FACT-FINDING MISSION ON TRANSGRANULAR COOPERATION AND MARITIME SAFETY

FINAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION: PRESENTATION OF THE MISSION

➢ At the request of the Interreg IIIB Atlantic Area Secretariat, the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions led a fact-finding mission on transnational cooperation and maritime safety between May and September 2004.

The aim of this mission was to promote maritime safety projects under the Interreg cooperation instrument. This consisted not only in determining how projects of this kind could be presented under Interreg IIIB of the current programming period, but also in identifying the conditions to be met in order for such projects to be promoted during the next cohesion policy programming period (2007-2013) as part of the policy on cooperation.

➢ The mission was carried out with the help of a group of experts made up of representatives from each of the EU’s sea basins (Baltic, North Sea, Atlantic, Mediterranean, Islands) assisted by a group of ‘observers’ representing the different levels at which decision-making and application of maritime safety measures are carried out, these being the European Maritime Safety Agency, European Union, central governments, maritime regions and Interreg IIIB Secretariats. (A list of experts and observers is included in Appendix 1.)

➢ The mission was carried out on the basis of a two-fold approach:
  - to identify competences in terms of delivering maritime safety policy, placing emphasis on the remit of regional and local authorities, including responsibilities for maritime safety related policies;
  - to analyse maritime safety projects put forward under the Interreg programmes covering the maritime areas of the Baltic, North Sea, North West, Atlantic, South West, Medoc, Archimede and Cadses.

The experts were requested to draw up a table of competences and projects for their specific geographical area (concerning competences, a summary of the contributions submitted by the experts is presented in Appendix 2).

➢ Two meetings of experts were held – one on 24 May 2004 in Brussels and the other on 12 July 2004 in Paris. The minutes of these meetings are included in Appendices 3 and 4. The aims were as follows:
  - The meeting of 24 May 2004 focused on analysing the remit of regional and local authorities with regard to maritime safety and examining the relations between maritime safety and associated policies (environmental protection, transport, civil security and research).
  - The meeting of 12 July 2004 focused on the work for Phase II – proposed priority issues, assessment criteria and partnerships – and the following two points: i) the structure of the final report and ii) the organisation of the final seminar to present the results.
A final seminar to present the results of the fact-finding mission was held on 8 October 2004 in Poitiers and was attended by around a hundred specialists from 12 European countries, the experts having provided a list of invitees from their area, whom they deemed to be particularly concerned by maritime safety issues (cf. programme and list of participants in Appendices 5 and 6). During this seminar, which was essentially technical in nature, the proposals set out by the group of experts (cf. table providing a recap of recommendations) were analysed and validated. They consequently constitute the recommendations formulated by the group within the scope of the fact-finding mission.

The fact-finding mission was led in partnership with the different decision-making levels represented by the observer members of the group of experts, and in cooperation with the initiatives being carried out in this field, particularly the Umbrella Project initiated by the Interreg IIIB Secretariat of the North Sea Area, which was directly involved in the meetings. Furthermore, the CPMR Geographical Commissions were involved in the work in order to gather information on the ground.

Structure of the report

The report of the fact-finding mission is divided into two parts:

i) the main body of the report which sets out recommendations and proposals with regard to the three aspects that formed the basis of the analysis, i.e. priority issues, assessment criteria and partnerships;

ii) the contributions of the experts in full for Phases I and II of the mission.

In its conclusion, the report identifies the conditions required to successfully implement the draft recommendations and proposes a policy for disseminating and publicising information among the bodies concerned.

It takes account of the known and foreseeable changes in cooperation activities at EU level and provides indications as to the actions to be carried out both in the short and medium term.

Content of the report

I. Final Report.

- Proposals and recommendations from the group of experts
- Conclusions
- Priority issues for cooperation: presentation of the 11 priority projects

- Appendices:
  - list of members and observer members of the group of experts
  - powers and responsibilities of regional and local authorities in the field of maritime safety: summary by country
  - minutes of the meetings of experts of 24 May and 12 July 2004
  - seminar to present the results: programme and list of participants

II. Contributions from the experts for Phase I and Phase II.
PART I

1. PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GROUP OF EXPERTS

The following proposals and recommendations result from the discussions undertaken by the group of experts. They cover the role and relevance of transnational cooperation in the area of maritime safety and were validated by delegates attending the seminar presenting the results of the fact-finding mission organised in Poitiers (F) on 8 October 2004.

“MARITIME” COOPERATION MUST BE UNDERSTOOD IN THE WIDEST POSSIBLE SENSE TO ENSURE CLARITY REGARDING INTERVENTIONS.

- Despite fairly wide diversity in the conditions under which responsibilities are exercised in the area of maritime safety, the preponderant role of central governments is not a factor in preventing or limiting transnational cooperation, including cooperation with territorial authorities. These authorities have a remit that differs greatly from one country to another with regard to specific issues such as harbour areas or territorial waters and in specific skills such as rescue operations, tackling pollution and cleaning contaminated sites. There is, therefore, a very real benefit in promoting and strengthening cooperation in this respect.

Cooperation should focus mainly on the following three areas – chronic pollution, accidental pollution and rescue and salvage operations with the setting up of refuge areas.

- An analysis of actions currently being undertaken in the various areas of Interreg cooperation shows that the possibilities for cooperation in maritime safety are not sufficiently well-known or mastered at the present time by decision-makers at various levels and that they do not use the full potential for progress in this approach. The result is confusion between actions based on an actual maritime safety policy and actions based on related policies such as marine environmental protection, civil protection and spatial planning policies for coastal areas. There is also under-use of the possibilities afforded by Interreg.

Information and public awareness campaigns aimed at defining the impact and outlines of cooperation in this area should be undertaken at EU level. It would also be appropriate to define the role of the instruments for cooperation in a “global” approach of the “maritime policy” type rather than limiting them to certain aspects of maritime safety in the strictest sense of the term.

Consideration should be given to this matter at Community level, by the relevant Directorates General. Each DG could draft a set of “specifications” laying down mandatory conditions for projects implemented within the framework of cooperation programmes to ensure that such programmes are complementary and consistent with the strategies and direction of such policies. This could constitute a basis for discussion with a view to initiating consultations in each state.

- As far as the necessary clarifications are required, they include a definition of concepts (i.e. knowing what one is talking about) and an indication of the complementary nature of actions. This can only be achieved as part of a Community framework for cooperative actions in this area.
In defining such a framework, the experts consider that cooperation should focus first and foremost on prevention and clean-ups rather than on emergency response operations and that priority must be given to operational projects rather than projects consisting of studies and observations(1).

They also consider that cooperation programmes should only be used to support existing policies and that a distinction should be made between the “political” level and the “technical” level forming the basis of cooperation actions. The aim of such a framework should be to ensure consistency and complementarity in the initiatives implemented within various frameworks and on the basis of several instruments but should leave cooperation projects with their capacity for innovation and experimentation.

OBSTACLES TO COOPERATION MUST BE OVERCOME.

 Generally speaking, it was noted that there were insufficient partnerships based on projects of this nature. These inadequacies concerned not only cooperation between the various levels of governance but also cooperation between public and private sectors, the current generation of Interreg programmes being targeted essentially at the public sector.

As far as links between institutions are concerned, two types should be given greater prominence:
- links with EU organisations: European Maritime Safety Agency and Management Committee on Marine Pollution,
- links with the secretariats of Regional Conventions e.g. HELCOM (Baltic), Bonn Accord (North Sea), OSPAR (North-West Atlantic) and the Barcelona Convention (Mediterranean).

With regard to the players in the maritime safety system, there is a need for greater involvement on the part of two categories of partners, alongside the public authorities in charge of these issues - port authorities and the maritime trade and transport industry.

Such partnerships can be established on an ad hoc basis, depending on the type of project. It is therefore important that territorial authorities build sustainable partnerships with the organisations responsible for implementing the maritime safety policy.

 The way in which the various policies function at the present time shows that practices are still much too individualistic and this constitutes an obstacle to any real cooperation. Given these individualistic practices, the real need is for a greater ability on the part of institutions to act as project leaders. This means that national agencies must work together successfully on the one hand and that cooperation must be achieved between levels of territorial governance on the other, depending on the “operational” levels of national agencies (decentralisation issues).

Given this independent approach, three main categories of projects can be identified:
- projects requiring solely action on the part of central governments;
- projects involving exchanges of experience between local and regional authorities;
- projects which ensure that regional and international agreements will benefit territorial agencies which can then promote such benefits and apply them to greater advantage.

 Consideration of geographical “priorities”, including the various areas of cooperation and the zones with the highest risks, led to the drafting of the following recommendations:
- Given the interrelations between maritime areas, the aim is to set up mechanisms that will provide the greatest possible operating flexibility and, consequently, cooperation between areas;

---

1 As shown by the example of the Prestige, although it is logical for operational discussions on fighting pollution to go through national authorities (e.g. coordination of fishing fleets operating within a national or regional framework, depending on the country), technical discussions between scientists involved in the collection and use of data on fighting pollution will be more effective and swifter if they take the form of direct dialogue within networks made up of national and regional teams (e.g. forecasts of slick movements).
maritime cooperation issues cannot be limited to cross-border cooperation alone, even within an extended framework. Maritime basins (the Baltic, North Sea, Atlantic etc.) are the most appropriate bases in terms of geographical area and they provide the right technical dimension in terms of content and partnership. It should also be noted that the actions defined by the experts as requiring priority all have a very clearly established transnational character and that none of them can be covered by a strictly cross-border approach;

although accidental pollution and problems relating to management and protection are of relevance to all seas and oceans, it might be useful to draw up a list of “high-risk zones” since this would constitute a first step towards a wider policy. Such a list could be drawn up for each maritime basin;

in order to achieve the greatest possible flexibility between future areas of cooperation, it is proposed that the general guidelines for cooperation programmes should contain a core that is common to each area. This core would enable projects to be implemented by several areas.

ISSUES, CRITERIA, PARTNERSHIPS.

Priority Issues.

➢ The identification of priority issues presupposes that a guideline has been established for use as a basis on which to form a judgement or undertake an assessment of the type of actions that should be selected.

In the area of “maritime” cooperation, the experts consulted proposed a philosophy of action based on the extent to which projects helped to meet the expectations and requirements of people living in coastal areas.

Such a proposal is based on the need for visibility in projects undertaken using EU aid and on a project’s ability to meet the concerns of coastal communities which have the (often justified) feeling that insufficient attention is paid to their desiderata.

➢ To avoid any confusion between the various policies, it is suggested that the various types of actions included in future cooperation programmes should be defined. There seems to be a particular need for the guidelines of such future programmes to make a clear distinction between:
  - actions based on an actual maritime safety policy;
  - actions based on tackling marine pollution;
  - actions based on related policies such as research, transport, fishing, tourism or civil protection;
  - actions based on the development of coastal areas.

➢ The work on priority subjects highlighted three categories:
  - subjects specific to a particular area: to date, discussions have identified only the conditions of navigation prevalent in the Baltic Sea in winter;
  - subjects common to all maritime areas;
  - network projects involving planning, training, scientific support and exchanges of experience based on real cases.

With regard to actual subjects, the experts representing each maritime basin were asked to put forward a list of projects considered by them to be “priority” issues.
The group of experts proposed more than 50 possible projects, 11 of which were considered to require priority action and which are described in project presentation sheets.

➢ The principles proposed for the identification of subjects are as follows:
  - Identify the issues and priorities common to all the maritime areas then deal with them by adapting them to suit the particular characteristics of each maritime basin;
  - Identify the subjects that can be dealt with globally e.g. management of compensation funds;
- Give priority to projects with an operational purpose rather than projects consisting of studies and observations;
- Provide a framework for maritime safety by introducing a top-down approach to the cooperation policy. The experts consider that free rein should not be given to grass roots initiatives because the risks of project duplication, confusion and inconsistency are too high.

Assessment Criteria

The criteria currently used to assess projects seem to be inadequate when judging the relevance and consistency of proposals. The current criteria do not provide a precise view of the benefits of a project in terms of a maritime safety policy or pinpoint the compatibility between the proposals being tabled and the current level of implementation of the corresponding policy. It is therefore proposed that the criteria for project selection should be significantly increased.

Furthermore, it is highly recommended to step up the analysis of the different existing instruments in order to avoid duplicating efforts. This is especially the case for research and innovation related projects.

It is proposed to take account of the following criteria for transnational and interregional projects in the future programming period:

- **Core aim of the project:**
  - added value provided by the project as regards current and planned systems and techniques;
  - project compatibility with current regulations and operational requirements;
  - project compatibility with existing strategies and work programmes on an international and regional level (i.e. within the framework of Regional Conventions);
  - consistency between the type of project and the geographical scale proposed by the project;
  - impact of the project with regard to coastal populations.

- **Individual actions:**
  - compatibility with existing tools and systems or those currently being developed, especially geographical information systems, indicators, and monitoring, surveillance and control systems;
  - quality of the transfers of experience and technology between partners, zones and regions;

- **Project building:**
  - appropriate institutional and technical partnership;
  - complementarity with earlier projects;
  - partners' experience in technology transfers.

The strengthening of project assessment criteria must be accompanied by an adaptation of the conditions in which assessment is undertaken, especially as regards the bodies consulted and the time limits granted for the assessment.

Partnerships

Cooperation depends very much on the establishment of an appropriate, strong, comprehensive partnership. In the area of maritime safety, the projects proposed within the framework of the co-funding of cooperation programmes must comply with this requirement to avoid any inappropriate decisions. The experts consider that the following should be avoided:

- "one-sided" projects involving only partners of the same type;
- projects which aim to meet the needs of a single category of partner;
- projects which are wholly in the private or wholly in the public sector.

Regarding this latter point, it is necessary to take into account the powers exercised by each decision-making level. This means that projects involving only public authorities may be accepted under transnational cooperation, in areas that fall within the sole remit of central governments, e.g. identification of refuge areas.
Moreover, they emphasise the need to adapt each partnership to the type of project under consideration in order to “adhere” most closely to the reality of the situation in the field.

➢ The main partners involved in projects (depending on the type of objective for each project) include:
  - the relevant international organisations for the zone concerned (Regional Conventions e.g. HELCOM, OSPAR, Bonn);
  - The secretariats for existing multi- or bilateral accords (“Lion Plan” in the Gulf of Lions, Biscay Plan in the Bay of Biscay, RAMOG for the Gulf of Genoa, Manche Plan and the agreements concerning the Adriatic);
  - The relevant national ministries and their decentralised departments;
  - Professional organisations concerned with the use and protection of maritime resources and specific areas (national and European Union organisations);
  - Trade and industry organisations representing in the relevant zone;
  - Research and test institutes.
RECAP OF THE PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD BY THE GROUP OF EXPERTS IN “MARITIME SAFETY”

I. ESTABLISH CLEARLY IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES

1.1. The main aim of cooperation in the field of maritime safety should be to meet the needs and expectations of people living in coastal zones.

1.2 Cooperation in the area of maritime safety should be based on a Community framework providing consistency and giving added value to the projects.

1.3. Cooperation in the area of maritime safety should have a “global” aspect and cover the entire maritime dimension.

1.4. To achieve this, a clear distinction must be made between actions based on actual maritime safety policy, actions aimed at the protection of the maritime environment and actions based on “related” policies such as the environment, fishing, tourism or the development of coastal areas. The need for such a distinction should not exclude joined-up thinking between the different issues.

1.5. The main aim of actions taken within the framework of EU cooperation programmes must be help and support for policies relating to the maritime dimension.

II. STRENGTHEN THE INVOLVEMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL PLAYERS

2.1. The European Commission departments concerned by “maritime” projects must be involved in the drafting of “guidelines” for future cooperation programmes and in the assessment of projects. A set of “specifications” indicating exactly what is expected of cooperation programmes should be drafted for each policy concerned.

2.2. Information and awareness campaigns should be run for national ministries concerned by maritime questions in order to promote transnational cooperation.

2.3. The representatives of regional maritime authorities should be informed of work being undertaken within the framework of regional conventions and, where appropriate, should be involved in the work.
III. SPECIFY THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE OF COOPERATION PROJECTS IN THE VARIOUS POLICIES

3.1. Cooperation projects must primarily address prevention and clean-ups rather than focus on emergency response operations to accidental or chronic pollution.

3.2. Priority must be given to operational projects rather than projects consisting of studies or observations.

3.3. Cooperation projects must back up and be complementary to existing policies, and a clear distinction must be made between the “political” level and a more “technical” level which is the field of cooperation projects.

3.4. In this respect, cooperation must be used as a means of testing and introducing innovative new solutions.

IV. GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF MARITIME COOPERATION

4.1. A maritime basin must be the preferred territorial basis for cooperation projects.

4.2. Future programmes should be as flexible as possible in their operation to allow for projects involving more than one maritime basin.

4.3. A list of priority areas (with the highest risks) should be drawn up in each maritime basin.

V. ISSUES - CRITERIA - PARTNERSHIPS

5.1. To overcome the negative effects of current practices, which result in an approach that is still excessively sector-based, cooperation projects must clearly differentiate between (i) projects requiring action on the part of central governments only, (ii) projects resulting from discussions between local and regional authorities, and (iii) projects requiring joint intervention.

5.2. On this basis, three main categories of subject could be retained for future projects:
   i) subjects specific to a particular area (e.g. conditions of navigation in the Baltic Sea in winter);
   ii) subjects common to all areas of cooperation;
   iii) network projects involving planning, training, scientific support and exchanges of experiences based on real cases.
5.3. The criteria used to assess projects must be significantly strengthened so that they highlight the consistency of proposals and the manner in which they complement existing policies and the programmes being implemented by international agencies, and also their impact among coastal populations.

5.4. In addition to strengthening project assessment criteria, the operating conditions of cooperation programmes must be adapted as regards time limits and mandatory consultation.

5.5. Partnership should be seen as a basic principle and a mandatory condition for the eligibility of projects.

5.6. The type of partnership and the relevant skills and expertise required must be adapted to suit the objectives of the projects.

VI. CONDITIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND SUCCESS

6.1. Structure discussions between representatives of local and regional authorities, central governments and international agencies responsible for maritime policies.

6.2. Launch a project as soon as possible to create a network of regional players in all maritime basins.

6.3. Launch a study to identify key players within each maritime basin and implement action to provide these players with information to increase awareness of issues.
2. CONCLUSIONS

In addition to the recommendations set out above, the experts expressed a number of opinions on the conditions that need to be met to successfully carry out transnational and interregional cooperation projects in the field of maritime safety.

- Ensure that the results of the fact-finding mission are disseminated to the right people.

- Plan the forthcoming programming period on the basis of a Community framework for projects. This means that discussions need to be held with the DG REGIO services in charge of cooperation to ensure that the guidelines of the future Objective 3 take into account the recommendations formulated under the present fact-finding mission.

- Reform the governance aspect of cooperation programmes by improving coordination, ensuring a greater involvement of EU and national services directly and indirectly concerned by maritime safety policy, and promoting projects between the different cooperation areas. This means that discussions need to be held with the Commission’s services in charge of managing cooperation programmes, so as to ensure the right administrative, procedural and financial conditions.

- Structure the response capacities of regional and local authorities by setting up a network for the exchange of experiences and best practices.

With regard to the dissemination of the results, the following actions have already been carried out:

- presentation of the results at the seminar on transnational and interregional cooperation (future Objective 3) organised by the CPMR in October 2004 in Taormina;
- presentation of the results at the meeting of national experts in charge of integrated coastal zones management strategy – Rotterdam, 17 November 2004;
- inclusion of the results of the fact-finding mission in the preparatory work to define the specifications of the Green Paper on the EU’s maritime dimension;

Planned dissemination:

- presentation of the results to DG REGIO;
- presentation of the results to the CPMR Political Bureau in January 2005;
- presentation of the results at the General Assemblies of the CPMR Geographical Commissions in the spring of 2005.

With regard to structuring the response capacity of regional and local authorities, the CPMR proposes to initiate a project in early 2005 to give substance to priority issue No. 7.
3. PRIORITY COOPERATION AREAS PROPOSED BY THE EXPERTS

The following table records, distributed by types of co-operation, by themes and by sub-themes:

- In bold letters, the acronyms of the Interreg projects underway or in preparation, identified in the course of the study, and falling directly within its scope (projects with only marginal relation to this study, such as POWER, Northern Maritime Corridor or the Eurobaltic programme for civil protection, are not listed in the table);
- In italics, the titles of 11 new projects proposed by the experts, either as such or built by merging 2 to 4 project proposals from different experts.

More than 50 possible projects were identified by the experts, out of which they listed 28 as deserving priority consideration. The 11 projects in the table hereafter were built by:

- In a first step, putting aside projects concerning international co-operation at global level, such as the project “to establish an EU Coast Guard”, on the consideration that international co-operation projects at global level would too directly interfere with the responsibilities of national authorities;
- In a second step merging close-by projects proposed by individual experts into wider but still comprehensive projects.

The 11 projects in the table are all considered by the experts to be of priority interest, with ranking into either first (7 projects) or second (4 projects) priority. The criteria selected for election of a project to first priority was direct applicability to operational decision making in a spill situation.

The 7 first priority projects are underlined in the table.

All 11 projects are summarily described hereafter in project sheets numbered from 1 to 11. Those numbers imply no ranking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Inter-regional co-operation at maritime basin level</th>
<th>Inter-regional co-operation at global level</th>
<th>International co-operation at maritime basin level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maritime safety:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) vessels control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S@S Improve authorities power to impose technical requirements and routes to passing vessels in areas at risk (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) pollution prevention</td>
<td>Identification of possible refuge areas for ships in distress (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIOS Needs for tug escort and supply of emergency towing capacity (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine pollution:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) response planning</td>
<td>EROCIPS</td>
<td>SOLE Improve response ways, tools, plans and awareness at different levels (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine pollution response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) training</td>
<td>Training of local staff and fishermen in pollution response (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) scientific support</td>
<td>Monitoring and operational oceanography services to predict drifting at sea and assess pollution importance (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine pollution response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Exchange of experience</td>
<td>POST-PRESTIGE</td>
<td>Exchange of experience and advisory network on pollution response (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated policies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) waste management</td>
<td>Training of local staff and fishermen in pollution response (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated policies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) impact assessment</td>
<td>Methodologies and best practice for impact assessment and changes monitoring (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal zones management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) beaches</td>
<td>Beach cleaning and management of marine debris (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) ports and economic activities</td>
<td>Tools and programme to assess economic activity influence on the sea environment, with special emphasis on role of ports (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EROCIPS = Emergency Response to coastal Oil, Chemical and Inert Pollution from Shipping
SOLE = Systèmes Opérationnels de Lutte pour l’Environnement
S@S = Safety at Sea ; TRIOS = Transnational Integrated Offshore Surveillance
Project 1

Improve authorities power to impose technical requirements and routes to passing vessels in areas at risk

Source
Merger or projects:
- “Improve the coastal stage power to control vessels with hazardous cargo in ZEE and territorial waters – change in the innocent passage and freedom of sailing in the law of the sea” (Fernando Novoa).
- “To establish mandatory sea lanes to vessels with hazardous cargo – the idea is to adapt the flight safety control system to the sea traffic” (Fernando Novoa).
- “Study of requirement for ice classing of various types of vessels when entering the Baltic Sea area in winter time” (Markku Milly).
- “To produce a methodology for designation of routes for shipping in coastal waters especially where there are environmentally sensitive area. Also included are areas of avoidance, PSSAs and approaches to ports” (Andrew Blackadder).

Nature
International co-operation at maritime basin level, theme maritime safety, sub-theme vessel control. Original proposals concerned the Baltic Sea (with a specific question of ice classing for entering the area in wintertime) and the heavy traffic line between cape Finisterre (Spain) and the Finistère cape (France). It can be applied to any maritime basin around Europe: all have zones with particular issues regarding sensitive areas and controversial routes (ex: in the western Mediterranean basin, the route between Corsia and Sardinia).

Specificity
Each maritime basin project would have specific aspects related either with physical characteristics (ex: ice in winter in the Baltic) or economic ones (ex: the heavy weight of sea related tourism in the Mediterranean).

Possible leader
A regional authority with operational responsibilities in coastal waters.

Recommended partners
In each region concerned the regional authority and a technical body representing the national competence.

Possible main tasks
- Co-ordination
- State of the art: the situations in the participating regions
- Technical requirements to vessels
- Monitoring of passing vessels
- Methodology for routes designation in sensitive areas
- Possible initiatives in powers of control of coastal authorities
- Matters specific to the maritime basin of the project (ex: ice, tourism, etc.)
- Dissemination of project results
Project 2
Identification, assessment and planning of possible refuge areas for potentially polluting ships in distress

Source
Project “Identification of possible refuge areas for ships in distress” proposed by Rosella Bertolotto, reduced to potentially polluting ships (no sheltered area will be refused to a non-potentially pollution ship in distress) and widened to assessment (of risks) and planning (to minimise consequences).

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at maritime basin level, theme maritime safety, sub-theme pollution prevention. The original proposal concerned the Gulf of Lion, in relation with the experience of the Haven oil spill. Considering that a ship in distress from in a maritime basin should find refuge in that same basin, a project under that title can be implemented in any maritime basin around Europe, with specifics related to the particularities of the concerned basin.

Objectives
To identify potential areas, within the concerned maritime basin, where potentially polluting ships in need of assistance or in distress may find or be taken for refuge. To assess the environmental and economic risks for that area in case of total or partial loss of cargo and for the surrounding areas in case of drift of part of that cargo. To consider the possible routes to the refuge area and the consequences in case of spill along those routes. To elaborate a response plan adapted to the different situations assessed. The studies should be based on modelisation of extreme climatic conditions, with suitable wind-waves models and they should highlight the presently missing information for sound decision-making and full control of potential emergency situations.

Possible leader
A regional authority with operational responsibilities in coastal waters or a technical institute with such responsibilities (ex: ARPAL could be the project leader on behalf of the Liguria region)

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority, a representative of the national competent authority (ex: in Italy, the department for sea protection of the ministry in charge of the Environment) and/ or a technical institute versed in sensitivity of coastal areas.

Possible main tasks
- Co-ordination
- State of the art: existing and planned practice and rules in participating regions
- Analysis of past incidents
- Environmental approach to refuge areas
- Economic and social considerations
- Routes toward refuge areas
- Strategies at maritime basin level
- Dissemination of project results
Project 3
Needs for tug escort and supply of emergency towing capacity

Source
Merger or projects:
- “Study of regional need for emergency towing capacity in the Baltic Sea area” (Markku Milly)
- “Study of escort towing need and preparedness in different ports in the Baltic Sea area” (Markku Milly).

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at maritime basin level, theme maritime safety, sub-theme pollution prevention. Original proposals concerned the Baltic Sea, with the specific question of towing and escort in heavy fog and ice conditions. It can be applied to any maritime basin around Europe, with specifics related to the particularities of the concerned basin.

Possible leader
A regional authority with operational responsibilities in coastal waters

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority or a suitable representative of the national authority in charge, and a technical body versed in salvage.

Possible main tasks
- Co-ordination
- Study of existing emergency towing capacity in participating regions
- Study of existing escort capacity in ports of participating regions
- Authorities in charge and decision making procedures
- Co-ordination of procedures at maritime basin level
- Dissemination of project results
Project 4
Improve response ways, tools, plans and awareness at different levels

Source
Merger or projects:
- "Improve the response at different levels (Fernando Novoa)
- "Improve the officials training and education on clean-up operation response" (Fernando Novoa)
- "Study to develop new and more effective ways and tools to combat environmental disasters in winter time - icy conditions" (Markku Milly)
- "To improve the response capability through training local people and fishermen in oil pollution control and response techniques on the one hand and in handling the media and information flows on the other - To prepare courses for transnational use in pollution control techniques and preparation of plans; to produce a best practice guide for emergency plans (Andrew Blackadder).

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at global level, theme maritime pollution response, sub-theme response planning. One original proposal concerned the Baltic Sea, with the specific question of icy conditions. It can be implemented by a group of partners from any coastal regions of Europe, with one task specifically devoted to particularities of the areas concerned.

Possible leader
A regional authority with operational responsibilities in coastal waters

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority or a suitable representative of the national authority in charge, and a technical body versed in response planning. There could be merits in the participation of one or two response tools makers or makers associations.

Possible main tasks
- Co-ordination
- Comparison of existing plans in participating regions
- Adequacy of tools in participating regions
- Specific ways and tools for particular regions in the project
- Dissemination of information and level of awareness of tools and plans
- Best practice: lessons of interests from the tools and plans of others
- Working together
- Dissemination of project results
Project 5
Training of local staff and fishermen in pollution response

Source
Merger or projects:
- "Training local authority officers in tackling sea pollution arising from major incidents and operational incidents in the context of improved coastal management" (Michel Girin)
- "To improve the response capability through training local people and fishermen in oil pollution control and response techniques on the one hand and in handling the media and information flows on the other - To prepare courses for transnational use in pollution control techniques and preparation of plans; to produce a best practice guide for emergency plans (Andrew Blackadder)
- "Improve the officials training and education on clean-up operation response" (Fernando Novoa).

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at maritime basin level, theme maritime pollution response, sub-theme training. It can be implemented by a group of partners from any coastal regions of Europe and become inter-regional co-operation at global level. But there would be more efficiency in joint training at maritime basin level.

Objective
Provide technical officers from local coastal authorities with the capacity to carry out emergency response operations and participate in crisis management through access to the types of training schemes and skills developed under the European Management Committee for Accidental and Intentional Marine Pollution (MCMP)

Possible leader
A regional authority or a specialised trainer.

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority or a suitable representative of the national authority in charge, and a technical body versed in training. National correspondents of the European Management Committee for Marine Pollution (MCMP/CGPM) with experience in training and disseminating skills on response strategies and techniques should be encouraged to take part. Would UK regions participate, there would be merits in arranging a participation of the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, so as to benefit of its existing oil spill control course for local authorities. The same applies to Cedre would French regions participate.

Possible main tasks
- Co-ordination
- Needs assessment : available training
- Elaboration of reference inter-regional courses and information sessions
- Elaboration of specialised local courses
- Implementation of joint inter-regional training sessions
- Implementation of specialised training sessions at local level
- Organisation of mutual assistance in emergency situations
- Dissemination of project results
Project 6

Monitoring and operational oceanography services to predict drifting at sea and assess pollution importance

Source
Merger or projects:
- “Interregional cooperation in operational oceanography to help forecast movements of oil slicks, containers, packages, wreckage and floating debris over the short, medium and long term” (Michel Girin).
- Improve the regional administration acknowledgement on the sea contamination sources from the coast: methods of control or diminish, GIS based» (Fernando Novoa)

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at maritime basin level, theme maritime pollution response, sub-theme scientific support.
Possibly extended to:
- either one sea basin (e.g. Bay of Biscay, Channel, Gulf of Lion) with the participation of neighbouring sea basins as observers/ commentators.
- or an entire EU seaboard (e.g. Atlantic, Mediterranean)

Purpose
Through a better knowledge of sea basins having an interregional dimension and above all by making this knowledge available to those in charge of managing emergency situations, establish a better knowledge of sources of pollution drifting at sea and an improved capacity for forecasting the drift of objects and products in emergency situations.

Possible leader
A regional authority or a technical institute with experience in operational oceanography services. (ex: in Cantabria, the oceanographic department of the University of Cantabria)

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority and a technical body versed in operational oceanography. For the Atlantic and western Mediterranean, a relation with the Spanish project ESEOO (development of a national capacity in operational oceanography) should be sought.

Possible main tasks
- Coordination
- State of knowledge on the sources and drift of pollution
- Development of a programme to monitor the drift of buoys
- Experimentation on different objects and products
- Introduction of a system for the real-time circulation of information between partners
- Procedures for mobilising capabilities in emergency situations
- Dissemination of project results
Project 7
Exchange of experience and advisory network on pollution response, communication and compensation

Source
Merger or projects:
- "To share experience with compensation and insurance regimes and produce proposals for improving the system on the basis of experience in trying to claim for costs involved in a clean up ad restoration of the physical environment, businesses and communities - To consider ways of dealing with the problem of non toxic cargoes and container ships where there in no compensation system in place and multiple cargo » (Andrew Blackadder)
- “Controlling communication on the environment in emergency situations and learning how to limit dramatisation by the media” (Michel Girin)
- “Study of regional and local players in the Baltic Sea area to have suitable and enough tools and capacity to enable them to carry out their task in managing and prevention marine pollution hazards especially in winter time - icy conditions - and how to cooperate and utilise the capacity maximally in the area. Also to find out the best practice of financing the emergency capacity preparedness” (Markku Milly)
- “Shared experience in compensation funds management” (Rosella Bertolotto)
- “To establish a rule system - so what when the polluter is identified, it must pay the oil spill response operations and the clean-up from the starting point. He must propose a response plan to the administration and, after agreement, pay its implementation” (Fernando Novoa)

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at global level, theme maritime pollution response, sub-theme exchange of experience

Objectives
To build a permanent network of interregional exchange of experience in maritime pollution response, complementing the existing international network (CGPM/ MCMP).

As regards the compensation component, the project will facilitate the exchange of information on the administrative and financial procedures implemented at local and national levels to assist claimants in their action, on both major and local pollution incidents, oil and non-oil ones. The comparison between ways of using the compensation money, between the different modes of management, between the different structures concerned, will be interesting and useful at all levels.

As regards the communications element, the project will attempt to give officials from local authorities the capacity to provide information designed to limit media aggravation of the economic and social impact of environmental crises. This will be done by training them in how to compile and disseminate environmental information, together with an initiation into the circulation of information between sources, different levels of media (regional and national) and different types of media (TV, radio, written press) in environmental crisis situations.

Possible leader
A regional authority among those having faced the Prestige, Erika or Baltic carrier spill or a technical institute of one of those regions (or with office in one of those regions) with experience in oil spill management.
CRPM was proposed at the end of phase 2 meeting as the ideal project leader.

Recommended partners
The project should as much as possible gather participation from all regions having faced oil spill incidents in the last decade. In each participating region, partners could be the regional authority or a representative structure and a technical institute or university department versed in either exchange of experience or in oil spill response.
Possible main tasks
- Coordination
- State of experience and problems faced in participating regions
- Seminars of exchange of experience: response options and techniques, communication, response financing, damage compensation
- Relations with the polluter – obligations of the polluter
- Environmental communication: training and guide of best practice
- Construction of a permanent exchange of experience network
- Dissemination of project results
Project 8
Sharing experience and best practice guide for waste management in ports

Source
Merger of projects:
- "To share experience in the provision of waste facilities in ports in line with the new EU directive and in monitoring and surveillance of ships coming to and from a port in relation to a pollution; To produce a best practice guide for ports of effective waste management" (Andrew Blackadder)
- "To improve the ports facilities to waste reception and to improve the MARPOL fulfilment and control” (Fernando Novoa)

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at global level, theme associated policies, sub-theme waste management

Possible leader
A regional authority or a technical institute versed in waste management.

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority and a technical/management body versed in waste management or a port authority (ex: in a Spanish autonomy, the regional delegation of Puertos del Estado; in a French region, the regional chamber of commerce).

Possible main tasks
- Coordination
- State of experience: problems faced by ports in participating regions
- Exchange of experience between ports and local authorities (seminars on waste treatment techniques and costs, on waste management control, etc.)
- Participation of regions in MARPOL control
- Dissemination of project results
Project 9
Methodologies and best practice for impact assessment and changes monitoring

Source
Merger or projects:
- “To produce best practice guide for impact assessment and monitoring of environmental, social and economic changes” (Andrew Blackadder)
- “Definition of an environmental reference state for a coastal area” (Rosella Bertolotto)

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at global level, theme associated policies, sub-theme impact assessment
The participating regions should preferably have been impacted by the Prestige, the Erika or the Baltic Carrier or by an environmental catastrophe of another nature (ex: the Aznalcollar mine waste storage spill).

Possible leader
A regional authority with recent experience of a major oil spill or a technical institute versed in environmental impact assessment.

Recommended partners
Regional authorities having faced the incidents cited above and/or a technical institute of one of those regions (or with office in one of those regions) with experience in environmental catastrophe monitoring.
In each region concerned, the regional authority and a technical body versed in environmental impact studies (ex: in Galicia, the Centro de Control del Medio Marino and/or the regional delegation of the Instituto Español de Oceanografía)

Possible main tasks
- Coordination
- State of experience and problems faced in participating regions
- Definition of an environmental reference state before pollution
- Procedures and practice of short and long term environmental impact assessment
- Inter-relation between environmental effects and social and economic changes
- Guide of best practice
- Dissemination of project results
Project 10
Beach cleaning and management of marine debris

Source
Merger of projects:
- “Managing of marine debris in Mediterranean Sea – research” (Rosella Bertolotto)
- “Knowledge and management of the economic and ecological consequences of beach clean-up operations using machinery and techniques acquired during an oil spill” (Michel Girin)

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at global level, theme coastal zone management, sub-theme beaches

Objectives
The main objectives of the project are to improve knowledge, research and information on marine litter at maritime basin level, together with the economic and environmental consequences of permanent or semi-permanent cleaning of littered beaches with machines acquired and techniques apprehended at the opportunity of an oil spill. The project would illustrate the eco-chain that exists between all groups of users of the marine environment and how their behaviour affects themselves and others in the region. It would promote exchange of experience between those in charge of beach cleaning and preservation. It would train local authorities technicians in best practice in the use of beach cleaning machines, in impact assessment and in the development of a cleaning programmes both satisfactory for recreational use of beaches and respectful of environmental balance. An important part of the project is to illustrate the marine litter situation from an individual perspective, bringing the great issue down to personal issue that can partly be solved by a personal commitment to change behaviour and attitude.

Possible leader
A regional authority or a technical institute versed in the environmental management of coastal zones (ex: in Galicia, the Centro de Control del Medio Marino).
Region Liguria might volunteer to be the project leader.

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority and a technical body versed in pollution response and/or coastal zone management and/or environmental impact studies.

Possible main tasks
- Co-ordination
- Assessment of the situation regarding mechanised clean-up in the area concerned
- Drafting of a good practice guide
- Dissemination of the good practice guide in the priority zones covered by the project through training/briefing seminars
- Monitoring programme in pilot zones
- Dissemination of knowhow throughout European coastal areas
Project 11

Tools and programme to assess economic activity influence on the sea environment, with special emphasis on the role of ports

Source
Merger of projects:
- “Development of tools to help the administration to assess the new industrial, fisheries, tourism... activity influence on the sea environment, sea water quality...” (Fernando Novoa)
- “Monitoring programme to assess the quality of ports waters and sediments (Rosella Bertolotto)

Nature
Inter-regional co-operation at global level, theme coastal zone management, sub-theme ports and economic activities

Possible leader
A regional authority or a technical institute versed in coastal zone management.

Recommended partners
In each region concerned, the regional authority and a technical body versed in coastal zone management and the economy of marine activities (ex: in Galicia, the CETMAR foundation, centre for maritime studies).

Possible main tasks
- Coordination
- New related economic developments in the participating regions, related environmental concerns
- Tools for environmental assessment of sea related economic activities
- A case study: assessing and managing quality of ports waters and sediment
- Guides of best practice
- Network of permanent exchange of experience
- Dissemination of project experience
# APPENDIX 1

**GROUPE OF MARITIME SAFETY EXPERTS - INTERREG.III.B. FACT-FINDING MISSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME - First Name</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GIRIN Michel             | Directeur du CEDRE                                                        | CEDRE, 715 rue Alain Colas F - 29218 BREST   | Tel : +33 2 98 33 10 10  
Fax : +33 2 98 44 91 38  
michel.girin@ifremer.fr |
| BLACKADDER Andrew        | AB Services Ltd                                                           | Kirk Business Centre - Castle road UK - SCALLOWAY  
Shetland Islands ZE 1 OTF | Tel : +44 1595 88 08 52  
Fax : +44 1595 88 08 53  
andrew@abassociatesltd.com |
| NOVOA Fernando           | Director Tecnico - Servicio de Busquero y Salvamento                      | Xunta de Galicia  
Conselleria de Pesca  
Manel de Castro, 3-5°A E - 36210 VIGO | Tel : +34 986 21 25 29  
Fax : +34 986 21 25 29  
fernando.novoa@arrakis.es |
| MYLLY Markku             | Director                                                                  | Shipping Enterprise  
P.O. Box 545  
FIN - 00181 HELSINKI | Tel : +358 207 60 7100  
Fax : +358 207 60 7030  
markku.myll@finstaship.fi |
| Einar LEKNES             | Head of Research                                                          | RF - Rogaland Research  
P.O. Box 8046  
N - 4068 STAVANGER | Tel: +47 51 87 51 31  
Fax: +47 51 87 52 00  
Einar.Leknes@rf.no |
| BERTOLOTTO Rosella       | Directeur scientifique ARPAL (Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione dell’Ambiente Ligure) | ARPAL, Piazza Vittoria  
I - 16 121 GENOVA | Tel: +39 010 57633 234  
Fax: +39 010 57633 224  
rosella.bertolotto@arpal.org  
GSM +39 3 332 50 74 08 |
## Observer Members of the Group of Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME - First Name</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELATOUR Isabelle</td>
<td>Directrice des Affaires Internationales Région des pays de la Loire</td>
<td>Conseil Régional des Pays de la Loire 1, rue de la Loire F - 44066 NANTES Cédex 2</td>
<td>Tel: +33 2 28 20 61 50 fax: +33 2 28 20 50 12 <a href="mailto:isabelle.delatour@paysdelaloire.fr">isabelle.delatour@paysdelaloire.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LORNE Michel</td>
<td>Chef du Service Etudes SGAR Région Provence Alpes Côte d’Azur</td>
<td>SGAR - Préfecture de Région Bd Paul Peytral, F - 13282 MARSEILLE Cédex 20</td>
<td>Tel: +33 4 91 15 62 74 Fax: +33 4 91 15 61 90 <a href="mailto:michel.lorne@paca.pref.gouv.fr">michel.lorne@paca.pref.gouv.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURITZEN Sverre</td>
<td>South and West of Norway Assembly -SAVOS-</td>
<td>SAVOS P.O. BOX 130 N - 4001 STAVANGER</td>
<td>Tel: +47 51 53 27 01/ 51 69 27 Fax: +47 51 53 24 60 <a href="mailto:savos@rogaland-f.kommune.no">savos@rogaland-f.kommune.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLAT Francis</td>
<td>Président de l’Institut FR de la Mer Membre du Conseil d’administration de l’EMSA</td>
<td>Institut Français de la Mer 42, avenue Montaigne F - 75008 PARIS</td>
<td>Tel: +33 1 53 67 54 75 Fax: +33 1 53 67 54 74 <a href="mailto:fv-marine@wanadoo.fr">fv-marine@wanadoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAUVIN Xavier</td>
<td>SGAR Aquitaine</td>
<td>48, esplanade Charles de Gaulle F - 33000 BORDEAUX</td>
<td>Tel: +33 5 56 90 65 93 Fax: +33 5 56 90 65 00 <a href="mailto:xavier.chauvin@quitaine.pref.gouv.fr">xavier.chauvin@quitaine.pref.gouv.fr</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES

- Summary -

This summary of the powers and responsibilities exercised by regional and local authorities has been drafted on the basis of the contributions made by the experts during Phase I.

Atlantic Sea Basin:

✓ France:
  • Government level: (General Secretariat for the Sea and Ministries concerned: Transport, Ecology, Budget (for IOPCF) and scientific agencies (CEDRE, IFREMER) with authority to represent the State and establish international agreements (Secretariat General for the Sea) with regard to flag state and port state control (Ministry of Transport), traffic monitoring, organisation of rescue and salvage operations and refuge areas, pollution arising from operational incidents and accidents at sea.
  • Maritime prefects have delegated powers:
    - to establish direct agreements for mutual assistance and to inspect, divert and board ships;
    - to carry out rescue and salvage operations and environmental protection measures (powers to carry out seizures and issue formal notices);
    - to carry out joint surveillance operations with their counterparts from neighbouring countries and draw up mutual assistance agreements to tackle pollution arising from operational incidents;
    - draw up response plans (Polmar plan for pollution arising from accidents at sea);
  • The maritime prefect ensures the overall coherence of land-based response plans through a regional maritime conference and directs all government services responsible for interventions at sea:
    - CROSS - regional rescue coordination centres (run by the Ministry of Transport and accountable to the maritime prefect from an operational point of view) are responsible for ground control of vessels in transit.
    - Maritime Affairs regional and departmental offices (Ministry of Transport), responsible for administrative inspections in regional and local ports.
    - Prefects of départements, responsible for:
      - Ground response to pollution arising from major incidents (Polmar plan);
    • Local mayors are responsible for:
      - rescue and salvage: intervention from land up to a distance of 300m from the coast;
      - clean-up operations further to pollution arising from operational incidents;
      - ground response to pollution on a small scale arising from accidents at sea.

✓ United Kingdom:
  • Government level:
    - Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions through its executive agency (Maritime Coastguards Agency-MCA), responsible for:
      - implementing maritime safety policy (flag state regulations, port state control, inspection of classification societies, surveillance, salvage facilities, refuge areas, pollution control and response plans, training.)
      - preventing marine pollution
  • Regional/Local level:
    - Scottish Executive has responsibilities for:
      - preventing marine pollution (agreement with the MCA)
      - islands (special powers acquired on account of oil terminals).
    - Harbour Authorities responsible for response operations (type of action?)
    - Local Authorities designated Port Authorities in the islands: power of jurisdiction and control of traffic exclusion zones and designated channels for oil tankers sailing to and from the port.
    - Local and Regional Authorities are responsible for:
      - emergency plans and response plans to accidents and assessing their effectiveness
      - beach clean-up operations (voluntary commitment).
✓ Spain:
• Government level:
  . SASEMAR (Maritime Safety Agency): responsible for:
    - maritime traffic monitoring
    - sea search and salvage operations
    - supervising and assisting vessels
    - preventing and combating contamination of the marine environment
    - tugs and auxiliary vessels
    - immediate response to pollution arising from accidents (seaborne operations)
  . General Directorate of the Merchant Navy (has branches in ports) responsible for:
    - ship registry (flag state and port state)
    - application of international and European regulations
    - organising and carrying out response actions to pollution arising from accidents
  . Ministry of Public Works and Transport responsible for:
    - organisation of sea rescue and refuge areas
    - organising and carrying out response actions to pollution arising from accidents
  . Ministry of the Environment:
  - land-based operations to combat pollution arising from accidents (the Ministry has the support of municipal authorities for operations on beaches)

The National Maritime Rescue Committee was set up in 2002 to ensure coordination of the responsibilities at each political level.

• Regional/Local Level:
  . The government delegates responsibility to the autonomous communities for:
    - informing the public;
    - policy and administrative coordination for response to pollution arising from accidents.
  . Autonomous Communities:
    - Galicia: mandatory regional contingency plan: the autonomous communities must have the resources to implement the plan and must approve territorial and inland plans in accordance with the national standard; in Galicia, permanent response capacity for pollution arising from accidents; also a training scheme for staff at the Fisheries Department.
    - Canary Islands and Catalonia: permanent response measures to combat accidental pollution are currently being drawn up.
    - Management of recovered waste.

✓ Portugal:
• Government Level:
  . Directorate General of the Navy is responsible for maritime administration:
    - flag state and port state control (responsibility shared with the Ministry of Transport)
    - organisation of sea rescue and salvage operations
    - protection of the marine environment
  . MRCC (Maritime Traffic Control Centre):
    - maritime traffic control;
  . Ministry of Transport (Harbour and Transport Institute):
    - ship inspection;
    - certification of vessels with regard to flag state and port state (responsibility shared with the Directorate General of the Navy)
• Regional/Local Level:
  . port authorities:
    - recovery and treatment of waste resulting from operational pollution.
Baltic Sea Basin:

✓ Finland:
  • Government Level:
    . Ministry of the Environment (Finnish Environment Institute): management and supervision of the response against pollution. The Environment Office draws up a sea response plan (Polmar plan) and ensures that it is coherent with land-based plans by means of an annual regional conference.
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . Municipalities: responsible for planning response operations and have powers to direct government departments responsible for land-based operations.

✓ Estonia:
  • Government Level:
    . Ministry of Internal Affairs, which delegates powers to the Estonian Board of Border Guard: coordinating role in tackling pollution
    . national rescue board: combating pollution on the beaches and coast (powers shared with local authorities)
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . Local authorities: clean-up of beaches and coastline
    . Port authorities: responsible for tackling pollution in ports

✓ Sweden:
  • Government Level:
    . Environmental Protection Agency
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . county administrative boards: responsible for implementing environmental goals at regional level
    . municipal authorities: responsible for supporting implementation of objectives in dialogue with local people and stakeholders.

✓ Poland:
  • Government Level:
    . Ministry of Infrastructure which delegates responsibility to the maritime search and rescue service: responsibility for pollution response operations (especially preparation of the national contingency plan)
    . maritime offices: delegated powers to organise and supervise pollution response operations.
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . port authorities: responsible for preparing regional contingency plans for ports

✓ Latvia:
  • Government Level:
    . Ministry of Defence
    . Ministry of Transport: Maritime Administration (port state control, control and management of accidents), and Maritime Department (legislation and conventions)
    . Ministry of Environmental Protection (Marine Environment Board): environmental inspections.
    . Naval Forces (responsible for the Maritime Rescue and Coordination Centre): pollution response operations. The coordination centre may establish a committee that includes all competent national authorities in order to take the appropriate decisions.
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . regional and local governments: tackling pollution on the shoreline, restoration of beaches
    . port authorities: responsible for combating pollution in ports and harbours.

✓ Lithuania:
  • Government Level:
    . Ministry of the Environment, which has overall responsible for the strategy for combating oil pollution incidents. This is executed by Klaipeda Regional Environmental Protection Department.
    . Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre: response activities.
• Regional/Local Level:
  . Port authorities: responsible for tackling pollution in the port of Klaipeda
  . Regional and district authorities: response action in their respective areas

✓ Russia:
  • Federal Level:
    . Ministry of Natural Resources: Maritime Inspectorates assess environmental damage
    . Ministry of Transport: national system of oil spill response, which delegates duties to the State Marine Pollution Control & Salvage and Rescue Administration
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . Local authorities: responsible for combating pollution on the beaches and coastlines
    . Harbourmaster: responsible for combating pollution in ports and harbours

North Sea Basin

✓ Norway:
  • Government Level:
    . Norwegian Maritime Directorate (has regional stations):
      - port state control
      - emergency preparedness (equipment, training, planning) of ships
    . Norwegian National Coastal Administration (has regional stations)
      - traffic monitoring
      - intervention in dangerous situations
      - contingency preparedness
      - ports of refuge
      - emergency tug
      - handling of dangerous goods
    . pollution control authority (Ministry of the Environment) + mapping authority (Ministry of the Environment) + Royal Navy (Ministry of Defence) + search and rescue centres (Ministry of Justice):
      - risk management.
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . port authorities:
      - safety within the harbour district
    . municipal authorities:
      - contingency organisation (responsibility shared with private bodies and central government, and implemented under guidelines for emergency preparedness planning for acute pollution, which detail the scope of responsibility of the different players).

✓ Denmark:
  • Government Level:
    . Danish Maritime Authority (Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs);
    . Royal Administration of Navigation and Hydrography (Ministry of Defence):
      - safety of shipping routes, navigation systems, rescue services;
      - data collection for sea maps or other purposes;
    . Admiral Danish Fleet: combating pollution at sea:
      - traffic monitoring
      - emergency tug
    . Environmental Protection Agency:
      - restoration of beaches according to the nature of the pollution
  • Regional/Local Level:
    . Regional/local councils:
      - combating pollution on the shoreline
      - restoration of beaches according to the nature of the pollution
    . Local authorities:
      - combating pollution in ports and harbours
      - restoration of beaches according to the nature of the pollution
Germany:
- Federal Level:
  - port state control
  - contingency preparedness (equipment, training, planning) (responsibility shared with the Emergency Command of Schleswig-Holstein)
  - environmental protection (monitoring of pollution)
  - safety of shipping routes
    . Waterways authorities (under the authority of the Federal State):
      - monitoring of sea traffic.
  - Länder (for the North Sea Basin: Schleswig-Holstein, Lower Saxony, Bremen, Hamburg):
    . ‘Havariekommando’: authority in case of maritime accidents since January 2003 (jointly financed by the federal government and federal states in question). It is a competence centre responsible for:
      - collecting traffic monitoring data
      - instructing federal authorities (customs, national police, etc.) in case of emergency.
+ responsibility of states for:
  - intervention in dangerous situations,
  - tug escort,
  - contingency preparedness, ports of refuge

Netherlands:
A Calamity Plan has been drawn up that describes the relations and responsibilities of each level of intervention.
- Government Level:
  . Department for Freight Transport (Ministry of Transport):
    - risk management strategy
    - coastguard cooperation organisation
    - safe navigation
    - responsible for operational tasks (traffic monitoring, intervention in dangerous situations, search and salvage)
  . Den Helder Operational Centre:
    - centralisation of information.
- Local/Regional Level:
  . port authorities:
    - tug escort, handling of dangerous goods
  . Municipal authorities:
    - removal of oil pollution waste of less than 5m³
    - ports of refuge

Belgium
Shared responsibilities between regional and federal governments for planning and implementation of national policy
- Federal Level:
  . Federal Ministry:
    - protection of the marine environment
    - coordination of environmental matters (via an Inter-ministerial Commission)
  . Ministry of the Interior (civil protection): operational responsibility (which may be delegated to Provincial Governors)
- Regional Governments
  - pilotage services, traffic monitoring.
- Provinces:
  - intervention in dangerous situations
  - contingency preparedness (equipment of ships, training, planning...)
  - handling of dangerous goods
Mediterranean Sea Basin:

✓ Slovenia:
The maritime administration is the Maritime Directorate of the Ministry of Transport. It has two branch offices, one in Izoal and the other in Piran. It is responsible for:
- goods salvage
- refuge areas
The authority in charge of environmental protection is the Ministry of Environmental and Physical Planning. These two ministries are in charge of preventing pollution caused by ships.
The Ministry of Defence and Civil Protection is in charge of dealing with marine pollution incidents (implementation of the national contingency plan).

✓ Greece
• Government Level:
  - Ministry of the Merchant Navy (maritime rescue coordination centre), in collaboration with the Marine Environment Protection Division of the ministry):
  - provides for a raft of actions to tackle pollution incidents depending on their gravity
  - Marine Environment Protection Division:
  - control of major oil spills
  - assistance to local authorities (sends qualified personnel from the ministries and national institutes concerned)
• Regional/Local Level:
  - port authorities:
  - activate contingency plans after assessment of the situation by the port authority and coordination centre (the harbourmaster is considered as the local coordinator).
  - response to small oil spills by local port authorities (under the command of the marine pollution combating stations in the ports)

✓ Espagne, France (see Atlantic Sea Basin).