

Joint Workshop on Risk Assessment & Response Planning in Europe

**Co-organised by EMSA and DG ECHO
Held on 14 March 2018, in London, UK**

Workshop Report v.1
Date: 18 April 2018

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|------------|--|
| DG ECHO | Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations |
| EMSA | European Maritime Safety Agency |
| CTG MPPR | Consultative Technical Group for Marine Pollution Preparedness and Response |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| HELCOM | Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission |
| BRISK | Sub-regional risk of spill of oil and hazardous substances in the Baltic Sea Project |
| BE-AWARE | Area-wide Assessment of Risk Evaluations Project |
| REMPEC | Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea |
| MEDESS-4MS | Mediterranean decision support system for marine safety Project |
| DRA | Disaster Risk Assessment |
| NRA | National Risk Assessment |
| DRM | Disaster Risk Management |
| UCPM | Union Civil Protection Mechanism |
| MS | Member State |
| ABM | Automated Behaviour Monitoring |
| IMS | Integrated Maritime Services |
| BSEE | U.S. Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement |

1. Introduction

1.1 EMSA together with the European Commission / DG ECHO, organised the fourth joint workshop on “Risk Assessment and Response Planning in Europe”, on 14 March in London during the Interspill 2018 Conference and Exhibition event. As part of an on-going initiative to improve coordination between at-sea and shoreline pollution response authorities, EMSA and DG ECHO regularly co-organise such ‘joint workshops’ under the framework of the Consultative Technical Group for Marine Pollution Preparedness and Response (CTG MPPR), to share expertise and knowledge among the EU marine pollution response and civil protection communities on topics of common interest.

1.2 The topic of Risk Assessment is of particular interest also to the European Regional Seas Secretariats, which have undertaken relevant work in recent years at regional level. This workshop brought together 49 experts from the EU and EFTA Member States’ marine pollution response and civil protection authorities, representatives from the Regional Agreement Secretariats and the European Commission, as well as experts from relevant organisations, to share best practices on risk assessment methodologies and discuss effective response planning approaches and tools. The workshop was co-chaired by Julia Stewart-David (DG ECHO) and Frederic Hebert (EMSA); the workshop Agenda (Annex 1) and list of participants (Annex 2) are attached to this report.

2. Scope

2.1 Considering the wide definition and complexity of the topic addressed, this workshop focused on **risk assessments relating to marine pollution preparedness and response**. The first part of the workshop looked into the EU requirements and various risk assessment processes, focusing on the Union Civil Protection Mechanism framework and the regional work and risk assessment projects undertaken to date, while the second part looked at how risk assessment outcomes are implemented at national and regional levels and the future of maritime risk assessments.

2.2 More specifically, the workshop presented the current EU regulatory framework for risk assessments, including relevant work of the European Commission (DG ECHO & the JRC); reviewed key lessons learnt from the past and ongoing regional marine pollution risk assessment projects undertaken by the Regional Agreements; addressed current challenges, as identified by the participants through break-out discussion groups; and explored how to make such risk analyses easier and more effective and how to best implement their outputs, in order to achieve more efficient response planning and to improve marine pollution preparedness and response in Europe.

3. Summary of Session 1: Setting the scene in Europe

3.1 During this first session, **DG ECHO presented an overview of the disaster risk assessment (DRA) policy in the EU**, reminding that in accordance with the 2013 Union Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM) legislation¹, Member States (MS) are required to develop and submit to the European Commission every three years (starting at the end of 2015) their national risk assessments, as well as to develop disaster risk management planning and risk management capability assessments. With regard to the latter, the Commission published in 2015 ‘[Risk Management Capability Assessment Guidelines](#)’², to assist MS in their reporting obligations. It was clarified that Risk Management capability is assessed in terms of technical, financial and administrative capacity to carry out adequate risk assessments, risk management planning and risk prevention and preparedness measures.

3.2 A cross-sectoral [Overview of natural and man-made disaster risks in the EU](#)³ (published in May 2017) was also presented, covering the main risks of disasters as identified from national risk assessments (NRA) across the 28 EU MS and the six non-EU countries participating in the UCPM. This overview focuses on the 11 most frequently identified disaster risks and for each of these risks a more detailed factsheet (fiche) with key trends has been developed. No fiche exists currently on maritime incidents/marine pollution risks, as very few countries identified marine pollution as a disaster risk in their NRA reports, something that participants were invited to reflect upon within their national disaster risk assessment procedures in the future.

3.3 The International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation (ITOPF) provided an overview of types and frequency of maritime incidents in European waters, based on the ITOPF incident statistics, which look into two

¹ Decision No 1313/2013/EU on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism

² Commission Notice Risk Management Capability Assessment Guidelines (2015/C 261/03)

³ Commission Staff Working Document (SWD(2017) 176 final) – Overview of Natural and Man-made Disaster Risks the EU may face

types of datasets: the ITOPF mobilisations (which cover tanker and non-tanker incidents which may or may not result in spills), as well as the tanker spills (which cover tanker incidents that have resulted in spills of 7 tonnes). There has been a clear decline in the number of tanker oil spills in Europe since the 1970s. For the period 2008-2017, and based on the ITOPF tanker oil spill statistics, the average number of tanker oil spills (7 tonnes) in Europe was around 1 per year, with allisions/collisions being the top causes of spills and with most incidents occurring while the vessels were underway. Based on the ITOPF marine incident mobilisations in Europe for the period 2010-2017, 39 incidents were attended by ITOPF, the majority of which were non-tanker incidents, with groundings, followed by allisions/collisions identified as the top causes of marine incidents. Over a third of these incidents resulted in bunker spills.

3.4 The European Commission's **Joint Research Centre (JRC)** provided more information on:

A recent "**Study on impacts of natural hazards to offshore oil and gas structures in European waters**", which made a statistical analysis of incidents with a natural hazard trigger (e.g. bad weather, earthquake, hurricane, freeze) that occurred at oil and gas offshore installations in European waters, looking into the underlying causes and deriving lessons learned in support of future risk assessments. The results of this study can be used for scenario building for risk assessment and to build recommendations for improved emergency management. Relevant data from the Worldwide Offshore Accident Database (WOAD) were used for this study, which analysed 307 offshore incidents in European waters. The work's findings allowed the identification of the numerous factors (environmental, operational, structural, etc.) that contribute to increasing natural hazard risks at offshore infrastructures.

The **RiskData Hub**, which is a web-based platform, currently being developed by the JRC's Disaster Risk Management Knowledge Centre (DRMKC), intending to improve the access and sharing of curated EU-wide risk data, tools and methodologies for fostering Disaster Risk Management (DRM) related actions. [The Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction 2015–2030](#), recognized the critical role of geospatial technologies in disaster risk related actions in support of several of its Priorities. This recognition resulted in initiatives to use spatial information at all the stages of DRM and covering all geographical scales (local, sub-national, national, regional). Within the DRMKC's Risk Data Hub development, JRC are proposing to also develop the spatial identification of *marine* hazards and areas of impact at pan-European level (risk mapping). The data hosted at the RiskData Hub (which is an open source platform) are provided through different scientific groups (who own the data) and the work is still at its very beginning. While this tool could in the future be used to support maritime risk assessments, further information is needed to better understand the exact scope and requirements for the provision and dissemination of the risk data via the RiskData Hub.

4. Summary of Session 2: What have we learned so far

4.1 This session provided a brief overview of the main (past and ongoing) regional oil and chemical spill risk assessment projects, focusing on presenting the key project outcomes and main challenges faced.

BRISK: The representatives of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) presented the project "Sub-regional risk of spill of oil and hazardous substances in the Baltic Sea ([BRISK](#))", which was the first overall risk assessment of pollution caused by shipping accidents covering the whole Baltic Sea area. It aimed to identify missing response resources needed to effectively tackle major spills of oil and hazardous substances and to prepare investment plans on how the countries can jointly improve preparedness in the region. The risk assessment models used, key challenges faced and main project outcomes were presented.

BE-AWARE: The Bonn Agreement representative presented the "Area-wide Assessment of Risk Evaluations (BE-AWARE)", which aimed at identifying areas in the wider North Sea at increased risk of pollution, the potential for spills in those areas and the criteria for undertaking an analysis of the socioeconomic and environmental vulnerability ([BE-AWARE I](#)). This was followed up with [BE-AWARE II](#), aiming to identify the most effective future risk reduction and response measures, building directly upon the outcomes of the first project. A BE-AWARE Implementation Plan was adopted in 2016, identifying priorities for each sub-region, reviewed annually. The risk assessment models used, key challenges faced and main project outcomes were presented.

MEDESS-4MS: The Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC) representative presented the project "Mediterranean decision support system for marine safety ([MEDESS-4MS](#))", which aimed to develop an integrated operational multi model decision support tool accessible via a web-portal with interactive capabilities, enabling the assessment of an oil spill for the Mediterranean region. The tool gathers and analyses met-ocean data as well as data related to ship traffic,

ship operations and sensitivity mapping. The risk assessment approach used, the key challenges faced and the main project outcomes were presented.

OpenRisk: The HELCOM representative presented the ongoing project “Open-source tools for regional risk assessments to improve European preparedness and response at sea ([OpenRisk](#))”, which aims to address some of the challenges identified from past efforts, such as high costs, lack of transparency, lack of structured methodology to make assessments comparable, the need to harmonize the terminology used and strengthen the link between risk assessment and risk management. The approach used was presented, noting the use of the ISO 31000:2009 Standard on Risk Management and the four inter-regional workshops to be held under the project. It was also clarified that the expected outcomes include two publications, one with Guidelines for Risk Management and another on a Baltic Sea case study, including demonstration of new risk assessment tools.

Circumpolar Oil Spill Response Viability Analysis: The representative of DNV/GL presented the ‘[Circumpolar Oil Spill Response Viability Analysis](#)’ project, which aimed to assess the ability of oil spill response systems to operate in the Arctic marine environment and to estimate the percentage of time that the conditions for oil spill response are either ‘favourable’ or ‘marginal’ or ‘non-favourable’. For this purpose, the project analysed and matched the effects of the Arctic met-ocean conditions on oil spill response and the operating limits of oil spill response systems. The presentation highlighted some of the challenges and limitations of the approach used, and the main project outcomes and findings. This study was not a full risk assessment, but it looked into options for oil spill response in such a large and remote area as the Arctic, by estimating how often different types of oil spill response systems could be deployed in the Arctic based on defined operational limits.

The representative of the **Norwegian Coastal Administration (NCA)** presented how Norway followed-up the above mentioned circumpolar analysis to do a similar oil spill response viability analysis in the Norwegian waters, primarily looking into making the study available in a web-based application / planning tool. The added value for planning purposes of having the analysis outcomes available in a digital web-based tool with scalable area maps and with a drop-down choice of response systems and time of year were emphasised.

4.2 EMSA and DG ECHO concluded this session by **summarising some of the key points mentioned:**

- All projects presented were supported by external funding (high costs of projects);
- Most projects are based on proprietary models, owned by the consultant undertaking the study;
- The difficulty to engage with all the relevant stakeholders, either in the data-collection phase or in the implementation phase of the project outcomes, was a common challenge identified in most projects;
- Risk models involve uncertainties; the risk model limitations and assumptions used should be communicated very clear alongside the projects’ outcomes. Effective communication of the data sets used and the risk assessment outcomes is vital;
- Large and complex risk analyses projects are time-consuming, resource-intensive, not completely transparent and require specific technical expertise, as well as political and financial support;
- There is a need for a common ‘weighing scale’, a more harmonised terminology and understanding of the data used (risk assessment; vulnerability; socio-economic impacts; etc.);
- The scope and outcomes of the risk assessment projects undertaken to date vary largely, from ‘static snapshot’ exercises to more dynamic response planning approaches; each one of them provides concrete lessons learned and experiences that can be shared, in support of future efforts and/or for more detailed follow-up projects at national level. Marine pollution response is often an international effort, hence the *regional* approach for risk assessments makes sense and should be encouraged;
- It is very important to define the exact purpose and scope of the risk assessment exercise/study;
- Risk assessments should be directly linked to risk management planning to ensure their viability.

5. Summary of Session 3: How to address the main challenges & limitations of risk assessment

5.1 During this session, the participants held discussions in small groups of 6-8 people, facilitated by moderators, exchanging information and national / regional experiences on the following topics:

- How are risk assessments conducted at national level.

- What are the main challenges at national level and how are they addressed.
 - Recommendations on how to improve risk assessment procedures and outcomes.
- 5.2 Based on the feedback received following the discussions, **main elements identified included:**
- Cooperation between the civil protection and the marine pollution response authorities on disaster risk assessment is vital, but may be challenging, as it is not always clear which is the leading institution; cross-sectoral awareness and communication at national level are very important for effective risk assessments.
 - A more common approach is needed and if possible relevant expertise (tools, methods) and guidance on the procedure and the data format (input) required, could be centralised or built-up at EU level.
 - There is a large variety of approaches taken with regard to national risk assessments on marine pollution preparedness and response capabilities, varying from very structured approaches to basic or non-existent.
 - How to approach the 'likelihood' of oil spills is a challenge; should maritime traffic remain the main element for risk assessments, and should climate change and the morphology of the environment play an increasing role?
 - Data collection, sensitivity mapping and the prioritisation of affected resources are common challenges.
 - The outcomes and lessons learnt from past regional projects should be considered in any future approach.
 - Marine pollution risk assessment seems to be only a small part of the national disaster risk analysis, if it is included at all; maritime risk assessments could be done at regional level and followed-up nationally.
 - A clear link between risk analysis and risk management is vital to ensure financial support and the risk analysis continuity. In this regard, the appropriate and effective communication of the risk analysis outcomes towards all the relevant authorities and stakeholders is very important.
 - The use of the [ISO 31000:2009](#)⁴ (International Standard on Risk Management - Principles and Guidelines) used by the OpenRisk project could be an interesting approach for future efforts.

6. Summary of Session 4: How do we move forward from risk assessment to effective response planning

6.1 DG ECHO presented the main elements of the **revised Union Civil Protection Mechanism proposal**, which aims to improve response capacity building to the natural disasters faced in Europe. The new proposal, which is currently being negotiated, includes two main elements:

- (a) A legislative proposal – an amendment of the current legislation – with two pillars, the first aiming to strengthen the EU collective response to disasters (through the [rescEU](#) - a reserve at European level of civil protection capabilities managed by the Commission, ensuring additional capacities based on risk assessment); and the second pillar aiming towards a more robust prevention and preparedness. It was mentioned that in the marine pollution area, EMSA's services provide a sort of "maritime rescEU" capacity.
- (b) A Communication outlining what the Commission will do in the coming months to lay the ground for this new UCPM, including extended funding for risk reduction actions.

6.2 EMSA presented its **Integrated Maritime Services (IMS)** and how they can improve the operational maritime awareness through the analysis and integration of existing services providing maritime data (such as SafeSeaNet, CleanSeaNet, LRIT), filtered and customised for each user category. The IMS main functionalities were presented, noting the Automated Behaviour Monitoring (ABM) tool, which is a computer, rule-based system analysing vessel positions for the detection and alerting of abnormal and/or user specific vessel behaviours. With regard to risk assessment and response planning, the IMS can provide: a comprehensive overview of situation at sea (incl. integrated vessels info: accidents, incidents, HAZMAT, Waste, type and Earth Observation images and derived products, such as oil spills VDS, etc.); Profiling of high/medium/low risk vessels based on user preferences; ABM alerts; Meteorological and ocean information; Nautical charts with seabed & coastal characteristics; Information on Areas of Interest, shore authorities and responsibilities (including contact details); and link to external relevant databases & registries (e.g. EQUASIS, THETIS).

6.3 The session continued with a presentation by the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency on **how risk analysis and strategic planning are conducted in Sweden**. Sweden develops a new strategy document every

⁴ This standard has been revised by [ISO 31000:2018](#) Risk Management - Guidelines

10 years and this is done through a national coordination group which has been established by experts from local, county and national levels. The process is kept simple and transparent, and includes throughout all the relevant stakeholders. This helps achieve a joint understanding of risks and trends through a national risk assessment, followed by a guiding strategy document and an action plan with concrete actions and listed priorities, which is coordinated by a national group with a joint national vision on the purpose and outcomes. The Swedish risk assessment review conducted in 2016, the Swedish strategy for oil spill preparedness and response from 2014 and the 2016 action plan were presented.

6.4 The representative from the Oil Spill Preparedness Division of the U.S. Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) presented the US experience with **Planning Standards, Preparedness Research, and New Planning Tools for Measuring Response Equipment Capabilities**, looking into the question “How much response equipment is enough?”. He referred to the various limitations shown during the Deepwater Horizon spill, of using the combination of EDRC rates (effective daily recovery capacity) of skimming equipment and oil discharge volumes as the primary basis for evaluating the adequacy of oil spill response equipment. Following this, the BSEE developed a series of improved metrics for evaluating the capabilities of various response countermeasure systems (mechanical recovery, dispersants, and in situ burning), with the resulting calculators estimating potential response capabilities taking into account the components of a response system that address areal coverage and encounter rates, in addition to the volumetric ability to recover, store, and offload oil. These response system planning calculators are a good and simple tool for evaluating each system’s limitations and potential; they are stand-alone html files, downloadable from the [BSEE website](#). Reference was also made to the 2016 BSEE study on [Oil Spill Response Equipment Capability Analysis](#), which modelled the responses to nine different subsea blowout worst case discharge scenarios.

6.5 The participants then held discussions in small groups of 6-8 people, facilitated by moderators, exploring recommendations on how we can make risk management planning more effective in Europe. Based on the feedback received following the discussions, **recommendations commonly identified included:**

- Risk management planning is a continuous process and it is very important to realistically communicate the risk management plans, and what can be really done and what not, to all relevant stakeholders.
- Effective data collection and data management is a big challenge.
- The risk analysis process should be kept as simple and transparent as possible, and guidance on how to standardise a bit the methodology used could be developed at regional or EU level. More guidance on this issue and dedicated funding to support the continuity of effective risk management are needed.
- There should be a higher political awareness on the outcomes of the relevant large-scale regional/EU projects; the Commission could assist to raise awareness on the key outcomes and challenges.

7. Workshop outcomes and recommendations

7.1 This workshop was an initial attempt to address at EU level the wide topic of maritime (oil and chemical) spill pollution risk assessment and response planning, by bringing together relevant civil protection and maritime authorities. The workshop looked into the lessons learned from the regional risk analysis projects conducted to date and the existing EU framework for risk assessment and on this basis, addressed challenges and made recommendations for improved and easier risk assessment and response planning procedures. Interactive group discussions throughout the workshop facilitated the exchange of national / regional experiences and best practices.

7.2 The following **concluding remarks** were made by DG ECHO and EMSA:

It is important to find a sustainable funding mechanism for regional risk assessment and risk reduction processes, via the Regional Agreements and the EU. Member States need to find the way to plug into national risk assessment processes. Coordination at national level is imperative. The EU can support with tools and methodologies that could potentially be applicable (e.g. an inventory of JRC, EMSA & ECHO supporting tools could be developed).

Need to develop a suitable simple, robust and open source ‘model’ to run (and easily repeat) risk assessments according to regional or national needs (both for sophisticated and more simple and frequent risk assessments). Starting with more simple risk assessments could be a more realistic target.

As demonstrated by Sweden, keeping regional risk assessments simple and transparent, without too many layers, creating a common foundation and a joint vision, while engaging with all stakeholders at national level (including research institutes) can facilitate the process.

The importance of clearly identifying the purpose(s) and scope of risk assessments and risk management plans and clearly communicating these to all stakeholders (responders, decision makers and general public) was highlighted. Communicating more realistically what maritime preparedness and response can do and what could be the acceptable risk, based on the available response resources is very important in order to manage expectations. Every spill, no matter the contingency plan in place or the response resources available, will result in oil contacting the environment.

There is a need for a common weighting scale to harmonise the use of socio-economic, vulnerability and other data and for defining data standards for input to risk assessments.

Need for EU guidance on how to move from static to (partially) dynamic risk assessment exercises with national uptake and use of regional outcomes. Need to support the move from risk assessment to response management and how to adjust national contingency plans.

It could be useful to re-assess the effectiveness and gaps of national response means (as per US example).

While for marine pollution the regional risks seem to be clearly mapped, the national planning or risk assessment barely takes this into the overall approach; there is room to strengthen the existing risk management planning framework in this regard. This differs a bit from the EU Risk Overview (civil protection community) where more regional planning is encouraged for commonly identified national risks.

Risk assessments should reflect the relevance of climate dimensions associated with certain risks.

All MS must conduct national risk assessments where marine pollution should be considered/included, so that it could be in the future properly presented in the 'Overview of Risks in the EU', with a dedicated factsheet (fiche). The question if MS should view marine pollution as a part of a multi-sectoral risk assessment approach, or address it as a stand-alone (as has been done at regional level) was discussed.

Requiring scenario-based modelling in contingency plans in order to evaluate the capability of the contracted response resources to reduce oil contact with the environment could be a good practice approach.

7.3 Based on the workshop discussions and concluding remarks, the need for more guidance on this issue was identified. Also, a clear willingness was shown by Member States to further work on this topic with a view to achieve a European wide, easy to work with risk assessment 'tool or method or approach', mainly based on maritime traffic data, able to assess the efficiency of the possible response actions to various spill scenarios, as well as their environmental and socio economic impact. The preferred geographical scale to perform these risk assessments is the regional one, in cooperation with the respective Regional Agreements.

7.4 In addition, DG ECHO and EMSA will further explore the relevant work and tools of the JRC, to clarify their potential use to support marine pollution risk analysis methodologies. EMSA informed the meeting that its Administrative Board has adopted a recommendation asking the Agency to perform in 2018-2019, a kind of "stress test" of the regional capacities and mechanisms to assess the level of top-up resources needed. Based on the workshop discussions, EMSA will come back to the Member States with proposals on how to implement this action.

7.5 The outcome of and possible follow-up from this workshop will be presented to the 12th CTG MPPR meeting in October 2018. This report and the workshop presentations are published on EMSA's website (<http://emsa.europa.eu/>).

List of Annexes

| | |
|---------|--------------------|
| Annex 1 | Workshop Agenda |
| Annex 2 | Participants' List |

European Maritime Safety Agency

Praça Europa 4
1249-206 Lisbon, Portugal
Tel +351 21 1209 200
Fax +351 21 1209 210
ems.europa.eu



Annex 1 - Revised Agenda

Joint Workshop on risk assessment and response planning in Europe, co-organised by the European Commission/DG ECHO and EMSA

South Gallery Room 17, ExCeL Centre, London, UK, 14 March 2018

Chairpersons: Julia Stewart-David (European Commission/DG ECHO) & Frederic Hebert (EMSA)

Wednesday, 14 March 2018

| Time | Agenda Item |
|--|--|
| 08:00 – 09:00 | Arrival & Registration of Participants at ExCeL Centre (Registration is done right outside the Interspill 2018 Exhibition Hall, see info in Annex 2) |
| 09:00 – 09:20 | Interspill Conference & Exhibition Hall opens at 9:00 - delegates then have until 9:20 to reach the South Gallery room 17 for the workshop on the 1 st floor (through the Exhibition Hall) |
| 09:20 – 9:35 | Workshop starts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome (EMSA & DG ECHO) ▪ Scope of workshop (EMSA) |
| Session 1 – Setting the scene in Europe | |
| 09:35 – 10:40 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EU Regulatory Framework (DG ECHO) ▪ Frequency & typology of incidents in European waters (ITOPF) ▪ Relevant work of the Joint Research Centre (JRC) (European Commission/JRC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study on impacts of natural hazards to offshore infrastructures in European waters - EU Tools that could assist in risk assessment - RiskData Hub |
| Session 2 – What have we learned so far | |
| 10:40 - 12:15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key conclusions from past regional risk assessment projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BRISK (HELCOM) - BE-AWARE (Bonn Agreement) - MEDESS-4MS (REMPEC) ▪ What can ongoing projects show us: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OpenRisk (HELCOM) - Circumpolar Oil Spill Response Analysis & Norwegian Risk Assessment approach (DNV GK & NCA) ▪ Common challenges and limitations - Wrap-up (EMSA) |
| 11:15 - 11:30 | Short Break |

| Time | Agenda Item |
|---|---|
| Session 3 – How to address the main challenges & limitations of risk assessment | |
| 12:15 – 13:15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small discussion groups with all participants addressing the following topics (45m): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How are risk assessments conducted at national level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approach to the risk assessment process (scope, risk selection criteria, timeframe, multi-stakeholder involvement, use of data and scientific tools) - Risk assessment methodologies (risk identification, risk analysis (likelihood and impact), risk evaluation) 2) What are the main challenges at national level and how are these addressed? (E.g. data collection challenge, different terminologies; impact assessment & prioritisation, sensitivity mapping, sustainability of risk assessment outcomes, etc.) 3) Recommendations on how to improve risk assessment procedures and outcomes (how can we make risk assessments easier?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Each group to come-up with 2-3 action points. ▪ Brief feedback from the discussion groups back to the plenary (15m) |
| 13:15 – 14:30 | Lunch Break |
| Session 4 – How do we move forward from risk assessment to effective preparedness & response planning? | |
| 14:30 – 15:30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Union Civil Protection Mechanism perspective (DG ECHO) ▪ EMSA's Integrated Maritime Services (EMSA) ▪ Regional work – examples from Sweden and the HELCOM Shore network (Sweden) ▪ Planning preparedness capabilities – How much is enough? A US example (BSEE) |
| 15:30 - 15:45 | Short Break |
| 15:45 – 16:30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small discussion groups with all participants addressing the following topic (30m): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Recommendations on how we can make risk management planning more effective in Europe (how can we best implement the risk assessment outcomes to improve preparedness and response actions nationally, regionally and at EU level)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Each group to come-up with 2-3 action points. ▪ Brief feedback from the discussion groups back to the plenary (15m) |
| 16:30 – 17:00 | Conclusions & end of workshop (DG ECHO and EMSA) |
| 17:00 – 18:00 | <i>Attendees can visit on their own the Interspill 2018 Exhibition (which closes at 18:00)</i> |

EMSA-DG ECHO Join workshop on Risk Assessment & Response Planning in Europe

14 March 2018, London, UK

List of Participants

| Nr | Country/ RA | Name | Surname | Organisation | Email |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|--|---|
| MPPR participants: | | | | | |
| 1 | Bulgaria | Irina | Tasheva | Bulgarian Maritime Administration | irina.tasheva@marad.bg |
| 2 | Croatia | Zana | Cagali | Ministry of Sea, Tansport & Infrastructure | Zana.Cagalj@pomorstvo.hr |
| 3 | Denmark | Torben | Iversen | Naval Staff, Defence Command Denmark | vfk-m-msp330@mil.dk |
| 4 | HELCOM | Valtteri | Laine | Regional Agreement / HELCOM | valtteri.laine@helcom.fi |
| 5 | HELCOM | Markus | Helavuori | Regional Agreement / HELCOM | markus.helavuori@helcom.fi |
| 6 | HELCOM | Floris | Goerlandt | Regional Agreement / HELCOM | floris.goerlandt@helcom.fi |
| 7 | Finland | Pekka | Parkkali | Finnish Border Guard | pekka.parkkali@raja.fi |
| 8 | France | Pierre | Volondat | Secretariat General de la Mer | pierre.volondat@pm.gouv.fr |
| 9 | Germany | Frank | Deutscher | Ministry of Transport | frank.deutscher@bmvi.bund.de |
| 10 | Greece | Stylios | Markoulakis | HELLENIC COAST GUARD | smarkoul@hcg.gr |
| 11 | Iceland | Sigurros | Friedriksdottir | Environment Agency of Iceland | sigurros@ust.is |
| 12 | Ireland | David | Mc Myler | Irish Coast Guard | davemcmyler@dttas.ie |
| 13 | Italy | Gabriele | Peschiulli | Ministry of Environment | peschiulli.gabriele@minambiente.it |
| 14 | Latvia | Ojars | Gerke | Latvian Coast Guard Service | ojars.gerke@mrcc.lv |
| 15 | Lithuania | Igor | Kuzmenko | Lithuanian NAVY | igor.kuzmenko@mil.lt |
| 16 | REMPEC | Gabino | Gonzalez | Regional Agreement / REMPEC | ggonzalez@rempec.org ; mmangion@rempec.org |
| 17 | REMPEC | Malek | Smaoui | Regional Agreement / REMPEC | msmaoui@rempec.org |
| 18 | Malta | Richard | Gabriele | Transport Malta | richard.gabriele@transport.gov.mt |
| 19 | Norway | Synnove | Lunde | Norwegian Coastal Administration (NCA) | synnove.lunde@kystverket.no |
| 20 | Norway | Hans Petter | Dahlslett | DNV GL (on behalf of NCA) | hans.petter.dahlslett@dnvgl.com |
| 21 | Poland | Marek | Reszko | Maritime Search and Rescue Service | m.reszko@sar.gov.pl |
| 22 | Romania | Irina | Casiade | Romanian Naval Authority | icasjade@rna.ro |
| 23 | Slovenia | Arturo | Steffe | Slovenian maritime administration | arturo.steffe@gov.si |
| 24 | Spain | Marcos | Riestra Vega | SASEMAR | marcosrv@sasemar.es |
| 25 | Sweden | Alexander | von Buxhoeveden | Swedish Coast Guard | alexander.von.buxhoeveden@coastguard.se |
| 26 | The Netherlands | Richard | van Belzen | Rijkswaterstaat | richard.van.belzen@rws.nl |
| 27 | Copenhagen Agreement | Bernt | Stedt | Reg. Agreement / Copenhagen Agreement | bernt.stedt@kbv.se |
| 28 | UK | Neil | Chapman | Maritime & Coastguard Agency (MCA) | neil.chapman@mcga.gov.uk |
| 29 | UK | Matthew | Herbert | Department for Transport | Matthew.Herbert@dft.gsi.gov.uk |

| Nr | Country/ RA | Name | Surname | Organisation | Email |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|--|
| 30 | BSEE/USA | John | Caplis | Bureau of Safety & Envir. Enforcement | john.caplis@bsee.gov |
| 31 | ITOPF | Naa | Sackeyfio | ITOPF | NaaSackeyfio@ITOPF.COM |
| Civil Protection participants: | | | | | |
| 32 | Czech Republic | Frantisek | Paulus | Population Protection Institute | paulus@ioolb.izscr.cz |
| 33 | Denmark | Helle | Noppenau | Danish Emergency Management Agency | HHN@brs.dk |
| 34 | Finland | Rami | Ruska | Dept. for Rescue Services, Min. of Interior | rami.ruuska@intermin.fi |
| 35 | Latvia | Janis | Grinbergs | State Fire and Rescue Service of Latvia | janis.grinbergs@gmail.com |
| 36 | Malta | Michel | Galea | Ministry of Home Affairs & Nat.Security | michel.galea@gov.mt |
| 37 | Netherlands | Noura | Akdi | Min. of Infrastructure & Water Mngmnt | noura.akdi@rws.nl |
| 38 | Romania | Roxana-Mihaela | Popescu | Ministry of Internal Affairs | popescu.roxana.mihaela@gmail.com |
| 39 | Slovakia | Dominika | Reynolds | Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic | dominika.reynolds@minv.sk |
| 40 | Slovenia | Zvezdan | Bozic | Civil Protection and Disaster Relief | Zvezdan.Bozic@urszr.si |
| 41 | Sweden | Sonja | Dobo | Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency | sonja.dobo@msb.se |
| 42 | UK | Vincenzo | De Meulenere | UK Representation to the EU | Vincenzo.DeMeulenaere@fco.gov.uk |
| European Commission & EMSA participants: | | | | | |
| 43 | JRC | Amos | Necci | European Commission / JRC | Amos.NECCI@ec.europa.eu |
| 44 | JRC | Tiberiu-Eugen | Antofie | European Commission / JRC | Tiberiu-Eugen.ANTOFIE@ec.europa.eu |
| 45 | DG ECHO | Asta | Mackeviciute | European Commission / ECHO | Asta.MACKEVICIUTE@ec.europa.eu |
| 46 | DG ECHO | Julia | Stewart -David | European Commission /ECHO | Julia.Stewart-David@ec.europa.eu |
| 47 | EMSA | Frederic | Hebert | EMSA | frederic.hebert@emsa.europa.eu |
| 48 | EMSA | Lito | Xirotyri | EMSA | lito.xirotyri@emsa.europa.eu |
| 49 | EMSA | Samuel | Djavidnia | EMSA | samuel.djavidnia@emsa.europa.eu |