



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
 DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
 ENVIRONMENT  
 Directorate C - Quality of Life  
**ENV.C.4 - Industrial Emissions & Safety**

Brussels, 19 January 2017

**4<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE COMMISSION EXPERT GROUP ON THE CONTROL OF MAJOR ACCIDENT HAZARDS INVOLVING DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ("SEVESO EXPERT GROUP")**

**THURSDAY 14<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2016 10:00H TO FRIDAY 15<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2016 16:00H**  
**ALBERT BORSCHETTE CONFERENCE CENTRE**

## **Summary records**

### **1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

The meeting was attended by all MS except EL, LV and RO. Following observers attended the meeting: Norway, Turkey, UNECE (TEIA secretariat), OECD (WGCA secretariat), CEFIC, EEB, EPSC and FECC.

The meeting was chaired by Ms Aneta WILLEMS (Head of Unit ENV.C.4) who welcomed the participants and informed about the practical arrangements for the meeting (timing, translations, breaks) and other organisational issues (e.g. reimbursement of participants). The chair also reminded the participants about the standing agreement that professional contact information of the participants may be made available by the Commission on request and in duly justified cases e.g. to facilitate surveys and information exchange.

The agenda of the meeting and the minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Seveso Expert Group (SEG) were adopted without changes.

### **2. COMMISSION ACTIVITIES**

#### **2.1. Ongoing activities of DG Environment**

##### *2.1.1. Article 4 of Seveso Directive*

The Commission<sup>1</sup> reminded the SEG about the workshop on an assessment methodology related to Article 4 of the Seveso-III-Directive that took place in October 2014. The final report was published but as the methodology only covered technical aspects, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless explicitly mentioned differently the term "Commission" in this document refers to the Directorate General Environment Unit C.4.

Commission developed a paper describing the necessary administrative process. Member States were consulted on the first draft and the feedback was integrated into an updated version which was circulated on 23 November 2015. No further comments were received. The Commission outlined the main aspects of the administrative process highlighting its indicative nature.

Several Member States welcomed the paper and informed that currently some stakeholders expressed initial interest but it did not yield to concrete discussions about a potential substance that could be notified under Article 4. Whether or not TEIA would need to be involved and at what stage would depend on the nature of the requested exclusion. One Member State pointed out that there may be other ways of addressing the issue e.g. through the Classification, Labelling and Packaging Regulation (CLP) mechanism but an observer pointed out that there are differences between the approach of CLP and SEVESO.

→ As they were no further requests to modify the document the final version will be made available on CIRCABC shortly.

→ The Commission invited Member States to communicate to the SEG any potential candidate substance in advance if it is likely to result into a notification.

#### *2.1.2. Streamlining of reporting*

The Commission informed the SEG about its activities to look into opportunities to simplify reporting on establishments. Under the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) the Commission is currently investigating, in cooperation with the EEA, options to streamline electronic reporting by using synergies in reporting obligations under the IED and the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (E-PRTR). As the reporting obligations involve some geospatial data on installations and plants the relevant requirements of the INSPIRE Directive (Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Union) need to be integrated in the Electronic Reporting Tool. The work conducted by the EEA under the IED showed potential in the long-term to establish synergies also with the reporting under the Seveso-III-Directive as many sites covered by the Seveso-Directive are also covered by the IED. A workshop will be conducted in March 2016 to provide information to participants, further explain the electronic reporting process and clarify technical details.

Member States generally welcomed the initiative but expressed concerns about accidental release of potentially sensitive information. The Commission pointed out that the discussions are at a very early phase but if Seveso data was to be included at some point it would be managed in a way that did not compromise the security of Seveso establishments.

#### *2.1.3. eSPIRS confidentiality*

The Commission reminded the SEG that the agreed timeline for updating establishment reports is 31 December 2016 and informed about the related confidentiality arrangements as communicated earlier:

- All new data submitted as of 1 June 2015 is public unless declared confidential in eSPIRS.

- Datasets submitted under Seveso-II and updated as of 1 June 2015 will be public unless declared confidential during the update (initial entry into force was scheduled for 1 December 2015 but needed to be postponed. New date will be communicated<sup>2</sup>).
- As of 1 January 2017 all data will be publically available unless declared confidential in eSPIRS.

→ Because of those deadlines Member States were reminded to update all previously reported data in line with the new requirements before the deadline to ensure that all potentially confidential data is protected.

Several Member States expressed concerns about the timeline and asked to postpone any publication until the data was updated to ensure that all confidential data was protected. One Member State noted that an obligation to make data available does not mean that it would need to be made actively available online. One observer questioned whether there is evidence that Seveso sites would be at risk from terrorist attacks. Whilst one Member State noted that an EU wide risk assessment may be useful another Member State replied that security issues fall under national competence and shall not be dealt with on Union level. Some Member States also questioned whether it was useful to publish possibly outdated Seveso-II data.

The Commission pointed out that the legal framework was clear and that the confidentiality of establishment information had been discussed at the Committee meeting in October 2014 resulting in Commission Implementing Decision 2014/895/EU. The deadline of 31 December 2016 therein was based on a proposal from Member States and constituted already a grace period as under the Seveso-III-Directive the obligation to publish data had immediate effect. This would not give a legal possibility to distinguish between Seveso-II and Seveso-III data. The Commission confirmed that the SEG is not the appropriate body to conduct security risk assessments and that such assessments fall under Member State competence. On the question on whether data is made actively or passively available, the Commission reminded that the obligation in Article 21(7) refers to a publication of data, thus requiring active distribution. However, eSPIRS provided various options to Member States on how to provide data and how to declare it confidential which would allow Member States to steer themselves how their establishment data is disseminated.

→ The MAHB invited Member States to test the confidentiality functions as to further improve them and would assist if help was needed.

#### *2.1.4. Accident reporting to eMARS*

See agenda item 2.2.

## **2.2. Ongoing activities of DG Joint Research Centre**

The JRC reported that the work programme continues to focus on accident analysis and lessons learned, risk assessment, and exchange of good practice and capacity building. This work continues to support and build on Seveso implementation in Member States but increasingly contributes to the work of DG ECHO on chemical accident prevention

---

<sup>2</sup> After the meeting the date 30 June 2016 was communicated.

policy at the international level associated with the Civil Protection Mechanism and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. Ongoing work includes an online version of AIDA and capacity building in neighbourhood countries. The Land-use planning scenario handbook is currently in internal review and publication is expected by the end of March 2016. Common inspection criteria on various topics are currently being drafted. A Mutual Joint Visit (MJV) on safety culture took place in the Netherlands. The next MJV will be hosted in Norway on explosives. The December 2015 lessons learned bulletin on explosive accidents was produced in anticipation of this workshop.

There is still no consistent trend in the major accidents occurrences. Many reports are still not published because of the lengthy translation and the approval process with Member States. Overall the process still takes 2-3 years. To bridge the gap a new status will be introduced shortly in eMARS to show that an accident was notified but was still being processed. .

To improve the quality of accident reports and the lessons learned, an accident analysis benchmarking exercise was launched in November 2015 during a workshop. Actors included competent authorities, industry and organisations from both the EU and third countries. The objective is developing a tool for lessons learned analysis. The exercise is expected to be completed by mid-2017 and followed by the production of an analysis handbook addressing both inspectors and investigators.

The JRC also presented its strategy for enhancing accident analysis tools and accident reporting, notably the modernisation of the eMARS reporting system and the new AIDA data collection and reporting tool. eMARS will be developed to improve its ability to create lessons learned, make it more practical and user-friendly. During 2017-2018 MAHB will propose changes to the structure of eMARS for testing of Member States that will encourage better reporting and lessons learned analysis, for example, one text box for “telling the accident story” instead of 9 different text boxes across 9 different tabs. These changes may be adopted into eMARS without a new Implementing Decision. eMARS will be transferred to the new MINERVA portal. This change gives eMARS the same, more powerful, IT platform as eSPIRS

Member States in general welcomed the developments but called for a close co-ordination with the national authorities well in advance because changes may need to be embedded into national databases. In addition eMARS should facilitate automated electronic exchanges e.g. via XML. Some Member States indicated that the eMARS and eSPIRS development should consider security related issues, e.g. by including a possibility to declare certain information confidential. The Commission pointed out that in general accident information was public environmental information. In the longer term the issue could be re-discussed when an update of the Implementing Decision was due.

In response to the comments the JRC pointed out that the development of options would be limited by resources. For the time being the review was focused on changes within the current legal framework and on changes with big impact. The JRC assured Member States that implementation would be carried out in a way that would allow adequate time to absorbing changes into their reporting systems.

## **2.3. Activities involving other Directorates General**

### *2.3.1. Chemicals legislation REFIT*

The Commission informed about the ongoing REFIT Fitness Check on the chemicals legislation except REACH which will also touch upon issues related to the Seveso-III-Directive. The exercise will not assess each piece of legislation but assess the overall framework and the relation of downstream legislation to CLP.

→ SEG members may be contacted to contribute to a related case study.

### *2.3.2. Accident notification and response system*

The Commission informed that it commenced discussions with DG ECHO on how to enhance its performance with regard to accident notification and mutual assistance.

→ The SEG will be kept informed about progress.

### *2.3.3. Civil Protection Mechanism*

The Commission (ECHO.A.5) informed that according to Decision 1313/2013 on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism the role of the Commission was to facilitate cooperation in the area of civil protection on prevention, preparedness and response activities, inside the Union and in third countries. The Commission mentioned a few innovations of the Mechanism, such as the Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC), the European Emergency Response Capacity, and the Member States' obligations on risk assessment and management. Upon request the Commission can also provide satellite images which could also be used for managing industrial disasters, or to facilitate land-use planning. In the Work Programme 2016, CBRN Disasters have been identified among the priorities for preparedness activities and for international cooperation with Candidate and Neighbouring countries.

### *2.3.4. Sendai Framework*

The Commission (ECHO.A.3) informed about EU activities under the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 which was adopted in March 2015. The framework includes many elements of EU policies and it complements the Civil Protection Mechanism. Compared to the previous Hyogo Framework new elements include the prevention of disasters and how to address disaster risks in general. Under the Hyogo Framework much was achieved in terms of disaster response but not so much on addressing the underlying risks. The Sendai Framework now also makes reference to technological risks to which the Seveso community could contribute. Science will also play a greater role in future. The Sendai Framework includes 7 voluntary targets (e.g. reducing mortality, economic losses and damage to critical infrastructure, and to increase e.g. international cooperation).

### *2.3.5. Community of users on Disaster Risk and Crisis Management*

The Commission (HOME.B.4) presented its project to establish a Community of Users on Disaster Risk and Crisis Management. "Security" as well as "safety" covers a wide range of disciplines and actors. The different communities engaged in related research are not always sufficiently interlinked nor in contact. The Community of Users will in future allow that projects from different programmes are linked to the relevant actors

from the beginning to the end and to maximise synergies and cooperation between research programs. HOME is currently working on mapping the policies with the relevant Horizon 2020 projects to boost synergies and information exchange.

#### *2.3.6. CBRN-E and CIP*

The Commission (HOME.D.1) presented the recent developments in the area of CBRN-E action plan and Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP). A new European Agenda on Security was adopted in April 2015. Measures are primarily based around 3 pillars of better information exchange, increased cooperation and supporting actions (e.g. training, funding or research). The first CBRN action plan has technically expired but is continued to be applied. Focus areas are prevention of access to CBRN materials, detection of such materials and preparedness & response for incidents. For example a list of high-risk materials was established. A review of the action plan is ongoing which also includes the explosives action plan. The new plan is likely to focus on some key areas with EU added value. A new regulation on explosion precursors has been a major achievement which prevents the sale of particular chemicals to the general public.

On CIP the 6 pillars to implement the policy were explained. Some progress has been made in identifying critical infrastructures (2012: less than 20, 2014 almost 80) and awareness has increased. A new approach to CIP has been proposed which also circulates around prevention, preparedness and response.

### **3. GENERAL IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

#### **3.1. Seveso II implementation (15:30-15:40)**

The Commission thanked Member States for submitting most reports near to the deadline and invited LU, LV, FL and IS to submit their reports as soon as possible. The Commission informed the SEG that as usual the evaluation of the reports would be conducted by a consultant and that the outcome of the evaluation will provide further insight in any potential implementation support needs. It is expected that the call for tender will be launched in April 2016. The contractor will also be asked to conduct additional work on analysing data and trends compared to previous reports.

#### **3.2. Seveso III transposition & implementation**

##### *3.2.1. Status of transposition into national law (15:40-15:50)*

The Commission informed that it opened infringement procedures of the Seveso-III-Directive against following Member States: AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, LT, LU, LV, PL, RO, SI and UK due to the absence of a transposition notification or late or incomplete transposition. The Commission stressed that this is a serious shortcoming having significant impact on the functioning of the Directive and on legal certainty for operators and expressed its surprise that despite the exceptionally long transition period 19 Member still had not fully completed transposition.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> After the meeting some of the listed Member States have submitted transposing legislation, which is currently subject to a completeness check by the Commission.

### 3.2.2. *Update of the Q&A (15:50-16:05)*

The new version of the Q&A document has been reviewed to further improve coherence with Seveso-III and its layout. The document now also includes the new Q&A on alternative fuels as discussed during the last SEG. The Commission made the document available for comments in November 2015 and informed that a typo had been found in question 10c which would be corrected.

Several MS welcomed the document and its new structure but pointed out that there was an error in question 10c. Some MS also mentioned inconsistencies between some of the questions relating to the summation rule and how carcinogens are dealt with. One MS also proposed merging the document again with the document on FAQ or at least to include references. One MS asked to retain the original text in question 2 in addition to the newly proposed text because the text would contain useful background information. One MS asked for more time to assess the new draft.

→ The Commission invited MS to provide any further comments on the modified content by 29 February 2016 so that it can be published as soon as possible. Comments to other parts can be submitted anytime and will be looked into for the next version of the document. Question 10c would be corrected so that it resembles the text of the current version.

### 3.2.3. *Summation rule – named carcinogens (16:05-16:20)*

The United Kingdom sought guidance from the SEG on how to apply the summation rule with regard to the named carcinogens in entry 33 in Annex I. A background document had been prepared and circulated before the meeting. Member States found that carcinogens should be considered in the summation rule and that always the substance specific threshold should be used. This is in line with the Commission interpretation. A different position would require a legislative process. An observer also pointed out that industry in the UK was made aware that use of hydrazine may bring the establishment under Seveso some 10 years ago and as a consequence many sites switched to diluted hydrazine solutions to avoid falling under the Seveso Directive. There were no dissenting opinions and the Commission concluded that there was no need for further discussion on the issue.

### 3.2.4. *Cost of industrial accidents (United Kingdom) (16:20-16:35)*

The United Kingdom presented a study on "Estimating the costs of major accidents". The study was driven by the need to monetise the risk associated to particular sites to demonstrate that legal measures are proportionate. The work was based on information from 1900 major hazardous sites and looked into five cost components (injury & fatality, building damage, business disruption, evacuation, emergency response) but did at this stage not yet consider environmental damage, domino effects and image loss. The study found that overall the average cost per event depended on the specific site and event type ranging between 130 to 550 million Euro.

### 3.2.5. *Support tools for businesses potentially affected by the Directive (16:35-16:55)*

Denmark and France presented tools developed and used on national level which allow businesses to understand whether or not they are covered by the provisions of the

Seveso-III-Directive. Some Member States informed that they have developed similar tools. An exchange of experience with specific cases took place.

→ The Commission encouraged Member States to share such information so that it can be uploaded or linked in CIRCABC for the benefits of all stakeholders.

#### **4. ACTIVITIES OF MEMBER STATES AND OBSERVERS**

##### **4.1. Reports by Member States and observers on major accidents and developments**

###### *4.1.1. Buncefield – 10 years after*

At the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Buncefield incident the United Kingdom presented the lessons learned and progress made. Buncefield was not only critical in terms of impact but has also been one of the most complex investigations ever. It was a catalyst for change also on cooperation within authorities involved as well as with industry towards improving safety management. A short summary report was published. Improvements include the introduction of automatic overfill controls, a containment policy, or competence management systems. A lesson learnt is the need for strong leadership to promote safety culture.

###### *4.1.2. Reports by Member States and observers*

France reported on the incidents involving malicious acts at Seveso sites near Bouches-du-Rhone and Saint-Quentin-Fallavier. The investigations are still ongoing. A meeting between industry and government bodies took place resulting into a decision to inspect all Seveso sites by end 2015. Furthermore, it was found that more attention needed to be paid to understanding 'who does what' on Seveso sites. Also the information provided to the public about Seveso sites should be reviewed to identify information that should not be published. Finally a review of the legal provisions is ongoing. France also informed about its intention to launch a survey amongst Member States on how the balance between national security and transparency obligations towards the public is being achieved.

One Member State reported that it uses the upper-tier classification to identify what sites might pose a security risk. Another Member State stated that not all Seveso sites should be treated similar; instead, measures should be based on a vulnerability assessment. An observer pointed out that not disclosing information might hamper minimising risk as often deficiencies are identified by the public scrutiny.

###### *4.1.3. Accidents involving Explosives*

Italy reported about on three incidents in its fireworks industry leading to 15 fatalities and on its activities to enhance industrial safety in this sector. It was found that often there was a lack of staff training and awareness leading to inadequate safety measures.

Bulgaria provided an update on the investigations related to the explosion in Gorni Lom at the Ammo Plant Videx on 01<sup>st</sup> October 2014 and informed on the events in the VMZ facility during 2015. Preliminary results of the Gorni Lom event suggest that the accident was triggered by an apparent inability to perform the safe dismantling of the amount of mines required by the contract. A number of changes were implemented in the permitting regime as a result of the accident.



→ Member States were invited to assist Bulgaria with information on how such sites are handled.

## **5. INTERNATIONAL ISSUES**

### **5.1. TEIA convention**

The TEIA Secretariat informed that the discussions on an amendment of the Convention are ongoing. Also capacity building activities are ongoing in various countries including sub-regional capacity building on the new Annex I and a table-top and field exercise in the Danube Delta. Recent publications include safety guidelines for oil terminals and a checklist for contingency planning affecting transboundary waters. The next Conference of the Party will take place 28-30 November in Ljubljana and will include a seminar addressing the links with the Sustainable Development Goals and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. A workshop on land-use planning will take place on 14 April 2016.

The chair of the COP invited Member States to attend the next COP in Slovenia and contribute to actively engage into the shaping of the next work program to ensure that interest and needs of EU Member States would be reflected. She also invited Member States to contribute actively to the objectives of the Convention, either financially, by in-kind contributions or by nominating officers.

The chair of the Working Group on Implementation highlighted that the proposed change in the reporting cycle will facilitate providing support to beneficiary countries. Providing practical information on the implementation by established countries will assist less advanced countries. She also highlighted the importance of receiving a report from the European Union.

One Member State highlighted the importance of the implementation reports but pointed out the related workload which could be minimised by synchronising the UNECE and Seveso reporting cycles.

### **5.2. OECD Working Group on Chemical Accidents (11:20-11:40)**

The WGCA secretariat informed about ongoing activities which include projects on ageing of hazardous installations and concerning facilities with ownership change on which a report will be published soon. The WGCA will now start the development of the new workplan for 2017-2020.

Information was also provided on the Interagency Meeting which is an informal group that had been established to strengthen international cooperation, to improve the use of resources and avoid potential duplication of work across the agencies and to facilitate understanding and coordination of the programmes of each agency.

The Commission pointed out that the upcoming review of the legal acquis of the OECD and the development of the guiding principles on industrial accidents may require formal EU coordination at least to some degree. This is due to the fact that some elements may be legally binding or have legal implications when modified. However at this state the Commission has not yet completed its assessment and will keep MS informed.

## **6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **6.1. Pipeline safety**

The Commission informed that it was contacted by Denmark who is seeking for information and experiences on how other Member States have addressed the issue of safety of pipelines outside Seveso establishments. As there was no time to discuss the issue during the meeting, and noting that pipelines are not within the scope of the Seveso-III-Directive, the Commission announced that this consultation will be launched online.<sup>4</sup>

### **6.2. CIRCABC – an introduction**

Due to time constraints the issue was not addressed.

## **7. TOWARDS AN IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT STRATEGY**

The Commission presented the outcome of the small survey launched in September 2015 on needs of Member States for further implementation support. Issues related to land-use planning seemed to be most relevant but other topics followed not far behind.

In the debate several Member States confirmed the continued difficulties with issues related to land-use planning and highlighted their importance. In the past meaningful information exchange was hampered by the diversity of approaches on land-use planning throughout the EU. Difficulties may also still exist in Member States that have well established systems. Earlier attempts to identify similarities, to harmonise the different approaches and develop holistic guidance failed. Hence, instead of preparing guidance document Member States considered that establishing a working group or organising workshop may offer better approaches whilst acknowledging that the issue can only be addressed on a long-term basis. One Member State suggested a document on lessons learnt from the consequence assessment on safety distances. An observer reported frustrations in the industry about new housing developments near Seveso establishment and subsequent imposition of additional safety measures. Some establishments would go as far as purchasing surrounding land to prevent such developments. The TEIA Secretariat reminded that guidance on land-use planning is currently being developed.

→ The Commission highlighted the importance of continued information exchange and invited Member States to organise workshops on the issue.

Other needs raised by Member States included:

- Emerging new risks on Seveso sites such as increased flood risks due to climate change or induced earth quakes.
- Emergency planning and other preparedness measures and their relation to hazardous substances present at the sites, as well as the accident scenarios.
- Continued work of the SEG towards a harmonised interpretations and implementation of the Seveso-III-Directive, e.g. discussions on definitions such as on 'presence of

---

<sup>4</sup> After the meeting Denmark informed the Commission that the issue was resolved and that an online consultation would no longer be required.

substance', 'intermediate storage' (including its borders to transport law', and 'significant change'. Classification of waste also remains an issue.

- The need to have a sufficient number of SEG meetings which should allow sufficient time for exchange and discussions, in particular as many Member States are now entering into the main phase of Seveso-III implementation. One Member State also called for occasional meeting sessions without the presence of observers.

The Commission also recalled issues already raised earlier in the meeting such as security related issues (incl. cyber-crime, protection from attacks, public information) and self-classification. Member States and observers were invited to communicate additional suggestions after the meeting.

## **8. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

The meeting was closed at 16:30h.

## 9. ANNEX: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### 9.1. European Commission

DG ENV.C.4
DG ECHO.A.3
DG ECHO.A.5
DG GROW.D.2
DG HOME.B.4
DG HOME.D.1
DG JRC.G.5

### 9.2. Member States

<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Austria	Federal Ministry for Economics, Family and Youth
Austria	Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Environment and Water
Austria	Styrian Government Authority
Belgium	Federal Public Service - Employment, Labour and Social Dialogue
Belgium	Federal Public Service Interior - Crisis Centre - Emergency Planning
Belgium	Flemish Authorities – Environment, Nature and Energy Department
Belgium	Public Service of Wallonia
Bulgaria	Ministry of the Environment and Water
Cyprus	Labour Inspection Department
Croatia	Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection
Czech Republic	Ministry of the Environment
Czech Republic	Technical University of Ostrava
Denmark	Danish Environment Protection Agency
Denmark	Danish Emergency Management Agency
Estonia	Estonian Rescue Board
Estonia	Technical Regulatory Authority
Finland	Finnish Safety and Chemicals Agency
Finland	Ministry of the Interior
France	Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development
France	Ministry of the Interior

<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Germany	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Germany	Federal Environmental Agency
Germany	Authority for Nature, Environment and Consumer Protection of North Rhine Westphalia
Greece	- (not present)
Hungary	Ministry of Interior
Ireland	Health and Safety Authority
Italy	Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea
Italy	National Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
Latvia	- (not present)
Lithuania	Ministry of the Interior
Luxembourg	Inspectorate for Work and Mining
Malta	Occupational Health and Safety Authority
Netherlands	Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment
Netherlands	Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment
Poland	Chief Inspectorate for Environmental Protection
Portugal	National Authority for Civil Protection
Portugal	Portuguese Environment Agency
Romania	- (not present)
Slovakia	Ministry of Environment
Slovenia	Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
Spain	Ministry of Interior
Sweden	Civil Contingencies Agency
United Kingdom	Health & Safety Executive
United Kingdom	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency

### **9.3. Observers**

#### *9.3.1. Non-EU countries*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Norway	Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning
Turkey	Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation
Turkey	Ministry for European Union Affairs

9.3.2. *Institutions and organisations*

CEFIC	European Chemical Industry Council
EEB	European Environment Bureau
EPSC	European Process Security Centre
FECC	European Association of Chemical Distributors
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe