

Project

Subregional training session for the evaluation of safety reports in Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

16.11.2009 – 31.05.2010



Training participants and experts
Source: UNECE Secretariat

Financially supported through the
**Advisory Assistance Programme of the German Federal Environment Ministry for
Environmental Protection in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the
Caucasus and Central Asia**
(Funding Reference No. 380 01 220)

Executed under
**Assistance Programme of the
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Convention on the
Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents**

With the participation of the beneficiary countries
Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Geneva, June 2010

Mr. Lukasz Wyrowski

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)

Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

AV. De la Paix, 9-11 1211 Genève

Switzerland

Tel.: +41 (0) 22 9174053

Email: lukasz.wyrowski@unece.org

Anlage 1 zum Formular

Berichtsnummer 1. UBA-FB	2.	3.
4. Titel des Berichts Training zur Evaluierung von Sicherheitsberichten für Vertreter von relevanten Behörden Kroatiens, Serbiens und der ehemaligen jugoslawischen Republik Mazedonien Beratungshilfeprogramm des BMU für den Umweltschutz in den Staaten Mittel- und Osteuropas, des Kaukasus und Zentralasiens		
5. Autor(en), Name(n), Vorname(n) Wyrowski Lukasz		8. Abschlußdatum 31.05.2010
		9. Veröffentlichungsdatum
6. Durchführende Institution (Name, Anschrift) UNECE, Sekretariat des Übereinkommens über die grenzüberschreitenden Auswirkungen von Industrieunfällen Palais des Nation CH - 1211 Genf 10		10. UFOPLAN-Nr. / Förderkennzeichen (FKZ) 380 01 220
		11. Seitenzahl 13
7. Fördernde Institution (Name, Anschrift) Umweltbundesamt Postfach 1406 06813 Dessau		12. Literaturangaben 6
		13. Tabellen / Diagramme
		14. Abbildungen 3
15. Zusätzliche Angaben		
16. Kurzfassung Schwerpunkt des Projekts bildete ein Training zur Evaluierung von Sicherheitsberichten. Es vermittelte Vertretern kroatischer, serbischer und mazedonischer Behörden Wissen über die Evaluierung von Sicherheitsberichten, die von Betreibern relevanter Industriebetriebe entwickelt werden müssen, um den Behörden einen sicheren Arbeitsablauf zu demonstrieren sowie um relevante Lizenzen zu erhalten. Das Projekt hatte auch zum Ziel, den Weg für weitere Maßnahmen der Länder vorzubereiten, um die Qualität der Sicherheitsberichterstattung und -evaluierung und damit die Störfallvorsorge zu verbessern. Innerhalb des Projekts wurde ein Modell eines Checklistensystems entwickelt, das die Evaluierung von Sicherheitsberichten erleichtern sowie helfen soll, Strategien zur Vermeidung von Industrieunfällen zu verbessern und Richtlinien bzw. Trainingsmaßnahmen für Betreiber relevanter Industriebetriebe zu erarbeiten. Vorliegender Bericht fasst die Ziele, Maßnahmen und Ergebnisse des Projekts zusammen und weist auf Anknüpfungspunkte für Folgevorhaben hin.		
17. Schlagwörter Beratungshilfeprogramm, UNECE, Übereinkommen über die grenzüberschreitenden Auswirkungen von Industrieunfällen, Checkliste, Sicherheitsbericht, Störfallvorsorge, Kroatien, Serbien, ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien		
18. Preis	19.	20.

UBA-F+E-Berichtsmerkblatt (6.80)

Report - Data Sheet

1. Report No.: UBA-FB	2.	3.
4. Report Title Subregional training session on evaluation of safety reports in Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Advisory Assistance Programme for Environmental Protection in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia		
5. Author(s), Family Name(s), First Name(s) Wyrowski Lukasz		8. Report Date 31.05.2010
		9. Publication Date
6. Performing Organisation (Name, Address) UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Secretariat of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents Palais des Nations CH - 1211 Geneva 10		10. UFOPLAN-No. (FKZ) 380 01 220
		11. No. of Pages 13
7. Sponsoring Agency (Name, Address) Umweltbundesamt Postfach 1406 06813 Dessau		12. No. of References 6
		13. Tables and Diagrams n.a.
		14. Figures 3
15. Supplementary Notes		
16. Abstract The project's main event was a training session on the evaluation of safety reports. It led to help the project beneficiary-countries Croatia, Serbia and fYR of Macedonia to build up the knowledge of public authorities in evaluating safety reports that are to be prepared by operators of hazardous industrial sites for demonstrating to the authorities safe operations at the sites and for receiving relevant licenses or permits. The project was designed also to provide the basis for future steps to be taken by the countries to improve the quality of safety reporting and evaluation and, through this, enhance the level of industrial safety. In the context of this project a checklist system was developed which is available for the countries to use it for evaluation of safety reports, but can be used also for further improvement of the policies for prevention of industrial accidents, and for the preparation of guidelines and trainings for operators of hazardous activities. This report gives a summary on the objectives, activities and results of the project and suggests items/topics for follow-up projects.		
17. Key Words Advisory Assistance Programme, UNECE, Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, checklist, safety report, prevention of accidents, Croatia, Serbia, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		
18. Price	19.	20.
UBA-F+E-Berichtsmerkblatt (6.80)		

Table of contents and list of annexes

1. Summary of the final report in English	6
2. Summary of the final report in German	8
3. Summary of the final report in Russian	10
4. Project environment / context	12
5. Project goals	15
6. Course of project implementation	16
7. Project implementation – experiences and difficulties	25
8. Evaluation of project	27

Annexes

Annex 1 Checklist System for Safety Reports in English

Annex 2 Checklist System for Safety Reports in German

Annex 3 Checklist System for Safety Reports in Russian

Annex 4 Checklist templates

Annex 5 Presentations on checklist system

Annex 5.1 Safety Reporting as Key Factor of Major Accident Control

Annex 5.2 Master Checklist (MCL) for Safety Reporting

Annex 5.3 Checklist System for Safety Reporting

Annex 5.4 Safety management system SMS

Annex 5.5 Identification And Accidental Risks Analysis

Annex 5.6 SCL Checklists on Site & Environment, Activities, Substances and Mitigation

Annex 5.7 Experience in evaluation of Safety reports

Annex 6 Presentations on case studies

Annex 6.1 Procedures for and problems faced in safety reporting in Croatia

Annex 6.2 Safety reports, Croatia

Annex 6.3 Experience in evaluation of safety reports in Serbia

Annex 6.4 Case study LPG storage in Serbia

Annex 6.5 Case study safety report evaluation in Serbia

*Annex 6.6 National activities for Industrial Accidents Prevention and
Control in FYR of Macedonia*

Annex 7 Model case study: Chelopech safety report

Annex 8 Pictures (included in the body of the report)

Annex 9 List of participants

1. Summary of the final report in English

Subregional training session for the evaluation of safety reports in Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Financially supported through the Advisory Assistance Programme for Environmental Protection in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia

The project, managed by the UN Economic Commission for Europe, secretariat for the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic (fYR) of Macedonia was successfully implemented from 16.11.2009 to 31.05.2010.

The objective of the project was to build up the knowledge of authorities from Croatia, Serbia and fYR of Macedonia in evaluating safety reports. The project was designed also to provide the basis for future steps to be taken by the countries to improve the quality of safety reporting and evaluation as well as, through this, enhance the level of industrial safety.

The implementation of the project was divided into three phases:

- (1) A preliminary phase consisting of preparatory meeting and preparatory work for the training session;
- (2) A training session; and
- (3) A follow-up to the training session.

The main phase of the project was the training session during which countries were provided with recommendations on how to further enhance the procedures for evaluation of safety reports. During the training session the participating beneficiary-countries' experts together with the training facilitators elaborated a checklist system for evaluation of safety reports. This system is available for the countries and should be used, if needed with additional modifications, when evaluating the safety reports, for reviewing the existing safety policy but

also for preparing guidelines and training for operators of hazardous activities in preparing safety reports. This should be a national follow-up by the countries.

The experts from countries participating to the project on evaluation of safety reports, i.e. Croatia, Serbia, and fYR of Macedonia requested that the project is also followed up through Assistance Programme capacity-building activity under the Convention. This follow-up should consist in the on-site inspection during which the countries would like to learn how to use the results of the safety report's evaluation in preparing for and conducting an effective inspection. This project may also lead to the elaboration of some simple guidelines for inspectors and further improvements to the checklist system.

2. Summary of the final report in German

Training zur Evaluierung von Sicherheitsberichten in Kroatien, Serbien und der ehemaligen jugoslawischen Republik Mazedonien

Gefördert durch das Beratungshilfeprogramm für den Umweltschutz in den Staaten Mittel- und Osteuropas, des Kaukasus und Zentralasiens

Das Projekt zur Unterstützung der Länder Kroatien, Serbien und der ehemaligen jugoslawischen Republik Mazedonien, welches vom UNECE-Sekretariat für das Übereinkommen über die grenzüberschreitenden Auswirkungen von Industrieunfällen betreut wurde, ist in der Zeit vom 16.11.2009 bis 31.05.2010 erfolgreich durchgeführt worden.

Aufgabe des Projekts war die Qualifikation der o.g. zuständigen Länderbehörden zur Überprüfung von Sicherheitsberichten in störfallrelevanten Industrien. Darüberhinaus sollte die Befähigung der Länder bei der Erstellung und Überprüfung von Sicherheitsberichten weiter entwickelt und damit ein Beitrag zur Erhöhung der industriellen Sicherheit erreicht werden.

Das Vorhaben bestand aus drei Teilen:

- (1) Durchführung eines Treffens zur Vorbereitung des Trainingsseminars, Erarbeitung der Trainingsmaterialien durch Experten;
- (2) Durchführung des Trainingsseminars;
- (3) Auswertung des Trainingsseminars.

Schwerpunkt des Vorhabens war die Durchführung des Trainingsseminars, in dem den Ländervertretern die von den Experten ausgearbeiteten Empfehlungen zur stringenteren Überprüfung von Sicherheitsberichten gegeben wurden. Im Zentrum stand dabei die Ausarbeitung einer Checklistenmethode zur Überprüfung von Sicherheitsberichten. Diese Methode kann, ggf. nach Anpassung an die länderspezifischen Bedürfnisse, grundsätzlich zur Überprüfung von Sicherheitsberichten, zur Überarbeitung von Sicherheitskonzepten, sowie zur Erarbeitung von Richtlinien für Betreiber und zum Training von Mitarbeitern verwendet werden. Die weitere konkrete Verwendung der Methode obliegt den teilnehmenden Ländern.

Die Experten der teilnehmenden Länder von Kroatien, Serbien und der ehemaligen jugoslawischen Republik Mazedonien brachten zum Ausdruck, dass das Projekt auch in das nach der Konvention gegen grenzüberschreitende Industrieunfälle vorgesehene Unterstützungsprogramm zum Aufbau von Überwachungskapazitäten eingeordnet werden kann. Zur Fortsetzung dieses Programms sollten mit der Checklistenmethode „Vor-Ort“-Inspektionen in Industrieanlagen durchgeführt werden, bei denen die Länder lernen können, wie die Ergebnisse aus der Überprüfung eines Sicherheitsberichts zur Vorbereitung und Durchführung effektiver Inspektionen genutzt werden können. Im Rahmen des Projekts können darüber hinaus auch Handlungsanleitungen für Inspektoren entwickelt werden und durch die praktische Anwendung die Checklistenmethode verfeinert werden.

3. Summary of the final report in Russian

Субрегиональный семинар по оценке отчетов по мерам технической безопасности в Хорватии, Сербии и в Бывшей югославской Республике Македония

Программа консультативной помощи по охране окружающей среды в государствах Центральной и Восточной Европы, Кавказа и Центральной Азии

Проект Секретариата Конвенции о трансграничном воздействии промышленных аварий для Хорватии, Сербии и Бывшей Югославской Республики Македония Европейской экономической комиссии Организации Объединенных Наций (ЕЭК ООН) был успешно реализован с 16.11.2009 по 31.05.2010.

Цель проекта заключалась в углублении знаний экспертов Правительств Хорватии, Сербии и Бывшей Югославской Республики Македония об оценке отчетов о мерах безопасности. Проект также был разработан с целью предоставления странам основы для новых инициатив, направленных на повышение качества составления отчетов о мерах безопасности и их оценка, и, таким образом, на повышение уровня промышленной безопасности.

Реализация проекта состояла из трех этапов:

- (1) Предварительный этап, состоящий из подготовительного совещания и подготовительных работ по семинару;
- (2) Семинар, и
- (3) Последующая работа по семинару.

Основная фаза проекта состояла из семинара, в ходе которого странам были предоставлены рекомендации по дальнейшему укреплению процедур оценки отчетов о безопасности. Во время семинара эксперты стран-бенефициаров вместе с модераторами семинара разработали систему контрольных списков оценки отчетов о безопасности. Эта система доступна для стран и должна быть использована, в случае необходимости с поправками, при оценке отчетов о мерах безопасности, при пересмотре

существующей политики в области техники безопасности, а также для подготовки руководящих принципов и обучение операторов опасных видов деятельности составлению отчетов о мерах безопасности. Последующая работа должна быть продолжена странами-бенефициарами.

Эксперты стран, участвующих в проекте по оценке отчетов о мерах безопасности, т.е. Хорватии, Сербии и Бывшей Югославской Республики Македония, обратились с просьбой о продолжении ранее начатой работы в рамках программы помощи, посредством деятельности по оказанию помощи в работе по укреплению потенциала в рамках Конвенции. Данные меры должны представлять собой инспекцию на месте, в процессе которого страны хотели бы узнать, как применять результаты оценки отчетов о мерах безопасности в подготовке и проведении эффективной экспертизы. Этот проект также может привести к разработке простых руководящих принципов для инспекторов и дальнейшего совершенствования систему контрольных списков.

4. Project environment/context

The 1992 Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents is designed to protect people and the environment against industrial accidents. The Convention aims to prevent accidents from occurring or reducing their frequency and severity and mitigating their effects if happening. However, the Convention is complex and requires, for its implementation, the establishment and implementation of industrial safety policies (e.g. legislation, standards and procedures). As well, shortcomings and challenges in policies need to be identified and addressed. Taking into account the difficulties that certain countries in Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe face, the Conference of the Parties of the Convention launched the Assistance Programme in October 2004. The Conference of the Parties also adopted the Strategic Approach for the Assistance Programme to provide beneficiary countries with a mechanism for identifying their priority needs in strengthening the implementation of the Convention.

The aim of the Assistance Programme and its Strategic Approach is to enhance the efforts of countries in implementing the Convention and in particular towards the establishment of the necessary policies in priority areas of work: a) identification of hazardous activities; b) notification of hazardous activities; c) prevention; d) preparedness; e) response and mutual assistance; f) information to and public participation.

Countries participating in the Assistance Programme have been reviewing the implementation in the six priority areas of work under the Convention since the capacity-building activity held in Kyiv in December 2007. The reviews carried out by the participating countries in the past led to the decision by the Bureau of the Convention and the Convention's Working Group on Implementation to organise two training sessions: one on identification of hazardous activities and one on integrated approaches to major hazard prevention.

The training session on identification of hazardous activities (Minsk, October 2008) provided the experts of participating countries with the possibility to improve their knowledge in applying the Convention's annex I and location criteria, as well as in using the worst-case scenario analysis in identification of hazardous activities. The experts could also exchange

good practices in collecting, processing and maintaining information on hazardous activities. The training session also made the experts recognize the need to further improve their knowledge in the area of risk assessment.

The training session on integrated approaches to major hazard prevention (Prague, February 2009) gave an opportunity to learn from good practices regarding the organization of work of the authorities involved in major hazard prevention and crisis management, as well as in establishing better cooperation and coordination between the authorities. One of the conclusions was that organization of activities aimed at strengthening safety culture is needed (e.g. facilitating training for trainers with respect to assessment of safety documentation, participating in inspections and helping to evaluate the results, supporting the organization of response simulations).

The Republic of Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic (fYR) of Macedonia and the Republic of Serbia were among the countries that were interested to further strengthen safety culture. They recognized as a next step in this process the need to improve the knowledge of experts within the national inspection authorities in evaluating safety reports as submitted to them by operators of hazardous activities. The countries indicated that they were encountering problems in evaluating those reports because the authorities have limited experience with the safety report content, the applied methodologies, in particular with the selection of the possible major accident scenarios, their probability and assessment of the extent and severity of the consequences (modelling of consequences).

In view of the request and based on the project proposal prepared by the three countries and accepted by the Bureau of the Convention, a project on evaluation of safety reports was organized for Croatia, fYR of Macedonia and the Republic of Serbia.



Consultation with an expert during group work
Source: UNECE Secretariat

5. Project goals

The objective of the project was to build up the knowledge of inspection authorities from Croatia, fYR of Macedonia and the Republic of Serbia in evaluating the safety reports (to be prepared by operators of hazardous industrial sites for demonstrating to the authorities safe operations at the sites and for receiving relevant licenses or permits). The project was designed also to provide the basis for future steps to be taken by the countries to improve the quality of safety reporting and evaluation and, through this, enhance the level of industrial safety.

The detailed objectives for the project and its main phase, the training session, were to provide participants with the possibility to:

- discuss the approaches (including the roles of authorities) for the evaluation of safety reports;
- discuss safety reports and in particular the content and methodologies used in safety reports;
- discuss the modalities for the selection of accidents scenarios, their probability and modelling of consequences;
- develop a checklist on safety reports;
- discuss how the checklist can be developed into guidance for operators for preparation of the safety reports.



Assessing a safety report with use of the template checklist system

Source: UNECE Secretariat

6. Course of project implementation

The implementation of the project was divided into three phases:

- 1) a preliminary phase consisting of preparatory meeting and preparatory work for the training session;
- 2) a training session on evaluation of safety reports, and
- 3) a follow-up to the training session.

(1) Preliminary phase

The preliminary phase aimed at effective planning for the training session so that the identified priorities of the countries would be addressed in the best possible way. For this reason a preparatory meeting was organized.

The preparatory meeting, which took place on 16-17 November 2009 and was attended by project coordinators of the beneficiary countries, the secretariat and consultants (referred to also as training facilitators) hired by the secretariat to support the project and to develop the checklist system.

The preparatory meeting led to the following outcome:

- a) Programme for the training session

It was agreed that the training session should consist of three parts:

Part I was to focus on organization by countries of the safety reporting processes and sharing of responsibilities within the authorities for the evaluation of safety reports. It was to start with a presentation setting the scene for the whole training session on safety reporting and to introduce the reporting as an important instrument in major hazard prevention. The session was to continue with the presentations from the project countries on their practices and organization / procedures (or ideas for organization) for evaluation of safety reports. Each presentation was to be followed by a Q&A and then with the work in national groups, during which countries experts would be discussing with the training facilitators their approaches and will have a chance to ask questions how certain

challenges / certain procedures had been addressed in the countries of origins of the facilitators. Part I was to finish with a brief discussion in plenum wrapping up the work in groups.

Part II was to focus on evaluation of safety reports and on working out a checklist system for this evaluation. It was to start with presentations on the content of the safety reports and a template checklist system, to be delivered by the training facilitators. The presentations were to address such parts of the safety report like: Safety Management System (SMS); site and environment; substances, active processes and activities; risk assessment, identification of accidents scenarios and modelling of consequences; measures for limitation of consequences and mitigation; internal emergency plans. Thereafter three case studies were agreed to be presented. The cases were to be based on the safety reports prepared for different types of activities - LPG storage from Serbia, production facility from Croatia and either production facility or a storage facility from Bulgaria. After the presentations the cases were to be studied in the work in groups. Each case was to be taken by one group and studied in detail using the template checklist system. During this studying on one hand the groups were supposed to note the shortages of a particular safety report, on the other hand they were supposed to work with the checklist to turn the template into a suitable and needs-tailored checklist system for an application in their daily work. It was agreed that the groups would be mixed ones and each supported by two facilitators. The work carried out in each of the three groups was to be compared and discussed in plenum at the end of the training. The presentations had to be done by the groups' reporters on the work carried out and conclusions drawn.

Part III was to concentrate on the way forward. On one hand it was designed to discuss the way forward for the countries to transfer the knowledge gained in the training session to other national experts. On the other hand it was to focus on finalizing the checklist system based on the conclusions from the work in groups of session II. It was also designed to discuss on the possibilities to test the checklist system during an on-site visit to a hazardous activity and develop a guideline document for operators for preparing the safety reports.

b) Preparatory work by the project beneficiary countries

Each project country agreed to prepare a presentation on the practices and organization / procedures (or ideas for organization) for evaluation of safety reports. Croatia had to present a case-study on the safety report for a production facility. Serbia had to present a case study on the safety report for LPG storage.

For the presentations a template was to be provided to the countries. Together with the template an example of a case study from Bulgaria, prepared by a consultant was to be shared with the countries for preparation of their own case studies.

The case studies from the countries and the presentations were delivered to the secretariat before end of January 2010.

c) Preparatory work by the consultants

After the preparatory meeting, the consultants hired by the secretariat delivered the agreed material. The material is to be seen as results for the preparatory phase:

Consultant I

- template for project countries' presentations on processes and procedures for evaluation of safety reports;
- case study based on a safety report for a storage facility.

Consultant II

- presentation on the setting the scene - the safety reporting as an important instrument in major hazard prevention;
- presentation regarding the content of the safety report and template checklist system with regard to (a) description of the site and the environment, (b) substances, active processes and activities, (c) measures for limitation of consequences and mitigation, and (d) internal emergency planning, coordination with Consultants III and IV;

Consultant III

- presentation regarding the content of the safety report and template checklist system with regard to SMS including the selection of installations within an industrial complex/facility that can cause major hazard.

Consultant IV

- presentation regarding the content of the safety report and template checklist system with regard to risk assessment methods, accidents scenarios, and modelling of consequences.

At the same time the secretariat drew up the information notice containing the provisional agenda and agreed on the logistical arrangements with the host country.

(2) Training session on evaluation of safety reports

The training session took place in Belgrade, Serbia on 8-10 February 2010. It was well attended by experts from the beneficiary countries with exception of Croatia, whose participation was limited. The representatives from the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction cancelled their participation at the very last moment, due to work-related problems. Due to this cancellation Croatia was represented in the training session by representatives of the National Protection and Rescue Directorate.

It was held according to its agenda that is:

- welcoming session
- setting the scene by consultant II
- Session I, part I on procedures for safety reporting with following presentations:
 - o Procedures for and problems faced in safety reporting in Croatia
 - o Procedures for and problems faced in safety reporting in Serbia
 - o Procedures for and problems faced in safety reporting in fYR of Macedonia
- Session I, work in national groups to discuss the challenges in safety reporting
- Session I, part II on safety report content and introduction to a system of template checklist, with presentations as follows:
 - o Master checklist
 - o System of checklist

- SMS
- Risk assessment
- Description of the site and the environment, substances, active processes and activities, measures for limitation of consequences and mitigation, and internal emergency planning
- Session I, part III discussion in plenum on the template checklist methodology
- Session II, part I, evaluation of safety report with following presentations:
 - Case study on LPG storage from Bulgaria
 - Case study on LPG storage from Serbia
 - Case study on production facility from Croatia
- Session II, part II, work in groups to review the available safety reports with the use of template checklist
- Session II, part III, discussion of the results of the work in groups
- Session III, wrap-up and discussion on the way forward

The presentations of the part I showed that all three countries established competent authorities for the Convention. For Croatia it is the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction, for Serbia it is the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning but also Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, for fYR of Macedonia it is Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning.

The presentations also showed clearly that Croatia introduced the legislation in accordance with the Convention and the Seveso directive (*Regulation on the prevention of major accidents involving dangerous substances (Official Gazette No. 114/2008)*, *Ordinance on the register of installations in which dangerous substances have been identified and on the register of reported major accidents (Official Gazette No. No.113/08)*, *Regulation on the manner of establishing environmental damage (Official Gazette No. 139/08)*, *Rule book on the measures for remedying the environmental damage and the restoration programmes (Official Gazette No. 145/08)*, *Regulation on information and participation of the public and public concerned in environmental matters (Official Gazette No. 64/08)*), Serbia was under way in doing so (*Law on Environmental Protection LEP ("Official Gazette of RS", no.135/04)*, *Regulation of Methodology for accident hazard assessment and the environmental pollution assessment, with the measures of preparation and mitigation measures ("Official Gazette of RS", no. 60/94)*, *Law on amending and supplementing the Law on Environmental Protection*

("Official Gazette of RS", no.36/09), Law on Ratification of the Convention on transboundary effects of industrial accidents ("Official Gazette of RS",no.41/09)), with a few legal acts awaiting the adoption by the parliament (Regulation on the content and methodology of elaboration of Major-accident Prevention Policy, Safety Report and Internal Emergency Plan, Regulation on the content of notification for new Seveso installations and establishments, the existing Seveso installations and establishments, for permanent closure of the Seveso installations and establishments, Regulation on the list of dangerous substances and their quantities on the basis of which obligation of elaboration of Major-accident Prevention Policy, Safety Report and Internal Emergency Plan is determined).

Both countries also identified hazardous industrial activities. Serbia prepared a preliminary list with specification which installations were lower and which upper tier establishment according to Seveso requirements. At the same time, fYR of Macedonia had still to prepare most of the bylaws that would allow effective enforcement of a safety regime and to carry out the identification process.

Despite the legislation introduced or partly introduced also Croatia and Serbia have been facing challenges. These were related to strengthening the administrative capacity in enforcing safety regime, in particular through improving the knowledge of public authorities on requirements of safety reporting. These were also related to coordination and cooperation of different public authorities whose primary tasks lie in ensuring the safety regime, and in particular cooperation between the Ministries of Environment, including their agencies, with the Ministries of Interior. These challenges were also identified by fYR of Macedonia.

Croatia and Serbia also informed about their procedures issuing operational permits for evaluation. They presented which bodies were involved and what were the timeframes for the reports evaluation (safety study for Serbia at the time of the training) and for the on-site inspections leading to the approval or denial of issuing a permit. These procedures were discussed in details with the training facilitators, who provided among others the following recommendations:

- Evaluation of the reports and on-site inspections should be well documented, so that in case of claims related to prohibition of operation, the results coming from the evaluation

and providing the basis for prohibition of operation can be clearly presented in courts. System of checklists is very helpful tools in documenting the evaluation and inspections;

- The four-eyes principle for evaluation ensures more reliable results;
- Timeframes should be set accordingly so that the evaluating authorities can meet the deadlines;
- There should be one coordinating body for the evaluation of safety reports and inspections;
- The evaluation procedures should foresee time for getting feedback from other authorities and public;
- The priority for public authorities should be the promotion of a compliance and cooperative approach with operators. At the same time there should be a clear regulation on prohibition of operation and/or a system of fines;
- The enforcement system should be kept rather simple and cost-effective, thus avoid the involvement of too many authorities and too many procedures.

The countries took due note of these recommendations in reviewing or in organizing the safety enforcement regime. At the same time they were aware that implementation of some of these procedures might be a long-lasting process, especially when it would need to involve negotiations between different authorities on the tasks and responsibilities and when it might lead to amendments in the legislation.

In the session II the cases for studies were presented. In the case of the Bulgarian and the Croatian case studies, those were related to safety reports for respectively LPG storage and a production facility. In case of Serbia the case study referred to a safety study on LPG storage. Each presentation provided background information on the facility and its operation and continued with more details on each of the following sections, unless they were not part of the report/study:

- MAPP and SMS,
- Presentation of the environment of the establishment,
- Description of the installation,
- Identification and accidental risks analysis and prevention methods, and
- Emergency preparedness and response.

After the presentations, participants were split into 3 cross-national groups, each joined by two evaluators, to look closer into the available reports/study and made an evaluation as far as it was possible by applying the template system of checklists.

During the work in groups the countries' experts were asking questions regarding many of the items included in template checklist system. The facilitators were explaining the meaning of these items. It was then decided that the checklist system should contain a column with explanation, examples and reference to material explaining the precise meaning of the checklist's items, where necessary.

The work in groups allowed the countries' experts to get a clear understanding of what should be the proper content of the safety report.

The part of risk assessment was considered the most difficult. It was evident that a training on risk assessment techniques and methodologies would be required as a future step for experts from public authorities. Such training should also be focused on how to recognize a well-prepared risk assessment.

The countries also agreed that the next step for them, once the checklist system would be finalized on the basis of the comments from the training session, would be to work with it vis-à-vis the national legislation for enforcing the safety regime and to bring the legislation in line with internationally accepted standards, i.e. make amendments in the national legal framework, should this fall short with the international standards, or simplify the checklist system in case any items are deemed to address too high degree of detail vis-à-vis the legislation.

The next steps should then also be a training for operators on the development of safety reports and of internal emergency plans that would meet the requirements acknowledged internationally and to be implemented in the national legislation. It was agreed that the final checklist system would be appropriate for conducting training for operators and provide them with guidance on preparation of safety reports. The countries also expressed a wish, since the enforcement of the safety regime covers both the evaluation of safety reports, but also the on-site inspection, that there would be a follow-up to the project focused on using a checklist system during the on-site inspection. The participants could then consider during such project how to adapt the checklist system for the on-site inspections.

(3) Follow-up to the training session

In the immediate follow-up to the training session, the checklist system methodology was improved by the consultants based on the conclusions drawn during the work in groups of the training session.

The final checklist was translated into Russian what would make it possible to be used by the Eastern European, Caucasian and Central Asian countries where the Russian language would be still dominant for a few years to come. This Russian version while tested could be further improved to better meet the requirements/needs of its users.

In a medium and a longer term the project-beneficiary countries should take the steps to further review the legislation and procedure to bring it in conformity with internationally accepted standards.

The follow-up project for the on-site visit has been under exploration. Such a follow-up should include the application of the checklist methodology and allow its further improvement.

The secretariat received positive feedback from the participants for the organisation and the usefulness of the training session and the material presented.

7. Project implementation – experiences and difficulties

The project was implemented without particular difficulties, i.e. no situation occurred which could prevent the project from reaching its objectives, especially none of the possible risks assessed before starting the project, occurred.

The quality of training facilitation was outstanding with very knowledgeable consultants with many years of experience in the business of industrial safety. One of them was highly involved in the preparation of the international standards on industrial safety and their implementation in his country of origin, other two either advised or worked on establishing effective safety policies in their countries of origins; and the fourth one is a senior advisor of a private consultancy company providing services to operators of major industrial activities in preparing safety documentation as well as advising public authorities in the area of safety policy.

The material prepared by the consultants was highly appreciated by the training participants, i.e. by the experts from public authorities from Croatia, Serbia and FYR of Macedonia.

The training was actively attended by the representatives of beneficiary countries as it was covering a subject of their great interest and priority. Although, for Croatia, whose experts from the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction could not participate in the training session due to some last moment work-related problems at the Ministry, the benefit obtained from the training session and in particular from the joint discussions with training facilitators could not be achieved.

An aspect that could be seen as a challenge of the training session concerned the evaluation of the available reports/study in the work in groups. The reports/study, for their nature, are quite extensive documents and they had to be analysed in the time available during the training session. In addition, to make the preparation of the material for the training more easy and quick, it was decided that only the main parts of these reports/studies should have been translated, whereas the detail information was available in one case only in English and in the other cases in local languages. With this, during the process of evaluation, there was additional difficulty that the detailed information from the reports/study had to be read aloud and

interpreted rather than just read separately by each participant. Nevertheless, the experience during the training session showed this to be sufficient; therefore it is not necessary that all of the material is always translated. It would be just important that outstanding interpretation is available during the sessions, what was the case.

8. Evaluation of the project

The participating countries provided very positive feedback on the project and in particular the training session and the prepared material, which among others included:

- the template checklist system, to be still improved after the training session (improved version was made available in the meantime);
- availability of a kind of “model” safety report through Bulgarian case study and its material;
- the very informative presentations related to the content of safety reports.

The participating countries also highly valued the discussions with the training session’s facilitators and the practical recommendations given in Session I regarding the setting of procedures for the evaluation of safety reports. Some of the recommendations are listed in chapter 6.

The long-term results of the project should be ensured through the availability of the checklist system that upon translation into national languages (the template checklist system as it was available for the trainings session has been translated into national languages) would be applicable in the every day’s use of the relevant public authorities. Also by using it, the checklist system could be further improved. Such an opportunity would be offered during the on-site inspection project. The German and Russian versions should also be tested in training sessions, so that possible improvements could be introduced to make the expression used better understood to the end-users, i.e. public authorities. The Russian version could be tested in a training session under the Assistance Programme, should such be requested by any of the Russian speaking countries.

The checklist system provides references to a broad literature in the area of industrial safety: major accident prevention policies, safety management systems, risk assessment which is also available online. Through this, experts from public authorities can use this material in self-learning processes.
