

V.1. Contingency Planning

REMPEC/MOIG Assessment																																							
<table border="1"> <caption>Bar Chart Data: NCP Status</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCP adopted</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Relevant national legislation adopting the plan</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Authority in charge of the plan maintenance</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Authority in charge of implementing the plan</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	NCP adopted	62%	Relevant national legislation adopting the plan	58%	Authority in charge of the plan maintenance	68%	Authority in charge of implementing the plan	53%	<table border="1"> <caption>Bar Chart Data: NCP Status</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCP adopted</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NCP drafted/under preparation</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No NCP</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contingency plan tested</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Percentage	NCP adopted	62%	NCP drafted/under preparation	25%	No NCP	13%	Contingency plan tested	58%	<p>Legend: ■ NCP adopted ■ NCP drafted/under preparation ■ NCP not adopted ● REMPEC Assistance</p>	<table border="1"> <caption>Bar Chart Data: Sites at Risk</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>% against total number of sites at risk in the need</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Emergency contact</td> <td>90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Contingency Plan</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Equipment Test 1</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Equipment Test 2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Mutual aid agreement</td> <td>90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Trained personnel</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Exercise</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	% against total number of sites at risk in the need	1. Emergency contact	90%	2. Contingency Plan	100%	3. Equipment Test 1	50%	4. Equipment Test 2	50%	5. Mutual aid agreement	90%	6. Trained personnel	50%	7. Exercise	50%
Category	Percentage																																						
NCP adopted	62%																																						
Relevant national legislation adopting the plan	58%																																						
Authority in charge of the plan maintenance	68%																																						
Authority in charge of implementing the plan	53%																																						
Category	Percentage																																						
NCP adopted	62%																																						
NCP drafted/under preparation	25%																																						
No NCP	13%																																						
Contingency plan tested	58%																																						
Category	% against total number of sites at risk in the need																																						
1. Emergency contact	90%																																						
2. Contingency Plan	100%																																						
3. Equipment Test 1	50%																																						
4. Equipment Test 2	50%																																						
5. Mutual aid agreement	90%																																						
6. Trained personnel	50%																																						
7. Exercise	50%																																						
<p>When National Contingency Plans (NCP) are adopted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation adopting the plan are known and communicated • Authorities in charge of the plan maintenance and its implementation are identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A majority of Mediterranean Coastal States have a NCP adopted • Plans adopted are regularly tested • Possible improvement in few countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in three (3) countries were no NCP exists: Amongst these countries, REMPEC already proposed its support to Libya and Lebanon • Five (5) countries with a plan drafted or under preparation: In this connection, REMPEC has supported or planned to assist Albania, Malta and Montenegro. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of contingency planning development in sites analysed • Emergency number in place • Need to promote contingency planning development outside MOIG members 																																					
<p>Group Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most countries have a plan in place but its update is a challenge • Countries express the need of more details in the plan • National Contingency Plan are discussed with the industry • Local plans are approved at local level • Government and Industry need to work more together • Industry should be familiar with the national regulation • Lack of clarity and understanding of EMSA's role for non EU Member States 	<p>National Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In most cases, where national plans exist, industry plans are integrated • There is an obligation for industry plans to be approved • Process for updating plans needs to be better defined and improved • Operational implementation of plan lacks legal basis and/or vice versa • Need to improve involvement of stakeholders (e.g. customs, immigration, etc.) <p>Lack of communication between the Ministry regulating the industry activities and the national competent authority</p>																																						