

# Mapping of Institutional Architecture for Protection from Oil Spills in the Baltic Sea Region

– Survey results and report



# Mapping of Institutional Architecture for Protection from Oil Spills in the Baltic Sea Region

– Survey results and report

Acknowledgements:

Authors of this survey and report would like to express thankfulness for and acknowledge the contribution of Baltic Sea region countries' focal points for HELCOM RESPONSE/SHORE working group, as well as CBSS Civil Protection Network. Engagement of colleagues from across the Baltic Sea region is the main precondition for the success of macro-regional cross-border environmental and civil protection efforts.

Mapping of Institutional Architecture for  
Protection from Oil Spills in the Baltic Sea Region  
– Survey results and report

Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)

Project Management MSB:

Julia Fredriksson

Sonja Dobo

Margaretha Ericsson

Consultant:

Egle Obcarskaite, Sister Consulting

Photo: MSB, Shutterstock

Layout: Advant Produktionsbyrå

Print: DanagårdLiTHO

Order No.: MSB936 - November 2015

ISBN: 978-91-7383-614-2

# Content

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Background to the survey .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Rationale.....	9
Cooperation frameworks and background to common approach .....	9
Literature overview .....	11
Respondents.....	12
Survey design.....	14
Challenges and limitations.....	15
<b>Results of the survey .....</b>	<b>17</b>
General overview .....	17
Analysis per country.....	17
Denmark.....	17
Estonia.....	20
Finland .....	22
Germany.....	23
Iceland.....	24
Latvia.....	25
Lithuania.....	28
Norway.....	29
Poland.....	31
Russian Federation.....	32
Sweden.....	34
<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Annex I.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Annex II.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Annex III.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Annex IV.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Annex V.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Annex VI.....</b>	<b>73</b>

# Introduction

# Introduction

This report presents results of the survey **Institutional Architecture Mapping for Protection from Oil Spills in the Baltic Sea region**<sup>1</sup>, commissioned by the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency MSB, and carried out by a consultant, in a close dialogue with experts at MSB. This survey was intended as a pilot in drawing a comprehensive picture of oil spill contingency management in the Baltic Sea region, aimed to understanding of what institutions may be involved in this process in different countries. Oil spill protection is a complex undertaking due to its cross-sectorial nature, and may vary in different approaches and practices on how to organise it institutionally. Knowing these different models may encourage and facilitate good practice exchange among countries, and, more importantly, facilitate cross-border information exchange and cooperation.

Due to the nature of information collection (a survey was sent out to nominated focal points per country), this analysis does not imply the final and exhaustive picture of institutional involvement in the process of oil spill contingency management. The survey was designed with leaving space for respondents to interpret and comment on their answers. The risk was taken in that interpretations of questions in the survey may vary among countries, depending, among other aspects, on national oil spill contingency management systems and inter-institutional relations in each country in this field.

Therefore, it does not mean that on case-by-case basis only listed actors would be involved in the oil spill contingency management process in each country. However, for the purpose of this survey it was intended to disclose the similarities and differences in the very principle of institutional involvement and responsibility division among countries. In general, it was meant to provide a general picture and to document basic principles of which institutions are involved in each country. The report therefore does not claim that in a certain specific situation the constellation of institutions working on a certain action within the cycle of oil spill contingency management would not include any additional actors/institutions.

The deliverables of the mapping are to be considered as working material for benefiting oil spill protection related cooperation activities in the Baltic Sea region. As such it thus is open for comments, additions and further clarifications by countries themselves. The material invites relevant stakeholders to a dialogue on how institutional and cross-sectorial complexity impacts oil spill contingency management processes in the Baltic Sea region, as well as how a better understanding of these systems and actors involved can contribute to facilitating macro-regional cooperation and national oil spill contingency efforts.

In agreement with the commissioner of the study, it was selected that this report will present the following results: the narrative description and summary of institutional architecture based on the information provided by survey respondents through answering the questionnaire; per-country tables where responses to survey questions are provided (Annex I); per country tables where principles of sectorial participation of institutions in different phases of oil spill contingency management process are presented (Annex II); a list of international oil spill exercises in the Baltic Sea Region (Annex III); a list of international Baltic Sea region expert working groups and their institutional representation (Annex IV); a list of international agreements that countries are the contracting parties of (Annex V).

---

1. In this document (as well as in the survey itself), Baltic Sea region is defined as consisting of the following countries: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, the Russian Federation and Sweden.

# **Background to the survey**

# Background to the survey

## Rationale

The fourth and the latest update of the Sweden's Strategy for the protection from oil spills, adopted in 2014, indicates the area of oil spills protection in Sweden being an integrated part of the larger national CBRNE protection field. The Strategy targets a full range of relevant stakeholders for oil spill protection and response, including national and local level institutions, environmental and civil protection agencies, public and private entities among others.

The transboundary nature of the matter includes also cross-border aspects related to potential oil spills, both on-shore and at-sea. It is therefore necessary to identify relevant contact points for information access and exchange, as well as for the effective cooperation in oil spills protection in particular and CBRNE in general on the macro-regional Baltic Sea region level. Due to the differences in national civil protection systems across the region, the task of identification of said contact points requires a better understanding of institutional architecture (including ownership, mandate and responsibilities) in the field of oil spill protection in the Baltic Sea region. Further than only national architecture specifics, cross-border cooperation frameworks such as HELCOM, EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) and Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) Civil Protection Network, as well as the Copenhagen Agreement (the Nordic countries) and the Arctic Council Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response Working Group (EPPR) among others, have to be taken into account.

Against this backdrop, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), the mandate holder for planning and implementing CBRNE work in Sweden, has initiated a project of initial institutional architecture mapping for the protection from oil spills in the Baltic Sea region. Herewith an initial overview (map) of institutions' responsibilities and mandates architecture, when it comes to oil spill contingency management in the Baltic Sea region, has been prepared in order to support the implementation of the Strategy for the protection from oil spills and, eventually, in the area of CBRNE. Results of this project are expected to further facilitate the process of coordinating cooperation in the targeted field among relevant institutions on the macro-regional level. The results will also contribute to the ongoing attempts to identify synergies and cooperation points between marine pollution and civil protection fields. Depending on the needs of Baltic Sea region stakeholders after presenting results of this mapping, the material remains open for a follow up process to draw a tailored civil protection institutional architecture map in the Baltic Sea region, should this be identified as a need.

## Cooperation frameworks and background to common approach

Looking from a macro-regional perspective, there are several intergovernmental, policy and/or expert networks/frameworks that define and in some cases steer multilateral cross-border cooperation in the Baltic Sea region in the areas of environment protection, civil security and protection, maritime safety, nuclear and radiation safety and preparedness for threats to health. Formal and informal experience exchange, learning and network facilitation, as well as common activities planning are taking place during regular and extraordinary meetings of experts and officials within these frameworks. While placed within closely related thematic areas, they may vary through representing institutions per each

country. Therefore it was considered useful to include the map of institutional representation in relevant international cooperation frameworks in this mapping exercise (Annex IV).

One of the central environment cooperation frameworks in the region is provided by the convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area. The Convention is governed by an intergovernmental organisation The Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission, also known as Helsinki Commission, or HELCOM. HELCOM's International Secretariat facilitates work of several international expert groups. It is particularly the work of HELCOM MARITIME and HELCOM RESPONSE, with the sub-group RESPONSE ON SHORE, that are mostly relevant to the topic of this survey. HELCOM contracting parties are all countries of the Baltic Sea region (as defined by this survey), except Iceland and Norway, as well as the EU.

For the land-based civil protection cooperation in the Baltic Sea region, the central intergovernmental framework is Council of the Baltic Sea States Civil Protection Network. The Network convenes annually on the Directors General level, as well as has annual information exchange meetings on senior expert level. Additionally, ad hoc joint project development and experience exchange activities may be organised for senior experts throughout the year.

A policy framework that is in a dialogue with and in some cases involves both above mentioned platforms, is the EU Baltic Sea Region Strategy EUSBSR. EUSBSR is a commitment by EU member states to cooperate in facing common challenges, in particular related to improving environmental condition of the Baltic Sea, among others. EUSBSR works through policy areas (PAs), the most relevant of which for the purposes of this survey are PA Safe and PA Secure. Policy areas in EUSBSR work by coordinating cooperation (through international steering groups/committees), as well as by bringing forward their area of work and overall goals related flagship projects.

Another intergovernmental expert group that is significant for cooperation in the area of oil spill response in the region is operating under the Arctic Council. The Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response Working Group EPPR addresses various aspects of prevention, preparedness and response to environmental emergencies in the Arctic. EPPR developed operational guidelines for the Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response in the Arctic, which was signed in May 2013. While geographically this framework is operative outside the Baltic Sea region, however, six of eight of its signatories are the countries of what in this survey is considered to be Baltic Sea region, namely: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russian Federation and Sweden. Therefore, in terms of considering institutional architecture for oil spill contingency management in these countries, it was considered relevant to mention EPPR in this report.

Additionally to these cooperation frameworks, an important mode of cooperation for cross-border threats and assistance in emergencies, are bi-lateral agreements between countries. The survey intended to identify a list of bi-lateral agreements as a way to trace different levels of cross-border cooperation between countries. Finally, an important operational cooperation facilitation tool especially for the area of preparedness, is common international exercises. The survey identified a list of the most common exercises for BSR countries, included also in this report (Annex III).

## Literature overview

In preparation for the survey, a basic literature search was carried out, in order to map previous attempts to study oil spill risk management systems (or related) in the Baltic Sea region, in particular those carried out from a macro-regional point of view (i.e. looking into several countries in the region).

One of the thematically closest projects to the scope of this study was Baltic Master project<sup>2</sup> (I (2005–2007) and II (2009–2012)), a project led by Region Blekinge, Sweden, and financed by the Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007–2013). Baltic Master I aimed to improved maritime safety by integrating and bringing forward local and regional governments. Baltic Master II build on the results of the first project, and aimed to improve the on-land response capacity to oil spills in the Baltic Sea as well as to enhance prevention of pollution from maritime transport. The report that the project produced on Oil spill preparedness in the Baltic Sea Countries<sup>3</sup> provided a comprehensive overview of oil spill contingency planning for the most of Baltic Sea region countries (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russian Federation and Sweden), including institutional responsibilities, response chain, equipment, previous accidents, exercises, and ratified conventions.

This survey builds on the results of the above research by adding Norway and Iceland to the scope of inquiry. Furthermore, it extends the above perspective by focusing concretely on institutional responsibility with the emphasis on cross-sectorial aspect of oil spill contingency management. That is to say that while Baltic Master II came from the perspective of maritime safety, this survey opens up for the transboundary nature of the field and observes links between various sectors (environment protection, maritime safety, civil protection on land, CBRN/ hazardous substances, border safety etc.), as well as how it manifests through institutional involvement in various steps of oil spill contingency management. Finally, the novelty of this study is the attempt to populate the grid of three areas of contingency management for oil spills, namely at sea, on shore and on land.

In this way, this survey conceptually lies closer to another recent macro-regional project BSMIR – Baltic Sea Maritime Incident Response Survey<sup>4</sup>, implemented by the Finnish Border Guard in 2014. While the study was not specifically focused on oil spill incidents but rather aimed to identify how the Baltic Sea region countries (the same definition as in this survey) are prepared to deal with a major multisectorial incident at sea. BSMIR project focused mainly on the preparedness side, while this survey addresses also response and recovery. However, this survey shares the same perspective with BSMIR in that due to the multisectorial operating environment associated with a major incident, it chose cross-sectorial cooperation as the starting point for the inquiry, aiming to ensure that holistic situational awareness could be achieved<sup>5</sup>.

Within the framework of the EUSBSR, a macro-regional project Sub-regional risk of spill of oil and hazardous substances in the Baltic Sea (BRISK) was implemented under leadership provided by Denmark (2009–2012). The overall aim of the project was to increase the preparedness of all Baltic Sea countries to respond to major spills of oil and hazardous substances from shipping. The project delivered scenarios for risk of spills of oil and hazardous substances, suggestions for investment plans for each sub-region, and an overview of the existing bilateral and trilateral agreements for joint response actions across national borders<sup>6</sup>.

2. <http://www.balticmaster.org/>

3. [http://www.balticmaster.org/media/files/general\\_files\\_1212.pdf](http://www.balticmaster.org/media/files/general_files_1212.pdf)

4. [http://www.raja.fi/download/53418\\_BSMIR\\_final\\_report.pdf?61026c340a18d288](http://www.raja.fi/download/53418_BSMIR_final_report.pdf?61026c340a18d288)

5. BSMIR Final Report [http://www.raja.fi/download/53418\\_BSMIR\\_final\\_report.pdf?61026c340a18d288](http://www.raja.fi/download/53418_BSMIR_final_report.pdf?61026c340a18d288) p. 12.

6. More information about BRISK can be found here: [http://www.brisk.helcom.fi/publications/en\\_GB/publications/](http://www.brisk.helcom.fi/publications/en_GB/publications/)

While the above mentioned projects and subsequently their reports approached the issue of oil spill contingency mainly from the perspective of maritime safety, and in most of the cases focusing on one phase of oil spill contingency management (either preparedness or response), there was one macro-regional project which introduced the first Baltic Sea region wide thematisation of oil spill contingency from a cross-sectorial perspective. A project 14.3<sup>7</sup>, a flagship project under the EUSBSR priority area Secure<sup>8</sup>, aimed at developing scenarios and identifying gaps for all main hazards in the Baltic Sea region. The project<sup>9</sup> the partnership of which consisted of all Baltic Sea region countries with an exception of Iceland, resulted in, among other achievements, providing guidelines for macro-regional risk assessment, as well as six risk scenarios<sup>10</sup>. One of these scenarios developed was scenario Accident at Sea<sup>11</sup> – an accident caused by a collision between an oil tanker and a passenger vessel. The scenario and risk assessment within the project particularly looked into what other sectors can be affected in case of this incident.

Additional source that was used for the report of this survey was EU Vademecum for Civil Protection.<sup>12</sup> This online source provides a general overview of the measures taken by EU member states as well as at EU level to deal with disasters. Vademecum was especially informative for giving overview of country profiles, with specificities of national civil protection mechanisms. However, as Vademecum is mainly a land-based civil protection overview, as well as country profiles did differ up to a certain extent, in this report it could have been used only in fragments.

## Respondents

The scope of the mapping activity implied that the respondents to the survey through which the activity should be implemented, should be responsible institutions from Baltic Sea region countries, as defined in above in this report. The countries namely were: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, the Russian Federation and Sweden. The starting point for this mapping exercise was to approach institutional architecture from macro-regional and thus ongoing cooperation perspective. Furthermore, the commissioning authority – Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency MSB – is the official contact point/participant in the main macro-regional BSR civil protection cooperation frameworks (HELCOM (RESPONSE and SHORE working groups) and CBSS Civil Protection Network), and also is a co-coordinator and national focal point of EUSBR policy area Secure. For these reasons it was decided to identify respondents through official network contact points of these networks. National contact points would be invited to nominate survey focal points upon an official request from MSB.

The process of identifying survey respondents was carried out on two levels. First, an official invitation to nominate focal points was sent out by MSB to their contact points within HELCOM RESPONSE/SHORE and CBSS Civil Protection Network. Scope and purpose of the mapping activity was provided. Second, after receiving official nominations, the questionnaire was sent out to the nominated focal points. It was left open for focal points to either respond to the survey by themselves, or in consultation with other relevant institutions in their country. For the countries that did not respond to the request for nominations, the initial official contact was contacted also with the request for survey.

7. Reads: Fourteen point three.

8. Since June 2015 – EUSBSR policy area Secure.

9. <http://www.14point3.eu>

10. Scenarios were published in: <http://www.14point3.eu/wp-content/uploads/Red-Book-One.pdf>

11. Red Book One – Fourteen point Three Notebooks, p. 39. <http://www.14point3.eu/wp-content/uploads/Red-Book-One.pdf>

12. [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/civil\\_protection/vademecum/](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/civil_protection/vademecum/)

An observation was made that while invitations to national contact points of the two networks mentioned above were distributed in parallel, there were no double focal point submissions: nominated focal points belonged either to HELCOM RESPONSE, or to CBSS Civil Protection Network. This, however, does not exclude that network contact points in each country have consulted on which institution should remain as a national nominated focal point for the survey. The survey did not specifically request to identify which institutions have participated in providing answers.<sup>13</sup>

COUNTRY	HELCOM CONTACT	CBSS CIVPRO CONTACT	NOMINATED FOCAL POINT
Denmark	Danish Defence Command	Danish Emergency Management Agency (DEMA)	Danish Defence Command, Naval Staff
Estonia	Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of the Environment, Police and Border Guard Board	Estonian Rescue Service	Estonian Ministry of the Interior
Finland	Ministry of the Environment, Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE), Government of Åland	Ministry of the Interior	Finnish Environment Institute SYKE
Germany	Central Command for Maritime Emergencies (CCME)	Hamburg Fire and Rescue Service	Hamburg Fire and Rescue Service
Iceland	n/a	National Commissioner for the Icelandic Police	Icelandic Environment Agency
Latvia	State Environmental Service	State Fire and Rescue Service	Latvian Coast Guard Service
Lithuania	MRCC of the Lithuanian Navy	Fire and Rescue Department under Mol	Fire and Rescue Department under Mol
Norway	n/a	Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection (DSB)	Norwegian Coastal Administration
Poland	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Ministry of Infrastructure and Development, Maritime Office in Gdynia, Maritime Office in Szczecin, National Water Management Authority	State Fire and Rescue Service	Maritime Search and Rescue Service
Russian Federation	State Marine Emergency and Rescue Coordination Service of the Russian Federation (SMRCS)	The Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (EMERCOM of Russia)	The Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (EMERCOM of Russia)
Sweden	Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), Swedish Coast Guard, Ministry of Defence	Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)	Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)

Chart 1: Results of nomination process.

13. The survey requested to identify one institution/focal point who was responsible for the provided response and thus could have been contacted back for clarifications. Nevertheless, one respondent provided a list of institutions that have been contributing to the response process.

## Survey design

The objective of mapping of institutional architecture for oil spill protection in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) defined the principle in which the survey would be designed. It was intended for this activity to apply full-cycle DRR approach, and therefore to address oil spill contingency management process in all of its stages: preparedness, response and recovery. Since the fourth stage – prevention – in many countries fall outside of the institutional scope that is common to the three aforementioned stages and opens up for a whole range of different measures and responsibilities, it was decided to not to include prevention stage in this mapping activity.

Following this principle, the survey was designed in three parts: (1) preparedness (questions no. 1–6), (2) response (questions no. 7–10), and (3) recovery (questions no. 11–15). Additionally, due to the cross-border nature of the objective of this activity, the fourth part of the survey inquired into (4) regional and international cooperation (questions no. 15–18). Due to the broad scope of the survey, number of questions under each part had to be kept to a minimum and therefore do not claim to have exhausted all the potential tasks that are being undertaken in each of the stages.

One of the objectives of the mapping was to identify common principles, differences and similarities in institutional responsibilities in BSR countries when it comes to oil spill contingency management for different areas: at sea, on shore, and on land. Therefore, the survey questionnaire was designed in the way that would distinguish between these areas that may be affected/participate in the process of protection from oil spills. It was defined in the questionnaire that these areas may differ depending on 1) the location where the incident occurs; 2) the mandate of the institution that participates in the risk management process.

Finally, the survey intended to draw as broad institutional involvement across sectors picture as possible. Knowing that many of the identified oil spill contingency management tasks due to their transboundary nature would include the responsible authority consulting other relevant authorities, the survey included the possibility to indicate which institutions are “responsible”, and which are “contributing”, or providing “ad hoc support when requested”. It was anticipated that in this way, respondents would be encouraged to include all range of stakeholder institutions that may contribute to the task in question. Furthermore, as the objective of this mapping activity was to go beyond oil spill contingency management as solely a maritime safety issue, as well as to identify at which point in the process institutions from sectors like environment protection, as well as land-based civil protection appear, there were two questions included in the survey questionnaire that addressed this aspect, namely questions 12 and 13.

Definitions of the main terms used in the survey, as provided to respondents:

1. Category “AT SEA” covers institutions that are mandated to coordinate, implement and/or contribute to activities at sea.
2. Category “ON SHORE” is intended for listing what institutions have responsibilities to act on shore in the case of an oil spill. For the purpose of this questionnaire, definition of “oil spill response on shore” is used following HELCOM Manual on Co-operation in Response to Marine Pollution within the framework of the Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention), Volume III<sup>14</sup>: “Response on the shore is defined as response to pollution incidents on the shore, involving oil and other harmful substances, and covers”:

---

14. [http://www.helcom.fi/Documents/Ministerial2013/Ministerial%20declaration/Adopted\\_endorsed%20documents/Response%20Manual%20Volume%20III.pdf](http://www.helcom.fi/Documents/Ministerial2013/Ministerial%20declaration/Adopted_endorsed%20documents/Response%20Manual%20Volume%20III.pdf)

- Response operations carried out from land or smaller boats/tugs which are under the same command as operations on the shore.
  - Clean-up of pollution on the shore.
  - Oiled wildlife response in the above mentioned areas.
3. Category “ON LAND” is intended for listing institutions that are mandated to/participating in oil spill contingency management process, even though their usual mandate is to undertake civil protection activities on land; this category also covers where an oil spill pollution incident may have impact on areas that are usually covered by civil protection on land (including potential deployment of on-land rescue services).

The complete questionnaire is provided in the Annex VI of this report.

## Challenges and limitations

Cross-sectorial nature of the topic was the major challenge and limitation of the mapping activity. The survey specifically targeted two main areas relevant to the oil spill contingency planning issue (maritime safety and environmental protection), as well as the third one – civil protection, – foreseeing that in some cases the answers may “fall between chairs.” In some instances, respondents themselves have identified that they were retaining from answering certain parts of the survey which fell out of the mandate area of their institution.

Another challenge identified was that due to the pioneering and cross-sectorial nature of the request, the questions may have been interpreted in varying degrees, and thus subjected to a sectorial or institutional biases. These biases may have been enhanced due to what the object of inquiry was, namely that questions in the survey targeted responsibility question, without providing a concrete definition of what it was meant by responsibility (leaving it for countries’ interpretation).

Finally, a challenge in interpreting and summarising results of the survey appeared due to the fact that responses varied in how detailed information was provided. To provide a narrative detailing for each answer was made possible by the survey design, by adding commentary to the field assigned to each question. This function, however, was optional (filling it out was not a prerequisite for moving further within the survey). Such details as distribution of responsibilities among national, regional and local governance levels were not specially addressed, even though the results of the survey show that this could have been distinguished more concretely.

Limitation for the report was also that there were cases where respondents indicated that they lack information in order to be able to answer some questions (especially related to institutional country representation at international working groups). Due to short time of the mapping as well as due to limited possibility of multiple follow ups with the respondents, some of the information of non-responded questions could not have been retrieved. However, the overall marginal of such cases throughout all responses remained low.

These listed challenges and limitations determined the way how the material developed from the survey results can be used. It is made available as a working material and open to further analysis, additions, clarifications and particularisations.

# Results of the survey

# Results of the survey

## General overview

Responses were received from all countries that were invited to participate in the survey. Responses varied to some extent in level of detail. In what follows, the results are presented in the form of narrative overview per each country, based concretely on answers received, and aiming to identify underlying trends in responsibility division (by providing a summary at the end of each country profile). In order to deal with the risk of interpretation bias, the answers are also provided in a form of a table from which conclusions were drawn (Annex I).

In order to answer the research question of this mapping activity, namely to identify the area (at sea – on shore – on land) division through institutional responsibility mapping, a model table was developed where shift in responsibilities among various institutions could be identified and compared among countries in the BSR. Results are provided in Annex II. In order to be able to interpret and use tables in Annex II, the following information has to be taken into account: Institutions in the table are provided as “prototypes”, making an assumption that each of the analysed countries have “a ministry of Defence”, or “an agency/institution of Environment”, to give an example. This is for the reader to be able to identify, which of the listed entities are their equivalent/counterpart. However, as national institutional architectures may vary, this approach conditioned some generalisations and exceptions. It must be highlighted here that the aim was to provide a general overview of at which stage and in which area a given institution join in to the oil spill contingency management process.

The tables in Annex II provide stratification for different stages of oil spill contingency management, however, they do not provide it for the level of responsibility of those involved. Neither does it stratify in terms of for how many various tasks in the given stage the institution is responsible. Therefore, interpretation of a table should read as follows: “a given institution is/may be present at some point of this particular stage (e.g. preparedness).”

In Annexes II, IV and V, lists of international agreements, exercises and participation in selected Expert Groups are provided as results of the survey.

## Analysis per country

### Denmark

Nominated focal point for the survey: Defence Command Denmark – Naval Staff.

Response to the survey indicated that on the **strategic preparedness level**, responsibility for oil spill preparedness lies with two ministries – the Danish Ministry of Defence (at sea) and the Danish Ministry of Environment (on shore and on land). The two ministries further share responsibility for carrying out **risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills**, where responsibility among them is divided in that at sea area belongs to the mandate of the Defence Ministry, whereas the Ministry of Environment is responsible for the areas on shore and on land.



**OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY  
MANAGEMENT IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION:  
MAPPING POLICY AREAS**

**C** – CBRN/Hazardous substances

**M** – Maritime safety

**D** – Civil protection/Disaster Risk Management

**E** – Environmental protection

**NORWAY**  
C-M-E

**SWEDEN**  
C-M-D-E

**FINLAND**  
M-D-E

**ESTONIA**  
M-D-E

**RUSSIAN  
FEDERATION**  
M-D-E

**LATVIA**  
C-M-D-E

**DENMARK**  
C-M-D-E

**LITHUANIA**  
D-E

**GERMANY**  
M-D-E

**POLAND**  
M-E

Ministry of Environment further is responsible for **overall assessment of impact and recovery** coordination, in the areas on shore and on land. In this responsibility they are joined by two specialised agencies (both situated under the Ministry of Defence), namely the Defence Command Denmark, and the Danish Emergency Management Agency (DEMA). The Defence Command covers the area at sea in this regard, and DEMA is responsible for on shore and on land areas. More than overall impact assessment and recovery **coordination** only (responsibility of the Ministry of Environment), the Defence Command and DEMA are also responsible for **implementation** of this task, under the same principle of area division.

These two specialised agencies also share the responsibility for **national contingency plan for oil accidents** in Denmark. The area division of responsibility here remains almost the same – the Defence Command covering area at sea, whereas DEMA extends responsibility throughout the all three areas (at sea, on shore, on land). Furthermore, responsibility for national contingency plan on shore and on land level involves also local authorities (Local councils).

Defence Command Denmark and DEMA continue sharing participation in the **national warning system** for oil accidents, where they continue with the same area division (the Defence Command – at sea, and DEMA – on shore and on land), and are joined by other actors, namely the Danish Nature Agency (under the Ministry of Environment), Police and Local councils. All these actors are joining in for the areas on shore and on land.

Similar constitution, however without the Danish Nature Agency, is established for the task of **response coordination and implementation**: the Defence Command is responsible for this task in the areas of at sea and on shore, whereas DEMA, the Police and Local councils bear responsibility in the areas on shore and on land. The Defence Command remains responsible for **clean-up and disposal of oil and waste** task for the area at sea, whereas DEMA and Local councils take up this responsibility on shore and on land. For **information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident** within all areas (at sea, on shore, on land), responsibility falls under the Defence Command, whereas the same task for the on shore and on land areas falls under the jurisdiction of the Police. The Defence Command also handles **international assistance requests (both, asking and receiving)** at sea. **Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response** falls under responsibility of the Defence Command at sea, and DEMA as well as Local councils on shore and on land.

**Environmental impact assessment and recovery** falls under the responsibility of two agencies under the ministry of Defence: the Defence Command (at sea), and DEMA (on shore and on land). The same responsibility division remains for **impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective**. Participation in the evaluation and follow-up across sectors include Defence Command Denmark, DEMA, the Police, The Danish Nature Agency and the Local government in the area at sea, and the same group of actors except the Defence Command, for the area on shore and on land. The Defence Command and DEMA are the actors who are participating in the process of **lessons-learnt dissemination internationally**, maintaining the same area division as for most of the tasks (the Defence Command at sea and DEMA on shore and on land).

Policy areas:

- CBRN/Hazardous substances (acting/representing authority Danish Defence Command and DEMA).
- Maritime Safety (acting/representing authority Danish Maritime Authority).
- Civil protection/Disaster Risk Management (acting/representing authority The Danish Emergency Management Agency).
- Environmental Protection (acting/representing authority the Ministry of Environment).

## SUMMARY

Responsibility for oil spill contingency management in Denmark falls under two ministries – Defence and Environment – for the overall strategic level. The division between the two is kept along the division between the areas at sea – Ministry of Defence, – and on shore/on land (the two being collated most of the times) – Ministry of Environment. On a more operative/implementation level, however, it is mostly agencies situated under the Ministry of Defence who bear responsibilities for various tasks. The division between two areas – at sea and on shore/land – remains constant for the most of tasks: at sea area most often falls under the responsibility of the Defence Command Denmark, whereas on shore/on land stays within the responsibilities of the Danish Emergency Management Agency (DEMA). For more operative implementation tasks, these two agencies are joined by Local government actors and the Police. The responsible agency under the Ministry of Environment – the Danish Nature Agency – has responsibilities within the national warning system on shore and on land, as well as participates in the cross-sector evaluation and follow up (at sea, on shore, on land).

When it comes to different stages of oil spill contingency management (preparedness – response – recovery), there occurs no significant task based division between participating actors. Most of the actors on implementation level participate in all stages and tasks of the process, with remaining divisions only according to the following areas as identified above: at sea and on shore/on land.

## Estonia

Nominated contact point for the survey: Estonian Ministry of the Interior.

Responsibility for strategic tasks in the preparedness stage in Estonian oil spill contingency management (**the overall strategy for oil spill preparedness and the national oil spill contingency plan**) is taken by the Estonian Ministry of the Interior in all areas: at sea, on shore and on land. In the area at sea for these two tasks, the ministry is joined by the Police and Border Guard Board. Whereas for areas on shore and on land the ministry is joined by the Estonian Rescue Board. Police and Border Guard Board also contributes on shore. These two state agencies, both under supervision of the Ministry of the Interior, are assigned responsibilities in further tasks in the preparedness stage: **national warning system for oil spills**, as well **risk assessment and hazard identification of oil spills**. Area responsibility division for these tasks follow the same model as for those listed above: at sea area falls under the mandate of Police and Border Guard Board, whereas Rescue Board is responsible for on shore and on land. Police and Border Guard Board contributes to on shore area as well. For the specifically environment protection related task – **environmental prioritisation for oil spill response** – responsible in all areas at sea, on shore and on land, is Estonian Ministry of the Environment. All other above mentioned institutions (Ministry of the Interior, Police and Border Guard Board as well as Rescue Board) are contributing in this task.

In the response phase, for all tasks mentioned in the survey (**coordinating and implementing response measures for oil spill incidents; information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident, asking/receiving requests for international assistance; clean up and disposal for oil and waste**), applies the same responsibility division pattern: Police and Border Guard Board is responsible for tasks in the area at sea (and contributing on shore), whereas Rescue Board – for areas on shore and on land. For the activity of asking/receiving requests for international assistance it is notable that all requests go through the Ministry of the Interior. Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste on shore and on land is implemented in cooperation with Estonian Environmental Board.

In the recovery phase, the tasks of **coordination and implementation the overall assessment of impact and recovery**, as well as **evaluation and follow-up across sectors** fall under responsibility of Estonian Environmental Inspectorate for all areas: at sea, on shore and on land. For the on land area, the recovery process is coordinated by Estonian Environmental Board. Contribution to the process of **lessons-learnt dissemination internationally** is provided by Police and Border Guard Board and the Environmental Inspectorate for all areas (at sea, on shore, on land), Maritime Administration for at sea area, and Rescue Board for on shore and on land area.

#### Policy areas

- Maritime safety (represented by Estonian Ministry of the Interior with Police and Border Guard Board and Rescue Board, as well as Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communication).
- Civil protection/Disaster risk management (represented by Estonian Ministry of the Interior).
- Environmental protection (represented by Estonian Ministry of Environment).

#### SUMMARY

In general, responsibilities for oil spill contingency management in Estonia mainly fall under the mandate of Estonian Ministry of the Interior, where the Ministry is active on the strategic level, and mandates responsibilities to the State agencies under its supervision (Police and Border Guard Board as well as Estonian Rescue Board) for more operational tasks. The split between these two agencies follows the area division principle, where at sea area falls under responsibility of Police and Border Guard Board, and Rescue Board is responsible for tasks on shore and on land. However, Police and Border Guard Board (and Ministry of the Interior as well where relevant), also contribute to the processes on shore, thus making this area a meeting point for sectorial mandates. Since both agencies are acting under the supervision of the Ministry of the Interior, it results in Estonian oil spill contingency management being centered under the jurisdiction of this ministry.

Estonian Ministry of Environment, as well as its agencies Environmental Board and Environment Inspectorate, carry responsibilities in particular tasks related to environment protection issues. Environment Inspectorate also is active in the list of tasks related to environment recovery in the recovery phase, with this process being coordinated by Environmental Board in the area on land.

## Finland

Nominated contact point for the survey: Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE).

The most prevalent institutions in Finnish oil spill accident management process are Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) and Rescue Service on various administrative levels (eg. regional or district). **The overall strategy for oil spill preparedness** in Finland falls under responsibility of SYKE – at sea – and regional rescue services in coastal areas, on shore and on land. SYKE also is responsible for **national oil contingency plan** at sea, and shares this responsibility with Centers for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment from sub-regions involved. On shore and on land the national oil contingency plan falls under district rescue service responsibility.

In the **national warning system for oil spills**, SYKE, together with the Border Guard and Vessel Traffic Services are participating in the at sea area, whereas district rescue services, with contribution from Centers for Economic Development, Transport and Environment, are participating for the on shore and on land areas. Further on, SYKE is also carrying out **risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** at sea, with support from district rescue services in coastal areas. On shore and on land this task is implemented by district rescue services, with contributions from Centers for Economic Development and the Environment. The same constitution remains also for the task of carrying out **environmental prioritisation for oil spill response**.

**Coordination and implementation of response measures for oil spill incidents** fall under the responsibility of SYKE at the open sea, and under Rescue Service in coastal areas. Contribution for this is provided by the Border Guard, the Navy, Traffic Administration and volunteer troops. Rescue services continue bearing responsibility for the task on shore, where they receive contribution from municipal administrations and volunteers, as well as on land. Depending on which organisation is leading the response, responsibility for **information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident** may shift: from SYKE to Rescue Service at sea, or Rescue Service on shore and on land. In addition, each actor disseminates information on their own actions. The same responsibility division principle (SYKE or Rescue Service, depending on who leads the whole response operation) applies to the task of **clean-up and disposal of oil and waste**. Additionally, in the on land area, during the restoration phase, this task also falls under municipal responsibility.

In terms of **asking/receiving requests for international assistance**, it is SYKE who is responsible in case the pollution is ship based, whereas in other cases the responsibility falls under the Ministry of Interior. SYKE, together with Centers for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment are responsible for **coordination and participation in the overall assessment of impact and recovery**, as well as **environmental impact assessment and recovery** (at sea and on shore, whereas on land the task remains solely under Centre's responsibility). Additionally, it was indicated in answering to the survey that several governmental and private companies take part in the impact assessment, and they vary throughout various accidents. **Impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective** is implemented by Vessel Traffic Services at sea, and by rescue services on shore and on land. **Evaluation and follow-up across sectors** include participation of all actors that were involved in the process. In addition, Regional State Administrative Agencies and Safety Investigation Authority may be involved in the process. **Lessons learnt** at the areas at sea and on shore are disseminated internationally by SYKE, whereas on land lessons learnt are disseminated by rescue service that handled the operation.

#### Policy areas

- Maritime Safety – Ship safety and fairway safety; Safety for navigation.
- Civil Protection/Disaster Risk Management – on land, on shore.
- Environmental protection – Oil spill response preparedness.

#### SUMMARY

In Finland, main strategic and implementation responsibilities in oil spill contingency management are mandated to the agencies or operational institutions level, where for the area at sea (and, when needed, on shore) the most prevailing institution is Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE). SYKE is joined by Rescue Service and Regional administration bodies, namely Centers for Economic Development, Transport and Environment, who have responsibilities in oil spill contingency management mainly for the areas on shore and on land. It can be noted that Finland does not have a specialised government agency for operational civil protection and/or rescue services. The central coordination on national level for civil protection in Finland comes from the Ministry of the Interior. In oil spill contingency management in Finland, however, regional (regions and districts) as well as local (municipalities) rescue services come in as responsible actors for on shore and on land area for oil spill contingency. It was indicated also that response phase include volunteer support, whereas various government and private actors participate in risk assessment. Finnish Border Guard and Finnish Rescue Service at sea operate in coordination with SYKE and Finnish Navy.

#### Germany

Nominated focal point for the survey: Hamburg Fire and Rescue Service.

In Germany, responsibilities related to virtually all of the in the survey indicated tasks fall under the special body – the Central Command for Maritime Emergencies, located in Cuxhaven (Havariekommando Cuxhaven). This body is a joint institution of the Federation and Federal States (Bundesländer) for the coordination of work in the case of a maritime emergency in the North and Baltic Sea. The Central Command ensures consistent and structured operation control/management in the event of serious maritime emergencies with complex damage situations including public information. It also is a competence centre for maritime emergency preparedness.

The Central Command for Maritime Emergencies takes up the responsibility in all areas (at sea, on shore and on land), when it comes to the following tasks: **coordination and implementation of response measures for oil spill incidents, information dissemination to the public of an occurring oil spill incident, asking/receiving international assistance, coordinating and taking part in the overall impact assessment and recovery, implementing environmental impact assessment and recovery as well as impact assessment from civil protection and safety perspective, and the task of contributing to the process of lessons-learned dissemination internationally.**

While the Central Command remains responsible in the area at sea for the tasks of **the overall strategy for oil spill preparedness, the national oil spill contingency plan, as well as integration in the national warning system for oil spills**, on shore it shares responsibility with the Federal States, whereas the Federal States take over the responsibility on land (except the national warning system where responsibility is still kept with both, the Central Command and Federal States).

**Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** is implemented by the Central Command for the at sea area, whereas solely by the Federal States on shore and on land. **Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response** is carried out by the Central Command at sea and on shore, whereas on land it falls under the responsibility of the respective municipality. **Evaluation and follow-up across sectors** is being implemented jointly by the Central Command, and Federal States at all areas – at sea, on shore, and on land.

Policy areas

- Maritime safety (represented by the Central Command for Maritime Emergencies).
- Civil Protection/Disaster Risk Management (represented by the Central Command for Maritime Emergencies).
- Environmental protection (represented by the Central Command for Maritime Emergencies).

#### SUMMARY

In Germany, a body specialised on maritime emergency management in the North Sea and the Baltic Sea was created within the mandate from Federal States (Bundesländer). Therefore, it may appear that oil spill contingency management processes are strongly centralised in one institution. For the most tasks, in particular in areas at sea and on shore, it is indeed that the responsibility lies with the Central Command for Maritime Emergencies. On land area it more often falls under responsibility for regional rescue services (each Federal State in Germany maintain their own rescue service system). However, the fact that the Central Command was created by the Federal States suggests that institutionally oil spill contingency management is concentrated on the federal level.

## Iceland

Nominated focal point for the survey: Environment Agency of Iceland.

In Iceland, **the overall strategy for oil spill preparedness** outside harbour areas falls under responsibility of the Environment Agency of Iceland, Harbour Masters within harbours, and Local fire departments for the area on land. Environment Agency of Iceland in cooperation with the Icelandic Coast Guard, Icelandic transport authority and Road and Coastal Administration are responsible for the **national oil contingency plan** for the area at sea and on shore, whereas Harbour Masters continue holding responsibility within harbours. **National oil spill contingency plan** for the area on land was indicated as non-applicable in answering the survey.

For the **national warning system** Icelandic Coast Guard was indicated as a contributing institution for areas at sea and on shore, whereas Local health authority – as an institution that comes in ad-hoc or upon request for the area on land.

**Response measure coordination and implementation** at sea and on shore falls under responsibility of the Environment Agency of Iceland and the Harbour Masters within harbours (indicated as non-applicable for on land area). Icelandic Coast Guard and the Environment Agency in cooperation are responsible for **information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident** at sea (indicated as non-applicable on shore and on land). **Asking/receiving requests for international assistance** at sea and on shore in Iceland is responsibility of the Environment

Agency of Iceland, which also is contributing to the process of **lessons-learnt dissemination internationally** (joined by Icelandic coast guard in the area at sea).

**Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste** is implemented by the Environment Agency at sea and on shore, whereas Harbour Masters are responsible for clean-up within the harbour area on land and may receive contribution from Local health authority ad hoc or when requested. Local health authority may provide ad hoc/ upon request support for **overall impact assessment and recovery on land**. **Impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective** is implemented by Civil Protection in Iceland.

Policy areas

- Environmental protection (represented by Environment Agency of Iceland).

### SUMMARY

Oil spill contingency management in Iceland falls mainly under responsibility of the Environment Agency and the Icelandic Coast Guard at sea, and of port administrations – Harbour Masters within harbour areas. The same is valid when it comes to the on shore area, where the responsibility falls under the Environment Agency and the Icelandic Coast Guard outside harbour areas, as well as Harbour Masters within harbours. Additional institutions (Local fire departments, Environment Agency of Iceland, Local health authority and Civil Protection Iceland) come in to contribute to cross-sectorial tasks, however, mainly on the ad hoc basis or upon a request. Oil spill contingency management in Iceland thus is approached mainly as a maritime – at sea – issue.

## Latvia

Nominated focal point for the survey: Latvian Coast Guard Service.

In Latvia, the **overall responsibility for the strategy for oil spill preparedness** lies under the Ministry of Environment. However, for distinct areas within the strategy, the responsibility is taken by the State Environmental Service (for the area at sea) and the State Fire Service (for areas on shore and on land). For the **national oil contingency plan**, in Latvia National Oil Spill Contingency Plan covers only the sea area, whereas National Civil Emergency Plan covers the areas on shore and on land. Respectively, Latvian Navy, which is the overseeing body of Latvian Coast Guard, is responsible for the former, whereas the State Fire Service takes the responsibility for the latter.

Similarly, the **national warning system** at sea in Latvia is maintained by the Coast Guard Service under the Latvian Navy. **Warning system** on shore and on land is maintained by State Fire Service. **Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** in Latvia is carried out on three levels: national, municipal and enterprise (private). For risk assessment at sea, the responsibility falls under the State Environmental Service, and on shore as well as on land – under municipalities and the State Fire Service. **Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response** in all three areas (at sea/on shore/on land) is the responsibility of the State Environmental Service.

In the field of response, all in the survey mentioned tasks, namely **coordination and implementation of response measures for oil spill incidents, information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident, asking-receiving requests for international assistance, as well as clean-up and disposal of oil and waste**, falls under responsibility of the Latvian Navy (and Coast Guard Service as operating under it) and the State Fire Service. Responsibility is divided following the same territorial division principle: Latvian Navy responsible for at sea area, and the State Fire Service – for areas on shore and on land. For the last of the mentioned tasks – namely, **clean-up and disposal of oil and waste** – both institutions are joined by the State Environmental Service (all areas at sea, on shore, on land).

Responsibilities for recovery related tasks are assigned using the same model of area division: Latvian Navy responsible for the at sea area, and the State Fire Service – for the area on shore and on land. These tasks namely are: **coordination and implementation of the overall impact assessment and recovery, environmental impact assessment and recovery, evaluation and follow-up across sectors, lessons-learned dissemination internationally, as well as impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective**. For all of these tasks except the last one, throughout all areas, these institutions are joined by the State Environmental Service.

#### Policy areas

- CBRN/Hazardous substances (represented by Latvian Armed Forces/ State Fire Service).
- Maritime Safety (represented by Latvian Navy).
- Civil Protection/Disaster risk management (represented by the State Fire Services).
- Environmental protection (represented by the State Environmental Service)<sup>15</sup>.

#### SUMMARY

In Latvia there is a clear division made between the area at sea, and that of on shore and on land. This in particular is visible through the fact that there are two separate contingency plans that cover these areas, namely National Oil Spill Contingency Plan (covers at sea only) and National Civil Emergency Plan (includes on shore and covers on land). The same division is strictly kept when it comes to the national warning system as well. Institutional responsibility is shaped according to these divisions – at sea, for more strategic areas the responsibility lies with the State Environmental Service under Ministry of Environment, whereas more operative tasks – under Latvian Naval Forces (Coast Guard Service in particular). Whereas for the on shore and on land areas, the responsibility falls under the State Fire Service, which is the national body for civil protection on land. It is in these areas that municipal level comes in to the picture of oil spill contingency management as well. On shore area in this system mostly falls under the same jurisdiction as on land. Institution that trespasses divisions between these three areas (at sea, on shore, on land), is the State Environmental Service.

15. DRR for oil spills is addressed by National Emergency Committee which includes representatives from all policy areas.



## Lithuania

Nominated focal point for the survey: Fire and Rescue Department under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania (MoI).

In Lithuania, responsible institution for the **overall strategy for oil spill preparedness** in the area at sea is Lithuanian Armed Forces. For areas on shore and on land, responsibility distribution depends on the size of the spill and its consequences. If the spread of the consequences of the emergency does not exceed the territory of three municipalities, responsible is the Economic Entity and the Municipal administration (director). If the spread of the consequences of the emergency exceeds the territory of three municipalities, responsible is the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of the Interior, and municipalities.

For the **national oil contingency plan** in the area at sea, responsible is the Ministry of National Defence, with contributions from the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Transport and Communications, as well as the Ministry of the Interior. For the areas on shore and on land, at State level the responsibility is taken by the Ministry of Environment, which receives support from the Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of the Interior, and Municipal administration (director). Lithuanian Armed Forces are integrated into the **national warning system** for the at sea area. For areas on shore and on land responsibility is divided depending on the administrative level: at local level responsibility lies with the Economic Entity, at municipal level – with municipality, and at the state level – under the Fire and Rescue Department under Ministry of the Interior (MoI).

**Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** for the area at sea is carried out by the Ministry of Defence. For the areas on shore and on land, municipalities carry out the task at local level, whereas Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Energy and Ministry of Environment are responsible for risk assessment at national level. Ministry of Environment, on the other hand, is also carrying out **environmental prioritisation for oil spill response** for all areas – at sea, on shore and on land.

**Response measures for oil spill accidents** in the area at sea is coordinated and implemented by the Armed Forces. The same task for areas on shore and on land is implemented by the economic entity, Fire and Rescue Services and the Municipality (all listed at local level), as well as by the Ministry of Environment (at state level). Similar division remains for the task of **information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident**, except for the on shore/on land local level, where information dissemination responsibility rests with the Director of Municipal Administration. As for **asking/receiving requests for international assistance**, the mandate for the area at sea lies with the Ministry of Defence, for the areas on shore and on land – with the Fire and Rescue Department under MoI after the decision of the Government. **Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste** at sea is responsible the Armed Forces, whereas both for on shore and on land – municipalities and economic entities.

In the field of recovery, the Ministry of Environment is coordinating the **overall assessment of impact and recovery**, as well as implementing **environmental impact assessment and recovery** for all areas – at sea, on shore and on land. The Ministry of Environment continues to be responsible under the same principle also for implementation of **impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective**, however within this task, it is joined by municipalities for the areas on shore and on land. For the process of **follow-up across sectors**, involved institutions, according to their particular competencies, are

sharing experience and lessons learnt across various sectors. **For lessons-learnt dissemination internationally**, all institutions that may have been involved, are sharing their experience within the groups of international organisations in which they represent the country.

#### Policy Areas

- Civil Protection/Disaster risk management (represented by Fire and Rescue Department under MoI (at state level) and municipality (at local level)).
- Environmental protection (represented by Ministry of Environment).

#### SUMMARY

Institutional responsibilities' division in oil spill contingency management in Lithuania follows the division between area at sea on the one hand, and areas on shore and on land on the other. For the first area, the most prevalent institution in oil spill contingency management is Lithuanian Armed Forces (on the ministerial level – Ministry of National Defence). For areas on shore and on land responsibilities are divided according to the administrative level: on local level, municipalities are responsible actors, whereas on the state level – relevant ministries. Besides this area based division, there also appears institutional responsibility division across contingency management phases. Namely, for the preparedness and response phases, responsibilities fall under Lithuanian Armed Forces, as well as, on state level under various ministries: Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Transport and Communications, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of the Economy, Ministry of Energy, and Ministry of Environment (many of these have a contributing role in various tasks). For the recovery phase, it is mainly the Ministry of Environment that takes up responsibility, joined by municipalities for areas on shore and on land.

#### Norway

Nominated focal point for the survey: Norwegian Coastal Administration.

In Norway, the field of oil spill contingency management is led and implemented by Norwegian Coastal Administration. This authority carries responsibility for all preparedness activities indicated in the survey, in three areas (at sea, on shore, on land). These namely are: **the overall strategy for oil spill preparedness, the national oil contingency plan, the national warning system for oil spills, environmental prioritisation for oil spills**, as well as **risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills**. For the latter activity, the Coastal Administration is joined by municipalities in the area on shore, whereas in the area on land, the activity remains the sole responsibility of municipalities. In addition to that, the offshore oil industry are also responsible to carry out **risk assessments related to their activities**. This also is the responsibility for large industry facilities on land. Municipalities are also joining in the activity on environmental prioritisation in the areas on shore and on land.

In reference to the **national warning system**, it was indicated that Norwegian Coastal Administration is responsible to develop the system and is the end point in it. However, the Police, fire rescue brigades, Petroleum Safety Authority and Aviation services have also roles assigned to them in the system.

In the field of response, the general responsibility division for the tasks of **coordination and implementation of response measures for oil spill incidents, information dissemination to the public**, as well as **clean-up and disposal of**

**oil and waste**, has the recurring model of Norwegian Coastal Administration being responsible and oil industry contributing in all areas (at sea, on shore and on land). For the areas on shore and on land, responsible are also municipal authorities. Norwegian Coastal Administration is further responsible for **asking/receiving requests for international assistance** in all areas (at sea, on shore and on land). However, it must be taken into account that the actual division in practice depends on the source of the spill. Oil industry responds for spill caused by their activities. For ship incidents, Norwegian Coastal Administration is responsible on behalf of the shipowner.

The same general responsibility model – the Coastal Administration and Oil industry at sea, and the Coastal Administration, Oil industry and municipalities on shore and on land – applies for the field of oil spill recovery. The tasks where this division applies are: **coordination and participation in the overall impact assessment and recovery**, as well as **environmental assessment and recovery**. For the former one, it was indicated that also other actors may be included, such as the Governor, Norwegian Environment Agency, and Directorate for Fisheries among others. The Coastal Administration, Oil industry, the Coast Guard, municipalities and relevant contractors can be all participating in the process of evaluation and follow-up across sectors. For this task, specific routines are established that also identify relevant stakeholders who should be contributing to the process.

**Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally** for the area at sea is taken care of by the Coastal Administration, Coast Guard and Oil Industry, whereas for on shore and on land areas – by the Coastal Administration and Oil industry only.

#### Policy areas

- CBRN/Hazardous substances (represented by Norwegian Coastal Administration et al.).
- Maritime safety (represented by Norwegian Maritime Directorate and Norwegian Coastal Administration).
- Environmental protection (Norwegian Environment Directorate and Norwegian Coastal Administration).

#### SUMMARY

Norwegian oil spill contingency management model is a centralised model, where most of the tasks fall under the responsibility of Norwegian Coastal Administration. In this model, there is no division observed, neither on the area (at sea, on shore, on land) basis, nor in terms of contingency management stages (preparedness, response, recovery), as Norwegian Coastal Administration remains present through all stages, and in all areas. The differences between areas can be observed only taken into account that municipal level (municipalities), are joining in for on shore and on land areas, mostly in response and recovery stages. Furthermore, in response and recovery phase, responsibilities are taken up by oil industry as well. It must be noted that while results of the survey presented Norwegian Coastal Administration as a gatekeeper to oil spill contingency management in Norway, it was also indicated that there are processes and routines in place that include various relevant stakeholders on case-by-case basis, such as the police, fire rescue services, Petroleum Service Authority and Aviation services to name but a few. More detailed cross-institutional consultation routines for each task, however, were not described in the response to the questionnaire.

## Poland

Nominated focal point for the survey: Maritime Search and Rescue Service.

Responsibility for the **overall strategy for oil spill preparedness** in Poland falls under the responsibility of Maritime Search and Rescue Service for the area at sea, local government authorities for the area on shore, and government authorities for the area on land. Additionally, the response to the survey indicated that for the area on land there also is division of responsibility between the government authorities, the State Fire Service (who are contributing), and those commercial companies who's production profile involves a risk of a potential oil spill. The same responsibility division pattern applies to the responsibility for a **national oil contingency plan**, with reservation that contribution to the area on land by government authorities may appear only on ad hoc basis or when requested. This may be so because of, as it was indicated in the response to the survey, in Poland there is no national oil contingency plan that would cover on land area.

The **national warning system** for oil spills in Poland include Maritime Search and Rescue Service and Maritime Authority (the former takes full responsibility, and the latter is contributing). Maritime Authority, together with other government authorities are also contributing to the warning system on shore, whereas State Fire Service is contributing to the national warning system for the area on land, together with government authorities (they join ad hoc/ when requested). **Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** in the areas at sea and on shore are carried out by the Maritime Authority, whereas the same task falls under the responsibility of local government authority when it comes to the area on land. To this task, Maritime Search and Rescue Service are contributing for the area at sea, Local Government Authorities and the State Fire Service are joining ad hoc/ when requested for the area on shore, whereas the State Fire Service may also be ad hoc requested to participate in the assessment of the on land area. Maritime Authority and Maritime Search and Rescue Service are contributing to carrying our **environmental prioritisation for oil spills** at sea, whereas the Environment Authority contributes to this tasks for the areas on shore and on land.

**Coordination and implementation of response measures for oil spill incidents** in the area at sea falls under the responsibility of Maritime Search and Rescue Service, where contribution is also received from the Maritime Authority. In the area on shore, this task falls under the responsibility of the local government authority, with contribution from government authorities and, when requested the State Fire Service. On land responsible is the State Fire Service, with contribution from government authorities. **Information to the public on an occurring oil spill incident** for the area at sea is disseminated by the Maritime Search and Rescue Service, on shore and on land – by the State Fire Service, with contributions from Local Government Authority (on shore) and Government Authority (on land). The Maritime Authority is responsible for **asking/receiving requests for international assistance** at sea, whereas government authority – for this task in areas on shore and on land. Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste at sea is responsibility of the Maritime Search and Rescue Service (with contribution from the Maritime Authority), whereas on shore and on land it falls under responsibility of the local government authority (with contribution from the government authority in both areas).

In the process of **coordination and participation in the overall assessment of impact and recovery**, all institutions were indicated in the survey as participating on contributing level. The Environment Authority and the Government Authority contribute throughout the three areas, Maritime Search and Rescue Service together with the Maritime Authority – in the areas at sea and on shore, whereas Local Government Authority – in the areas on shore and on land.

**Environmental impact assessment and recovery** is implemented by the Environmental Authority at sea, on shore and on land, with contributions from the Maritime Authority at sea and on shore. **Impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective** is implemented by the Maritime Search and Rescue Service and Maritime Authority at sea, and local government and government authorities on shore and on land (all on contributing level).

**Evaluation and follow-up across sectors after an oil spill incident** does not have an applicable procedure. The Maritime Search and Rescue Service and the Maritime Authority are contributing to international **lessons-learnt dissemination** for the areas at sea and on shore, where for the latter one they are joined by the State Fire Service, which also remains responsible for this activity for the area on land.

Policy areas

- Maritime safety (represented by the Maritime Authority and Maritime Search and Rescue Service).
- Environmental Protection (represented by the Maritime Authority and the Environment Authority).

#### SUMMARY

In most of the tasks throughout all of the stages of oil spill contingency management in Poland there is maintained an area (at sea, on shore, on land) based institutional responsibility division. Clear sectorial division between the areas is especially strong when it comes to national oil spill contingency plan. Poland indicated that they do not have a national oil contingency plan that would cover land area. This may be related to the reasons for having a clear distinction between at sea, on shore and on land responsibilities, and especially keeping the area on shore separate from the other two (not a common principle among other BSR countries).

Another particularity that came out from the response to the survey was that while there is a prevailing maritime institution – Maritime Search and Rescue Service – that maintains responsibility for the vast majority of tasks in at sea area, whereas for the areas on shore and on land, the main representatives are local government and/or state government authorities. Response to the survey, however, did not indicate concrete responsible institutions. On the other hand, this presented how an institutional responsibility division can shift in oil spill contingency management, from concrete institutional actor, to a numerator which indicates governance/administration level.

## Russian Federation

Nominated focal point for the survey: EMERCOM of Russia.

In Russian Federation, for the **overall strategy for oil spill preparedness** in the area at sea, responsible is the Transport Ministry, with contribution from The Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (EMERCOM of Russia) and, ad hoc/when requested – regional authorities. For the strategy in the area on shore, responsibility falls under the owner of the object to which oil spill is related, and ad hoc/when requested – under regional authorities. On land area in the strategy is covered by the owner of the object (responsible), EMERCOM of Russia and regional authorities (contributing).

The Ministry of Transport continues to be responsible for the **national oil spill contingency plan** in the area at sea, sharing responsibility with the object owner. On shore and on land, responsibility lies under regional authorities and the object

owner, with contributing EMERCOM of Russia. For areas on shore and on land this latter responsibility model is repeated also for integration in **national warning systems for oil spills**. For the area at sea in this matter, the Ministry of Transport remains the responsible authority, however, contribution it receives from EMERCOM of Russia.

**Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** for the area at sea are carried out by the Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Environment and EMERCOM of Russia (responsible level for all). The latter two remain holding responsibility also for the on shore and on land area. **Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response** is carried out solely by the Ministry of Environment.

In the field of response, Ministry of Transport continues to take responsibility for nearly all in the survey outlined tasks in the area at sea. In **coordination and implementation of response measures for oil spill incidents**, as well as in **information dissemination to the public on and occurring oil spill incident**, it is EMERCOM of Russia who takes over the responsibility for the areas on shore and on land. In the process of **clean-up and disposal of oil and waste**, the Ministry of Transport is joined by the object owner (at sea, and same responsibility level). For this task on shore and on land, the object owner continues to bear responsibility, whereas EMERCOM of Russia and regional authorities are contributing. Asking/receiving international assistance falls under the responsibility of the Government.

**The overall impact assessment and recovery** in the area at sea is coordinated by the Ministry of Transport with contribution from the Ministry of Environment; whereas the latter takes over responsibility, with contribution from EMERCOM of Russia, for areas on shore and on land. The same responsibility division model applies for **implementation of environmental impact assessment and recovery**. For **impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective**, Ministry of Transport are taking up the task alone for the area at sea, and EMERCOM of Russia – for areas on shore and on land. In the same way they are responsible also for the evaluation and follow-up across sectors, as well as for contribution to the process of **lessons-learnt dissemination internationally**.

#### Policy areas

- Maritime safety (represented by the Ministry of Transport).
- Civil Protection/Disaster risk management (represented by EMERCOM of Russia).
- Environmental protection (represented by the Ministry of Environment).

#### SUMMARY

Oil spill contingency management in Russian Federation has institutional division based on both axes, namely which area it is (at sea, on shore, on land), as well as which stage of the process (preparedness, response, recovery). Area division: Ministry of Transport remains having main responsibilities for the area at sea throughout all stages of oil spill contingency management, and it does not extend its mandate to other areas. EMERCOM of Russia is carrying responsibilities for on shore and on land areas, and is doing so throughout all stages as well. However, in the case of EMERCOM of Russia, its responsibility and contribution level vary depending on a concrete task. On shore and on land, particularly in preparedness stage, regional authorities have responsibilities in various degrees. Ministry of Environment has responsibilities during preparedness stage and is contributing during recovery stage. In this system, private object owners carry responsibilities especially in preparedness and response stages, mostly in areas on shore and on land.

## Sweden

Nominated focal point for the survey: Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB).

In Sweden, the coordinator of the **overall strategy for oil spill preparedness** is Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), and the strategy covers all areas at sea, on shore, and on land. The strategy itself, however, is a joint commitment and document between eight responsible authorities, namely: Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, Swedish Coast Guard, Swedish Maritime Administration, Swedish Transport Agency, County Administrative Board, the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions.

**Oil contingency plans**, on the other hand, fall under the responsibility of the Swedish Coast Guard (at sea) and relevant municipalities (on shore and on land). The **national warning system** is responsibility of the Swedish Coast Guard and focused for the area at sea, whereas when needed, relevant actors on shore and on land forward information to the Coast Guard.

**Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills** for the area at sea is carried out by the Swedish Coast Guard. For the areas on shore and on land, this task is implemented by the County Administrative Board (on the regional level), and relevant municipality (local level). These two institutions (on regional and local levels) are also carrying out **environmental prioritisation for oil spill response**, in all three areas (at sea, on shore, on land).

In the field of response, Swedish Coast Guard continues to have responsibility for the tasks in the area at sea, namely: **coordination and implementation response measures for oil spill incidents, information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident, clean-up and disposal of oil and waste**. In areas on shore and on land, municipality is in general responsible. This, however, may vary depending on the size of the spill, where in case of a large spill also the County Administrative Board can take over the rescue service. If the spill is very large, MSB will support all actors both at sea and on shore with information dissemination. **Asking/receiving requests for international assistance** at sea falls under the mandate of the Swedish Coast Guard, whereas on shore and on land, rescue services at municipal level channel requests to MSB which is the focal point for international requests on shore and on land.

The **overall impact assessment and recovery** falls under responsibility of the Swedish Coast Guard for the area at sea, and under responsibility of County Administrative Board for the area on shore and on land. However, a small spill on shore/on land is managed by the municipality. **Environmental impact assessment and recovery** for the area at sea is implemented by the Swedish Coast Guard, whereas for areas on shore and on land – by the municipalities (rescue service for on shore, and private entrepreneurs for on land). The same model of responsibility division also applies to the task of **implementation of impact assessment and recovery** from civil protection and safety perspective. In this task, however, the main responsibility remains with the municipality.

In general, MSB is the institution responsible for **evaluation and follow-up across sectors**; however, all responsible actors must evaluate their own experiences. In a large scale scenario MSB can support with a cross-sectorial evaluation. MSB is also contributing to the process of **lessons-learn dissemination internationally** at all areas, whereas for the at sea area it is also supported by the Swedish Coast Guard.

#### Policy areas

- CBRN/Hazardous substances – Preparedness and cooperation networks (holistic approach).
- Maritime safety – Prevention aspects are placed under maritime safety.
- Civil protection/Disaster Risk Management – On shore aspects are managed within CP networks.
- Environmental protection – National networks, Marine spatial planning etc.

#### SUMMARY

The main underlying principle of oil spill contingency management in Sweden is Sweden's Strategy for the Protection from Oil Spills, adopted in 2014. The coordinating body of the Strategy is Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), a government agency for civil protection in Sweden, with mainly land-based civil protection mandate. However, the Strategy is a cross-institutional effort, and it was developed as well as is monitored jointly by eight authorities. Therefore, while operational mapping of institutional architecture in Sweden may present mainly regional and municipal authorities that are active on-ground, as well as one coordinating authority, the actual management of the Strategy involves eight main authorities participating in the process of protection from oil spills in Sweden, namely: Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB), Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management, Swedish Coast Guard, Swedish Maritime Administration, Swedish Transport Agency, County Administrative Board, the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions.

# Conclusions

## Conclusions

Complexity of oil spill contingency management was taken as a baseline when formulating the research question and designing the survey. Results of the survey as well as the analysis of responses have further disclosed institutional complexity in question by providing a more concrete and detailed picture on the diversity of institutional involvement in oil spill contingency management in the Baltic Sea region (BSR). Results of the survey confirmed that there is no one common model of institutional involvement architecture in BSR. The results also confirmed that the fact which institutional architecture solution may be applicable in one or another country, depends largely on what overall governmental and public administration structure that particular country has. For instance, for countries that have a designated maritime and/or transport safety authority (which may or may not be under, respectively, defence or transport ministry), this authority would have a significant role in, especially, oil spill contingency management at sea area. Should a country not have such a designated authority, the responsibility may be assigned to the, for instance, search and rescue services or the coast guard/border guard (which in turn may be the same body or two different institutions).

Most of the survey responses indicated that in spite of which institutions are officially mandated to have a specific oil spill contingency management responsibility, the process of oil spill contingency planning involves participation of various actors and most of the countries have established procedures on how they involve other bodies besides those that bear the primary responsibility. An element to observe here may be the length of negotiations and potential hindrances to rapid reaction as an impact of such procedures, directly affecting especially international cooperation in terms of response, as well as the sharing of lessons-learned. However, the operational procedures of cross-sectorial involvement were outside the scope of this study and therefore have not been addressed in further detail.

Despite the above noted diversity, there are certain common basic trends to be observed when it comes to institutional architecture of oil spill contingency management in the BSR. To indicate these trends the general responsibility division tables were created (Annex II of this report). Based on the responses to the survey, a list of model institutions in oil spill contingency management in BSR was prepared, and a per-country chart on at which point in the oil spill contingency management process (and for which geographic area) which institution joins in was drawn. To summarise, Annex II tables were created as a part of the conclusion of the analysis of the survey results, aiming to summarise and visualise concrete trends that were discovered in institutional architecture in the BSR when it comes to oil spill contingency management.

The challenges faced when creating Annex II tables mirrored the challenges of the whole intention to define a comprehensive institutional architecture picture for the whole region. A comparable comprehensive picture requires a level of generalisation, in particular in making general assumptions that basic institutional actors in the addressed process are more or less the same in all countries. In other words, it is the assumption that one general common model of institutional architecture can be found. It was identified, however, that the differentiation occurs not only due to slight dissimilarities in institutional systems in different countries in the region, but also due to different administrative governance models (i.e. into how many levels of administrative units the country is divided, and what level of autonomy these units possess).

In the field of oil spill contingency management, when it comes to responsibility assignment and division, the issue of scalability appears as an important element. Several respondents have stratified their answers to include detailed explanations on how the scale of the oil spill affects responsibility assignment and institutional architecture for a particular task within the oil spill contingency management chain. In these cases, the range of institutions that acquire responsibilities significantly increases. These particularities, as provided in survey responses, were registered in the narrative descriptions of institutional architecture per country. It should be noted that it was not the intention of this study to provide a further deeper analysis of the variation that occurs depending on the size of the spill nor how it is reflected on different administrative governance levels. For this, a further research and analysis may be needed.

#### **FURTHER TRENDS IN INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY ARCHITECTURE CAN BE ESTABLISHED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. A model of centralised operational responsibility, where a special agency deals with all (or the very most of) relevant oil spill contingency management issues (often under the mandate from and in coordination with government bodies by which it was established). This is a model used in Germany and in Norway.
2. Various agencies/authorities can be assigned to include all or some parts of oil spill contingency management responsibility to their mandate; this is the most common model of institutional architecture in the region; responsible institutions can be fully responsible for all geographic areas related to an oil spill (at sea, on shore, on land). Alternatively, it is also common that responsibilities are split according geographic area (at sea – on shore and on land). This distinction commonly is a result of which geographic area falls under the mandate of that particular authority.
3. The third model observed from the survey results was a “virtual institution model”, where coordination is centralised, however not through a specialised authority, but through cross-institutional steering body. This last model is most visibly used in Sweden, where eight authorities form a steering body where they on a standing basis exchange information and participate in coordination, strategy and action plan development for oil spill contingency management in the country. Some other countries (e.g. Latvia) have also indicated having procedures to include various relevant authorities in coordination and update on oil spill contingency work.

One of the reasons for commissioning this study and survey was the intention by institutional mapping to identify the placement of two different sectors, namely environmental protection and civil protection in the field of general oil spill contingency planning. In all of the countries and their institutional architecture models, institutions from both sectors are present. The models of responsibility sharing and geographic area division, however, vary. For instance, in Latvia, Finland and Iceland, Environmental authorities have responsibilities for oil spill contingency management mostly at sea (or at sea and on shore). Whereas in Denmark, and to some extent in Poland, environmental authorities have bigger presence in the area on shore/on land. Many of the countries, however, have a mixed model of responsibility sharing in this aspect.

Another principle of responsibility division may be according to the presence in various oil spill contingency management phases (i.e. preparedness, response and recovery). In this regard, authorities from a specific sector participate in particular phases only. For instance, Russia indicated that Ministry of the Environment has responsibilities throughout all at sea, on shore and on land areas, but during preparedness and recovery phase only.

The survey intended to identify whether there is a consensus model among countries on how to institutionally address “on shore” area in oil spill contingency management in BSR. The results have shown that no common principle can be found in this regard. It appeared though that a more common grouping is “on shore and on land”, instead of “at sea and on shore” (i.e. it is more common that an authority that is responsible for land area will also be responsible for on shore area; even though in some cases (e.g. Estonia, Iceland) have at sea + on shore grouping).

Private entities/economic bodies/industry are not well visible in this report, and while they are mentioned in the narrative part of country descriptions (mostly upon the initiative and comments by respondents themselves), they have been kept out from the Annex II list of generally involved authorities. This was mostly due to the reason that the questionnaire itself did not address explicitly private/industry bodies’ involvement in oil spill contingency management in BSR (even though it was left open for countries to comment). Attempt to include these actors would have led to even more complexity and difficulties with generalisation, as further stratification would have had to be introduced (what defines a private entity? Is it an economic/industry body? Are sub-contractors of government authorities counted as private body or not in this case?). However, the fact that a number of respondents included private entities in their comments provided with survey responses, signals that private actors are well present in the oil spill contingency management, and have various levels of responsibility within the institutional involvement model. It may thus be recommended that a further analysis of the involvement of private sector and their responsibilities in oil spill contingency management in the BSR could be undertaken.

Finally, during this undertaking the first general overview of institutional participation in various relevant international expert groups and fora, either attached to international organisations or being a part of a specific international agreement/convention, was presented. Even though institutional participation is not always addressed as a relevant aspect of cross-border cooperation (as long as a country is represented, it does not matter much which institution attends the meetings), it may be quite defining in terms of the effect of international cooperation. Responses to the survey have shown that there are cases where only a few institutions who have a role in oil spill contingency management on the national level are participating in the international expert group work. This does not mean that there are no processes established to ensure cross-institutional input from each of participating countries to the work of a specific expert group. However, representation lists usually indicate which institutions do BSR actors find as their immediate counterparts and have a direct contact with. A closer look into the institutional representation of countries in international expert/working groups also show that most often participating authorities are from similar institutions (and the same sector). Therefore, these groups may not necessarily represent the actual cross-sectorial nature of oil spill contingency management at the first glance.

The list of BSR relevant exercises was also compiled, in order to add a generic operational interaction overview for cross-border cooperation in the region for oil spill contingency management. This list was not taken forward and analysed at this stage. Therefore, it was not intended to look deeper and stratify these exercises based on whether they are routinely carried out, or organised ad-hoc.

Suggestions stemming from the results of this undertaking may be a basis for further analysis of stakeholder diversity and its impact on interoperability of cooperation on oil spill contingency management in the Baltic Sea region.

# **ANNEX I**

## **SURVEY RESULTS**

## Survey results – Denmark

	RESPONSIBLE FOR			ON SHORE	ON LAND
	AT SEA				
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Defence Command Denmark on the authority of the Danish Ministry of Defence	The Danish Ministry of Environment	The Danish Ministry of Environment	The Danish Ministry of Environment
	National oil spill contingency plan	Defence Command Denmark and the Danish Emergency Management Agency (DEMA)	The Danish Emergency Management Agency	The Danish Emergency Management Agency	The Danish Emergency Management Agency and Local Councils
	National warning system for oil spills	Defence Command Denmark	DEMA, the Police, Danish Nature Agency and Local councils	DEMA, the Police, Danish Nature Agency and Local councils	DEMA, the Police, Danish Nature Agency and Local councils
<b>Response</b>	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	The Danish Ministry of Defence	The Danish Ministry of Environment	The Danish Ministry of Environment	The Danish Ministry of Environment
	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Defence Command Denmark	Local councils, DEMA	Local councils, DEMA	Local councils, DEMA
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Defence Command Denmark	Defence Command Denmark, DEMA, the Police, Local councils	Defence Command Denmark, DEMA, the Police, Local councils	DEMA, the Police and Local councils
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Defence Command Denmark	Defence Command Denmark, the Police	Defence Command Denmark, the Police	Defence Command Denmark, the Police
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Defence Command Denmark	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Defence Command Denmark	DEMA, Local councils	DEMA, Local councils	DEMA, Local councils
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Defence Command Denmark	Danish Environmental Ministry, DEMA	Danish Environmental Ministry, DEMA	Danish Environmental Ministry, DEMA
<b>Recovery</b>	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Defence Command Denmark	DEMA	DEMA	DEMA
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Defence Command Denmark	DEMA	DEMA	DEMA
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	Defence Command Denmark, DEMA, the Police, the Danish Nature Agency and the Local Government	DEMA, the Police, the Danish Nature Agency and the Local Government	DEMA, the Police, the Danish Nature Agency and the Local Government	DEMA, the Police, the Danish Nature Agency and the Local Government
	Lessons-learned dissemination internationally	Defence Command Denmark	DEMA	DEMA	DEMA

## Survey results – Estonia

Preparedness	RESPONSIBLE FOR			
	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND	
Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Estonian Ministry of the Interior, Police and Border Guard Board	Estonian Ministry of the Interior, Rescue Board (With contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Estonian Ministry of the Interior, Rescue Board	
National oil spill contingency plan	Estonian Ministry of the Interior, Police and Border Guard Board	Estonian Ministry of the Interior, Rescue Board (With contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Estonian Ministry of the Interior, Rescue Board	
National warning system for oil spills	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board (with contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Rescue Board	
Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board (with contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Rescue Board	
Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Estonian Ministry of the Environment (with contribution from the Ministry of the Interior, Police and Border Guard Board as well as Rescue Board)	Estonian Ministry of the Environment (with contribution from the Ministry of the Interior, Police and Border Guard Board as well as Rescue Board)	Estonian Ministry of the Environment (with contribution from the Ministry of the Interior, Police and Border Guard Board as well as Rescue Board)	
Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board (with contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Rescue Board	
Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board (with contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Rescue Board	
Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Police and Border Guard Board (all requests go through the Ministry of the Interior)	Rescue Board (all requests go through the Ministry of the Interior)	Rescue Board (all requests go through the Ministry of the Interior)	
Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board (in cooperation with the Environmental Board)	Rescue Board (in cooperation with the Environmental Board)	
Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Environmental Inspectorate	Environmental Inspectorate	Environmental Inspectorate (On land recovery process coordinated by the Environmental Board)	
Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Environmental Inspectorate	Environmental Inspectorate	Environmental Inspectorate (On land recovery process coordinated by the Environmental Board)	
Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board	Rescue Board	
Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	Police and Border Guard Board	Rescue Board (with contribution from Police and Border Guard Board)	Rescue Board	
Lessons-learned dissemination internationally	Police and Border Guard Board, Environmental Inspectorate, Maritime Administration	Rescue Board, Police and Border Guard Board, Environmental Inspectorate	Rescue Board, Environmental Inspectorate and Environmental Board	

## Survey results – Finland

		RESPONSIBLE FOR			ON SHORE		ON LAND	
		AT SEA	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON SHORE	ON LAND	ON LAND	
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Finnish Environment Institute at Open Sea, Rescue Service Regions in coastal areas	Finnish Environment Institute at Open Sea, Rescue Service Regions in coastal areas	Rescue Service Regions	Rescue Service Regions	Rescue Service Regions	Rescue Service Regions	
	National oil spill contingency plan	National: Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE), in three sub-regions designated Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	National: Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE), in three sub-regions designated Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Service Districts	Rescue Service Districts	Rescue Service Districts	Rescue Service Districts	
	National warning system for oil spills	Finnish Environment Institute, Border Guard, VTS (Vessel Traffic Service)	Finnish Environment Institute, Border Guard, VTS (Vessel Traffic Service)	Rescue Service Districts; Finnish Environment Institute, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Service Districts; Finnish Environment Institute, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Service Districts; Finnish Environment Institute, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Service Districts; Finnish Environment Institute, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Finnish Environment Institute; Coastal areas also Rescue Service Districts	Finnish Environment Institute; Coastal areas also Rescue Service Districts	Rescue Service Districts; if needed Finnish Environment Institute and Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (CONTRIBUTE)	Rescue Service Districts and Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Service Districts and Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Service Districts and Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	
	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Finnish Environment Institute, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Finnish Environment Institute, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Services, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Services, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Services, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Rescue Services, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	
<b>Response</b>	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	SYKE at open sea and Rescue Services in coastal areas. Contributing: Border Guard, Navy, Traffic admin, volunteers	SYKE at open sea and Rescue Services in coastal areas. Contributing: Border Guard, Navy, Traffic admin, volunteers	Rescue Services, contributing cities and volunteers	Rescue Services, contributing cities and volunteers	Rescue Services	Rescue Services	
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	SYKE or Rescue service depending which is leading the response. In addition each actor disseminates information on their own actions	SYKE or Rescue service depending which is leading the response. In addition each actor disseminates information on their own actions	Rescue service depending which is leading the response. In addition each actor disseminates information on their own actions	Rescue service depending which is leading the response. In addition each actor disseminates information on their own actions	Rescue service depending which is leading the response. In addition each actor disseminates information on their own actions	Rescue service depending which is leading the response. In addition each actor disseminates information on their own actions	
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	SYKE (if pollution is ship based: SYKE, other cases Ministry of the Interior)	SYKE (if pollution is ship based: SYKE, other cases Ministry of the Interior)	SYKE	SYKE	Ministry of the Interior	Ministry of the Interior	
<b>Recovery</b>	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	SYKE or Rescue service depending which is leading the whole response operation	SYKE or Rescue service depending which is leading the whole response operation	SYKE or Rescue service depending which is leading the whole response operation	SYKE or Rescue service depending which is leading the whole response operation	Rescue Services response stage, Municipality in restoration phase	Rescue Services response stage, Municipality in restoration phase	
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	COMMENT FOR ALL: Several governmental and private companies take part in the impact assessment – these are different in different accidents
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	SYKE & Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment	
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	VTS	VTS	Rescue services	Rescue services	Rescue Services	Rescue Services	
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	All that were involved in actions	All that were involved in actions	All that were involved in actions	All that were involved in actions	All that were involved in actions	All that were involved in actions	All that were involved in actions
Lessons-learn dissemination internationally	SYKE	SYKE	SYKE	SYKE	Rescue Service that handled the case	Rescue Service that handled the case	Rescue Service that handled the case	

## Survey results – Germany

	RESPONSIBLE FOR			
	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND	
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bundesländer	Bund/Bundesländer
	National oil spill contingency plan	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bundesländer	Bund/Bundesländer
	National warning system for oil spills	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bundesländer	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bundesländer
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Bundesländer	Bundesländer
<b>Response</b>	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Municipality
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven
	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bundesländer
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven
<b>Recovery</b>	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bund/Bundesländer	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bund/Bundesländer	Havariekommando Cuxhaven/Bund/Bundesländer
	Lessons-learned dissemination internationally	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven	Havariekommando Cuxhaven

## Survey results – Iceland

	RESPONSIBLE FOR			ON SHORE		ON LAND	
	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON SHORE	ON LAND	ON SHORE	ON LAND
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Environment Agency of Iceland	Harbours Masters (within harbours)	Local fire departments			
	National oil spill contingency plan	Environment Agency of Iceland, Icelandic Coast Guard, Icelandic transport authority, Road and coastal administration	Environment Agency of Iceland, Icelandic Coast Guard, Icelandic transport authority, Road and coastal administration, and Harbours Masters (within harbours)	n/a	n/a		
<b>Response</b>	National warning system for oil spills	Icelandic coast guard (contributing)	Icelandic coast guard (contributing)	Local health authority (ad hoc)			
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	n/a	n/a	Local health authority (ad hoc)			
	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	n/a	n/a	n/a			
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Environment Agency of Iceland	Harbours Masters (within harbours)	n/a			
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Environment Agency of Iceland, Icelandic Coast Guard	n/a	n/a			
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Environment Agency of Iceland	Environment Agency of Iceland	n/a			
<b>Recovery</b>	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Environment Agency of Iceland	Environment Agency of Iceland (on shore), Harbour Masters (within harbours)	n/a			
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	n/a	n/a	Local health authority (ad hoc)			
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	n/a	n/a	n/a			
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Civil Protection in Iceland	Civil Protection in Iceland	Civil Protection in Iceland			
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	Environment Agency of Iceland, Icelandic Coast Guard	Environment Agency of Iceland	Environment Agency of Iceland	n/a			

## Survey results – Latvia

	RESPONSIBLE FOR		
	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	State Fire Service	State Fire Service
	National oil spill contingency plan	State Fire Service	State Fire Service
	National warning system for oil spills	State Fire Service, State Environmental Service, Municipality	State Fire Service, State Environmental Service, Municipality
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Municipality, State Fire Service	Municipality, State Fire Service
<b>Response</b>	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	State Environmental Service	State Environmental Service
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	State Fire Service	State Fire Service
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Latvian Navy (Coast Guard is under Latvian Navy)	State Fire Service
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Latvian Navy (Coast Guard is under Latvian Navy)	State Fire Service
	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Latvian Navy, State Environmental Service	State Fire Service, State Environmental Service
<b>Recovery</b>	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	State Environmental Service, Latvian Navy	State Environmental Service, State Fire Service
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	State Environmental Service, Latvian Navy	State Environmental Service, State Fire Service
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Latvian Navy	State Fire Service
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	State Environmental Service, Latvian Navy	State Environmental Service, State Fire Service
	Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	Latvian Navy, State Environmental Service	State Fire Service, State Environmental Service

# Survey results – Lithuania

## RESPONSIBLE FOR

### AT SEA

### ON SHORE

### ON LAND

	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Lithuanian Armed Forces	If the Spread of the consequences of the emergency does not exceed the territory of three municipalities, responsible is the Economic Entity and the Municipal administration (Director). If it does exceed, responsible is the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Interior, Municipalities	If the Spread of the consequences of the emergency does not exceed the territory of three municipalities, responsible is the Economic Entity and the Municipal administration (Director). If it does exceed, responsible is the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Interior, Municipalities
<b>Preparedness</b>	National oil spill contingency plan	Ministry of National Defence (responsible), Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Transport and Communications, Ministry of the Interior (contributing)	At state level responsible is Ministry of Environment, supporting institutions: Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of the Interior, Municipal administration (director)	At state level responsible is Ministry of Environment, supporting institutions: Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of the Interior, Municipal administration (director)
	National warning system for oil spills	Lithuanian Armed Forces	At local level is responsible the Economic Entity, at municipal – Municipality, at state level – the Fire and Rescue Department under the Ministry of the Interior (Mol)	At local level is responsible the Economic Entity, at municipal – Municipality, at state level – the Fire and Rescue Department under the Ministry of the Interior (Mol)
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Ministry of National Defence	Local level – Municipalities, state level – Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Environment	Local level – Municipalities, state level – Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Environment
	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment
<b>Response</b>	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Lithuanian Armed Forces	At local level responsible is the Economic Entity, Fire and Rescue Service, and Municipality; at state level – Ministry of Environment	At local level responsible is the Economic Entity, Fire and Rescue Service, and Municipality; at state level – Ministry of Environment
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Lithuanian Armed Forces	A local level responsible is the Director of Municipal Administration, at state level – Ministry of Environment	A local level responsible is the Director of Municipal Administration, at state level – Ministry of Environment.
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Ministry of National Defence	Fire and Rescue Department under Mol (after Government's decision)	Fire and Rescue Department under Mol (after Government's decision)
<b>Recovery</b>	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Lithuanian Armed Forces	Municipalities and Economic Entities	Municipalities and Economic Entities
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment and Municipalities	Ministry of Environment and Municipalities
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	Depending on their competence, institutions are sharing their experience and lessons learnt between sectors	Depending on their competence, institutions are sharing their experience and lessons learnt between sectors	Depending on their competence, institutions are sharing their experience and lessons learnt between sectors
	Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	Institutions share their experience in working groups of international organisation in which they are representing the country (EU, NATO, etc)	Institutions share their experience in working groups of international organisation in which they are representing the country (EU, NATO, etc)	Institutions share their experience in working groups of international organisation in which they are representing the country (EU, NATO, etc)

## Survey results – Norway

	RESPONSIBLE FOR			
	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND	
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration
	National oil spill contingency plan	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration
	National warning system for oil spills	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Municipalities	Municipalities
<b>Response</b>	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Municipalities
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Municipalities
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Municipalities
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities
	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities
<b>Recovery</b>	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry, Coast Guard, Contractors et al.	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Oil Industry and Municipalities	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Coast Guard, Oil Industry and Municipalities
	Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	Norwegian Coastal Administration, Coast Guard and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry	Norwegian Coastal Administration and Oil Industry

## Survey results – Poland

	RESPONSIBLE FOR	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Maritime Search and Rescue Service	Local Government Authorities	Government Authorities
	National oil spill contingency plan	Maritime Search and Rescue Service	Local Government Authorities	Government Authorities
	National warning system for oil spills	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority (contributing)	Maritime Authority (contributing), Government Authority (contributing)	State Fire Service (contributing), Government Authority (contributing)
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Maritime Authority, Maritime Search and Rescue Service (contributing)	Maritime Authority, Local Government Authorities and State Fire Service (ad hoc/when requested)	Local Government Authority, State Fire Service (ad hoc/when requested)
	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Maritime Authority, Maritime Search and Rescue Service	Environment Authority	Environment Authority
<b>Response</b>	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority (contributing)	Local Government Authorities, State Fire Service (when requested), Government Authorities (contributing)	State Fire Service, Government Authority (contributing)
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Maritime Search and Rescue Service	State Fire Service, Local Government Authority (contributing)	State Fire Service, Local Government Authority (contributing)
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Maritime Authority	Government Authority	Government Authority
	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority (contributing), Government Authority (when requested)	Local Government Authority, Government Authority (contributing)	Local Government Authority, Government Authority (contributing)
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority, Environment Authority, Government Authority (all contributing)	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority, Environment Authority, Local Government Authority, Government Authority (all contributing)	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority, Environment Authority, Government Authority (all contributing)
<b>Recovery</b>	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Maritime Authority and Environment Authority (all contributing)	Maritime Authority and Environment Authority (all contributing)	Environment Authority
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Maritime Search and Rescue Service and Maritime Authority (all contributing)	Local Government Authorities and Government Authorities (all contributing)	Local Government Authorities and Government Authorities (all contributing)
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority	Maritime Search and Rescue Service, Maritime Authority, State Fire Service	State Fire Service

## Survey results – Russian Federation

	RESPONSIBLE FOR			
	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND	
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Ministry of Transport (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing); Regional authorities (ad hoc)	Object owner (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing); Regional authorities (ad hoc)	Object owner (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing); Regional authorities (ad hoc)
	National oil spill contingency plan	Ministry of Transport; object owner	Object owner (responsible); Regional authorities (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)	Object owner (responsible); Regional authorities (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)
	National warning system for oil spills	Ministry of Transport (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)	Regional authorities (responsible); Object owner (responsible)	Regional authorities (responsible); Object owner (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Ministry of Transport; Ministry of Environment; EMERCOM of Russia (all responsible)	Ministry of Environment; EMERCOM of Russia (all responsible)	Ministry of Environment; EMERCOM of Russia (all responsible)
<b>Response</b>	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Ministry of Transport	EMERCOM of Russia	EMERCOM of Russia
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Ministry of Transport	EMERCOM of Russia	EMERCOM of Russia
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Government	Government	Government
<b>Recovery</b>	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Ministry of Transport (responsible); Object owner (responsible)	Object owner (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing); Regional authorities (contributing)	Object owner (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing); Regional authorities (contributing)
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Ministry of Transport (responsible); Ministry of Environment (contributing)	Ministry of Environment (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)	Ministry of Environment (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Ministry of Transport (responsible); Ministry of Environment (contributing)	Ministry of Environment (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)	Ministry of Environment (responsible); EMERCOM of Russia (contributing)
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Ministry of Transport	EMERCOM of Russia	EMERCOM of Russia
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	Ministry of Transport (responsible)	EMERCOM of Russia (responsible)	EMERCOM of Russia
	Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	Ministry of Transport	EMERCOM of Russia	EMERCOM of Russia

## Survey results – Sweden

	RESPONSIBLE FOR			ON SHORE			ON LAND		
	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND	AT SEA	ON SHORE	ON LAND
<b>Preparedness</b>	Overall strategy for oil spill preparedness	Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)	MSB						
	National oil spill contingency plan	Swedish Coast Guard	Municipality						
	National warning system for oil spills	Swedish Coast Guard	n/a						
	Risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills	Swedish Coast Guard	County administrative Board (regional), municipality (local)						
<b>Response</b>	Environmental prioritisation for oil spill response	County administrative Board (regional), municipality (local)							
	Response measure for oil spill incidents coordination and implementation	Swedish Coast Guard							
	Information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident	Swedish Coast Guard							
	Asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)	Swedish Coast Guard	Swedish Coast Guard	MSB focal point	n/a COMMENT TO ALL: Municipality asks MSB, who is the focal point for international requests on shore and land				
<b>Recovery</b>	Clean-up and disposal of oil and waste	Swedish Coast Guard	Swedish Coast Guard	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery COORDINATION	Swedish Coast Guard	Swedish Coast Guard	County Administrative Board					
	Overall assessment of impact and recovery IMPLEMENTATION	Swedish Coast Guard	Swedish Coast Guard	Municipalities (rescue service)	Municipalities (rescue service)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)
	Impact assessment and recovery – civil protection perspective	Swedish Coast Guard	Swedish Coast Guard	Municipalities (rescue service)	Municipalities (rescue service)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)	Municipalities (private entrepreneurs)
	Evaluation and follow-up across sectors	MSB							
	Lessons-learnt dissemination internationally	MSB/Swedish Coastal Guard	MSB/Swedish Coastal Guard	MSB	MSB	MSB	MSB	MSB	COMMENT TO ALL: "All responsible actors must evaluate their own experiences. In a large scale scenario MSB can support with a cross-sectorial evaluation."

# **ANNEX II**

**INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT  
PER AREA AND CONTINGENCY  
MANAGEMENT PROCESS STAGE**

DENMARK	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Private actors													
Municipal/Local Level			On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea
Regional Level													
Police					On shore	On land		On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	
Agency/Department for Environment					On shore	On land				At sea	On shore	On land	At sea
Border Guard/Coast Guard/Defence Agency	At sea			At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea			At sea
Agency/Department for Maritime Safety/Transport													At sea
Agency/Department for Civil Protection	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	At sea
Ministry of Transport													
Ministry of Environment					On shore	On land					On shore	On land	At sea
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence				At sea									
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups

At sea 

On shore 

On land 

Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

ESTONIA	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level													
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)													
Police*	At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		INT
Agency/Department for Environment**								On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency*	At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		INT
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport										At sea			INT
Agency/Department for Civil Protection		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	INT
Ministry of Transport/Communications													
Ministry of Environment***				At sea	On shore	On land							INT
Ministry of Defence													
Armed (Naval) Forces													INT
Ministry of the Interior	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land							INT
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan

INT – International expert/working groups

\* In Estonia Police and Border Guard Board is the same institution

\*\* Contributing to clean-up and disposal of oil and waste Recovery – Environmental Board on land; Environmental Inspectorate at sea and on shore

\*\*\* Environmental prioritisation only

At sea 

On shore 

On land 

Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

FINLAND	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level								At sea	On land		At sea	On land	
Regional Level (incl. regional Rescue services)	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment	At sea			At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore		Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency				At sea									Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport				At sea			At sea						Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Agency/Department for Civil Protection													
Ministry of Transport/Communications													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Environment													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Armed (Naval) Forces				At sea			At sea			At sea			
Ministry of Defence													
Ministry of the Interior									On land				Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups

At sea   
 On shore   
 On land   
 Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

GERMANY	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level													
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)		On shore	On land		On shore	On land			On land			On land	At sea
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment													
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency													
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport*	At sea	On shore		At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea
Agency/Department for Civil Protection													
Ministry of Transport/Communications													At sea
Ministry of Environment													
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence													
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan

INT – International expert/working groups

\* Central Command for Maritime Emergencies is a specialised body for dealing with maritime emergencies in the North and Baltic Seas

At sea 

On shore 

On land 

Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

ICELAND	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level*	■	■		■	■	■	■	■					
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)													
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment	■	■		■			■	■		■	■		
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency	■	■		■			■			■			
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport	■	■											
Agency/Department for Civil Protection										■	■	■	
Ministry of Transport/Communications													
Ministry of Environment													
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence													
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan

INT – International expert/working groups

\* In this case by local it is meant local port administration

At sea ■

On shore ■

On land ■

Institution is present at international expert/working groups ■

LATVIA	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level					On shore	On land							
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)													
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment	At sea						At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency	At sea			At sea			At sea			At sea			
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Agency/Department for Civil Protection		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Transport/Communications													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Environment	At sea			At sea			At sea			At sea			
Army (Naval) Forces													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Defence													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups

At sea   
 On shore   
 On land   
 Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

LITHUANIA	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)													
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment													
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency													
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport													
Agency/Department for Civil Protection					On shore	On land		On shore	On land				At sea
Ministry of Transport/Communications	At sea												At sea
Ministry of Environment	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land	
Armed (Naval) Forces				At sea			At sea						
Ministry of Defence	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land	At sea						At sea
Ministry of the Interior	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land							
Ministry of Economy		On shore	On land		On shore	On land							
Ministry of Energy					On shore	On land							
Coastal administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups

At sea 

On shore 

On land 

Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

NORWAY	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level					■	■		■	■				
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)													
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment													
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency										■			
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport													■
Agency/Department for Civil Protection													■
Ministry of Transport/Communications													
Ministry of Environment													
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence													
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				■
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups

At sea ■  
 On shore ■  
 On land ■  
 Institution is present at international expert/working groups ■

POLAND	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level		■			■	■		■			■		
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)													
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment					■	■				■	■	■	
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency*	■			■			■			■	■	■	■
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport				■	■		■			■	■	■	■
Agency/Department for Civil Protection					■	■		■	■		■		■
Ministry of Transport/Communications													
Ministry of Environment													
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence													
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority			■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups  
 \*Maritime Search and Rescue Service

At sea ■  
 On shore ■  
 On land ■  
 Institution is present at international expert/working groups ■

RUSSIAN FEDERATION	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level													
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)		On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land				
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment													
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency													
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport													
Agency/Department for Civil Protection													
Ministry of Transport/Communications	At sea			At sea			At sea			At sea			Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Environment				At sea	On shore	On land				At sea	On shore	On land	
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence*		On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NCP – National oil spill contingency plan

INT – International expert/working groups

\*EMERCOM of Russia – The Ministry of Civil Defence, Emergencies and Disaster Relief

At sea 

On shore 

On land 

Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

SWEDEN	NCP			PREPAREDNESS			RESPONSE			RECOVERY			INT
Municipal/Local Level		On shore	On land	At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	
Regional Level (incl. Regional rescue service)				At sea	On shore	On land		On shore	On land		On shore	On land	
Police													
Agency/Department for Environment													
Border Guard/Coast Guard/ Defence Agency	At sea			At sea			At sea			At sea			Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Agency/Department for Maritime (Safety)/Transport													Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Agency/Department for Civil Protection				At sea	On shore	On land				At sea	On shore	On land	Institution is present at international expert/working groups
Ministry of Transport/Communications													
Ministry of Environment													
Armed (Naval) Forces													
Ministry of Defence													
Ministry of the Interior													
Ministry of Economy													
Ministry of Energy													
Coastal Administration													
Government authority													

NPC – National oil spill contingency plan  
 INT – International expert/working groups

At sea 

On shore 

On land 

Institution is present at international expert/working groups 

# **ANNEX III**

**LIST OF INTERNATIONAL OIL SPILL  
CONTINGENCY EXERCISES IN THE BALTIC SEA  
REGION (INCL. REGULAR AND AD HOC)**

	DK	EST	FI	DE	IS	LV	LT	NO	PL	RU	SE
Balex Delta	X	X	X			X			X		X
SWEDENGER	X										
Copenhagen Agreement	X		X					X			X
SAR					X						
Bonn Agreement Exercise								X			X
ARCHOIL 2013 (ad hoc)			X								X
Fu Shan Hai 2013 (ad hoc)	X										X
SkagEx 2012 (ad hoc)	X							X			X
BOILEX 2011 (ad hoc)		X	X							X	X
Matteus 2010 (ad hoc)	X							X			X
POLGER				X					X		
Lithuania – Poland – Russian Federation							X		X	X	
Estonian PUHAS Meri Exercise		X	X								
Finnish-Estonian bilateral exercise		X	X								
Finnish-Russian bilateral exercise			X							X	
International Oil Spill Exercise NOSE-2004	X			X		X	X		X	X	X

# **ANNEX IV**

**BALTIC SEA REGION  
COUNTRIES' PARTICIPATION IN  
REGIONAL EXPERT GROUPS**

	HELCOM RESPONSE	HELCOM MARITIME	PA SECURE	PA SAFE	EPPR	CBSS CIVPRO
DK	Defence Command	Danish Nature Agency		Maritime Authority, Ministry of Defence, Defence Command	Defence Command	
	DEMA, Local Gov					
			DEMA			DEMA
EE	Mol, P&BG Board, MoE	Mol, MoE, MoEc&Com		Maritime Administration		
	Mol, P&BG Board, Rescue Board					
			Mol, Rescue Board			Rescue Board
FI	MoE, SYKE, Boarder Guard	TranspSafetyA, MoTrComm, MoE, TanspAgency	Mol	Mol, TranspSafetyA, MoTrComm, BorderGuard	MoE, Mol	Mol
	Mol, SYKE			Mol, TranspSafetyA		
DE	Havariekommando Cuxhaven			MoTranspDig-Infrastr		Hamburg Fire and Rescue Service
	Havariekommando Cuxhaven					
	Havariekommando Cuxhaven					
IS						
LV	Navy, Env Service	Maritime Admin	State Fire Service	MoTransp, Maritime Admin, MoDef	Maritime Dep	State Fire Service
	State Fire Service, Env Service			MoTransp		
LT	MoDef	MoTrComm		MFA, MoTrComm		
			FRD under Mol			FRD under Mol
NO	Coast Admin			MoTrade, IndustrFisheries	Coast Admin	
						DSB

At sea ■ On shore ■ On land ■ Institution(s) is representing for all three areas (at sea, on shore, on land) ■

	HELCOM RESPONSE	HELCOM MARITIME	PA SECURE	PA SAFE	EPPR	CBSS CIVPRO
PL	SAR, MaritimeAuth	MaritimeAuth		MoInfrDev, Maritime Univ		
	SAR, Maritime Auth, StateFireServ					
			State Fire Service			State Fire Service
RU	MoTransp					
	EMERCOM					
SE	Coast Guard	TranspAgency		TranspAgency, Maritime Admin, Coast Guard	Coast Guard	
	MSB		MSB			MSB

At sea  On shore  On land  Institution(s) is representing for all three areas (at sea, on shore, on land) 

### ABBREVIATIONS

Mol	Ministry of the Interior
P&BG Board	Police and Border Guard Board
MoE	Ministry of the Environment
MoEc&Com	Ministry of Economics and Communication
DEMA	Danish Emergency Management Agency
SYKE	Finnish Environment Institute
TranspSafetyA	Transport Safety Agency
MoTrComm	Ministry of Transport and Communications
MoTranspDigInfrastr	Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure
Env Service	Environmental Service
MoDef	Ministry of Defence
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Coast Adm	Coastal Administration
MoTrade, IndustrFisheries	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries
SAR	Maritime Search and Rescue Service
MoTransp	Ministry of Transport
FDR under Mol	Fire and Rescue Department under Ministry of the Interior

# **ANNEX V**

**BALTIC SEA REGION  
COUNTRIES' PARTICIPATION  
IN SELECTED INTERNATIONAL  
COOPERATION AGREEMENTS**



**MULTILATERAL AGREEMENTS**

1. The Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention).
2. The Agreement on Mutual Assistance between Finland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Iceland (Copenhagen Agreement).
3. The Bonn Agreement on Cooperation in Dealing with Pollution of the North Sea by Oil and other Harmful Substances.
4. MARPOL Convention Annex I.
5. The OPRC Convention – The International Convention on Oil Preparedness, Response and Cooperation 1990.
6. Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Pollution, Preparedness and Response in the Arctic.

**BILATERAL/TRILATERAL AGREEMENTS**

7. Bilateral Finnish-Russian marine pollution response agreement.
8. DenGerNeth.
9. Polish-Russian Agreement.
10. German-Polish Agreement.
11. Latvian - Estonian bi-lateral agreement on oil spill response collaboration.
12. Latvian - Swedish bi-lateral agreement on emergency response collaboration.
13. Latvian - Lithuanian bi-lateral agreement on support in the event of large scale accidents.
14. Agreement between Russian Federation and Norway on cooperation on Oil pollution in Barents Sea.
15. Bilateral agreement Norway-UK.

# **ANNEX VI**

## **SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Survey on Institutional Architecture for Protection from Oil Spills in the Baltic Sea Region

Answers to all questions were requested to be submitted by filling out the table below:

	RESPONSIBLE	CONTRIBUTING	AD HOC/ WHEN REQUESTED	NAME OF THE INSTITUTION
AT SEA	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	_____
ON SHORE	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	_____
ON LAND	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Preparedness:

1. Which authority/institution(s) are responsible for the overall strategy for oil spill preparedness?
2. Which authority/institution(s) are responsible for the national oil spill contingency plan or equivalent?
3. Which authority/institution(s) are integrated in the national warning system for oil spills?
4. Which authority/institution(s) are carrying out risk assessment and hazard identification for oil spills?
5. Which authority/institution(s) are carrying out environmental prioritization for oil spill response?
6. Under which national policy area is disaster risk reduction for oil spills placed (please mark few in case there are several that have elements of oil spill DRR)? Please indicate also institutions representing

Response:

7. Which authority/institution(s) are responsible for coordinating and implementing response measures for oil spill incidents?
8. Which authority/institution(s) are responsible for information dissemination to the public on an occurring oil spill incident?
9. Which authority/institution(s) is responsible for asking/receiving requests for assistance (international)?
10. Which authority/institution(s) are responsible for clean-up and disposal of oil and waste?

Recovery:

11. Which authority/institution(s) are coordinating/taking part in the overall assessment of impact and recovery?
12. Which authority/institution(s) are implementing environmental impact assessment and recovery?
13. Which authority/institution(s) are implementing impact assessment and recovery from civil protection and safety perspective?
14. Which authority/institution(s) are participating in the evaluation and follow-up across sectors? (Sharing of experience among authorities from different sectors, such as environmental protection, coast guard, rescue services, customs, etc.) If there are no such routines established, please mark n/a
15. Which authority/institution(s) are contributing to the process of lessons-learnt dissemination internationally?

International:

16. Summary of participation in regional working groups.

Which institutions represent the three levels (at sea, on shore, on land) in the work within the following working/coordination groups:

	FULL PARTICIPATION	OBSERVER	AD HOC/ UPON INVITATION	
AT SEA	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	_____
ON SHORE	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	_____
ON LAND	(1) <input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <input type="checkbox"/>	_____

- HELCOM Maritime.
- HELCOM Response.
- EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region PA Secure.
- EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region PA Safe.
- Arctic Council EPPR.
- CBSS Civil Protection Network.

17. Participation in Regional Exercises (please fill in exercise title and institution participating).

18. Please list international, bi-lateral and multilateral agreements/operational sub-regional plans that your country is participating in for the oil spill preparedness, prevention, response and recovery (please add more if relevant), indicating which institutions are responsible for participation and follow-up in the country:

- The Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention).
- The agreement on mutual assistance between Finland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Iceland (Copenhagen Agreement).
- The Bonn Agreement on cooperation in dealing with pollution of the North Sea by oil and other harmful substances.

MARPOL Convention Annex I.

The OPRC Convention – The International Convention on Oil Preparedness, Response and Cooperation 1990.

OTHER (please indicate).

