


FINAL TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT OF THE ACTION

Workshop on
“Contingency Planning in the European Union”

Grant Agreement No. 07.030900/2004/393052

1 to 3 June, 2005
Kalamata • Petalidi • South Peloponnese • Greece
Sunrise Village Beach Hotel



•HELMPEPA•

HELMPEPA WORKSHOP

*Under the Auspices of
the European Commission / DG Environment*

Contingency Planning in the European Union

www.helmepa.gr www.europa.eu.int

The Workshop has received
funding from the Community




Table of Contents

	Page Number
Introduction	2
A. Framework of the action and objectives	4
B. Workshop Program	5
C. Selection of case studies and guest speakers	6
D. Participation	7
E. Implementation of the Workshop	10
E.1 Day 1 of the Workshop - Wednesday 1 June 2005	10
E.2 Day 2 of the Workshop - Thursday 2 June 2005	11
E.2.1 WG1 Proceedings	12
E.2.2 WG2 Proceedings	14
E.2.3 WG3 Proceedings	16
E.2.4 Meeting of WG Chairpersons, Speakers and Organizers.....	21
E.3 Day 3 of the Workshop - Friday 3 June 2005	21
F. Evaluation Form.....	23
G. Follow-up action.....	25
H. Results – Concluding remarks.....	26
Annex I – Workshop Program.....	28
Annex II – List of Participants.....	31
Annex III – Working Groups.....	36
Annex IV – CD-Rom of Workshop Presentations.....	37
Annex V – European Commission’s Evaluation Form.....	38
Annex VI – New timetable of project.....	40
Annex VII - Lloyd’s List Issue of 9 June 2005.....	41

Introduction

In April 2004, the European Commission's Directorate General for the Environment (DG ENV) published in the Official Journal of the European Union its "Call for Proposals 2004 in the field of Community co-operation against accidental or deliberate marine pollution" (2004/C 93/13/17.4.2004).

This document invited interested parties to submit proposals for relevant actions in the following priority fields:

- A. Potentially polluting shipwrecks
- B. Illicit discharges from ships
- C. Response to harmful substances
- D. Environmental damage
- E. Contingency planning
- F. Animal welfare

In reply to the Commission's above-mentioned Call for Proposals, on 27 May 2004 the Hellenic Marine Environment Protection Association – HELMEPA submitted a proposal (from hereunder referred to as the Proposal) for the implementation of a Workshop under Theme E on "Contingency Planning in the European Union" (9130/ EC/ 27.05.2004).

There are a number of reasons for choosing this priority field. First of all, HELMEPA represents the voluntary will and commitment of a considerable segment of the Greek shipping industry, as well as international organizations and entities, to eliminate ship-generated marine pollution. Its membership consists of ocean-going vessels, managing companies, as well as other companies and organizations associated with shipping, such as oil companies, classification societies, salvage companies, P& I Clubs and international organizations. More than 13,500 Greek seafarers-members constitute the human element of HELMEPA and as such are its driving force.

In their 1982 Declaration of Voluntary Commitment "To Save the Seas", which led to the creation of HELMEPA, the Association's founding members Greek seafarers and shipowners declared that:

"Even the most widely accepted Conventions, Laws and Regulations cannot be fully effective until every sector of the shipping industry is committed to the elimination of marine pollution".

Therefore, they established voluntarily this pro-active, non governmental and non profit-making Association in Greece to nurture an environmental consciousness throughout shipping, so that a pollution prevention and safety culture prevails and complement international maritime legislation.

Since 1983, HELMEPA has implemented 22 annual refresher-training programs for

officers and staff of member companies. The objective is to update and refresh the knowledge of participating professionals so that they are kept abreast of developments. Oil pollution preparedness and response, as well as the impact of pollution on marine life and humans, are prominent topics on the syllabus of annual training programs, which have been attended so far by more than 14,500 seafarers and company staff.

Moreover, in 1992, well before the International Maritime Organization's International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, response and Co-operation (OPRC) entered into force in 1995, HELMEPA produced a "Ship's Manual" for the Association's members, vessels and managing companies, containing voluntary guidelines on management for safe ship operations and prevention of pollution. Special sections were dedicated to the onboard maintenance of the Oil Record Book (Chapter V - Part C) and Guidelines for the vessel's Oil Pollution Contingency Plan (Chapter IX – Parts A, B and C).

This voluntary and proactive approach has been followed in several parts of the world, where HELMEPA has assisted in the founding of similar non-governmental, non profit-making Associations - MEPAs in Cyprus (CYMEPA), Turkey (TURMEPA), the UK (BRITMEPA), Uruguay (URUMEPA), the Philippines (PHILMEPA) and Australia (AUSMEPA).

Also, over the past 23 years of its operation HELMEPA has developed a dynamic working relationship with international and intergovernmental institutions, such as the European Commission, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), the World Maritime University (WMU) and national coast guard agencies, as well as central and local government authorities in Greece.

Taking into consideration the above, it was anticipated that HELMEPA could act as a facilitator of positive developments in the field of contingency planning by organizing a Workshop that would bring together representatives from various stakeholders in the EU i.e. national governments, inter-governmental initiatives and agreements, international organizations and the industry. Such an action would contribute towards the objective of the European Commission to support and supplement Member States' efforts at national, regional and local levels for the protection of the marine environment, coastlines and human health against the risks of accidental marine pollution by oil and other harmful substances.

Moreover, as EU Member States are also threatened by large spills that may take place within the territorial waters of neighboring countries, HELMEPA proposed to invite representatives from states bordering EU waters, some of which are also major exporters of oil.

Following various clarifications regarding the Proposal requested by DG ENV and provided by HELMEPA during August 2004, the European Commission announced

to HELMEPA with its letter of 11 November 2004 (A.5/PB/TdL/isk D2004 250441) that it had selected the Association's Proposal for funding amongst 25 proposals.

In December 2004, the European Commission sent HELMEPA two original copies of the Grant Agreement (No 07.030900/2004393052), which were signed by the Association's Director General Mr. Dimitris Mitsatsos and returned to the Commission. On 14 December 2004 the Grant Agreement was signed on behalf of the European Commission by Mr. Grant Lawrence, Acting Director of Directorate A of DG Environment and one copy was returned to HELMEPA.

A. Framework of the action and objectives

According to Part I, para 2 of the Proposal, the Workshop was to take place between 8-10 March 2005. However, as the selected proposals were announced by the Commission in November 2004 and not in September 2004, as stated in Section VII.3 of the 2004 Call for Proposals, HELMEPA proposed a new timetable (Annex VI) for the implementation of the project, which were approved by the Commission.

The Workshop on "Contingency Planning in the European Union" eventually took place from 1 to 3 June 2005 at the Sunrise Village Beach Hotel in Petalidi, SW Peloponnese.

This particular area was selected because it offers the ideal setting for such a Workshop. It suffers from heavy maritime traffic as it has one major commercial port, Kalamata, and a bunkering port, Pylos, thus presenting a high risk of oil pollution incidents. Moreover, the coastline of Messinia comprises areas of high environmental value with a wide diversity of habitats and species of fauna and flora, including three sites of the EU's Natura 2000 network of protected areas

The Workshop was implemented as an Action under Priority Field III.4.1 "Contingency Planning" of the 2004 Community cooperation framework against accidental or deliberate marine pollution and was co-funded by the European Commission and HELMEPA on a 68% - 32% basis.

As stated in Part I, para 2.1.1 of the Proposal, the basic aim of this action was to offer to the objective set by the European Commission, to enhance and supplement Member States' efforts at the national, regional and local level for the protection of the marine and coastal environment and human health against the risks of accidental or deliberate marine pollution.

The particular objectives that the Workshop attempted to realize were the following:

- a. Provide a platform for the exchange of views, ideas and practices on

Contingency Planning between experts from Member States.

- b. Assess the existing level of cooperation between Member States and aiming stakeholders on the national level and suggest ways to improve cooperation through coordination of activities.
- c. Promote a framework of cooperation among stakeholders active both in the field of marine pollution prevention and response/clean-up activities in order to minimize marine pollution incidents and mitigate environmental damage.
- d. Highlight common factors that will help establish common guidelines in the application of Contingency Planning.
- e. Identify particularities of States or areas demanding special measures for Contingency Planning in order to consider the feasibility of establishing European guidelines.

B. Workshop Program

In order for the Workshop to achieve the best possible results, right from the start the beneficiary sought to consult with the competent officials of the European Commission's DG ENV/ Directorate A, Unit A5.

To this end, there was extensive communication, mainly by email, between HELMEPA staff and Mr. Thomas de Lannoy of the Civil Protection Unit throughout the period of the action. Moreover, on 2 February 2005 the Director General of HELMEPA Mr. Dimitris Mitsatsos accompanied by a staff member visited the DG ENV headquarters in Brussels for a fruitful meeting with Messrs Thomas de Lannoy and Aurelio Caligiore of the above-mentioned Unit.

Following these consultations, certain changes were made to the Program as envisaged in the Proposal submitted to the European Commission. Rather than a pure regional approach on the first day of the Workshop, it was considered best to focus on three case studies of what went well/wrong in previous accidents involving a European response. Then, during the second day, participants were divided into three Working Groups, each one further elaborating on specific themes that emerged from the case studies. The results of the Working Groups were presented on the third and final day.

The final Program of the Workshop is attached as Annex I and is presented in detail in Section D – Implementation of the Workshop.

C. Selection of case studies and guest speakers

The Workshop was based on the presentation of three case studies of past maritime accidents, namely the ERIKA, the FU SHAN HAI and the PRESTIGE.

The ERIKA (1999) and the PRESTIGE (2001) were selected as case studies because they were both followed by considerable pressure to review and change the marine pollution prevention and response emergency system. The ERIKA presented a landmark in the history of major oil spills in European waters and resulted in new IMO rules on tanker standards, while the PRESTIGE constituted the most recent major maritime accident in European waters the response to which involved the deployment of vessels from a larger number of States than ever before. Moreover, it was the first occasion that a significant number of response vessels from both northern and southern Europe worked together.

On the other hand, the FU SHAN HAI was selected as a case study because it constitutes a prime example of how long-standing close cooperation between Member States can lead to prompt and successful response to major oil pollution incidents.

The following organizations and entities were invited by HELMEPA to provide expert guest speakers to present the above-mentioned case studies, as follows:

Case Study	Organization/ Entity
ERIKA	Centre de Documentation, de Recherche et d'Experimentation sur les Pollutions Accidentelles des Eaux (CEDRE)
FU SHAN HAI	Helsinki Commission (HELCOM)
PRESTIGE	International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation (ITOPF)

CEDRE and HELCOM accepted HELMEPA's invitation and nominated expert speakers to present the case studies of the ERIKA and the FU SHAN HAI respectively. As ITOPF was unable to provide an expert speaker to present the PRESTIGE case study, the invitation was extended to Markleen Salvage who were actively involved in the response action and accepted. Thus, the case studies were presented at the Workshop by the following guest speakers:

Case Study	Organization/ Entity
ERIKA	Mr. Loeiz Dagorn, Service Plans et audits -Contingency Planning, CEDRE
FU SHAN HAI	Cdr Peter Sørberg Poulsen, Branch Chief Maritime Environment, Admiral Danish Fleet HQ, HELCOM
PRESTIGE	Ms. Stephanie Seddon-Brown, Environmental Projects and Marketing Manager, Markleen Salvage

Following the approval of DG Environment, the Program also included on the third and final day a presentation by the representative of the State Ministry of Urban Development and Environment of Germany titled “A computer aided contingency plan (VPS) of the German Coastal States”.

D. Participation

In accordance with Part I, para 2.1.2, p. 7 of the Proposal, DG ENV invited EU maritime Member States, Norway and Iceland to nominate representatives to participate in the Workshop.

Following two reminders sent by DG ENV to the competent national administrations, twenty-two (22) participants representing fourteen (14) coastal European Union Member States, Norway and Iceland took part in the Workshop. The number of participants per Member State is provided below:

Member State	Number of participants
Belgium	1
Denmark	1(*)
Estonia	2
Germany	2
Greece	2
Iceland (**)	1
Ireland	2
Italy	1
Latvia	1
Lithuania	1
Malta	1
Norway (**)	1
Poland	1
Portugal	1
Sweden	2
United Kingdom	2 (***)

(*) Denmark’s representative was the guest speaker from HELCOM.

(**) Non EU Member State.

(***) One representative from the Gibraltar Ships Registry was invited by HELMEPA.

The nomination of two representatives from certain Member States was permitted following the approval of DG ENV.

Six (6) EU maritime Member States, namely Cyprus, Finland, France, the

Netherlands, Slovenia and Spain, did not nominate a representative and therefore did not participate in the Workshop.

According to the previously mentioned section of the submitted Proposal and having consulted REMPEC, invitations were sent by HELMEPA to the following Mediterranean States, which are parties to the Barcelona Convention:

Invited Mediterranean States
Albania
Algeria
Bosnia & Herzegovina
Croatia
Egypt
Israel
Libya
Lebanon
Monaco
Morocco
Serbia & Montenegro
Syrian Arab Republic
Tunisia
Turkey

Taking into consideration the increasing flow of oil and tanker traffic from Russian ports, which leads to increased risk of spillage in environmentally sensitive areas of the Baltic and Mediterranean Seas, an invitation was also sent to the Russian Federation to participate in the Workshop.

Four (4) representatives from the above-mentioned invited States bordering EU waters participated in the Workshop, as follows:

State	Number of participants
Albania	1
Bosnia & Herzegovina	1
Israel	1
Serbia & Montenegro	1

Besides States bordering EU waters, HELMEPA also invited the following international organizations and private entities to participate in the Workshop in accordance with its Proposal:

Invited organizations/entities
Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS)
Bonn Agreement
Cypriot Marine Environment Protection Association (CYMEPA)
Environmental Protection Engineering SA (EPE)

European Maritime Safety Authority (EMSA)
Hellenic Chamber of Shipping (NEE)
Hellenic Union of Maritime Pilots
Helsinki Commission (HELCOM)
International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)
International Chamber of Shipping (ICS)
International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation (ITOPF)
Mediterranean Oil Industry Group (MOIG)
Oil Companies International Marine Forum (OCIMF)
Panhellenic Seamen's Federation (PNO)
Regional Emergency Marine Pollution Emergency Center for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC)
Sea Alarm Foundation
Tsavliris Salvage
Turkish Marine Environment Protection Association (TURMEPA)
Union of Greek Shipowners (EEE)
United Nations Environment Program/ Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP)

In total, eight (8) representatives from international organizations and private entities took part in the Workshop, as follows:

Organization/ Entity	Number of participants
Environmental Protection Engineering SA (EPE)	1
European Maritime Safety Authority (EMSA)	1
Helsinki Commission (HELCOM)	1
International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)	2
Mediterranean Oil Industry Group (MOIG)	1
Turkish Marine Environment Protection Association (TURMEPA)	1
United Nations Environment Program/ Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP)	1

The Bonn Agreement also nominated a representative to take part in the Workshop, who unfortunately cancelled his participation one day prior to the opening of the Workshop due to a sudden illness.

The final List of Participants is included in Annex II.

E. Implementation of the Workshop

In accordance with Part I, para 2.1.2 of the Proposal, prior to the implementation of the Workshop HELMEPA sent all participants the preliminary program and an Information Paper aiming to provide them with a brief outline of the existing regimes pertaining to preparedness and response to major marine pollution incidents within the European Union (Annex IV - 2).

Chapter 5 of the Information Paper also contains further details regarding the Italian Contingency Plan provided by the distinguished representative of Italy following the implementation of the Workshop.

The vast majority of participants coming from abroad arrived at the Athens International Airport on 31 May and resided at the adjacent Holiday Inn hotel. On the evening of the same day, the Chairman of the Board Nikolas P. Tsakos and HELMEPA staff members welcomed the participants during a dinner offered at the hotel.

Early on the morning of 1 June, the participants were transported by coach to the town of Petalidi in the Prefecture of Messinia, at the southern tip of the Peloponnese. There they registered at the Sunrise Village Beach Hotel, which was selected as the venue for the implementation of the Workshop.

E.1 Day 1 of the Workshop – Wednesday 1 June 2005

Following registration, the Workshop Program began at 15.00. Participants were welcomed to Messinia by the Mayor of Petalidi Mr. Elias Koutsodimitropoulos, who in his brief address reminded participants of the fragility of the marine and coastal environment in such areas, as well as the financial implications of a potential major accident for the local tourism and fishing industries.

The Honorary Chairman of HELMEPA, Captain Vassilis C. Constantakopoulos, a native of Messinia, opened the Workshop reiterating to participants the importance that Contingency Planning bears for seafarers at sea. "They feel safer" he said "when they are sure that those on land are ready to effectively offer help at time of need".

The Director General of HELMEPA Captain Dimitris Mitsatsos welcomed on his part all delegates, wished them a fruitful outcome to their workings and presented the Program and the objectives of the Workshop.

He was followed by the representative of the European Commission's DG ENV Mr. Thomas de Lannoy, who presented the European mechanisms for Contingency Planning stressing, among other, the importance of the cooperation between stakeholders for the effectiveness of Contingency Plans (Annex V).

The main part of the Workshop began with an “Introduction to Contingency Planning” presented by Dr. Vassilis Mamaloukas - Fragoulis, Marine Environment Director of HELMEPA’s member-company Environmental Protection Engineering SA. (Annex IV – 3).

The first of the case studies, which was the ERIKA accident, was presented by Mr. Loeiz Dagorn from CEDRE/ Service Plans and Audits - Contingency Planning (Annex IV – 4.1).

Answering questions submitted to him by the audience following the presentation, Mr. Dagorn further clarified that:

- no health problems were reported by the 30,000 workers that took part in the cleanup operations, noting that oil has to be in contact with the human body for a considerable time in order to penetrate it,
- there was a revision of the POLMAR plan following the ERIKA,
- the management of volunteers has not been efficient in France, and
- a lack of communication was noted during the cooperation between the prefects involved.

The FU SHAN HAI case study was presented by Cdr. Peter Søbørg Poulsen, Branch Chief Maritime Environment - Admiral Danish Fleet HQ, who also represented HELCOM (Annex IV – 4.2).

Answering a question by the audience, Cdr. Poulsen specified that there were two on-scene commanders during response operations to the FU SHAN HAI incident, one from Sweden and one from Denmark.

The final case study was the PRESTIGE, which was presented by Ms. Stephanie Seddon-Brown, Environmental Projects and Marketing Manager of Markleen Salvage (Annex IV – 4.3).

E.2 Day 2 of the Workshop – Thursday 2 June 2005

In accordance with the Workshop Program, participants were divided into three Working Groups (WGs), as these appear in Annex III.

In the morning session, each Working Group further elaborated on one of the case studies through the examination of lessons learnt. Moreover, the members of the WGs discussed specific themes that emerged from the presentations of the previous day with regards to Contingency Planning in general, based on the following:

- (i) Contingency Planning on national basis.

- (ii) Multinational Cooperation/ Regional Agreements/ Contingency Planning and implementation by response entities.
- (iii) Areas and issues that may have been dealt with more effectively if provisions were in place.

In the afternoon, each WG produced a report containing suggestions to improve preparedness and response through appropriate Contingency Planning and ways by which a more effective cooperation may be introduced to competent authorities.

E.2.1 WG1 Proceedings

Working Group 1 focused on the ERIKA case study and consisted of 13 members, as listed in Annex III. The Group members elected Mr. Thomas Liebert from the OSRL/EARL Alliance, representative of IPIECA as their Chairperson.

The Chairperson pointed out that even though it is the ERIKA incident that is the basis of discussions, the Group members should not focus only on that, but rather view the issue of Contingency Planning in general. Although weak and strong points can be identified and have been identified for many incidents in the past, this does not seem to have prevented people from doing the same mistakes over and over again.

Deliberations started with participants referring to main issues in Contingency Planning they thought of importance, as follows:

1. Cooperation between EU Member States, especially when there are no resources available from all sides. The representative from Italy mentioned that it is important to have regional agreements even when the other parties have no resources to offer within the agreement and provided the example of the bilateral agreement Italy is signing with Croatia. The rest of the participants agreed on that. They also agreed that the existing framework is good and what should be done is to try and make improvements at the national level and also make the most of existing agreements. They also expressed the view that the European Commission should push in the direction of creating regional agreements.
2. Updating of the Regional Information System (RIS) within the framework of the Barcelona Convention. Group members stressed that all States should make available relevant information, thus highlighting the issue of the exchange of information. They also noted that it would be useful if there were a link between the RIS and the Community Information System (CIS). As far as the Mediterranean is concerned, participants agreed that there should be a common policy on environmental issues. The representative of TURMEPA also pointed out that it is very important for States in the same region to cooperate even if they are not all EU members, otherwise measures taken will be in vain, as pollution does not recognize national borders and urged the European

Commission to move towards this direction. Although the rest agreed in principal, it was noted that the European Commission has no jurisdiction over non-Member States and cannot therefore impose any guidelines or regulations.

3. Importance of the link between salvage operations and contingency plans. It was noted that the issue of salvage should perhaps be addressed in contingency plans. The issue of Places of Refuge was also discussed and all participants agreed that further action should be promoted within the European Union and that an idea would be for coastal States to have more control over ships in distress.
4. Use of volunteers. This issue was extensively discussed, as it seems to be of great importance to all. The safety of volunteers was a major point and participants suggested that training would be useful even though the same volunteers are rarely used twice. It was also proposed that, in order to solve the problem of liability, contracts with volunteers could be signed with a small fee in each case. The Chairman noted that IPIECA has produced a Protocol for the use of volunteers, which it would be willing to share with anyone interested. It was also agreed that there should be a review of the contribution of the fishing industry to oil recovery, which has been proved extremely valuable in the past.
5. The establishment of a Rapid Response Group, already an EMSA initiative. Participants discussed the possibility of establishing two different groups, one for the north and one for the south. EMSA has carried out a risk assessment for placing resources throughout Europe and the participants mentioned that it would be useful if it was made available so that individual states' risk assessment would be conducted in the same way.
6. Relationship between government and private sector. Participants agreed that this should be based on the cost effectiveness outcome of such cooperation or the cooperation with neighboring countries. As it was pointed out though, this is mainly government responsibility and it is the recovery equipment that is being discussed.
7. Importance of cooperation between land and sea. The representative of CEDRE provided the example of France regarding the interaction between contingency plans for land and sea, namely Polterre and Polmar respectively.
8. Importance of revisions of contingency plans. Participants agreed that such revisions, as well as the implementation of drills and exercises, are of great significance.
9. Different strategies between states regarding contingency planning. For example, the representative from UK mentioned that in his country all response vessels are private and that the use of dispersants is allowed, which is not the case in other States. So, they concluded that it would be feasible to have

general guidelines for Contingency Planning based on IMO regulations, but National Contingency Plans should be different according to the particular national characteristics.

E.2.2 WG2 Proceedings

Working Group 2 focused on the “FU SHAN HAI” case study and consisted of 11 members, as listed in Annex III. The Group members elected as their Chairperson Cdr. Peter Soberg Poulsen, Branch Chief Maritime Environment - Admiral Danish Fleet HQ, who also represented the HELCOM.

The WG agreed to use IMO’s OPRC 1990 as a common format for future contingency plans within the EU.

At the first stage, the key points to be included in the contingency plan were discussed. Risk assessment was also a key point in the discussion. The representative from Latvia pointed out that statistics could be used as a ground for risk assessment. The representative of Germany wondered whether we are free to do a risk assessment based on mathematical figures. The WG agreed that risk assessment has not experienced any real change since the 1980s. The representative of Gibraltar pointed out that quantitative and qualitative approaches could be very variable in different areas.

Following an initial risk assessment, it has to be evaluated whether any preventive measures can be made such as changes of traffic routes, lanes and navigational aids. The chairman of the WG stressed that following the “FU SHAN HAI ” accident an extra buoy was added for navigation purposes.

The cost effectiveness of Contingency Planning was also discussed due to the fact that the number of accidents has decreased significantly.

It was agreed that neighbouring countries have to work together and written agreements must be in place as part of the Contingency Plan. The example of the Baltic Sea was provided, where tri-lateral agreements are in place not only for response, but also for cooperation in aerial surveillance, flights coordination etc.

The issue of satellite surveillance was mentioned as part of the aerial surveillance. The representative of Iceland stressed that co-operation between Member States will improve the surveillance system. The representative from Greece referred to the level of success of satellite surveillance. It was suggested that different policies are followed depending on the level of risk in each case. The representative of Latvia referred to the experience from his country where, if there is an extra flight, they cancel the programmed one in order to control the cost. As far as the Automated Identification System is concerned, the WG identified that surveillance through AIS is a key point in Contingency Planning.

It is considered that the EUMAREX exchange of personnel, which will be finalized in 2005, should be prolonged. Moreover, invitations could be sent to all Member States when one Member State carries out a large-scale exercise.

The importance of reimbursement from the responsible party after dealing with an oil pollution incident was also referred to as a priority. The examples of Greece (implementation of the Blue Fund) and the experience from Croatia where everyone who uses the Croatian waters pays were mentioned. Following the proposal of the representative of Iceland, the WG agreed that the implementation of the Bunker's Convention, which is not yet in force, would provide an efficient tool for reimbursement regarding response to oil pollution stemming from bunker oil.

It was further agreed that in EU waters, a common approach should be followed regarding the responsible authority dealing with pollution incidents.

With regard to pollution resulting from cargo in the case of the "FU SHAN HI" accident, it was decided that an evaluation should also be made on what is considered as non-toxic cargo.

The WG also discussed the importance of preparing operational guidelines and checklists from abstracts on national contingency plans to be used by the decision makers and the on-scene commanders. The importance of a liaison officer was considered in any operations where a number of Member States are engaged.

The issue of Places of Refuge was also discussed and it was agreed that they have to be integrated into Contingency Planning.

It was further agreed that English has to be the common language within the Community when operating with other Member States in response operations (depending on the Member States participating).

The WG agreed that the common European Contingency Plan should be divided into two sections, namely a General Part (administrative part of the plan) and the Manual (operational part of the plan). The General Plan should, if possible, be open for the public, whilst the Manual should include telephone numbers and staff positions that are confidential by law.

The WG also decided that communication with the media also has to be incorporated in the Contingency Plan, whilst people have to be trained in crisis management.

The issue of volunteers was also discussed. It was recalled that in the "BALTIC CARRIER" incident, the local authorities responsible for the clean up operations turned down volunteers' request for assistance for health and safety issues.

Finally, the WG members agreed upon the report, which summarised all the above-mentioned issues.

E.2.3 WG3 Proceedings

Working Group 3 focused on the PRESTIGE case study and consisted of 14 members, as listed in Annex III. The Group members elected Dr. Vassilios Mamaloukas - Fragoulis from Environmental Protection Engineering SA as their Chairperson.

At the first stage, each participant made a summary of the National Contingency Plan existing in his/her country in an attempt to identify the different practices and the existing level of cooperation between Member States. These summaries are listed hereunder.

Germany

- There is federalist system. The Federal Government and five Federal Coastal States have set up a Central Command for Maritime Emergencies, which is created by members of different states and ministries.
- The Central Command is the lead agency for the coordination of the work to be undertaken if a serious accident occurs.
- The Central Command gives orders to the coastal states. As long as the states follow the orders, the Central Command pays all the expenses; otherwise the individual states bear the cost.
- The Federal Government is responsible for claiming the expenses (e.g. from the P&I Clubs). Sometimes the P&I Clubs are invited as advisors, but under no circumstances can they decide.
- There are no cleaning contractors because there are not many spills.
- In the FU SHAN HAI incident it took Germany only 45 minutes to send two vessels.
- No problems of cooperation when they sent vessels for the PRESTIGE.

Estonia

- The Ministry of Environment is the responsible authority for general coordination. The operational responsibility belongs to the Board of Border Guard.
- There is regional cooperation with Finland, Russia, Latvia and Sweden.
- There is an Action Plan. The Contingency Plan is under construction.
- There are plans to increase the country's response capacity.
- When it comes to Tier III, Estonia is dependant on the assistance of partners. Estonia relies mainly on partners within HELCOM.

Greece

- The Central Command belongs to the Ministry of Mercantile Marine.
- There are three levels of response, activated according to the extent of the problem.
- Local authorities are required to have their own contingency plans and resources.
- There is multinational cooperation through REMPEC and the country can operate with other companies if it is needed.
- The “Blue Fund” is a non-governmental fund that covers the cost of the spills. The money comes from other previous polluters.

Markleen Salvage-Spain

- The Spanish Marine Safety Agency (SASEMAR) is responsible for at-sea response to oil pollution incidents.
- Recent law invites ports and communities to prepare their own contingency plans.
- There are maritime Captains in every community.
- Since the PRESTIGE incident there have been amendments and changes in the Contingency Plan.
- Catalonia has made a sensitivity mapping. All the other regions are still in progress.

Ireland

- The Department of Communications Marine and Natural Resources has the ultimate responsibility. The operational responsibility falls under the Irish Coast Guard.
- The Coast Guard has the responsibility for marine emergency management, search and rescue, and pollution response.
- For Tier III only one authority is responsible.
- The basic problem is the logistics. There are no people to carry out the work. The Coast Guard is comprised only of 10 people.
- The training of personnel is one of the most crucial elements in a successful response operation.
- The basic question is how to handle volunteers.

OSRL/PIECA

- In the UK, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency is the competent authority responsible for responding to pollution from ships and offshore installations.
- Exercising in advance is the basic element for those involved in pollution response.
- The polluters pay immediately. There is pressure from P&I Clubs.

Lithuania

- The Ministry of Environment has the administrative responsibility for combating oil pollution incidents. The Lithuanian Maritime Safety Administration has the overall operational responsibility.
- The Municipalities have their own contingency plans.
- There will soon be a bi-lateral agreement with Russia.
- There has been an increase in oil transportation and for this reason new risk assessments have taken place.
- There are no oil spill contractors.

Portugal

- The “Direcção-General da Autoridade Marítima”, under the auspices of the National Maritime Authority and the Ministry of Defence, is responsible for the prevention of and response to maritime pollution.
- The Contingency Plan, which is 10 years old, is under revision.
- There are 4 levels in Contingency Planning.
- There are dispersants in stock, but their use is considered only on a case-by case basis, as long as approval has been given by the Ministry of Environment. This can create problems, especially during bank holidays. The Ministry does not have an approved list of dispersants.
- In the case of accidents such as the PRESTIGE, a good Contingency Plan can help but cannot solve all the problems.
- Hydrographic Institutes help to predict the fate of the spill.
- Aerial surveillance is of paramount importance.
- The Lisbon Agreement never came into force due to political reasons.
- Governments have to base their decisions on the advice given by the technical expertise.

Norway

- The Ministry of Fisheries has the ultimate responsibility for oil spill response.
- The Coast Guard is a useful tool as there are Coast Guard vessels everywhere.
- During big spills the government will pay all expenses. The polluter does not appoint a contractor.
- There have been some small changes in the National Contingency Plan to cover hazardous substances.
- All oil spill incidents are reported efficiently.
- There is good cooperation with the industry.
- There are 16 stockpiles. Ten people are responsible for every stockpile and the system seems to work well. The most efficient way to deal with stockpiles is to have people to check around and inspect.
- No problems of cooperation when they sent vessels for the PRESTIGE.

Albania

- The Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Transport are the responsible government authorities for Contingency Planning.
- There is no National Contingency Plan, but there are attempts for cooperation with REMPEC and IMO in order for Contingency and Action Plans to be prepared.
- There is also close cooperation with Italy.
- There are master harbors and the ports have their own responsibilities.

Israel

- The Ministry of Environment has the ultimate responsibility.
- There is Tier I and Tier III. Tier II is non-existent. The Tier I has to do with the industry and ports.
- There are problems with the local authorities and coordination problems with the neighboring countries.
- There is good environmental mapping - areas of sensitivities.

Having taken into account the issues raised by the PRESTIGE case, the participants made the following general comments:

- No State can deal easily with a big spill.
- The National Contingency Plan should be seen as an on-going process that needs continuous review.
- There is lack of technical expertise, which is of paramount importance. An advisory council in every Member State could have a positive impact on the response operation.
- There is an urgent need to address the issue of local government.
- The issue of volunteers requires special attention.
- Aerial surveillance is essential
- Risk assessment is necessary. Questions were raised about the use of the worst-case scenario. It is not only necessary to examine the size of an oil spill, but also what happens in cases where an incident takes place between the borders of two states. A common sensitivity approach may prove helpful.
- There are financial problems with the contractors.
- The PRESTIGE highlighted the successful co-operation between EU Member States and Norway.

From the lessons learnt from the PRESTIGE, the participants addressed the importance of the following issues:

1. Integration of regional and national contingency plans is essential.

- Follow IMO guidelines and not develop new ones, which will result in duplication of effort.
- Clear chain of command /clear roles and responsibilities. A single lead authority is advisable.

2. Risk assessment

- Commonly excepted criteria for the risk assessment at European level (symbols, colors etc.) are recommended. Perhaps we have to follow UNEP-WCMC format/standard.
- Shoreline sensitivities as well as shoreline protection strategies should be included on maps.

3. Improvement in the ways we share information.

- This can be achieved by encouraging the Member States to update their information at the Community Information System. The use of a Common Emergency System, based on CIS, is advisable

4. Encouragement of training, equipment and alert exercises.

- Participation of observers is advisable. The finance of participation by the European Union was mentioned as a possibility.

5. Improving cooperation between EU member states.

- Regular contact between competent national administrations through frequent meetings/workshops will facilitate cooperation during a spill
- Follow-up workshops are advisable, specifically those focusing on one issue (i.e. Volunteers -within an oil spill response operation and their training- perhaps to come up with common European Guidelines on how to work with volunteers - Project already started within DG ENV's Civil Protection Unit).

5. Finding ways of ensuring funding during oil spill response operations (neighbouring state assistance or contractors)

- It was recognized that this is a national issue, but participants considered the possibility whether the European Commission could enforce measures.
- Contracts/agreements with contractors including price list to be agreed at planning stage

E.2.4 Meeting of WG Chairpersons, Speakers and Organizers

Upon completion of the Sessions, a meeting took place with the participation of the Chairpersons of the WGs, the guest speakers that presented the case studies, the representative of the European Commission's DG ENV, the Director General and staff of HELMEPA in order to sum up the findings-results of the WGs and prepare the final day's proceedings.

During the meeting, the Chairpersons of the 3 WGs presented the conclusions from their respective WGs. These presentations were followed by an extensive discussion between all participants regarding the feasibility of adopting a common approach to Contingency Planning in the European Union through the introduction of European Guidelines in the field.

Following constructive dialogue and an extensive exchange of views, ideas and proposals, the participants to the meeting agreed on the common points reached by the three WGs regarding Contingency Planning in the European Union.

The format of these points was further developed by HELMEPA, circulated amongst the participants to the above-mentioned meeting in the evening of the same day and finalized following minor amendments to the text.

E.3 Day 3 of the Workshop – Friday 3 June 2005

The final day of the Workshop began with a presentation titled "Computer- aided Contingency Planning System of the German Coastal States" by Mr. Dirk-Uwe Spengler of the State Ministry of Urban Development & Environment (Annex IV - 6).

Following, a panel consisting of the Chairpersons of the three Working Groups under the chairmanship of HELMEPA's Director General proceeded to the final stage of the Workshop with the presentations of the Reports of the Working Groups as follows:

Working Group 1 Report – ERIKA (Annex IV – 7.1)

Presented by the Chairperson of WG1, Mr. Thomas Liebert from the OSRL/EARL Alliance, representative of IPIECA.

Working Group 2 Report – FU SHAN HAI (Annex IV – 7.2)

Presented by the Chairperson of WG2, Cdr. Peter Soberg Poulsen, Branch Chief Maritime Environment - Admiral Danish Fleet HQ.

Working Group 3 Report – PRESTIGE (Annex IV – 7.3)

Presented by the Chairperson of WG3, Dr. Vassilios Mamaloukas-Fragoulis from Environmental Protection Engineering SA.

Following, the Chairperson of the Panel presented to the participants the commonly reached conclusions and recommendations made by the three Working Groups, as follows:

- Need for a common approach in Contingency Plans within the European Union through the use of common guidelines based notably on the IMO-OPRC 90 International Convention on Oil Spill Preparedness, Response and Cooperation.
- Enhancement of cooperation between EU Member States and neighbouring countries through common training and exercises, workshops and personal contacts of responsible persons.
- Encouragement of cooperation between countries within the framework of the regional agreements, such as Bonn Agreement, HELCOM and Barcelona Convention.
- Encouragement of Member States to continuously update the information in the CIS (Community Information System) to be used as a working tool.
- Examination of the use of volunteers during oil spills response operations, their training, safety and status.
- Establishment of criteria for a common approach to risk assessment.
- Inclusion of places of refuge into National Contingency Plans.
- Continuous cooperation between government and industry when appropriate.

These conclusions were included in a HELMEPA Press Release issued immediately after the conclusion of the Workshop and presented to the Press Conference that followed.

The Workshop came to an end with a final note by the representative of the European Commission Mr. Thomas de Lannoy who congratulated HELMEPA, thanked all participants and made reference to the following issues:

- Interesting discussions held during the Workshop.
- Importance of volunteers.
- European Commission to note the conclusions of the Working Groups.

- Exchange of observers between cooperating governments.
- Future EU sponsored Workshops on environmental damage and illegal discharges from ships.
- Exchange of knowledge between the participants of HELMEPA's Workshop.

F. Evaluation Form

Upon the request of DG Environment, prior to the commencement of the Workshop HELMEPA distributed to all participants the European Commission's Evaluation Form (Annex V).

Thirty (30) participants filled in and returned to HELMEPA the Evaluation Forms, which were then forwarded to the European Commission's DG ENV.

Listed hereunder are the replies of participants to the questions of the Evaluation Form.

Question 1: The objectives of the Workshop , as set by HELMEPA, were met completely according to 11 participants, well according to 15 participants and partly according to one participant.

Question 2: The objectives of the Workshop for the participants themselves can be summarized as follows:

1. Improve cooperation between member states.
2. Exchange information on Contingency Planning (CP).
3. New approaches on CP.
4. Find out how CP works through lessons learned from past cases.
5. Understand how other countries deal with this issue.
6. Establish contacts with partners.
7. Discuss different views on cooperation and regional agreements.
8. Based on the lessons learned to provide a way forward and specific actions that can be applied at a European level.

On the question how these were achieved, 12 answered completely, 16 answered well and 1 partly.

Question 3: With reference to the content of the event:

- a) 24 answered that it was very relevant to their job and 6 that it was relevant to their job.
- b) 26 answered that the content covered was about right, 3 that it was too much and 1 that it was too little.
- c) 29 answered that the level of content was about right and 1 that it was too long.

d) 26 answered that the length of the event was about right , 1 that it was too long and 3 that it was too short.

Question 4: Regarding the overall assessment of the speakers (0=poor, 3=very good), 23 of the participants rated them with a grade 3 and 7 with a grade 2.

Question 5: With regards to the way the event was given, 23 participants rated the use of visual aids with a grade 3 and 7 participants with a grade 2. The provision of handouts and other documentation were given a grade 3 by 15 participants, a grade 2 by 12 participants and a grade 1 by 1 participant.

Question 6: Regarding the overall rating for the Workshop, 21 participants gave it a grade 3 and 8 participants a grade 2.

Question 7: Asked whether such an event should be repeated, all participants answered positively.

Main comments made by participants:

1. Extremely worthwhile Workshop, which brought together a large number of EU colleagues and neighbors. Good exchange of views and experiences that can only be achieved through such workshops.
2. Very well chaired and organized.
3. Useful Workshop, its' conclusions will help us in future activities in this field.
4. Well balanced program.
5. Very useful for all participants.
6. A similar Workshop could be organized for the south Mediterranean countries with the participation of HELMEPA and MOIG using the feedback experience from this Workshop.
7. The Workshop went very well. Recommendation for future workshops on specific aspects of Contingency Planning.
8. Ensure participation of Member States at the right level to facilitate a more challenging meeting. Improve the quality of background information to prepare the Workshop better.
9. Copies of the presentation should be given before hand.
10. Too many issues for such a short time. Better to have Workshops solely aimed at specific themes of Contingency Planning ie the issue of volunteers.
11. Attendance should be encouraged from all Member States. It was noted that many important countries (i.e. France, Spain, Netherlands) were not present. Not sure if appropriate decision makers from each government were invited. Overall a very good Workshop.
12. Representatives from France and Spain should have been present.
13. Translation from French was not clear.
14. Copies of the presentations would be useful.

G. Follow-up action

In accordance with Part I, paragraphs 2.1.2 and 2.4 of the Proposal and following the new timetable of critical events approved by DG Environment (Annex VI), on 14 June 2005 HELMEPA sent a CD-Rom (Annex IV) titled "Proceedings Report" to all Workshop participants containing the following:

1. Final List of Participants.
2. Information Paper on Contingency Planning in the European Union.
3. Power-point presentation titled "Introduction to the issue of Contingency Planning".
4. Power-point presentations of case studies.
5. Working Groups' List.
6. Power-point presentation titled "Computer-aided contingency planning system of the German States".
7. Reports of Working Groups.
8. Photographs from the event.

The same CD-Rom was sent to the 209 HELMEPA member managing companies and organizations in Greece and abroad, as well as to international institutions and agencies with which HELMEPA co-operates, including the following:

Organization/Agency
Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS)
Australian Marine Environment Protection Association (AUSMEPA)
Bonn Agreement
Cyprus Marine Environment Protection Association (CYMEPA)
Hellenic Chamber of Shipping (NEE)
International Chamber of Shipping (ICS)
International Maritime Organization (IMO)
International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation (ITOPF)
Oil Companies International Marine Forum (OCIMF)
Regional Emergency Marine Pollution Emergency Center for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC)
Sea Alarm Foundation
Union of Greek Shipowners (UGS)
World Maritime University (WMU)

Moreover, 12,500 Greek seafarers who constitute the Association's driving force were informed about the results of the Workshop through an extensive article included in HELMEPA's quarterly newsletter (Annex VII). The total number of recipients of the HELMEPA newsletter are 14,000 people in Greece and abroad including inter-governmental institutions, government authorities, national coast guards, international shipping organizations, universities and training institutions.

There was also extensive media coverage of the event and the findings of the Workshop in the local press, TV and radio stations as well as in the national press in Greece. An article on the findings of the Workshop was also included in the Lloyd's List issue of 9 June 2005 (Annex VII).

In this way, a considerable segment of the Greek and international maritime industry, as well as government authorities and the wider public, were informed about this joint initiative of the European Commission and HELMEPA to upgrade the level of preparedness and response to major marine pollution incidents through the cooperation of all stakeholders involved.

Finally, following an invitation of the European Maritime Safety Agency, the results-findings of the Workshop were presented by HELMEPA at a workshop organized by EMSA between 30 June and 1 July 2005 in Brussels titled: "Oil Spills: Reflections on the Response Chain". Participants included EU maritime Member States, Norway and Iceland, Turkey, regional agreements and international organizations.

H. Results - Concluding remarks

Besides the findings of the three WGs as described in Sections E.2.1 - E2.3 and the common conclusions reached, as described in Section E.3, the HELMEPA Workshop also provided the platform for the following:

- Constructive exchange of views regarding practices and experience on Contingency Planning between experts from 14 maritime Member States of the European Union, Norway and Iceland.
- Transfer of technical know-how and experience from European States that are advanced in the field of marine pollution preparedness and response to less advanced European and Mediterranean States.
- Recording of strengths and weaknesses of existing national and regional contingency plans and establishment of best practice.
- Enhancement of links and networking between competent government administrations of EU maritime Member States and neighbouring countries, regional agreements, international organizations and the shipping and oil industries.
- Recording of common factors and particularities of Members States or areas in order to assess the feasibility of establishing common European guidelines in the field of Contingency Planning.

- Promotion of a framework of cooperation among stakeholders active both in the field of marine pollution prevention and response/ clean-up activities in order to achieve coordination of activities that may lead to minimization of marine pollution incidents and mitigation of environmental damage.

ANNEX I
Workshop Program

“Contingency Planning in the European Union”

Tuesday, 31 May 2005

Arrival in Athens of Workshop participants - Check in at the Hotel Holiday Inn – Attiki Odos by the Airport

20:00 Dinner at Hotel

Wednesday, 1 June 2005

08:30 Departure of participants by coach to Petalidi – South Peloponnese

12:30 Arrival at Petalidi – Check in at Hotel

13:30 Lunch

15:00-15:30 Registration

15:30-16:00 Welcoming addresses by:

Captain V.C. Constantakopoulos, Honorary Chairman of HELMEPA

Mr. Elias Koutsodimitropoulos, Mayor of Petalidi

Mr. Thomas de Lannoy, European Commission

16:00-16:15 Objectives of the Workshop by HELMEPA Director General

Captain Dimitris C. Mitsatsos, HN

16:15-16:30 Introduction to contingency planning by Dr. Vassilios

Mamaloukas Fragoulis, Director Marine Environment, EPE SA

16:30-17:15 Case Study 1: “ERIKA” by Mr Loeiz Dagorn, CEDRE

17:15-17:30 Coffee break

17:30-18:15 Case Study 2: “FU SHAN HI” by Cdr Peter Soberg Poulsen, HELCOM

18:15-19:00 Case Study 3: “PRESTIGE” by Ms Stephanie Seddon Brown, MARKLEEN Salvage

20:00 Dinner

Thursday, 2 June 2005

Workshop participants are divided into 3 Working Groups (WGs) as per the attached Table. Themes to be discussed at each WG may include:

- (i) Contingency Planning on national basis
- (ii) Multinational Cooperation/Regional Agreements/Contingency Planning and implementation by response entities
- (iii) Areas and issues that may have been dealt with more effectively if provisions were in place.

WGs will convene as follows:

09:30 -11:00 WGs in session

11:00 -11:15 Coffee Break

11:15 -12:00 WGs in session

12:00 -14:00 Lunch

14:00 -15:30 WGs prepare their report

15:30 -15:45 Coffee Break

15:45 -17:15 Meeting of WGs' Chairmen and organisers of the Workshop

20:00 Dinner

Friday, 3 June 2005

- 09.00-09.30 "A computer aided contingency plan (VPS) of the German Coastal States" by Mr Dirk-Uwe Spengler, State Ministry of Urban Development & Environment
- 09:30-10:00 Presentation of WG1 report
- 10:00-10:30 Presentation of WG2 report
- 10:30-10:45 Coffee break
- 10:45-11:15 Presentation of WG3 report
- 11:15-12:00 Discussion
- 12:00-12:45 Consideration of the feasibility of adopting a uniform approach for Contingency Planning in the EU through the establishment of a minimum set of standards
- 13:00 Sandwiches to be offered to delegates wishing to depart.
- 13:30 Coach departs for either Athens International Airport or Holiday Inn Hotel - Attiki Odos at Athens
- 14:00 Lunch
- 20:00 Dinner for participants to stay over the weekend

Note

Remaining participants will depart on Sunday, 5 June at 08.00 for Athens.

ANNEX II
List of Participants

SPEAKERS

Ms Stephanie Seddon-Brown
Environmental Projects and Marketing
Manager
MARKLEEN Salvage

Mr Loeiz Dagorn
CEDRE

Cdr. Peter Søberg Poulsen
Branch Chief Maritime Environment
Admiral Danish Fleet HQ

**EU MEMBER STATES, NORWAY &
ICELAND**

BELGIUM

Lt Cdr Manuel Dory, 1LV
COMOPSNV

ESTONIA

Mr. Silver Vahtra
Sea Pollution Response Section
Maritime dept.
Estonian Board of Border Guard

Mr. Jaan Tross
Estonian Rescue Board

GERMANY

Mr. Bernd Bluhm, Dipl.-Ing.
Central Command for Maritime
Emergencies (CCME) Germany

Mr. Dirk-Uwe Spengler
State Ministry of Urban Development and
Environment
Environmental Emergency Response Unit

GREECE

Capt. Andreas Zoulos

Director / Marine Environment Protection
Division
Ministry of Mercantile Marine

Cdr. Dimitrios Krioneritis

Ministry of Mercantile Marine
Marine Environment Protection Division

IRELAND

Mr. Eugene Clonan

Marine Pollution & Salvage Manager
Irish Coast Guard
Dept of Communications Marine & Natural
Resources

Mr. Michael McGarry

Divisional Controller
Malin Head Coast Guard Radio Station

ITALY

Ms. Ilaria Masone

Ministry for the Environment and Territory
Directorate General for Nature Protection

LATVIA

Mr Guntis Drunka

State Environmental Service
Marine and Inland Waters Administration

LITHUANIA

Ms. Agne Kniezaite

Chief Desk Officer of Water Division
Ministry of Environment of Republic of
Lithuania

MALTA

Capt Richard Gabriele MCIT, FNI

Harbour Master
Ports Directorate
Malta Maritime Authority

POLAND

Mr. Karol Wojcik

Marine Environment Protection Division
Department of Maritime
and Inland Waters Administration
Ministry of Infrastructure

PORTUGAL

Mr. Fernando Costa Freire

Autoridade Maritima of Portugal
Praca do Comercio

SWEDEN

Mr. Tommy Carlsson

Regional coordinator Rescue Department
Swedish Coastguard

Cdr. Anders Gelderman

Swedish Coast Guard Region South
Inspector of County Blekinge

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Donald McDonald

Counter Pollution & Salvage Officer
Maritime and Coastguard Agency
MCA Liverpool

Mr. Richard Montado

Gibraltar Ships Registry

NORWAY

Mr. Jan Nerland

Project Manager, Dep. for Emergency
Response, Norwegian Coastal
Administration

ICELAND

Dr. Kristján Geirsson

Project Manager
Environmental Regulation Environment and
Food Agency of Iceland

NON EU STATES

ALBANIA

Mr. Shkelqim Xhaxhiu

Director of Maritime Transport and Sea Port
Ministry of Transport and
Telecommunication

BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA

Ms Enisa Babic

Head of Department
Ministry of Communications and Transport
Department for air traffic, waterway and
pipeline transport

ISRAEL

Ms. Peleg Kremer

Hazmat ltd.
19 Hamelacha st. Rosh Ha'ayin 48091
Israel

SERBIA & MONTENEGRO

Captain Veljko Rakocevic

Maritime Safety Department
Montenegro

OTHERS

EPE SA

Dr. Vassilios Mamaloukas-Frangoulis

Environmental Protection Engineering SA

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Mr. Thomas de Lannoy

DG Environment A.5 BU-9 2/185
Civil Protection Unit

EMSA

Cdr. Alexandros Lagouros
European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA)
Policy Officer on Oil Pollution Response

IPIECA

Mr. Thomas Liebert
Advocacy Manager
OSRL/EARL Alliance

Ms Sioned Blackburn
Global Initiative Consultant
OSRL/IPIECA

MOIG

Mr. Ridha Dhaoui
Director / MOIG

TURMEPA

Mr. Levent Ballar
Secretary General TURMEPA

UNEP/MAP

Dr. Saverio Civili
UNEP/MAP

ANNEX III
Working Groups

WG 1: “ ERIKA ”	<u>WG 2: “FU SHAN HAI ”</u>	WG 3: “ PRESTIGE ”
Chairperson	Chairperson	Chairperson
Mr. Thomas Liebert (IPIECA)	Cdr Peter Soberg Poulsen (Speaker)	Dr. Vassilios Mamaloukas-Fragoulis (EPE SA)
Members	Members	Members
Mr Loeiz Dagorn (Speaker)	Mr. Jaan Tross (Estonia)	Ms Stephanie Seddon Brown (Speaker)
LtCdr Manuel Dory (Belgium)	Mr. Dirk-Uwe Spengler (Germany)	Mr. Silver Vahtra (Estonia)
Mr. Michael McGarry (Ireland)	Cdr. Dimitrios Kryoneritis (Greece)	Mr. Bernd Bluhm (Germany)
Ms Ilaria Masone (Italy)	Mr. Guntis Drunka (Latvia)	Capt. Andreas Zoulos (Greece)
Capt. Richard Gabriele (Malta)	Mr. Karol Wojcik (Poland)	Mr. Eugene Clonan (Ireland)
Mr. Anders Gelderman (Sweden)	Mr. Tommy Carlsson (Sweden)	Ms. Agne Kniezaite (Lithuania)
Mr. Donald McDonald (United Kingdom)	Dr. Kristjan Geirsson (Iceland)	Mr. Fernando Costa Freire (Portugal)
Ms. Enisa Babic (Bosnia & Herzegovina)	Mr. Richard Montado (Gibraltar)	Mr. Jan Nerland (Norway)
Dr. Saverio Civili (UNEP/MAP)	Capt. Veljko Rakocevic (Serbia & Montenegro)	Mr. Shkelqim Xhaxhiu (Albania)
Mr. Ridha Dhaoui (MOIG)		Ms. Peleg Kremer (Israel)
Mr. Levent Ballar (TURMEPA)		Cdr. Alexandros Lagouros (EMSA)
		Ms Sioned Blackburn (IPIECA)
Dr. Marina Papaioannou (HELMPEA)	Mr. Achilleas Mavranezoulis (HELMPEA)	Ms Aspasia Pastra (HELMPEA)
13	11	14

ANNEX IV
CD-Rom of Workshop Presentations

ANNEX V
European Commission's Evaluation Form



EVALUATION FORM

TYPE OF ACTION : Workshop
TITLE : Contingency Planning in the European Union
PLACE AND DATE : Kalamata, Greece 31 May – 2 June 2005

Please complete this form at the end of this event, so that:

- You can provide feedback on the event you have participated in.
- We can continually develop and improve this and other events.

Please indicate your views by circling the appropriate response to each question or statement

The objectives of the event were (to be completed by the organisers):
1) How well were these event objectives met?
Completely <input type="checkbox"/> Well <input type="checkbox"/> Partly <input type="checkbox"/> Not very well <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>

What were your objectives for this particular event (please be specific)
2) Were your objectives achieved?
Completely <input type="checkbox"/> Well <input type="checkbox"/> Partly <input type="checkbox"/> Not very well <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>

3) Content of the event			
Relevance to your job	Very relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant <input type="checkbox"/>	Of little Relevance <input type="checkbox"/>
Content covered	Too much <input type="checkbox"/>	About right <input type="checkbox"/>	Too little <input type="checkbox"/>
Level of content	Too advanced <input type="checkbox"/>	About right <input type="checkbox"/>	Too elementary <input type="checkbox"/>
Length of event	Too long <input type="checkbox"/>	About right <input type="checkbox"/>	Too short <input type="checkbox"/>

ANNEX VI

New timetable of project

Workshop dates: Wednesday 1–Friday 3 June 2005

2.4 Summary schedule of the project for which the subsidy is requested

Starting date of action/project:¹

14 December 2004

Date of completion of action/project:²

14 June 2004

Number of months necessary to complete the action/project:

6 months

Other information relevant to the schedule of the project and an indication of critical events for the successful implementation of the project, and where these might fall during the project period.

- Announcement of workshop and invitation to interested parties to participate will be made by **15 March 2005**
- European Commission is to appoint up to 25 participants (maritime Member States, Norway, Iceland and officials from DGs) as early as possible and no later than **1 April 2005**
- Final list of participants is to be drafted no later than **8 April 2005**
- Background report and workshop program will be sent to participants at least six weeks prior to workshop and no later than **15 April 2005**
- Guest speakers/participants to make presentations will be requested to submit their speeches/presentations by email three weeks prior to the workshop and no later than **11 May 2005**
- CD ROMs containing the final report and proceedings/presentations from the workshop will be sent to participants and other relevant bodies/institutions **by 14 June 2005**

¹ The dates of the start and completion of the action/project determine the period of eligibility of any expenditure. The date of the beginning of this period cannot be earlier than the date of registration of this present request.

² All expenditure incurred after this date will not be eligible except where express authorisation has been approved by the competent services.

ANNEX VII
Lloyd's List Issue of 9 June 2005

FOUNDED 1734

THURSDAY JUNE 9 2005

Lloyd's List

www.lloydslistevents.com SHIPPING • INSURANCE • ENERGY • TRADE • LOGISTICS

EU urged to co-operate on oil spills

By Nigel Lowry in Athens

GOVERNMENTS in the European Union and its neighbours have been urged to step up co-operation in contingency planning for oil spills.

A resolution calling for joint exercises, workshops and personal co-operation between officials at a wider European level was passed by a workshop of 40 contingency planning experts from 14 EU member states, seven other countries and nine international organisations.

The workshop, organised by the Hellenic Marine Environment Protection Association (Helmepa) and co-funded by the European Commission, also recommended that criteria be established for a common approach to risk assessment in the EU, as well as to contingency planning itself.

This could be based heavily on the IMO-OPRC 90 International Convention on Oil Spill Preparedness, Response and Cooperation, said Helmepa.

Experts also urged further co-operation

between government and industry "whenever appropriate" and backed the inclusion of places of refuge in national contingency plans.

Other recommendations included better updating of the Community Information System, increasing its effectiveness as a working tool, and a proper study of the use of volunteers during oil spill response operations.

The workshop, "Contingency Planning in the European Union", examined the lessons to be learned from three maritime accidents in European waters.

According to Helmepa director general Dimitris Mitsatsos, two of the accidents illustrated "doubtful actions and questionable bilateral co-operation".

Mr Mitsatsos said: "One can identify weaknesses which, if they had been foreseen and properly dealt with, might have avoided unfortunate developments.

"These are not limited to the technical or the environmental level but

they ride up on the political one, creating differences and friction among EU member states."

Mr Mitsatsos added: "Unfortunately, marine pollution does not recognise national boundaries and there are not always effective ways by which any one country can prevent the spreading of an oil spill. Co-operation between

countries in the wider region is necessary."

Shipowner Vassilis Constantacopoulos, Helmepa's honorary chairman, told the audience: "It is unfair for shipping, which is responsible only for 10% of global marine pollution, to be considered the sole culprit.

"Seafarers need to know that in time of need people on land are ready to assist them."