also utilized solutions as well. The support function means that any additional assistance builds up on the coordination structure put in place. Modern disaster response is based on allocation of resources, coordination and support of the professionals. In that direction on local level the mayor has to have the leading role first of all in declaring state of emergency in his/her area of jurisdiction which will allow him to utilize all the necessary resources in dealing with the calamity. Those resources should than be available to the Incident Commander (Police, Firefighter or Medical) for operational management with the situation. In the same time declaring emergency situation by the mayor should be alarm

for activating the national HQ for emergency operations. Activation of the national HQ should not be understood as substitution of the local HQ. Under contrary, the national HQ should have supporting and supplementing function. Creating one HQ for emergency operations on national level will give added value to the system by saving time and money in the response phase. In that direction protection and rescue units developed and trained by the state will be used as supplement to the local efforts. Giving the opportunity to the local municipalities to deal with the emergencies by themselves first of all is an act of respect towards their efforts, second it is a serious responsibility that will require their fully commitment especially in the preparation and mitigation phase and last but not least local knowledge is essential for successful disaster management.

6. Conclusion

Global trends in evolution from civil defense through civil protection toward crisis management have influenced current Macedonian disaster management. Like in the rest of the World globalization has also played its role in evolution of the Macedonian concept of disaster management. However process of transition has left specific marks on the existing disaster management model in Republic of Macedonia.

Following the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005) and the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN ISDR) Macedonian Government has decided to comply with the UN oriented disaster risk reduction process. This decision along with the effects of globalization and transition has among other influenced legal framework for disaster management system in Macedonia. Following the patterns of wider civilian involvement in crisis management current legislation is a compromise between old and new approach in this field. As a result national legislature contains both direct and indirect laws and regulations that regulate duties and responsibilities regarding crisis management system.

Although at first glance legislation gives hope that existing disaster management system is well designed closer view will exemplify two main issues. First one is regarding the risk assessment approach. This legal misfortune of the disaster management model inevitably hinders the process of performing risk assessments in practice and clearly shows the remains of the previous system where these matters were dealt with hieratical-centralized style unwilling to see evolving reality. The remedy of the situation is of course one risk assessment, conducted by one accepted methodology and intended mainly for the public sector and the local municipalities and exempting the private sector. The second issue is organizational and mainly addresses the aspect of parallel structures for command and control of operations during major emergencies. Largely influenced by the previous issue the recommendation to overcome organizational issue derives from idea of effective decentralization which in time of complex environment and relationship among all stakeholders will end in better disaster management. Ultimately failing to improve existing challenges could cause catastrophic results that no one wants to see.

We chose to focus our analysis only on these two issues with the assumptions that opening them it will trigger series of events that eventually will lead to improvement of the systems as a whole. If

the issue of risk assessment is open for transformation in the legal texts it will inevitably open questions of how do we do planning in general, do we see it as a process or as end result, how do we combine scientific knowledge with risk perception etc. Also if the issue of command and control during response operation is open for discussion as well we will definitely have to address topics like coordination and communication, information and knowledge shearing, effectiveness and efficiency. Opening debate about all of these issues will eventually lead to sound solutions and improvement of the system.

As we reach the final years of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 as a signatory country we have responsibility to analyze series of issues in order to contribute to the development of process. What after Hyogo is question that is asked now in 2012 and Republic of Macedonia has a lot to say on it. Recently the Federal Emergency Management Agency in USA published a report with a purpose to understand what will be the challenges in disaster management until 2030(FEMA,2012). Cuts in operational budgets for disaster management due to the global economic crisis, effects of the climate change, massive urbanization and new emerging threats will continue to be a challenge not only for FEMA but in general. Republic of Macedonia must recognize these aspects and adapt to the new conditions in timely manner. With this paper we have made a modest attempt towards that process.

References

Alexander, D., 2008, Emergency Command Systems and Major Earthquake Disasters, JSEE, Vol.10, No.3

Alexander, D., 2002, From civil defense to civil protection - and back again, Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol.11, No.3

Baldi, B., 1995, Emergency preparedness policy making: A comparative analysis between California and Italy, Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware, Delaware

Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2012, Crisis Response and Disaster Resilience 2030: Forging Strategic Action in an Age of uncertainty, available at:
http://search.fema.gov/search?q=strategic+foresight+initiative&btnG=Go&sort=date%3AD%3AL%3Ad1&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&client=fema&proxystylesheet=fema&site=fema

Flynn, S., 2004, America the Vulnerable, New York: Harper Collins, p. x,

Friedman, L. T., 2000, The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, p. xxi

McEntire, D.A., 2004, The status of emergency management theory: Issues, barriers and recommendations for improved scholarship, Emergency Administration and Planning, Department of Public Administration, University of North Texas

Quarantelli, E. L.,2000, Disaster planning, emergency management and civil protection: The historical development of organized efforts to plan for and to respond to disasters, Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware, Delaware

The Official Gazette of R.M (No.8/92, No.5/03, No.9/04, No. 36/04, No. 29/05, No.14/07, No.24/07, No. 55/07, No.92/07, No.117/07, No.98/08, No.103/08, No.26/09, No.92/09, No.114/09, No. 22/10, No. 36/10, No.48/10, No.67/10, No. 83/10, No. 140/10)

Wolf, M., 2004, *Why Globalization Works*, Yale University Press,

About the authors:

Metodi Hadji-Janev (PhD) was borne 15 June 1976 in Stip Macedonia. Lieutenant Colonel Metodi Hadji-Janev (PhD) had spent almost 12 years of service as Special Forces officer in Macedonian Special Forces. In 2003 LtC Metodi Hadji-Janev (PhD) was deployed as commander of Macedonian Special task forces in Iraq. He is the author of the book "Iraqi Freedom: The Road to Babylon" and author of numerous articles related to the International law, organized crime and international terrorism. Since January 2011 Hadji-Janev (PhD) has been assigned as the head of Social science department at the Military Academy in Skopje and Co-director of Intelligence sharing course in NATO Center of excellence-Defense Against Terrorism in Ankara Turkey.

Vlatko Jovanovski was born 7 September 1978 in Sveti Nikole, Macedonia. He has a Bachelor degree in law from the University St.Cyril and Methodius –Skopje since October 2002. In 2004 , successfully completed the qualification and specialization for Officers for legal service with the land forces of the Army of Republic of Macedonia at the national Military Academy. In 2006 he starts working for the Protection and Rescue Directorate and that is his current working environment. In the moment he is a student at the masters program for disaster management at the University of Copenhagen.