

**Table S1.** Comparison between the spatial planning constraints of the previous and current wildfire management systems.

<b>Defense System of Forest against Wildfires (DSFW)</b> <b>Decree-Law n.º 124/2006, June 28<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>Integrated Management System for Rural Fires (IMSRF)</b> <b>Decree-Law n.º 82/2021, October 13<sup>th</sup></b>
<b>WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT PLANS</b>	
Obligation to define Municipal Forest Defense Plans against Wildfires.	The previous plans have to be replaced by the Municipal Programs for the Implementation of Integrated Management of Rural Fires.
<b>WILDFIRE HAZARD MAP IN SPATIAL PLANS</b>	
Integration of the hazard map in the constraints map of the spatial plans.	The same as DSFW.
<b>WILDFIRE HAZARD CLASSES AND URBAN SPACES</b>	
The hazard map was not applied to consolidated built-up areas.	The hazard map does not apply to urban space (under reclassification in spatial plans) and rural settlements.
<b>BUILDING PERMIT CONSTRAINTS IN HIGH AND VERY WILDFIRE HAZARD CLASSES</b>	
<p>Outside the consolidated built-up areas, the building construction was not permitted in high and very high hazard areas.</p> <p><i>Exceptions:</i>            Construction intended for exclusive use in agriculture, livestock, aquaculture, fish farming, forestry, energy production, and exploitation of geological resources (<i>criteria: absence of alternative relocation outside areas with high and very high hazard, defensible space of 100 m, demonstration that they are not intended for residential or tourist use, among others</i>).</p>	<p>In rustic space and outside rural settlements, the building construction is not permitted in high and very high hazard areas.</p> <p><i>Exceptions:</i>            Construction intended for exclusive use in agriculture, livestock, aquaculture, fish farming, forestry, energy production, and exploitation of geological resources (<i>criteria: absence of alternative relocation outside areas with high and very high hazard, defensible space of 100 m, demonstration that they are not intended for residential or tourist use, among others</i>).</p> <p>Building conservation.</p> <p>Construction of buildings with little urbanistic relevance, like shacks, walls, etc..</p> <p>Reconstruction of buildings intended for permanent own housing or economic activity with recognized municipal interest (<i>criteria: absence of alternative relocation outside areas with high and very high hazard, defensible space of 50 m, implantation distance from the property limit higher than 50 m, among others</i>).</p> <p>Others</p>

<b>BUILDING PERMIT CONSTRAINTS IN VERY LOW, LOW AND VERY WILDFIRE HAZARD CLASSES</b>	
Outside the consolidated built-up areas, there is allowed:	In rustic space and outside rural settlements, there is allowed:
<p>Construction of new buildings and the expansion of existing ones (<i>criteria in forest, shrubland or pastures: the distance to the property limit of a protection strip of never less than 50 m, among others; criteria in order land uses: the distance to the property limit of a protection strip of at least 10 m, among others</i>).</p> <p>Construction of new buildings and the expansion of existing ones, intended exclusively for housing tourism, rural tourism, agriculture, forestry, livestock, aquaculture or related industrial activities and exclusively dedicated to the use and enhancement of its products (<i>criteria regardless of land use: the distance to the property limit of a protection strip of at least 10 m, among others</i>).</p>	<p>Construction of new buildings and the expansion of existing ones (<i>criteria in forest areas or less than 50 m from forest land: defensible space of 50 m, implantation distance from the property limit higher than 50 m, among others; criteria in non-forest areas: defensible space of 10 m, implantation distance from the property limit higher than 50 m, adoption of measures for enhance building resistance for wildfires to defined by the Civil Protection Authority, among others</i>).</p> <p>Expansion of existing building, intended exclusively for housing tourism and rural tourism (<i>criteria: defensible space of 10 m, implantation distance from the property limit higher than 10 m, among others</i>).</p> <p>Construction of new buildings and the expansion of existing for other economic activities (<i>criteria: defensible space of 10 m, implantation distance from the property limit higher than 10 m, among others</i>).</p> <p>Other infrastructural constructions.</p>
<b>HAZARD MAP SCALE</b>	
Hazard map made at municipal scale.	Hazard map made at national scale.

**Table S2.** Main difficulties identified by the survey respondents, regarding the IMSRF implementation.

<b>Difficulties faced in the implementation of the IMSRF</b>	<b>No of replies</b>	<b>Percentage (%) for each item (n=175)</b>
<b>LEGAL ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>69.14%</b>
Delay in the formulation of regulations and complementary technical standards	45	25.71%
Understanding the constraints on building permits	33	18.86%
Complexity, lack of clarity and low objectivity	31	17.71%
Field implementation constraints	3	1.71%
Omissions	2	1.14%
Others	10	5.71%
<b>RISK MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>54.29%</b>
Hazard map does not correspond to the existing reality in the territory	30	17.14%
Fuel management monitoring	13	7.43%
Definition of high and very high hazard areas prevents most initiatives for investment in rural areas	8	4.57%
Rigidity in the regulation of fuel management strips	7	4.00%

Lack of human and financial resources	6	3.43%
Fireworks launch licensing	4	2.29%
Difficulty in identifying landowners	3	1.71%
Doubts about the fire use licensing	3	1.71%
Survey and registration of burned areas	2	1.14%
Conditioning of activities in high and very high hazardous areas in conflict with what is the spatial valorisation of the territory	2	1.14%
Lack of awareness (fire use, use of machinery and access to high and very high hazardous areas)	2	1.14%
Obstacles to cultural and sporting activities	2	1.14%
Portuguese Land Use and Cover Map (COS) 2018 does not reflect the existing reality at the local level	2	1.14%
Others	20	11.43%
<b>GOVERNANCE</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26.86%</b>
Dispersion of competences and failure of articulation between involved entities	9	5.14%
Different interpretation between various entities	7	4.00%
Top-down imposition without knowing the local reality	5	2.86%
Excessive municipal competences, such as the registration of all fuel management actions in the municipality	5	2.86%
Undefinition of the exact competences of each entity with entities exempting themselves from responsibilities via abstention in the Municipal Integrated Management Committees	5	2.86%
Operationality dependent on several sources of financing	3	1.71%
Misalignment between IMSRF and Spatial Plans	3	1.71%
Regional and sub-regional Integrated Management Committees are too large	2	1.14%
Lack of articulation and commitment of several entities due to the non-mandatory participation in the Municipal Committees for Integrated Management of Rural Fires	2	1.14%
Inability of municipalities to implement building permit constraints and execution of fuel management strips	2	1.14%
Others	8	4.57%

**Table S3.** Impact of the IMSRF on the depopulation of rural areas, given the building constraints imposed by the IMSRF, considered by the survey respondents, given the building permit constraints.

<b>Impact of the IMSRF on the depopulation of rural areas, given the building constraints imposed by the IMSRF</b>	<b>No of replies</b>	<b>Percentage (%) for each item (n=175)</b>
<b>YES</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>63.43%</b>
<b>BUILDING PERMIT CONSTRAINTS</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>48.57%</b>
Excessive constraints to the construction of new buildings, reconstruction, and expansion of existing buildings in rustic space, discouraging investment	65	37.14%
Imposition of implantation of new buildings 50 meters from the limits of the properties prevents the construction in small plots	13	7.43%
Distance to forest areas as a very restrictive factor for construction	2	1.14%

Others	5	2.86%
<b>HIGH AND VERY HIGH HAZARD AREAS</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>18.86%</b>
Increase in high and very high hazardous areas (defined in the Structural Hazard Map, published on March 28, 2022)	28	16.00%
Structural Hazard Map is badly prepared (spatial resolution)	5	2.86%
<b>SPATIAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6.86%</b>
Without people in rural areas, there is no change in land use due to fuel management and an inherent reduction in hazard index	6	3.43%
Lack of incentive for spatial planning and land use change	1	0.57%
The mainland has several asymmetries, and rural and forest areas are distinct	1	0.57%
Country focused on the coast and not on the interior	1	0.57%
Master Plan also intends to concentrate people in towns and cities, and not in rural areas	1	0.57%
Scattered building considered incompatible with rural fire management	1	0.57%
Urgent a real planning of the rural space	1	0.57%
<b>IMSRF FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.14%</b>
IMSRF as a factor of increased complexity	1	0.57%
IMSRF does not defend the forest and does not allow any project to be adapted to defend the territory	1	0.57%
<b>NO</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36.57%</b>
<b>BUILDING PERMITS CONSTRAINTS</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13.14%</b>
Maintenance of the existing situation with the previous system, which already prohibited the implementation of new constructions in high and very hazardous areas	7	4.00%
Existence of exception regimes	3	1.71%
Contributes to the planning of rural space	2	1.14%
There are alternative sites where urban expansion can occur	2	1.14%
IMSRF as a way of protecting people and property without cancelling acquired rights of pre-existing buildings with the possibility of reconstruction and expansion	2	1.14%
Others	7	4.00%
<b>SPATIAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13.14%</b>
Depopulation as dependent on factors other than IMSRF	7	4.00%
People's lack of interest in investing in rural areas	2	1.14%
The urban space in the Master Plan falls short of what is necessary for urban expansion, so the IMSRF only restricts it because there is too much space classified as rustic	2	1.14%
Others	6	3.43%
<b>REQUALIFICATION</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.86%</b>
Opportunity to concentrate and upgrade buildings in villages, and limit dispersed building	3	1.71%
The country already has enough urban space and the priority must be requalification	1	0.57%
Persistence of the lack of identification of owners	1	0.57%
<b>MANAGEMENT TOOLS</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.86%</b>
If the areas of high and very high hazard and the agroforestry areas are reviewed, there is no big obstacle to building	5	2.86%

<b>BUILDING DEMAND</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.29%</b>
Polluting and job-generating industries should be established in isolation in the territory, and there should be an exception for their construction in areas of high and very high hazard, provided that an adequate fuel management strip is guaranteed.	1	0.57%
Does not interfere with the need for permanent housing	1	0.57%
Permission for agricultural buildings is quite reasonable	1	0.57%
It can contribute to the population increase in rural areas	1	0.57%

**Table S4.** IMSRF potential promotion of a transformation of the rural world (values, behaviors, needs) with positive effects on reducing the problem of wildfires.

<b>IMSRF potential promotion of a transformation of the rural world (values, behaviors, needs) with positive effects on reducing the problem of wildfires</b>	<b>No of replies</b>	<b>Percentage (%) for each item (n=175)</b>
<b>YES</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>34.86%</b>
<b>OPTIMISM</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11.43%</b>
Hope in the transformation of rural space by IMSRF	20	11.43%
<b>CHANGES IN FIRE USE AND FUEL MANAGEMENT BEHAVIORS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6.29%</b>
IMSRF as way of changing risk behaviors (use of fire and fuel management)	5	2.86%
Through citizen accountability	2	1.14%
Changing behaviors through younger generations and not by IMSRF	1	0.57%
Smaller change in behavior than in the SDFCI	1	0.57%
Fuel management criteria have led to forest destruction and biodiversity loss	1	0.57%
It can reduce the burned area	1	0.57%
<b>CHANGING WAYS OF LIFE AND FUEL MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4.00%</b>
National Action Program (PNA) will change ways of life and fuel management practice in the medium and long term	2	1.14%
Through constraints, fuel management ranges and Municipal Programs for the Implementation of Integrated Management of Rural Fires	1	0.57%
Spatial registration and identification of owners	1	0.57%
With financial support to rural areas for prevention and to be carbon sinks	1	0.57%
With more information on pre and post-fire mechanisms	1	0.57%
IMSRF makes owners more aware of compliance with legislation	1	0.57%
New inhabitants of rural areas will be more attentive to fuel management	1	0.57%
<b>BUT THERE ARE PROBLEMS WITH THE IMSRF</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2.86%</b>
Errors identified in the public discussion remained in the latest version of the IMSRF	1	0.57%
Expectation in the formulation of complementary norms for the execution of the IMSRF	1	0.57%
Greater forest abandonment due to the loss of land exploitation capacity by owners, whose profitability will be reduced	1	0.57%

Fewer people circulating in forested areas	1	0.57%
It will not solve the problem of wildfires, but it will help to avoid catastrophic situations arising from wildfires	1	0.57%
Despite the shortcomings of the IMSRF	1	0.57%
With lack of understanding and clarification about the IMSRF	1	0.57%
<b>ARTICULATION OF ENTITIES</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.43%</b>
Entities involved in the IMSRF are better articulated and closer to the communities	6	3.43%
<b>IMPROVEMENT OF PREVENTION, INFORMATION, INFRASTRUCTURE AND FIREFIGHT</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.86%</b>
IMSRF improves prevention, information, infrastructure and firefight	5	2.86%
<b>CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT AND ADJUSTMENT TO LOCAL REALITIES</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.29%</b>
Need to listen the local stakeholders	2	1.14%
As long as it is adjusted to each of the territories	1	0.57%
If the community is involved	1	0.57%
<b>LACK OF INCENTIVES</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.14%</b>
Lack of incentives for forest and rural owners	2	1.14%
<b>NO</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>65.14%</b>
<b>IMSRF PROBLEMS</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26.29%</b>
<i>TRANSITION TO THE NEW IMSRF</i>	<b>16</b>	<b>9.14%</b>
IMSRF as continuation of SDFCI with just some improvements	12	6.86%
Need to revise the IMSRF, which does not improve the SDFCI	3	1.71%
A real revolution took place with the SDFCI with the definition of the fuel management strips	1	0.57%
<b>LEGAL FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8.00%</b>
Complexity and poor clarity of IMSRF	8	4.57%
Expectation in the formulation of additional orders for the execution of the IMSRF	2	1.14%
Absence of complementary rules to the IMSRF	2	1.14%
IMSRF is bureaucratic and inefficient	1	0.57%
Unconsolidated legislation, so municipalities are afraid to provide unfounded information	1	0.57%
<b>GOVERNANCE</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6.86%</b>
IMSRF designed via top-down with no adaptive period, with municipalities having more powers assigned without any added support	4	2.29%
Lack of flexibility and adaptation to local reality in the IMSRF	3	1.71%
Degradation of values due to the lack of articulation between the various entities that make up the regional and sub-regional commissions	2	1.14%
Total disarticulation and arrogance in imposing the IMSRF when what was needed was just an improvement of the SDFCI	1	0.57%
Territorially competent entities were not heard	1	0.57%
Need for articulation between entities and clarification of their competences	1	0.57%
<b>FUNDING</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.71%</b>
Lack of funding	1	0.57%
Municipalities without the financial capacity to replace owners in carrying out fuel management tracks	1	0.57%

Increased costs arising from the replacement of previous Municipal Plans for the Defense of the Forest against Wildfires	1	0.57%
<b>HAZARD MAP</b>	1	0.57%
Need to revise the National Official Wildfire Hazard Map	1	0.57%
<b>THE MAJOR PROBLEMS IN THE RURAL AREAS DO NOT DEPEND ON IMSRF</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12.00%</b>
Maintenance of structural problems (depopulation and aging of the population, fragmentation of property and lack of identification of owners, among others)	14	8.00%
Depopulation and aging in the interior areas do not depend on IMSRF	5	2.86%
Attraction of people must be done through development programs that encourage the production of value and wealth (nature tourism, appreciation of endogenous products, landscape enhancement, conversion and forest management, cultural heritage)	1	0.57%
The quality of life in the interior must also be ensured by the permanence of services	1	0.57%
<b>WILL AGGRAVATE SOME PROBLEMS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8.57%</b>
Worsening rural abandonment	11	6,29%
Lack of real forest management by the IMSRF	4	2,29%
<b>IMPACT IN ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8.00%</b>
Very restrictive legislation, without focusing on management (hunting, fishing, recreation, production) and conservation (fauna and flora)	6	3.43%
Conditioning the use of mowers and balers according to the risk of fire means that the hay cannot be harvested in a timely manner, which leads to disinvestment	1	0.57%
Prohibiting work during the critical period is an option that will aggravate the situation of companies in the interior	1	0.57%
IMSRF as a hindrance to socioeconomic development	1	0.57%
IMSRF as a factor of inequality in low-density territories, where most of the activities related to nature and rurality will no longer be feasible	1	0.57%
Does not contribute to forest management	1	0.57%
The need to value agricultural-forestry products and ecosystem services as a means of securing young people in rural areas	1	0.57%
Planning need to respond to local needs	1	0.57%
Applications related to livestock farming should be able to cover 50% of the forest areas, as this is where the animals graze in the summer	1	0.57%
<b>LACK OF INCENTIVES</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7.43%</b>
Need for incentives	9	5.14%
Fuel management around the buildings is penalizing and costly, preventing the profitability of the land	2	1.14%
Settlement of people in rural areas can be achieved by a circular economy and investment in nature tourism	1	0.57%
Support for farmers and forestry producers to comply with fuel management strips	1	0.57%
<b>INVOLVEMENT OF THE POPULATION</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7.43%</b>
Need for community participation and awareness	9	5.14%
Need of attracting population to rural areas in order to encourage greater fuel management due to land use change	3	1.71%
People and their customs were not integrated into the process	1	0.57%
<b>CHANGING MENTALITIES</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.29%</b>



Need to change mindsets	2	1.14%
Weak ambition when it comes to changing behaviors	1	0.57%
Mentalities will only change by the example of government entities	1	0.57%
<b>LACK OF CONSISTENCY OF POLICIES</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.57%</b>
Non-existent policy consistency	1	0.57%
<b>REDUCTION OF IGNITIONS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.14%</b>
But you can reduce the number of ignitions depending on the constraints on the building	1	0.57%
But it may have a positive effect on the reduction of ignitions due to restrictions on the use of machinery in rural areas	1	0.57%
<b>CONSEQUENCES ON THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.57%</b>
It will change the rural world for the worse, driving managers away from the forest space, generating abandonment and uncontrolled growth of fuels	1	0.57%
<b>OTHERS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6.29%</b>

**Table S5.** Trust in integrating spatial planning and wildfire management for favour the municipal development.

<b>Trust in integrating spatial planning and wildfire management for favour the development of the municipalities</b>	<b>No of replies</b>	<b>Percentage (%) for each item (n=175)</b>
<b>YES</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>62.86%</b>
Need for integration and articulation between the two spheres with a view to sharing knowledge and resilience of the territory	33	18.86%
As long as it adapts to the local reality (forest, agricultural, environmental and social)	13	7.43%
May favour the development of the municipality	5	2.86%
Though the environment enhancement by sport, leisure, tourism, culture, customs, agriculture, forestry, livestock, among others	4	2.29%
Contribution to better forest management and enhancement of natural capital	4	2.29%
Simplification of building licensing	4	2.29%
Challenge of valuing the ecosystem services of the rural space	3	1.71%
Attract people to settle in the interior through the attribution of incentives	3	1.71%
Master Plan should value forest space and not focus on licensing urban operations	3	1.71%
Others	23	13.14%
<b>NO</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>37.14%</b>
Worsening social and environmental inequality in rural communities	6	3.43%
Each municipality defines the most advantageous strategy to meet its objectives	2	1.14%
Excessive conditioning to the building and use, which does not promote the development	2	1.14%
Weak articulation between the two spheres	2	1.14%
Promotes the depopulation of the territory	2	1.14%
Others	27	15.43%



**Table S6.** Degree of municipalities' consultation during the elaboration of the IMSRF.

Degree of consultation of the municipalities during the elaboration of the IMSRF	No of replies	Percentage (%) for each item (n=175)
<b>YES</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36.57%</b>
Through the discussion of the preliminary version of the opinion of the National Association of Municipalities, which, however, was completely changed in the final version (not put up for discussion)	10	5.71%
Through the Intermunicipal Community	2	1.14%
Outros	9	5.14%
<b>NO</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>63.43%</b>
Only the National Association of Portuguese Municipalities was heard	2	1.14%
No period for requesting contributions	1	0.57%

**Table S7.** Suggestions for increasing the articulation between the spatial planning and wildfire management.

Suggestions for increasing the articulation between the spatial planning and wildfire management	No of replies	Percentage (%) for each item (n=175)
A fire risk reduction system based on a rural development model that goes beyond simple fuel management	132	75.43%
Clarification of the building permit constraints set out in the IMSRF	115	65.71%
An integrated management system adapted to local realities - bottom-up, based on the development strategy recommended in the Master Plan	95	54.29%
A dynamic, participatory and collaborative planning system with fewer top-down impositions	87	49.71%
Valorisation of the forest by spatial plans	86	49.14%
Encouraging the development of public participation initiatives as part of the fire risk reduction process	77	44.00%
Outlining a results-oriented approach capable of promoting social well-being, community resilience and sustainable development	75	42.86%
Simplification of definitions	73	41.71%
Master Plan review by classification and qualification of urban space and rustic space	62	35.43%
Implementation of the new Municipal Programs for the Implementation of Integrated Management of Rural Fires	50	28.57%

**SURVEY S8.** Applied survey referring to the diagnosis about the alignment of spatial planning and wildfire management policies.

Within the scope of the AVODIS project – “*Understanding the social context of rural Portugal to implement social actions to prevent catastrophic fires*” (PCIF/AGT/0054/2017) through national funds (PIDDAC) and taking place in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Porto, this survey is being applied to the forestry technicians of all municipalities.

The AVODIS project aims to develop and achieve new strategies to raise knowledge within the social and territorial context of rural fire prevention and mitigation.

In accordance with current legislation, we are strongly committed to protect the privacy and personal data of respondents. The information collected is for scientific research purposes only, so the full anonymity of the respondents is guaranteed.

1. Based on your experience, assess the level of alignment between the Spatial Plans (IGT) and the following wildfire management systems (the previous DSFW and the new IMSRF).

	1 – No alignment	2 – Low alignment	3 – Reasonable alignment	4 – Good alignment	5 – Excellent alignment
Defense System of Forest against Wildfires - DSFW (DL No. 124/2006, of June 28, in its last version)					
Integrated Management System for Rural Fires - IMSRF (DL No. 82/2021, of October 13, in its latest version)					

2. What are the main difficulties you face with the implementation of the IMSRF (DL No. 822021, of October 13, in its latest version)? Please, specify.

3. In light of the building permit constraints, do you consider that the implementation of the IMSRF (DL No. 822021, of October 13, in its latest version) could contribute to accentuating the depopulation of rural areas?

YES NO

Please, specify.

4. Were the municipalities heard within the scope of the formulation of the IMSRF?

YES    NO

Please, specify.

5. Do you consider that the IMSRF (DL No. 82/2021, of October 13, in its last wording) will promote a transformation of the rural world (values, behaviors, needs) with positive effects on reducing the problem of rural fires?

YES    NO

Please, specify.

6. What suggestions for improvement would you recommend with a view of increasing the articulation between the instruments of these two spheres?

- a) Simplification of definitions.
- b) Clarification of the building permit constraints set out in the IMSRF.
- c) Valorisation of the forest by spatial plans.
- d) Master Plan review by classification and qualification of urban space and rustic space
- e) Implementation of the new Municipal Programs for the Implementation of Integrated Management of Rural Fires.
- f) A dynamic, participatory, and collaborative planning system with fewer top-down impositions.
- g) An integrated management system adapted to local realities - bottom-up, based on the development strategy recommended in the Master Plan.
- h) A fire risk reduction system based on a rural development model that goes beyond simple fuel management.
- i) Encouraging the development of public participation initiatives as part of the fire risk reduction process.
- j) Outlining a results-oriented approach capable of promoting social well-being, community resilience and sustainable development.
- k) Other. Specify.

7. Do you believe that the intended integration between these two spheres will contribute to a context favourable to the development of the municipality?

YES    NO

Please, specify.

8. Which municipality do you represent?

*Thank you!*