Appendix B
Member State summary sheets

Member State summary sheets have been prepared for each Member State and based on the information reported for the 2012-2014 reporting period. The summary sheets present some of the key features of the implementation of the Seveso II for the reporting period. For more details, the complete reports from Member States are available on CircaBC¹.

1. Member State summary sheet – Austria

AUSTRIA

Overview of Austria

Austria provided a complete response.

**Status of overall implementation:**

The Austrian response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**

A large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually.

**Number of establishments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

**Question 1 - General information**

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

None were reported by Austria.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 148 Seveso establishments in Austria at the end of 2014, down from 158 in 2011. This is due to a decreasing number of upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Austria exhibits fewer establishments per capita and fewer establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

The activities with the highest number of establishments at the end of the reporting period in Austria were

- "other activities" (10%);
- fuel storage (9%);
- LNG production, bottling and bulk distribution (7%); and
- LPG storage (7%).

“Other activities” and fuel storage are the two most common activity amongst EU Seveso establishments (14% and 12% of all establishments respectively). LNG production, bottling and bulk distribution; and LPG storage represent 8% and 4% of all EU establishments respectively.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

Austria has not answered this optional question.
AUSTRIA

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 3 upper-tier establishments the Austrian authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not needed as permitted by Article 11.6 of the Seveso II Directive, however the specific reason was not specified in the Austrian response. This corresponds to 4% of upper-tier establishments, the same percentage as across the whole EU-28. For all upper-tier establishments for which external emergency plans are required, these have been drawn up by the designated Authorities in Austria.

Note: Total 72 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 10 upper-tier establishments' external emergency plans had not been tested (14% of the upper-tier establishments in Austria), mostly due to pending revisions of the plans.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- There is a federal siren alarm system with consistent signals for the whole country. The public is kept informed about these alarm signals. Furthermore local sirens at the establishment may be used;
- Those liable to be affected by a Seveso accident are contacted individually by the operator which provides information according to the specific hazards; and
- Information is provided by radio information initiated by the alarm chain or in local newspapers or similar means.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Tests are carried out according to the specific local situation and cover in most cases certain parts of the structure. Local governmental bodies (community and region) are responsible for external emergency plans so there is a widespread variation of practices. National guidance published in 2008 serves as checklist for evaluation and defines minimum criteria, in addition to expert judgement afterwards. Emergency plans are tested using:
- On-the-spot exercises to test the technical or organisational measures;
- Staff communication exercises; and
- Emergency response services assume own scenarios for their purposes.
AUSTRIA

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Austria the operator is responsible for informing the public. The usual strategy is to offer basic information on-site with access for the public, supplemented by other means such as “open days” and nomination of responsible persons to give more information if requested. In most cases web-based information is also provided. In 58 upper-tier establishments (over 80% of total number of upper-tier establishments in Austria) information has been made actively available to the public at least once during the reporting period (2010-2014). The following shows a statistical breakdown of the means that have been used:

- Mailed leaflets or similar: 50%;
- Placard at the entrance of the site: 75%;
- Web-based information: 40%;
- Combination with emergency response tests: 20%;
- Local newspaper: 20%; and
- “Open Day”: 10%.

Note that usually the information is provided in more than one way. Therefore the sum of percentages of the various means is more than 100%.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Not answered.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
In Austria a generic table for defining the inspection intervals was in use during the reporting period (2010-2014).

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
The instruments comprise administrative fines (financial penalties) and in severe cases prohibition of activities. However, so far the degree of non-compliance has mostly not been significant enough to make use of these instruments.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
47 upper-tier establishments (65% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) were inspected annually. Another 17 (24%) were inspected at least during the last reporting period, but the remaining upper-tier establishments weren’t inspected at all during 2012-2014. In addition to this, 65 lower-tier establishments were inspected (86% of the total number of lower-tier establishments).

Question 5 – Domino effects
There were six groups of establishments exhibiting risks of domino effects during the reporting period (2012-2014) in Austria. In all of these cases the establishments within the group had previously been one establishment that was subsequently split into different establishments with different owners. The respective requirements on domino effects were therefore reportedly well-established and included in the relevant documents (safety reports etc.) and taken into account in emergency response tests and provision of information to the public.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

The Communities are the Authorities responsible for Land-Use planning in Austria. They are provided with the locations of Seveso establishments by their Permitting Authorities and additional relevant information from the operators as required by regional building legislation.

There are slight differences amongst the various regional provisions but in general any proposed planning in the vicinity of a Seveso site is subject to a consultation process. Based on an assessment of substance properties of concern, the amount present and the threshold quantity of the Seveso II Directive, a consultation distance is defined in the planning documents and the local building plan concept. In complicated cases, a case-by-case study is carried out, based on a table of agreed scenarios. The decision as to what is allowed within the distance depends on specific criteria, respecting the principles of Article 12 of the Seveso II Directive. Certain forms of development are allowed and thus there is no zone without any allowed use at all.

Experiences so far showed that the relevance of Article 12 was sometimes misinterpreted by local authorities and by the public in the vicinity. No further details on the nature of this misinterpretation was provided in Austria’s response, but it was indicated that nevertheless the general direction of reducing the residual risk around major accident sites is respected.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso-like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No information was provided.
2. Member State summary sheet – Belgium

Belgium provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:

- The Belgian response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:

None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

None were reported by Belgium.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 383 Seveso establishments in Belgium at the end of 2014, just two more than in 2011. During this interval, the number of lower-tier establishments has decreased, while the number of upper-tier establishments has increased.

As shown in the chart to the right, Belgium exhibits more establishments per capita and especially much more establishments per km² than the EU average. Hence, there is a particularly high density of Seveso establishments in Belgium.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

The activities with the highest number of establishments at the end of the reporting period in Belgium were:

- general chemicals (3%);
- wholesale and retail (23%); and
- “other activities” (20%).

While these activities are also common throughout the EU-28, they account for much smaller shares of the total number of total EU establishments (12%, 9% and 14%, respectively), than in Belgium.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

Belgium has not answered this optional question.
BELGIUM

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
The Belgian authorities decided that the requirement to produce an external emergency plan applied to all upper-tier establishments. However, for 18 establishments, no plan had been drawn up by the end of the reporting period (31/12/2014). This corresponds to 9% of upper-tier establishments, compared to 11% across the whole EU-28.

In Belgium, the information required for the emergency plan has to be submitted, with the safety report, by the operator. The external emergency plan is not produced until after the safety report has been assessed.

For 14 of the 18 establishments without an external emergency plan, the information had already been received from the operators, but the external emergency plans had not been finalised. For the other 4 establishments, the assessment of the safety report had not been finalised or not all necessary information had been submitted as of 31/12/2014.

Note: Total 204 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, external emergency plans had been tested for all but one upper-tier establishment during the previous three years. This corresponds to less than 1% of emergency plans not tested, compared to 27% on average in all Member States.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- There is a network of electric sirens managed by the federal authority and made available to local authorities;
- Information can be provided via the following means: police, fire or civil protection vehicles with loudspeakers, radio, television, websites and social media, call centres, telephone, teletext; and
- Currently, the system “BE ALERT” is being tested. It has been developed by the federal authority to directly warn and better inform the population affected in cases of emergency. It allow the authority responsible for crisis management to send alarm messages via multiple channels, such as voice messages to phones, SMS, e-mails, fax, twitter and facebook. Launch of the system was scheduled for the end of 2015 (http://be-alert.be/).

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Provincial authorities are responsible for testing external emergency plans in Belgium. The extent of tests can range from only key crisis management staff to all the emergency services and their resources in the field. Furthermore, there are tests on a strategic level, for instance regarding alert sirens and multidisciplinary alert systems, as well as partial tests (“minimex”) focusing on a specific component of the external emergency plans.

Tests are assessed by the security unit and their frequency is specified in the external emergency plans, unless it is subject to specific legislation in some cases. A multidisciplinary working group has laid down the general rules for the tests in a manual, which includes assessment lists, specifications of stakeholders’ roles and a typology of tests.

In summary, the types of tests used are:
- Table top exercises;
- Command post exercises ; and
- Field training exercises.
### Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
A comprehensive information campaign under the responsibility of the interior ministry was launched in Belgium in 2012. The campaign has covered all upper-tier establishments and included multiple means of communication. While due to the nature of the holistic campaign, a breakdown of which means has been used for how many establishments is not possible, detailed figures on how many people have been reached by the different means is available:

- National TV spots and documentaries: 68% of the population reached;
- Print media: 12 daily newspapers, 29% of the population reached;
- Leaflets: 400,000 distributed, 8% of the population reached;
- Website Seveso.be (in 4 languages): 33,142 visitors in the first two months online;
- Educational game “Seveso The Game: Be The Ultimate Survivor”: no figures on reach available;
- Information in schools: no figures on reach available;
- Local information sessions and leaflets: no figures on reach available.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
No information was provided.

### Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
In Belgium, all establishments (lower and upper-tier) are classified in one of three danger categories based on the “Rapid Ranking Technique” developed by TNO on the basis of the Dow Fire and Explosion Index. Two indicators (“fire and explosion” and “toxicity”) are calculated from the substances’ flammability, toxicity, reactivity and conditions of use (pressure, temperature, chemical reaction, etc.). Based on the indicators, equipment is assigned a danger category. Frequency of inspections ranging from yearly to once every three years is then assigned to each establishment based on the highest danger category of any of its equipment.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
The inspection teams are authorised to issue verbal and written suggestions, warnings and orders in case of potential violations. In case such warnings etc. are not followed by corrective measures, or in cases of gross shortfalls, more severe actions can be taken. In 2012-2014, in 13 cases orders of corrective actions were issued and in 4 cases legal proceedings were opened, all of which were due to non-compliance (i.e. not due to accidents).

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
137 upper-tier establishments (67% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) were inspected annually. Note that Belgium applies systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) and as such it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually. The remaining upper-tier establishments were inspected at least during the last reporting period. In addition to this, 179 lower-tier establishments were inspected (86% of the total number of lower-tier establishments).
Question 5 – Domino effects

Domino effects between establishments are systematically analysed semi-quantitatively in the safety reports (upper-tier) and in the framework of permit requests (upper and lower-tier). The main effects analysed include heat radiation and excess pressure. In case domino effects appear possible according to the semi-quantitative analysis, the need for additional safety measures and daily information exchange are assessed.

Question 6 – Land-use planning

New establishments and changes to existing establishments are regulated through the environmental permitting procedure. The Flemish spatial planning and environmental regulation specifies that external security has to be assessed for every spatial implementation that includes industrial land on which new Seveso establishments can be created or that is in the vicinity of existing establishments. Permitting procedures follow advice from the coordinating public services and consider information from safety reports. In Wallonia, and Brussels, zones vulnerable to risks are defined around Seveso establishments. All permit procedures in such zones must be advised by the Risk and Major Accident Unit in Wallonia and the Bruxelles Environment (IBGE) in Brussels. These take into account the risk posed by the Seveso installation and the consequences of any development of that risk. Risks from Seveso establishments are then included in the respective decisions regarding the spatial developments to limit consequences of any potential major accidents.

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No information was provided.
3. Member State summary sheet – Bulgaria

BULGARIA

Overview of Bulgaria

Bulgaria provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:

The Bulgarian response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:

None

Number of establishments:

![Number of establishments chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1. Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
Some significant changes regarding the responsible authorities have taken place according to the Bulgarian Environmental Protection Act (hereinafter “EPA”) in 2013. An overview of competent authorities and their tasks in Bulgaria is provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Key tasks and responsibilities related to Seveso as of 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Water</td>
<td>• in charge of the coordinated implementation and enforcement of Directive 2012/18/EC [“Seveso III”] at national level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• designated as a central body of the state administration in the area of major accidents prevention;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates safety reports for permitting of upper-tier establishments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the final reports on the occurrence and consequences of major accidents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the results of inspections;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• transboundary effects of industrial accidents; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• domino effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
<td>• internal emergency plans, safety measures on explosives, ammunitions and pyrotechnics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• emergency planning at national level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the documentation for permitting of upper-tier establishments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• keeps records of written notifications and final reports on occurrences and consequences of major accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Agency “General Labour Inspectorate” under the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs</td>
<td>• safety at work aspects; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the documentation of the operators submitted for permitting of upper-tier establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Inspection of Environment and Water (RIEW)</td>
<td>• environmental aspects, in charge of the coordinated enforcement, incl. preparation of inspection plans and reports, interlinkages with environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment procedures, and land-use planning requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the documentation submitted for permitting of upper-tier establishments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the major accident prevention policy reports of lower-tier establishments; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• organises, coordinates, participates in and reports on inspections of all Seveso establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>• preparation and testing of the external emergency plans; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluates the documentation submitted for permitting of upper-tier establishments and takes part in inspections of all establishments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BULGARIA

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 195 Seveso establishments in Bulgaria at the end of 2014, up from 164 in 2011.
As shown in the chart to the right, there are more establishments per capita but fewer establishments per km² in Bulgaria compared to the EU average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishments per 10m inhabitants</th>
<th>Establishments per 10,000 km²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The activities with the highest number of establishments at the end of the reporting period in Bulgaria were
- fuel storage (24%);
- production, destruction and storage of explosives (16%); and
- LPG storage (14%).
These activities are also common among the EU average, but they account for much smaller shares of the total number of total EU establishments. Fuel storage is the third most common activity amongst the EU Seveso establishments (11% of all establishments), destruction and storage of explosives and LPG storage represent 4% of EU establishments each.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
19 upper-tier and 19 lower-tier establishments are covered by (or consist of installations covered by) Directive 2010/75/EU (IED), accounting for 22% of all upper-tier and 17% of all lower-tier establishments. For these establishments, the competent authority sets conditions for safety measures and emergency planning in the IED (or formerly IPPC) permit.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
The Bulgarian authorities decided that the requirement to produce an external emergency plan applied to all upper-tier establishments and during the reporting period emergency plans have been produced for all upper-tier establishments.

Note: Total 86 upper-tier establishments
BULGARIA

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
No deviations from the testing requirements have been reported by the local authorities.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Operators are obliged to build and maintain local alert systems for warning the population in the potentially endangered settlements and to integrate them with the National Early Warning System. No further information on the nature of the alert system was provided by the response; and
- Letters to the mayor with information on the planned safety measures and actions in case of emergency and to the neighbouring establishment(s) on the level of the expected effects/damages in case of major accident, as well as brochures, leaflets and information on the website of enterprises.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
The types of tests used in Bulgaria are:
- full test (participation of establishment employees, rescue forces, state and local administration and general public);
- part test (establishment employees, rescue forces and part of the state and local administration);
- desk top exercises (only few staff from the Seveso site and the emergency services participate); and
- planning discussions and exercises may also be sufficient.

Criteria according to which the external emergency plan is considered appropriate and according to which option is selected for testing are: real accidents occurred in enterprises in past years; permits issued to establishments to perform production activities; reported errors in real simulation of the plan with the participation of emergency workers in the enterprise; and adjustments made in the inspections carried out by interagency committees in the enterprise. If necessary, the emergency plans need to be updated according to findings from the tests.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Bulgaria, the operators are responsible for informing the public and have actively done so for all upper-tier establishments at least once during the reporting period.

Information on the safety measures planned and on the requisite behaviour in the event of an accident has to be submitted by the operators to all sites that serve public purposes (hospitals, schools, kindergartens, hospices, etc.; it has not been further specified in the response by which means) and via one or more of the following channels: mail, placards/bulletins, operator’s website, mass media. The following shows a statistical breakdown of the means that have been used:

- Website of the establishment: 75%;
- Official letters: 10 %;
- Leaflets 10%; and
- Flyers 5%.

The quality and accuracy of the information as well as its submission are controlled during the inspections.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
All upper-tier establishments are required to keep permanently available up to date information on recommended safety measures and behaviour in case of emergency. This has to be provided through copies in paper or electronically and publication of information on the website of the company and/or the operator. The place on the premises where this information is available has to be publicly announced. Compliance with these specifications is controlled during inspections.
**BULGARIA**

**Question 4 – Inspections**

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards  
Regional Inspectorates for Environment and Water are responsible for the planning, preparation, execution and reporting of inspections. By the end of each calendar year an inspection plan for each of the districts is prepared and endorsed by the Minister of Environment and Water. Risk assessment is performed for each establishment during preparation of the inspection plan and programmes based on the following criteria: Activities carried out; quantity and type of hazardous chemicals; the level of risk due to the processes’ complexity; detection systems in terms of prevention of accidents and/or incidents; and location.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)  
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance  
Proportionate to the risk from the site, formal orders can be issued to prohibit the use of any site in order to prevent or stop emergency situations, hazards for the environment or human health and breaches of the legislation. These orders can be appealed in court, but the appeal does not stop their implementation. In case of non-compliances detected during inspections, all inspectors issue compliance notices which include the actions to be undertaken in order to achieve compliance. In case of non-compliance with the notices or violations to other provisions of the Seveso legislation, fines of up to €10,000 can be imposed. If an operator is running a Seveso site without a permit the penalty can be fines up to €50,000 or criminal prosecution. During the reporting period, fines between €5,000 and €15,000 have been imposed on a small number of establishments (at least 4).

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections  
All upper-tier establishments were subject to on-site inspections every twelve months and lower-tier at least once during the reporting period in Bulgaria.

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

For the operators of upper tier establishments, the competent authority sets permit conditions related to potential domino effects, for example - the operator is obliged to exchange information about the nature and extent of the danger of an accident with subsequent “domino effect” for emergency planning and evacuation routes with sites located in close proximity to the establishment. The establishments or groups of establishments where domino effects could occur are identified by the Ministry of Environment on the basis of risk assessment data submitted by the operators of all Seveso establishments, especially on the calculations/predictions for the aerial distribution of the expected negative consequences, particularly explosions and fires (overpressure, missile and thermal radiation effects).

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

The Bulgarian Law on Spatial Planning stipulates that the Minister of Environment and Water is asked for consent when development projects are evaluated by the competent authorities. For developments around existing sites, land development plans are developed as measures to prevent major accidents and limit their consequences for human health and the environment.
### BULGARIA

#### Question 7 – Further information (optional)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.a)</strong> Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</td>
<td>No information was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.b)</strong> IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing</td>
<td>No information was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.c)</strong> Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)</td>
<td>No information was provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Member State summary sheet - Croatia

CROATIA

Overview of Croatia

Croatia’s response was almost complete but unclear with regards to a number of key issues, which are summarised under compliance issues below.

Status of overall implementation:

The response submitted by Croatia indicates that while most of the provisions of the Directive have been implemented, there are deficits regarding key provisions of the Directive.

Key compliance issues identified:

The number of upper-tier establishments without an external emergency plan is unclear. It is also unclear how these plans are tested.

A large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually.

It is not entirely clear how compliance with the specifications regarding domino effects is ensured.

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

Croatia became a member of the EU during the reporting period (1st July 2013). As a result, it is the first implementation report submitted by Croatia. The country has provided a detailed overview of the Competent Authorities responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Directive and their tasks.

This indicates that the following Croatian competent authorities:

- Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection (MENP);
- National Protection and Rescue Directorate (NPRD); and
- Croatian Agency for the Environment and Nature (CAEN); formerly: Croatian Environmental Agency (CEA).

Furthermore there are cooperating institutions: The Ministry of Construction and Physical Planning (MGPU) and the local governments and regional government.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

The number of establishments covered by the Seveso II Directive in Croatia on 31 December 2014 was 57. As Croatia joined the EU only in 2013, no comparison to numbers from previous reporting periods can be made.

As shown in the chart to the right, Croatia exhibits a low density of establishments with fewer establishments per capita and much fewer establishments per km² than the EU average.
CROATIA

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
No statistical breakdown using the SPIRS categories was available

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Croatia reported that 19 establishments were also covered by the IED. The Competent Authorities responsible for both Directives have agreements for conducting coordinated inspections.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
Croatia reported that all upper-tier establishments are obliged to have an external emergency plan. The number of them that had not drafted such a plan at the end of the reporting period is unclear, as Croatia has only reported the number of “self-Government divisions” (6) for which external emergency plans had not been drafted.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
Croatia stated that the majority of external emergency plans were drafted during 2014. Croatia does not have data on the plans that have been tested yet.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Internal operator warning systems, public warning system (not described);
- Information broadcasted in the media about measures to take in case of a major accident; and
- General measures in case of a major industrial accident are available online2.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Croatia has indicated external emergency plans have to be tested at least once every three years. Also, Croatia stated that external emergency plans are tested alongside the potential participants (emergency services) in the case of a major accident. However, the methods for testing and determining whether a plan is adequate have not been stated.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
The safety reports of all Seveso establishments of Croatia are available on the website of the Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection3. The Croatian EA publishes the location of all establishments online alongside other relevant information. There are quarterly and annual reports that are also available to the public (though it is unclear how). Upper-tier establishments are also obliged to provide the public potentially affected by a major accident in their establishment with a copy of the external emergency plan. These potentially affected persons can participate in the approval of these plans through public consultation. Operators are also obliged to publish relevant information on their websites. Croatian Authorities ensure that this information is provided as part of their inspections of Seveso establishments.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Information on all establishments (upper and lower tier) is kept up to date and permanently available through a website that the competent authorities are in charge of maintaining. Also, operators have to publish relevant information on their websites, along with keeping the information provided to the Competent Authorities up to date.

---

2 http://www.duzs.hr/news.aspx?newsID=14637&pageID=134
3 http://www.mzoip.hr/hr/okolis/rizicna-postrojenja.html
CROATIA

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The inspection system in Croatia is not based on a systematic appraisal. Croatia reported that the criteria for establishing inspection priorities were under development in 2015.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
The results of the inspections for individual operators are published quarterly on the MENP website. An annual report is also published in the same website.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Croatia reported taking measures in relation to non-compliance of 6 lower-tier establishments and 13 upper-tier establishments. Croatia did not specify which measures were taken, but provided the range of measures that may be imposed in general, namely: order to cease the operation of the installation of part of it, cease of the activities, cease a specific manufacturing process, cease handling dangerous substances, order to take preventive and remedial measures, draft a safety report as obliged by the law.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
10 upper-tier establishments (40% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) were inspected annually. All upper-tier establishments were inspected at least in the last reporting period and 28 lower-tier establishments were subject to on-site inspections in the last three years (88%).

Question 5 – Domino effects

Establishments relevant for consideration of domino effects are designated by the competent authority. These establishments are informed of this and of the requirements they have to comply with as part of a Domino Group. No further information as to how this is achieved has been provided by the Croatian response.

Question 6 – Land-use planning

Competent Authorities draft and approve spatial planning documents with special conditions in the process of issuing site permits in accordance with threat assessments and protection and rescue plans. Local and regional (regional) governments in a special excerpt from the assessment, entitled "protection and rescue requirements in spatial planning documents", identify and prescribe preventive measures the implementation which will mitigate the consequences and effects of the natural and anthropogenic disasters and major accidents at critical infrastructure and increase the level of safety of the population, material goods and the environment. This excerpt forms an integral part of spatial planning documents of local and regional self-government units, as required by the Rules on the methodology for the preparation of threat assessments and protection and rescue plans.
CROATIA

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

**7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents**
Croatia reported that the legislation requires operators reporting a major accident to provide a list of “lessons learned”. This is used by operators and Competent Authorities to improve major accident prevention and mitigation measures.

**7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing**
The Croatian Environment Agency has a reporting tool that is used by operators. The data obtained is fed into the annual reports on Seveso establishments published in the country and the information reported to e-MARS and e-SPIRS.

**7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)**
Croatia has not replied to this optional question.
5. Member State summary sheet – Cyprus

CYPRUS

Overview of Cyprus

Cyprus provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:
The Cypriot response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Cyprus.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 22 Seveso establishments in Cyprus at the end of 2014, a significant increase compared to 2011 (16).

As shown in the chart to the right, Cyprus exhibits more establishments per capita but fewer establishments per km\(^2\) than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
There are 6 fuel storage and LPG storage establishments each in Cyprus. Together these establishments account for more than half of the establishments in Cyprus. These activities are also common among the EU average with fuel storage being the third most common activity amongst the EU Seveso establishments (11% of all establishments) and LPG storage representing 4% of EU establishments.

Further activities in Cypriot Seveso establishments are:
- mining, power generation (3 establishments each);
- production, destruction and storage of explosives (2 establishments) as well as; and
- industrial chemicals and wholesale and retail (1 establishment each).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
2 lower-tier establishments and 2 upper-tier establishments in Cyprus are also covered by Directive 2010/75/EU (IED). There is no significant impact on the way Seveso is applied by the competent authorities for the establishments concerned.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
The Cypriot authorities decided that the requirement to produce an external emergency plan applied to all upper-tier establishments and during the reporting period Cyprus’ Civil Defence has drawn up emergency plans for all the upper-tier establishments, following the instructions of the Department of Labour Inspection.

Note: Total 13 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
Cyprus Civil Defence tested all the external emergency plans through an exercise during the reporting period.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Specific information is transmitted by a local radio station in case of emergency. Small radios have been distributed to the public for free; and
- In the context of a national information campaign, leaflets were distributed.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
- Table top exercises (main test method); and
- Full scale exercises including Seveso establishments and all the services involved.

Before every exercise, independent observers/ evaluators are identified to assess the exercise and its outcomes. Upon the completion of the exercise an evaluation meeting is organised, coordinated by the observers/ evaluators. The outcomes of this meeting are recorded in order to help the competent authorities take any corrective measures.
Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Cyprus, operators of each upper-tier establishment are obliged to supply (e.g. by hand, by mail, by e-mail) the necessary information. The safety report of each upper-tier establishment is available to the public at the offices of the Department of Labour Inspection or at the offices of each upper-tier establishment. Compliance with these specifications is monitored in the inspections of the establishments and the Department of Labour Inspection actively participates in the information campaigns.

In 9 of 13 upper-tier establishments information has been made actively available to the public at least once during the reporting period (2010-2014). The remaining establishments are in the process of informing the public and persons liable to be affected by a Seveso accident, or have recently been classified as upper-tier establishment (and hence this action is pending). The means used to inform the public are listed below:

- Door-to-door distribution of operators’ leaflets as well as radios, torches, tape etc. to the citizens liable to be affected by a Seveso accident: 100%.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Not answered.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
All establishments are inspected at least once a year by the inspectors of the Department of Labour Inspection. Besides planned inspections, site visits may be initiated for a number of purposes, for example investigation of accidents or complaints, thematic inspections, formal assessment of safety reports, interim assessment of performance and so on.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Improvement notices, prohibition notices and prosecutions can be issued or initiated in case of violations. However, no such cases were identified during the reporting period except for minor breaches, for which about 50 letters have been sent to operators across all Seveso establishments. No further information with regards to why such a large number of letters (considering there are 22 establishments) has been sent was provided by the response.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All establishments are inspected at least once a year in Cyprus, both upper and lower tier.

Question 5 – Domino effects
### CYPRUS

In Cyprus, establishments are considered part of a domino group either if they share a common boundary, or if a buffer zone subject to potential impact from thermal, overpressure or toxic effects of one establishment overlaps with the physical boundaries of others. Affected establishments are obliged to exchange relevant information in writing and review or take measures to limit the consequences for their site. Compliance is checked by the authorities through inspections and review of safety reports (upper-tier establishments) or major accident prevention policy (lower-tier establishments).

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

The Cypriot Town and Country Planning Law ensures prevention of major accidents and limitation of their consequences during the preparation or amendment of development plans and for the examination of planning applications. Development plans need to consider risks from major accidents as well as appropriate distances between existing establishments and other establishments, residential areas, buildings, other areas of public use and major transport routes, recreational areas and areas of particular natural sensitivity or interest. Planning applications for new developments around existing establishments implement strict conditions regarding distances between establishments and other developments, and have to undergo a consultation procedure with the Department of Labour Inspection and other responsible governmental departments. As a result there have been cases during the reporting period in which applications were rejected or subjected to strict conditions. New establishments and modifications to existing establishments additionally require a technical report on the risk from the establishment and public notification of the application. New establishments will be sited in areas designated for industrial development which are separated into categories and sub-areas able to accommodate such developments.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents  
No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing  
No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)  
No information was provided.
CZECH REPUBLIC

Overview of Czech Republic

Czech Republic provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:
The Czech Republic response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
According to the response, external emergency plans of a large number of upper-tier establishments have not been tested every three years as required by Article 11.4 of the Directive.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by the Czech Republic.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
207 Seveso establishments were reported for the Czech Republic at the end of 2014, up from 197 in 2011. This is mostly due to a decreasing number of lower-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Czech Republic exhibits fewer establishments per capita and just slightly more establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The dominant activities of Seveso establishments in the Czech Republic are:
- general chemicals manufacture (17% of all establishments);
- production, destruction and storage of explosives (12% of all establishments); and
- fuel storage (12% of all establishments).

General chemicals manufacture and fuel storage are also among the most common activities across all of the EU representing 12% and 11% of EU establishments, respectively. Production, destruction and storage of explosives is less common making up 4% of EU establishments.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
No information was provided for this optional question.
CZECH REPUBLIC

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
The Czech authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not required for 23 upper-tier establishments in view of the information contained in the safety report. No further information on the specific reasons why such a relatively high number of establishments had been excluded from this requirement was provided by the response. For an additional 2 upper-tier establishments external emergency plans have not been produced during the reporting period, even though these establishments had not been excluded from the requirement to produce an external emergency plan.

Note: Total 117 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
According to the Czech response, external emergency plans of 65 upper-tier establishments (56% of all upper-tier establishments) have not been tested every three years as required by Article 11.4 of the Directive.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Links with the mass media such as texts or recordings containing information to be provided by television and radio in the event of an emergency; and
- All of these measures are specified in each emergency plan, alongside further information such as ways to verify whether emergency information has been received, alternative means of informing the public, the distribution of responsibilities for communicating, as well as organisational and material support.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Types of tests used in Czech Republic are:
- Field exercises, in which all rescue services work together; and
- Desktop exercises and exercises at the site of the accident.

The results of the exercises are used to improve the external emergency plans. This is based on the criteria of the completeness, timeliness, accuracy and practical utility of the plans. The criteria used for carrying out tests on external emergency plans include mainly connectivity testing with regard to alarms and the availability of the measures included in the plan; the systems and methods of alerting and informing the public; and the cooperation among institutions in case of an accident.
CZECH REPUBLIC

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In the Czech Republic, the regional authority is required to prepare and provide information on the risk of occurrence of a major accident to the public situated in the emergency planning zone. Subject to negotiations, the operator is involved in the information process. Information includes the possibility of a domino effect on preventive safety measures, mitigation measures and behaviour in the event of a major accident. For 90% of upper tier establishments in the Czech Republic, information has been actively distributed in the five years from 2010 to 2014. The means used to inform the public are listed below:

- Brochures or flyers and to businesses or public buildings via data boxes if available; and
- Otherwise in paper form.

A statistical breakdown was not available.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Up to date information on safety measures has been kept permanently available for all establishments (upper and lower-tier) during the reporting period in the Czech Republic, but no information regarding how it has been permanently kept available was provided.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The programme of inspections is not implemented on the basis of a systematic appraisal of major accidents in the Czech Republic, but in accordance with the control plan: Upper-tier establishments are inspected annually, lower-tier establishments every three years.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
In 2013, a number of shortcomings were detected. These related to irregularities concerning documentation or the internal emergency plan. Some establishments did not have insurance policies in force and measures were imposed to rectify this situation. In 2014, administrative proceedings were initiated in four cases on the grounds of the infringement of the provisions of this Act on the basis of checks carried out in 2013. In three cases fines of about EUR 2 000 were imposed, and in one case a fine of about €13,000.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All upper-tier establishments were subject to on-site inspections every twelve months and lower-tier at least once during the reporting period in the Czech Republic.
### Question 5 – Domino effects

Where the probability of occurrence or consequences of a major accident may be increased due to a domino effect is determined by the regional authority on the basis of the notifications and protocols of the classification of establishments as lower or upper tier. The regional authority then obliges operators of identified establishments to provide the necessary information for risk management in the establishment. The operator is required to use this information for the risk assessment, the safety programme for the prevention of major accidents, safety reports, the internal emergency plan and the documentation for drafting the external emergency plan.

### Question 6 – Land-use planning

The regional authority ensures that the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents are taken into account in relation to the siting of new establishments and facilities, modifications to existing establishments and maintaining safe distances between the establishments and residential areas, buildings and locations frequented by the public, major transport routes, recreational areas and areas protected under special laws. In the case of existing establishments and facilities, the regional authority will, if necessary, adopt additional measures on reducing the risk of a major accident. Upon initiation of the land-use proceedings, the regional authority contacts the building authority, which conducts the land-use proceedings and carries out an analysis and assessment of the risk of a serious accident based on information to be submitted by the operator.

### Question 7 – Further information (optional)

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents

No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing

No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)

No information was provided.
DENMARK

Overview of Denmark

Denmark provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:

The Denmark response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
A large number of external emergency plans are reported to not having been tested over the last 3 years. The central authorities will contact the local authorities concerned and either obtain confirmation that the emergency plans were tested or ensure that they are tested as soon as possible. A number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually or during the reporting period.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Denmark.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 121 Seveso establishments in Denmark at the end of 2014, almost the same number as in 2011.

As shown in the chart to the right, Denmark exhibits almost the same number of establishments per capita as the EU average, but more establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
Fuel storage establishments account for 36% of all establishments in Denmark. This activity is also one of the most common activities across the EU, though it is not as dominating in an EU-wide context, accounting for 11% of all establishments. Other common activities in Denmark include:
- chemical installations manufacturing ammonia and industrial gases (6% of installations each); and
- “other activities” not included in any other category (7%).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
No information was provided for this optional question.
DENMARK

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
52 upper-tier establishments have an external emergency plan, while two do not. One establishment without an external emergency plan has only been classified as upper-tier within the last year. As for the second establishment, the central authorities will contact the local authority concerned and ensure that an external emergency plan is drawn up or an assessment is carried out regarding whether one is needed.

Note: Total 54 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested 27 emergency plans were not tested over the three-year period. 41 establishments have tested their emergency plan at some point in time. It is possible that inaccurate reports were submitted by local authorities. The central authorities will contact the local authorities concerned and either obtain confirmation that the emergency plans were tested or ensure that they are tested as soon as possible.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
If a major incident occurs at a risk establishment which could have consequences for the local population and risk establishments nearby:
- information will be provided to the public via the local police force’s website;
- if necessary, via an emergency warning accompanied by a siren; and
- When the risk has passed, the all-clear will be given.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Emergency plans are tested using:
- Theoretical desktop exercise; and
- Physical exercise in whole or in part.

It is assessed locally whether the minimum provisions of the law are met with respect to the content of the plan and testing frequency.
DENMARK

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Denmark, the municipal council (as the local emergency service) and the police draw up the external emergency plans for upper-tier establishments. The police also informs the public of safety measures and the requisite behaviour in the event of incidents. The police made information available to the public for about 49 of the 54 upper-tier establishments during the last five-year period (2010-2014). In 9 of these cases, the information was actually provided in 2015. In one of the other cases, the information was last made available to the public in 2009. The information is available on the local police force’s website, and a specific assessment is also made regarding whether the information about the particular establishment should be made available by other means, e.g. by sending out leaflets. A statistical breakdown of the means used was not available.

In the case of lower-tier establishments, the police also evaluates whether there is a specific need to draw up an external emergency plan.

There is a guide for the police and the emergency services regarding drawing up the plans, which, amongst other things, outlines how the work should be coordinated. In order for the Environmental Protection Agency to be able to compile its reports to the EU, every authority concerned must also report on their publishing of information.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Not answered.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The inspection of establishments is organised jointly by the risk authorities based on a systematic appraisal taking into account the establishments’ production and risk conditions, the nature of the surroundings and a number of other factors that are specific to the individual establishment.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
In Denmark the following sanctions can be applied: Recommendations and warnings where the legal circumstances remain unchanged, and enforcement notices and prohibitions where there are changes to the legal circumstances, e.g. the notification of new conditions of risk. Non-compliance with conditions or legislation may lead to prosecution by the police or the courts, whereby fines or custodial sentences may be imposed.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
39 upper-tier establishments (72% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) were inspected annually. Note that Denmark applies systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) and as such it is it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually. Another 11 (20%) upper-tier establishments were inspected at least during the last reporting period. In addition to this, 50 lower-tier establishments were inspected (75% of the total number of lower-tier establishments).

The relevant local authorities of the establishments that were not inspected have been contacted by the national authority.
**DENMARK**

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Based on the safety documentation submitted by an establishment, the local risk authorities assess whether domino effects might occur. The risk authorities may also become aware of factors that could trigger domino effects when inspecting an establishment's surroundings. The inspection of establishments is organised jointly by the risk authorities and takes account of the establishments' production and risk conditions. This ensures that possible domino effects are taken into account in the establishment's safety work.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

Under Danish law, an establishment may not be set up, extended or modified in a way that leads to increased risk without prior authorisation. Under the Planning Act, the municipal councils, which are responsible for overall planning in the municipality, must review the general planning document, referred to as the municipal plan, every four years. The location of a new establishment is, as a rule, subject to local land use planning and an environmental impact assessment. In Denmark, the issue of land use planning is addressed in a circular from the Minister for the Environment to all municipal councils. It requires municipal councils to take into account the risk of a major incident before any land use provision is made in a municipal or local plan affecting areas within 500m of an establishment. Furthermore, the local planning authority must issue an opinion before the notification for an establishment is sent by the coordinating environmental authority to the other authorities.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
   No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
   No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
   No information was provided.
8. Member State summary sheet – Estonia

ESTONIA

Overview of Estonia

Estonia provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:

The Estonian response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:

Note that establishments were reported to not have individual emergency plans but instead they are covered by one national emergency plan.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

No significant changes have been made to the main competent authorities, nor to their main tasks. However, the name of one of the main competent authorities has changed from Technical Surveillance Authority to Technical Regulatory Authority. The other competent authority is, as previously, the Rescue Board.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 64 Seveso establishments in Estonia at the end of 2014, up from 51 in 2011. Especially the number of upper-tier establishments has increased significantly during that period from 28 to 37.

As shown in the chart to the right, Estonia exhibits much more establishments per capita but fewer establishments per km² than the EU average. This means while the average density of establishments in Estonia is fairly low, there are a lot of Seveso establishments in Estonia for a country of this population.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

28 establishments in Estonia are classified as fuel storage establishments, far more than any other category. They account for 42% of all establishments. This activity is also one of the most common activities across the EU, though it is not as dominant in an EU-wide context, accounting for 11% of all establishments.

Other common activities in Estonia include:
- general chemicals manufacturing (6 establishments);
- power generation (5 establishments), as well as; and
- production and storage of fertilisers (5 establishments).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
ESTONIA

No information was provided for this optional question.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
In Estonia, currently there is one national emergency plan for all Seveso establishments drawn up by the Ministry of the Interior according to the Estonian Emergency Act. In 2015, the Estonian Rescue Board decided to produce regional external emergency plans for all upper-tier establishments. These are planned to be completed in 2016.

Note: Total 37 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
The Emergency Act emergency plans were tested in 10 crisis management exercises between 2012 and 2014. Additionally, the Rescue Board carried out smaller exercises in cooperation with establishments.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Upper-tier establishments have sirens and some towns have municipal siren systems;
- People in the affected areas have been trained on response measures when sirens start to sound through leaflets, information on the establishments’ webpages and on local governments’ webpages. All Seveso establishments have to provide information to the public; and
- The Estonian Rescue Board is responsible for crisis communication at the time of an accident.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Emergency plans are tested using:
- desk top exercises; and
- field exercises.

According to the Emergency Act, emergency plans are tested in crisis management exercises that include desk top and/or field exercises and all responsible authorities. All exercises are evaluated and the evaluation report that also includes a budget report is submitted to the Crisis Commission and the Ministry of the Interior. Additionally, the Rescue Board carry out smaller exercises in cooperation with the establishment operators.
ESTONIA

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Estonia, informing the public and people liable to be affected by major accidents is the responsibility of the operators of all establishments, upper and lower-tier. The Rescue Board controls compliance with the information requirements. 30 of the 37 upper-tier establishments have made all required information publicly available and handed it out to persons liable to be affected by major accidents during the last five years (2010-2014). A statistical breakdown of the means used was not available. Furthermore, guidance for the public and operators' information links are available on the Rescue Board webpage. Information about the location, the hazard type and possible hazardous area of all establishments, upper and lower-tier, are presented in a map on the Land Board Agency webpage.

3.a), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Information about the hazards and adequate behaviour in case of an accident needs to be permanently available on the establishment and operator’s webpage.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
All upper-tier establishments are subject to on-site inspections every twelve months.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
In case of infringement, compliance orders are issued according to the Administrative Procedure Act. If the order is not complied with in time, a coercive measure (substitutive enforcement or penalty payment) may be applied according to the Substitutive Enforcement and Penalty Payment Act. In case of a severe infringement or stopping the authorities' inspection, the Code of Misdemeanour Procedure can be applied imposing penalty payments or detention. When operators provide false information, repeatedly infringe safety requirements causing acute accident hazard, fail to give notice of significant changes to the establishment or their activity has substantially damaged the public interest, the Technical Surveillance Authority can prohibit the operation of the establishment by cancelling the operator's permit according to the Chemicals Act.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All upper-tier establishments were subject to on-site inspections every twelve months and lower-tier establishments at least once during the reporting period in Estonia.
**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Information about the neighbourhood of Seveso establishments and their notification system in case of an accident needs to be included in an establishment’s risk analysis, safety report and internal emergency plan. These documents are submitted to and assessed by the competent authorities. Information exchange among establishments is ensured by the competent authorities’ inspections. In practice, additional information exchange and cooperation is also initiated by the port management as the identified groups of establishments with the risk of domino effects are located in port territory.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

The Estonian Chemical Act and Planning Act requires that preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents are taken into account land-use planning. For planning and constructing processes for new establishments, modifications to existing establishments and developments in the area around establishments, local governments have to consult with the Rescue Board. The Rescue Board assesses the developments’ impact on the probability and consequences of major accidents and planned safety measures and gives recommendations. The recommendations are based on the risk assessments from the establishment, environmental impact assessments, and an approach defining zones in which specific developments may or may not be allowed. Public notification, consultation and participation are required throughout the planning process.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
Information about the location, the hazard type and the possible hazardous area for all establishments (upper and lower tier) are publicly available on the Land Board Agency web map page: [http://xgis.maaamet.ee/xGIS/XGis?app_id=MA11A&user_id=at&bbox=337406.132665832,6375000,767593.867334168,6635000&LANG=1](http://xgis.maaamet.ee/xGIS/XGis?app_id=MA11A&user_id=at&bbox=337406.132665832,6375000,767593.867334168,6635000&LANG=1)

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No information was provided.
9. Member State summary sheet - Finland

FINLAND

Overview of Finland

Overall, Finland provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:
The Finish response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
A large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Finland.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 300 Seveso establishments in Finland at the end of 2014, up from 276 in 2011.

It is worth noting that Finland exhibits the highest number of establishments per capita but the second lowest number of establishments per km² (after Lithuania) of all EU Member States.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
According to the statistical breakdown provided by Finland, the most common activities among the establishments covered by the Seveso II Directive were:
- “fuel storage” (12%);
- “production, destruction and storage of explosives” (11%); and
- “power generation” (11%).

Fuel storage is one of the most common activities at EU level (12% of all Seveso establishments in Europe). On the other hand, power generation and production, destruction and storage of explosives are relatively uncommon (5% and 4% of all Seveso establishments in the EU, respectively). In fact, Finland is the EU Member State with the highest number of Seveso establishments in the “production, destruction and storage of explosives” category; and the second highest number of establishments in the “power generation” category, after Spain.
FINLAND

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Finland has not replied to this optional question.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
Finland has reported that all the upper-tier establishments in the country have an external emergency plan.

Note: Total 135 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
Finland stated that 4 upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested at the end of the reporting period. Finland has explained that these 4 plans had been tested in 2011 and were due to be tested in 2015. This represents 3% of the upper-tier establishments of the country. By comparison, the EU average is 25%.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Public warning siren network (the public has been given instructions on how to act when this siren is activated);
- Dynamic and static high volume loudspeakers (i.e. installed in rescue vehicles or at the site where the accident has occurred); and
- Information given via radio and TV.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested using full tests, which can be:
- Field exercises involving part or all the authorities that would take part in case of an accident; and
- Desk-based exercises involving part or all authorities as above.

The lessons learned from the results are used to improve external emergency plans. The Ministry of Interior published a guide and a platform for external emergency plans in 2010 to support the review of the plans. Another guide was published in 2014 on how to test the plans. The Regional States’ administrative agencies are in charge of ensuring that the plans have been drafted and tested. These agencies report on the testing of external emergency plans to the Ministry of Interior once a year.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Finland, information is made actively available using two main channels: operators (leaflets to people in the surroundings of their upper-tier establishments and open days) and authorities (leaflets). Finland has reported that information was made available for all of the upper-tier establishments. A statistical breakdown of how this was done is presented below:

- Operators’ leaflets: 85%; and
- Authorities’ leaflets: 15%.

Competent authorities make sure that the information is provided as part of inspections.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Finland stated that information is kept permanently available for "only some" of their upper-tier establishments, without specifying a number. This is done via the operators’ websites.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Finland reported having an inspection programme based on a systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards based on the following criteria:
- The results of previous inspections (with a rating system from 0-5);
- Occurrence of previous accidents;
- Type and size of the plant; and
- Surroundings.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Inspection reports are available to the public on request with the exception of confidential information.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
In the case of "severe non-compliance (i.e. in cases of a significant danger of an accident), competent authorities prohibit the use of part or the whole of the plant. Competent authorities also decide upon the remedial action to be taken by the operator. Should the operator refuse to take action, a penalty is imposed. Operators are also obliged to take remedial action in case of accidents, which may be followed by an inspection before restarting operation.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
The Finnish authorities reported that 25% of their establishments were inspected annually during the last reporting period. Note that Finland applies systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) and as such it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually. Nevertheless, the numbers of inspections of upper-tier establishments appear relatively low. 72% of upper-tier establishments were inspected at least once during the 2012-2014 period.

As regards lower-tier establishments, 95% were inspected at least once during the 3-year reporting period.
**FINLAND**

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Finland reported having identified all the establishments with possible Domino Effects. Competent authorities have also prepared guidelines for operators explaining how to cooperate in such cases. The cooperation includes exchanging information on the risks and potential accidents and include the risks of the other establishments of the Domino Group when preparing external emergency plans and safety reports.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

All Seveso establishments are surrounded by a so-called consultation zone (0.5–2 km). In case of any developments within this zone, spatial planners have to request competent authorities' opinion about the possible risks and take this into account.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents  
Finland did not respond to this optional question.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing  
Finland did not respond to this optional question.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)  
Finland reported that periodic inspections are carried out on certain non-Seveso establishments (those which exceed 1/5 of the lower-tier threshold) every 5 years. These non-Seveso establishments are required to have an internal emergency plan. Also, the operators of those Ports and Marshalling Yards through which large amounts of dangerous substances are transported need to draw up internal emergency plans and safety reports, and the emergency services are required to draft external emergency plans.
10. Member State summary sheet – France

FRANCE

Overview of France

France provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:
The French response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
External emergency plans for 45 upper tier establishments have not been tested during the reporting period.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by France.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
France is the country with the second largest number of Seveso establishments in the EU. It accounts for about 10% of all establishments in the EU. There were 1178 Seveso establishments in France at the end of 2014, which is slightly less than the 1196 reported for 2011. This is due to a decreasing number of lower tier establishments, while upper-tier establishments have increased in numbers.

As shown in the chart to the right, France exhibits fewer establishments per capita and fewer establishments per km² than the EU average. Hence, despite the large overall number of establishments in France, the number is relatively low for a country of France’s size.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The activities of most of the establishments in France are classified as “other activities” (i.e. not included in any of the more specific categories). They account for 42% of all establishments. At an EU-wide level, “other activities” account for 14% of all establishments.

Other common activities in France include:
- wholesale and retail (8% of establishments, compared to 9% across EU); and
- general chemical manufacturing (7% of establishments, compared to 12% across the EU).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
No information was provided for this optional question.
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Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 23 upper-tier establishments the French authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not needed as permitted by Article 11.6 of the Seveso II Directive. However, for an additional 75 establishments no plan had been drawn up by the end of the reporting period (31/12/2014). This corresponds to 12% of upper-tier establishments, compared to 11% across the whole EU-28. According to the response, the plans were in the process of being produced, pending the submission of further information in order to determine the required protective measures.

Note: Total 639 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
According to the French response, external emergency plans of 45 upper-tier establishments (3% of all upper-tier establishments) have not been tested every three years as required by Article 11.4 of the Directive.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Industrial and municipal sirens sounding the national alarm signal; and
- If necessary, further information can be transmitted by other means through automated calls, text messages and emails, alerts from vehicles of the civil security services, radio and television broadcasts and various signs and messages in publicly visible spaces.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested in the framework of exercises of the civil security services and assessed by the prefect of the respective Department (French administrative division) in accordance with the methodological guide on the management of general civil security and crisis management from 2009. A formal evaluation is required for every exercise, aimed at improving the emergency plans. Tests can take the shape of:
- General (full) exercises; and
- Thematic (part) exercises.

Specific areas tested include warning of the public, especially for the case of rapid impacts from accidents, the sheltering of the population, cooperation and coordination with the operator, as well as the implementation of the road closures without necessarily interrupting traffic.
FRANCE

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In France, the public and persons liable to be affected by a Seveso accident are informed about major-accident hazards, possible consequences and safety measures mainly by means of public consultations and websites.

Permits, inspection and monitoring reports, minutes of relevant meetings, and general information about establishments (including their address, risk classification, activity and substances used) are available at the dedicated national government websites “L’inspection des Installations Classées” and “Géorisques”. Furthermore, the website Prim.net hosts information on risks and technological risk prevention that has to be provided in every real-estate transaction.

Permit requests for Seveso establishments (including impact assessments), external emergency and technological risk prevention plans are subject to public consultations. Public consultations are organised locally and may include for instance leaflets, “open days” and public debates. The relevant information is also published on regional or local government websites, such as those of the Regional Environment Departments, the Prefectures or the municipalities.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Not answered.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Upper-tier establishments are inspected at least once every year, lower-tier establishments at least once every three years.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Information on the latest inspection for each establishment is available upon request from the responsible Regional Environment Department.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
French authorities can take a range of corrective actions, including issuing orders (for instance, order to comply, suspension orders, closing or suppression orders), imposing administrative fines, closing and sealing establishments and penalties to be paid until compliance is achieved. However, in 2012-2014, compliance orders were the main action taken (over a hundred cases per year), with consignation orders (13 cases, operators have to provide a deposit until compliance is achieved) and suspension orders (3 cases) having occurred occasionally during these three years.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
611 upper-tier establishments (96% of the total number of upper-tier establishments in France) were inspected annually. All remaining upper-tier establishments were inspected at least during the last reporting period in France.¹ In addition to this, 528 lower-tier establishments were inspected (98% of the total number of lower-tier establishments).

---

¹ The number of upper-tier establishments inspected during the last reporting period reported in this question exceeded the total number of upper-tier establishments reported in other questions above. Therefore, it is assumed that all upper-tier establishments were inspected during the last reporting period.
### FRANCE

#### Question 5 – Domino effects

The identification of domino effect risks is achieved mainly through inspections, based on the inspectors’ knowledge of the establishments and their environment. Communication between neighbouring establishments is required by a ministerial decree from 2000, which specifies that any relevant information on the risks and hazards of major accidents has to be submitted by the operators to the neighbouring establishments and the authorities. This information is also included in the permits issued by the regional prefectures and in internal emergency plans. In addition, operators communicate through meetings and correspondence and in the framework of site monitoring committees and permanent secretariats for the prevention of Industrial pollution. Operators can cooperate on alert systems, intervention measures, informing the public and testing of external and internal emergency plans.

#### Question 6 – Land-use planning

Around industrial areas containing at least one upper-tier establishment, so-called plans for the prevention of technological risks are implemented. According to these plans, first every possible measure to minimise the risk posed from the establishment is considered. If vulnerable populations are still at risk and no other means are available to reduce that risk, the plans allow different zones to be defined in which a right of first refusal or right of abandonment can be established, new construction can be prohibited, buildings can be expropriated, or technical protective measures can be prescribed for the affected buildings. 398 plans for the prevention of technological risks have been elaborated to date, 84% of which are approved so far.

For creating new upper-tier establishments, the French law provides a method of analysis and control of risks in which all zones potentially affected by the risk from the establishment, even if owned by the operator, are subject to the rules specified in the spatial plans in place. For lower-tier establishments, the French authorities inform the planning authorities of areas subject to technological risks in which new developments shall be prohibited or regulated, based on information from the establishments’ safety reports.

#### Question 7 – Further information (optional)

1. **7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents**
   - No information was provided.

2. **7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing**
   - No information was provided.

3. **7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)**
   - No information was provided.
11. Member State summary sheet – Germany

GERMANY

Overview of Germany

Germany provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:
The German response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
A large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually or during the reporting period.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>3264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Germany.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
29% of all Seveso establishments in the EU-28 were located in Germany at the end of the reporting period, far more than any other Member State. The number of establishments in Germany increased rapidly from 2,405 in 2011 to 3,264 in 2014, mostly due to a rapid increase of lower-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Germany exhibits much more establishments per capita and especially much more establishments per km² than the EU average. Hence, there is a particularly high density of Seveso establishments in Germany.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The Seveso Plants Information Retrieval System (SPIRS) classification of activities has not been fully implemented by German Authorities. Therefore a presentation of activities by SPIRS codes and a comparison with the EU averages is not available. However, Germany has provided a breakdown of establishments by NACE codes, the statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community, on section level. This shows that the majority of establishments belong to the manufacturing sector and the energy supply sector (“Electricity, Gas, Steam and Air Conditioning supply”). These two sectors each account for 34% of all establishments.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Quantitative data about the share of Seveso establishments that are also covered by the IED are not available for Germany as a whole. However, the German response indicated that a large share of establishments is affected, especially of upper-tier establishments.

This has practical consequences for the implementation of both Directives in these establishments, including permitting, public
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consultation, monitoring and inspection processes. These consequences vary significantly across Federal States, but include at least coordination and information exchange between the relevant authorities. Further cooperation, such as e.g. common inspections, depends on the potential synergies evaluated on a case-by-case basis and varies by Federal State.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan

For 82 upper-tier establishments the German authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not needed based on strict criteria including for instance quantities, properties and state of the hazardous substances and location of the establishment. This corresponds to 7% of upper-tier establishments, which is higher than the 4% EU average.

For an additional 83 upper-tier establishments external emergency plans had not been produced at the end of the reporting period, which is a lower share of upper-tier establishments (7%) than the EU average (11%). Main reasons for plans not being produced include cases where establishments recently changed or were recently classified as upper-tier, where the production of the plans or the security report required previously are still in progress. Furthermore, it is possible to partially impose upper-tier requirements on establishments which would according to the Directive only have to be classified as lower-tier. Such establishments have been listed as upper tier but may not be required to produce an external emergency plan.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested

At the end of the reporting period, for 16% of the upper-tier establishments in Germany the external emergency plans had not been tested (compared to 27% across the EU). Main reasons include the 3-year deadline for testing not having passed yet because establishments have been changed during the reporting period, testing being delayed by changes to the establishments, or establishments being decommissioned but still counting as Seveso establishments.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:

- Arrangements vary regionally, but typically consist of some type of alarm signal that prompts citizens to behave in a certain way, e.g. to turn on the radio for further information. Sirens owned by the communities exist in some Federal States and can be used to broadcast messages such as “turn on radio”. In other states the civil protection agencies have their own warning systems available.
- Possible means to provide information include: Radio and loudspeaker (on police and fire fighter vehicles) announcements, telephone hotlines, internet announcements, prepared print media, social media, warning apps for smart phones and SMS.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans

Testing of external emergency plans is planned and carried out usually by the counties (Landkreise und Kreisfreie Städte) based on the civil protection laws of the Federal States. The lower civil protection authorities are responsible for their
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evaluation and use (for instance) the following criteria: functioning of alarm channels; accessibility of accident sites; extent and intensity of safety measures of establishments; availability of relief units and materials; and information exchange across various stakeholders. External emergency plans are deemed appropriate if they comply with the respective civil protection laws and appear to realistically guarantee to mitigate damages from the relevant accident scenarios. Emergency plans are tested using:
- Full exercise: Cooperation of all management levels and practical testing of emergency measures, rescuing, medical care, communication and reporting;
- Staff exercise: Cooperation of all management levels and manufacturers or managers of communication and reporting; assessment of required material, staff and other conditions;
- Plan discussions and exercises: Analysis and evaluation of enacted or fictitious scenarios using e.g. maps or models, assessment of required material, staff and other conditions across relevant agencies and authorities.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Germany the operator is responsible for informing the public. However, the information is coordinated with the civil protection and other relevant authorities and can cover multiple Seveso establishments at once. The following shows a statistical breakdown of the means that have been used:
- Operator’s leaflets: 82%;
- Authorities’ leaflets: 3%;
- Flyers: 7%;
- Direct mail to citizens, public meetings: 10%; and
- Internet, operator’s homepage, placards/bulletins, newspaper ads, official register, public display: 3%.

In addition to the above, sometimes announcements via local radio stations and/or “open days” in Seveso establishments are used. Hospitals, medical practices, schools and kindergartens are targeted specifically for information and sometimes information booths are placed in public places on weekends. Furthermore, safety reports can be viewed in the establishments. In one Federal State, information is distributed via a comprehensive brochure for all establishments in the state.

In 802 upper-tier establishments (over 70% of total number of upper-tier establishments in Germany, compared to 76% EU-wide) information has been made actively available to the public at least once during the reporting period (2010-2014). Note that this is lower than the sum of percentages listed in the statistical breakdown of the means of information above, because usually the information is provided in more than one way. Main reasons for information to not have been made actively available include no public to be informed being present, even in the wider vicinity of the establishment; the 5-year deadline for informing not having passed yet because establishments have been changed during the reporting period; and establishments that are only partially classified as upper tier, as mentioned under question 2.a) and 2.b).

Content, quality and distribution of the information is ensured through internal and external security audits, as part of the on-site inspections or assessment of the security report. Furthermore, as the information is coordinated with the relevant authorities, it is also given final approval by the authorities prior to publication.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Not answered.

Question 4 - Inspections
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4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Inspection schedules are based on systematic appraisal
based mainly on the following criteria:
- Establishment-related criteria such as quantity and type of
  hazardous substances, type and complexity of the process
  and the handling of hazardous substances, accident-relevant
  operating parameters, safety-related standard of Seveso
  operation and possibility of detection of releases.
- Sensitivity of the local environment
- Operator-related criteria such as quality and organisation of
  self-monitoring, substantiated complaints, compliance
  history as well as results and evaluation of past inspections
  and EMAS certification.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
The inspection programmes and reports have not been
published but are accessible to the public upon request
subject to the specifications of the Environmental
Information Act.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
There is a high degree of cooperation between operators and authorities. Ordering follow-up actions from operators when
any deficiencies are detected is the only action that has been taken. However, the law provides a range of more severe
actions that can be taken by authorities, including fines, prohibitions, withdrawal of permits, imprisonment, withdrawal of
EMAS certification and others.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
422 upper-tier establishments (37% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) were inspected annually. Another 559
(49%) were inspected at least during the last reporting period, while the remaining upper-tier establishments were not
inspected at all during 2012-2014. Note that Germany applies systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see
4.a) and as such it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually. Nevertheless, the numbers of
inspections of upper-tier establishments appear relatively low. In addition to this, 1436 lower-tier establishments were
inspected (68% of the total number of lower-tier establishments).

Question 5 – Domino effects

Groups of establishments posing a risk of domino effects are identified by the relevant authorities in two steps in Germany:
1. All upper-tier establishments not further than 500m away or lower-tier establishments 200m away from any installations or activities of
   another establishment, as well as establishments where there are any specific indications of a risk of domino effects are taken forward
   for step 2.
2. On a case-by-case basis, additional information is analysed such as location and environment of the establishment, specific risks
   from activities and installations of the establishment and the hazardous substances present.

When a risk of domino effects is identified, safety concepts, safety management systems, safety reports and internal emergency plans
are exchanged between the affected establishments to establish a common risk management approach. Regular safety meetings and
joint exercises are held. The exchange of information is coordinated by the major accidents officers of the establishments, or a common
officer is established. Some establishments prepare a common emergency plan or coordinate their plans. Some plans also have a
common alarm centre, or in the case of industrial areas with a high density of establishments working groups on factory manager level.
Compliance is checked and supported by the relevant authorities in inspections.

Question 6 – Land-use planning
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The German Imission Act contains a segregation principle, according to which spatial planning zones dedicated primarily to living and other areas in particular need of protection are as much as possible to be segregated from areas at risk of being affected by major accidents. Furthermore, guidelines for the implementation of this segregation in both spatial planning and permitting have been published in 2010 and updated regularly since. The emission authorities are involved in any spatial planning or relevant construction projects and they determine the required distance between zones or construction projects and establishments based on the above guidance and inform the construction permitting and planning authorities.

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to lessons learned, Germany has introduced a third category of reportable incidents in addition to accidents and incidents as defined under Seveso II, in order to include serious disturbances of normal operations that have not yet led to serious accident in accident prevention. The Central Reporting and Evaluation Office for Accidents and Incidents of the German Federal Environment Agency centrally registers all reported incidents and distributes relevant information to stakeholders and the general public. It analyses the data and provides suggestions for improving safety. The Environment Agency also organises a yearly exchange of experiences among authorities and jointly with the Federal States has initiated a research project on methods of incident reporting and analysis. The German government also has an Advisory Board on Plant Safety which includes a wide range of relevant stakeholders and two committees regularly discussing reported incidents and experiences to provide suggestions for improvement of safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information is available to the general public from the Central Reporting and Evaluation Office for Accidents and Incidents as well as a database about the state of safety technology (DoSiS), via the Environment Agency’s “InfoSiS” portal (<a href="http://www.infosis.uba.de/">http://www.infosis.uba.de/</a>). Furthermore, various Federal States, sometimes jointly, have developed software systems to monitor the implementation of the Major Accidents Ordinance (which implements the Seveso II Directive) and for the sharing of data between the authorities concerned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore) | No information was provided. |
**12. Member State summary sheet – Greece**

**GREECE**

**Overview of Greece**

Greece provided a partially incomplete response.

**Key reporting gaps identified:**
- Criteria used for considering that an external emergency plan is adequate and that an external emergency plan has been tested.
- Number of establishments for which information has been made available to the public and how the distribution of information is monitored.
- Actions taken against operators in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance.
- Lack of clarity on the frequency of inspections in upper-tier establishments.
- How the objectives of Article 12 on Land-Use Planning have been ensured nation-wide.

**Status of overall implementation:**

![Bar chart showing number of establishments](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Greek response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are not fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**
- For a large number of upper-tier establishments, external emergency plans have not yet been produced.
- A large number of external emergency plans are reported as not having been tested over the last 3 years.
- A large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually.
- Further compliance issues cannot be ruled out due to the incompleteness of the response.

**Overview of the information reported**

**Question 1 - General information**

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Greece.
GREECE

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 193 Seveso establishments in Greece at the end of 2014, significantly less than in 2011 (223). This is due to a decreasing number of lower-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Greece exhibits fewer establishments per capita and fewer establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The activities with the highest number of establishments at the end of the reporting period in Greece were:
- fuel storage (28% of total number of establishments); and
- LPG storage (18%).

Across the rest of the EU, fuel storage is also the third most common activity (11% of all establishments), while LPG storage represents 4% of EU establishments.

Other common activities in Greece include:
- production, destruction and storage of explosives (10%); and
- power generation (9%).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Greece has not answered this optional question.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
The Greek authorities decided that an external emergency plan was needed for all upper-tier establishments in Greece. However, for 26 upper-tier establishments (31% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) the plans have not yet been produced. The Greek response did not indicate the reason.

Note: Total 83 upper-tier establishments
GREECE

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
There are 52 upper-tier establishments (63% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) that have had an external emergency plan tested over the last three years. The Greek response did not indicate the reason.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Sirens are available to alert the public in case of a major accident. These are tested by the General Secretariat of Civil Protection once a year; and
- Main response measures are referred to in many electronic and hard copy publications of the General Secretariat of Civil Protection authority, which have not been specified further in the response.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
There are specific accident scenarios (fully described in the existing Safety Report) taken into consideration for every test. Authorities participating in each test are: the local fire brigade, ambulances, the local hospitals, police, as well as the regional and municipal authorities. The nature of the tests has not been further specified in the response.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Regional Civil Protection Authorities request short reports (2-3 pages) from operators, containing all relevant information for the public according the Seveso II Directive. This information is then distributed to all Regional and Municipal Councils to distribute it to citizens in the neighbourhood. A statistical breakdown of the means used is shown in the following:
- Leaflets and flyers by the authorities in the envelopes with electricity bills to houses in the neighbouring area of Seveso establishments: 100%; and
- Information given to students in all elementary and high schools (in each class) in the area of Seveso establishments: 100%.

This only refers to establishments for which information has been made available at least once during the reporting period. No information was provided in the Greek response on the number of establishments for which information has been made available and how the distribution of information is monitored.

Additionally one Regional Civil Protection Authority distributed a publication of the Ministry of Environment providing guidance on what to do in case of an industrial emergency situation to the citizens living in the neighbourhood of a petroleum refinery.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Not answered.
GREECE

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
In Greece, the programme of inspections is not based upon a systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards, but on a yearly basis.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
So far, no information has been given to the public from the programme of inspections and from the inspection reports.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
During the 2012-2014 period there was not any major industrial accident in Greece, so no actions had to be taken in response. No information on what the possible actions in the event of accidents would be, or on actions in the event of other incidents and non-compliance, was provided by the Greek response.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
The Greek response is inconsistent with regards to the frequency of inspections in upper-tier establishments. However, it appears that 55 inspections in upper-tier establishments have been carried out between 2012 and 2014. 13 lower-tier establishments were inspected in the same timeframe.

Question 5 – Domino effects

To determine groups of establishments at risk of domino effects, in the accident scenarios for each establishment three protection zones and one domino zone in the form of concentric circles are estimated and drawn on a map of the establishment and its neighbourhood. The permitting authority informs all the neighbouring establishments about the results of the Safety Report by sending copies of the results including the domino zones of all accident scenarios, in order to allow for the consideration of all existing hazards of the specific establishment.

Question 6 – Land-use planning

A pilot project called "Industrial Risk and Planning - Spatial Intervention" funded by the Ministry of Environment developed a software system to assist decision-making in land use planning associated with the risk of Seveso establishments. The system is based on a Geographic Information System (GIS) and a computational module incorporating the results of multi-criteria analysis and calculating risk and vulnerability indicators where appropriate. The pilot project is being implemented in a selected region of Western Thessaloniki where many Seveso establishments (petroleum refinery, petrochemicals, oil and gas storage establishments, fertiliser and pesticides) are very near to densely populated areas. The Greek response has not indicated how preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents are taken into account in their land-use and/or other relevant policies.
### GREECE

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</th>
<th>No information was provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing | An application called “e-per” has been uploaded on the web site of the Ministry of Environment. All upper and lower-tier Seveso establishments in Greece are presented on a Geographic Information System (GIS). There is also an application with all existing information about all the establishments (addresses, contact information, dangerous substances, Seveso compliance issues, Safety Report, External Emergency Plan, public information, inspections, evaluation of the Safety Reports, Notifications, etc.). |

| 7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore) | No information was provided. |
13. Member State summary sheet - Hungary

HUNGARY

Overview of Hungary

Overall, Hungary provided a complete response

**Status of overall implementation:**

Hungary’s response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**

None

---

### Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

During the reporting period, the two Competent Authorities that performed implementation and enforcement duties in Hungary changed. The inspection duties that used to be carried out by a specialised agency were integrated into the other Competent Authority (National DG for Disaster Management of the Ministry of Interior). Then, the duties of the latter were transferred to the Regional Governments, in order to simplify procedures and make them more efficient.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 239 Seveso establishments in Hungary at the end of 2014, a significant increase from 169 in 2011. This is due to an increase in the numbers of both lower and upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Hungary now exhibits more establishments per capita and slightly more establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

At the end of the reporting period, the most common activities among the establishments covered by the Seveso II Directive in Hungary were:

- wholesale and retail (13%);
- production and storage of fertilisers (11%); and
- fuel storage (8%).

Whereas fuel storage and wholesale and retail are relatively common (11% and 9% of the Seveso establishments of the EU, respectively), production and storage of fertilisers only accounts for 3% of the establishments covered by the Seveso II Directive. Hungary has the second highest number of establishments in this category.
HUNGARY

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Hungary has not replied to this optional question.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 13 upper-tier establishments it was decided that an external emergency plan was not needed. In addition, 5 upper-tier establishments failed to produce an external emergency plan as required by Article 11.1. Hungary has reported that these were under review at the end of the reporting period.

Note: Total 105 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
The only upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested were those mentioned in 2.a) and 2.b) above. Therefore, all the plans that have been drafted have been tested in Hungary.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Monitoring and public alert and information system (the 'MoLaRi system') in the vicinity of establishments; and
- National risk map, safety region website, municipality website, regional emergency broadcasters, Twitter.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
In Hungary, external emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Partial practical exercises every year; and
- Full tests every three years.

The practical exercises are preceded by training. The plans are considered adequate if the actions envisaged are suitable for reducing the harmful effects identified in the safety report.
HUNGARY

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
According to Hungary, the information for all upper-tier establishments has to be made available during the 5-year period stated in question 3b (2010-2014). Competent Authorities are in charge of providing information on Seveso establishments in Hungary. “Active” provision of information includes leaflets prepared by the Competent Authority and the mayors of the municipalities likely to be affected. In the case of upper-tier establishments, the publication of the leaflet is the responsibility of the mayors of these municipalities. The leaflet has to be updated with modifications at least within 3 years of these modifications and in any case every 5 years. “Passive” information is provided in the form of public notices when the safety reports are drafted. Competent Authorities must make the report available to any interested party within 21 days of publication of the notice. The information provided to the public is also available online on the websites of each regional authority. Also, brochures are disseminated to each household in the areas potentially endangered by upper-tier establishments. Hungary has also described the MoLaRi (abbreviation of monitoring and public alert and information system, in Hungarian) alert system, which can warn up to 250,000 people immediately of a major accident. The National Competent Authority is also in charge of checking that this information is provided.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Hungary has not provided this optional information.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The length and frequency of inspections are not based on a systematic appraisal, but are pre-defined. Lower-tier establishments are inspected every two years and upper-tier establishments at least annually.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Hungary has not provided this information.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Hungary has provided a very detailed breakdown of the actions taken annually during the reporting period. These were: restricting a hazardous activity (6 establishments during the period 2012-2014), procedural fines (1), disaster management fines (12), removal and disposal of dangerous substances (1), orders to revise the safety report (12).

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
In Hungary, all (105 at the end of 2014) upper-tier establishments should be inspected annually. During the last reporting period, there were 98 annual inspections (93%). Hungary has clarified that the number of these establishments fluctuates every year and that new upper-tier establishments are not included in the statistics. As for lower-tier establishments, there were 176 inspections during the reporting period (55 in 2012, 50 in 2013 and 71 in 2014). However, it is not clear whether some lower-tier establishments were inspected more than once. Hungarian authorities reiterated (4a) that the frequency of inspections for lower-tier establishments is every 2 years.
Question 5 – Domino effects

Establishments relevant for consideration of domino effects are designated by the competent authority, following the information available in the safety reports, which have to designate domino effects using the “Belgian/Walloon” method. These establishments are required to exchange information on the effects of accidents and information on emergency plans. If they decide not to cooperate, Competent Authorities can enforce this requirement by issuing an order.

“*”= 'Methodology, guidelines and technical appendices to the study of domino effects', in: C. Delvosalle, F. Benjelloun, C. Fiévez, Ministère Fédéral de L'emploi et du travail (Belgique), Administration de la sécurité du travail, Inspection technique, CRC/WPS/07/97

Question 6 – Land-use planning

The land-use planning provisions of the Directive are implemented based on the general regulations on urban planning and in accordance with the specific rules laid down in the legislation implementing it. Under the Hungarian legislation, in order to limit the consequences of major accidents, on the basis of the safety report or the safety analysis, the authority demarcates a danger zone around the establishment (the operator may propose what that zone should be).

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
Hungary did not answer this question.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
Hungary did not answer this question.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
During the last reporting period, Hungary extended the coverage of the legislation implementing Seveso to establishments under the threshold (those with high priority facilities or those at or “above a quarter of the minimum threshold”). These have provisions that are less strict but may be obliged by authorities to prepare certain documents or implement certain measures.
14. Member State summary sheet - Ireland

**IRELAND**

**Overview of Ireland**

Ireland provided a complete response.

**Status of overall implementation:**

Ireland's response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**

None

**Number of establishments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of the information reported**

**Question 1 - General information**

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

None were reported by Ireland.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 96 Seveso establishments in Ireland at the end of 2014, up from 85 in 2011. This is due to an increasing number of upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Ireland exhibits slightly fewer establishments per capita and much fewer establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

According to the Irish implementation report, the most common categories were:

- fuel storage (19%);
- production of pharmaceuticals (18%); and
- power generation (11%).

Whereas fuel storage is a common activity at EU level (11% of all establishments), the other two activities are relatively uncommon (1% and 5%, respectively). In the case of production of pharmaceuticals, Ireland is the country with the highest number of establishments in this category in the EU.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

Ireland reported that 42 establishments were also covered by the IED. As the Competent Authorities responsible for the implementation and enforcement of Seveso are different to those responsible for the IED, there is not reported to be any impact of this. No further information has been provided by Ireland.
IRELAND

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
All upper tier establishments were required to adopt an external emergency plan. Competent Authorities reported that one upper-tier establishment did not have a plan drafted as required. It is stated that a draft was being prepared at the time of completion of the implementation report.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
Ireland stated that all plans have been tested except in one case where the upper-tier establishment has applied for a change of category (to lower-tier). This seems to be a different establishment than the one mentioned in 2.b) above. As a result, the external emergency plans of 46 out of 48 establishments were tested during the reporting period.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Siren system;
- Leaflets within designated areas, consultation when the external emergency plans are drafted; and
- Consultation of the off-site arrangements when external emergency plans are drafted.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Desk based exercises when the external emergency plans are drafted and as part of the standard tests;
- Multidisciplinary field exercises; and
- Exercises conducted at the establishment by the disaster management coordinating teams.

Inspectors and Competent Authorities are sometimes invited to the tests. Plans are considered adequate when they comply with the criteria set out in the government publication “A Framework for Major Emergency Management”[5]

IRELAND

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Ireland, operators inform the persons liable to be affected directly, by leaflet. The Competent Authority carries out ‘spot checks’ with the potentially affected public to confirm that this information has been received. The information content of the leaflet is assessed as part of the evaluation of the safety report and adoption of the external emergency plan, and following confirmation that the local competent authorities are satisfied with the contents, Irish authorities indicated that this information is actively available for those establishments with public within their area of potential influence (40 out of 48, 83%).

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Ireland indicated that the information is not kept permanently available for any establishment.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Ireland aims at inspecting all upper-tier establishments once a year and all lower-tier establishments once every two years. When this is not possible, they follow a systematic appraisal based on the nature of the hazard, surroundings of the establishments and the quality of the safety management system in place.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Ireland reports the use of written advice (321 cases), notices imposing requirements or restrictions (17 cases), prohibitions (5 cases) and prosecutions (5 cases). Prosecutions may involve fines up to €3,000 and/or 12 months imprisonment.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
47 out of 48 upper-tier establishments were inspected annually, the remaining one at least during the reporting period. Additionally, all lower-tier establishments were inspected at least once over the 3-year reporting period.

Question 5 – Domino effects

Establishments relevant for domino effects were identified based on an assessment by the Competent Authorities of the information contained in the notification and the safety report and feedback from inspectors. Inspectors ensured appropriate information was exchanged between operators and encouraged operators to cooperate in informing the public and local competent authorities.
IRELAND

Question 6 – Land-use planning

In Ireland, Competent Authorities provide technical advice to planning authorities on request. These requests are compulsory within the “consultation distance” i.e. safety distances from the establishments (or the potential location of new establishments), called. The advice can be generic or specific. Generic advice is based on a 3-zone risk-based system. A total of 696 requests for technical advice have been reported by Ireland during the 2012-2014 period.

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</th>
<th>Ireland has not responded to this question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing</td>
<td>Ireland has not responded to this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)</td>
<td>Ireland has not responded to this question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 A detailed description is available in: http://www.hsa.ie/eng/Your_Industry/Chemicals/Control_of_Major_Accident_Hazards/Approach_to_LUP_under_ComahRegs.pdf
15. Member State summary sheet - Italy

ITALY

Overview of Italy

Overall, Italy provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:

Italy’s response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive have been implemented but they have issues with some key aspects of the Directive.

Key compliance issues identified:
- Low level of testing of external emergency plans
- Low level of inspections. Only 20% of the upper-tier establishments were inspected during the whole period and none were inspected once a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of establishments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Italy.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
Italy is the Member State with the third highest number of Seveso establishments after Germany and France, with almost 10% of the Seveso establishments in the EU. There were 1112 Seveso establishments in Italy at the end of 2014, a marginal increase from 1101 in 2011. While the number of lower-tier establishments has decreased during that period, upper-tier establishments have increased in numbers.

As shown in the chart to the right, Italy exhibits fewer establishments per capita but significantly more establishments per km2 than the EU average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishments per 10m inhabitants</th>
<th>Establishments per 10,000 km2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The most common activities in Italy are:
- LNG production, bottling and distribution (24% of the establishments);
- general chemicals (24%); and
- processing of metals with electrolytic or chemical processes (11%).
Italy is the Member State with the highest number of Seveso establishments in these three activities. Two of them are relatively common (general chemicals with 12% of all Seveso establishments in Europe and LNG production, bottling and distribution with 8%), whereas “processing of metals with electrolytic or chemical processes” accounts for 3% of EU establishments (above half of them are located in Italy).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Italy has not provided an answer to this optional question.
ITALY

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 4 upper-tier establishments the Italian authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not needed, although they have not provided an explanation. Also, 66 establishments' external emergency plans were not drafted as required.

Note: Total 567 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 302 establishments' external emergency plans had not been tested as required. That is more than half of the total number of upper-tier establishments in Italy. Furthermore, it represents a significant proportion (above a fifth) of the establishments without an external emergency plan in the EU. Italy has a significantly weaker testing system compared to the average proportion of upper-tier establishments without an external emergency plan tested at EU level (25%), Italian authorities stated that 69 more cases were under review for verification.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Sirens in the upper-tier establishments;
- Alert via TV, radio, SMS, email, social media. Where relevant, local amateur radio associations are also warned and asked to cooperate; and
- Communication from operator to the Fire Brigade, communication from the Mayors of the potentially affected municipalities to the population, communication of the accident to the central Governments. These are done through the channels described above (TV, radio, SMS, etc.).

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested as follows:
- 'Joint' trials (on-site, with the involvement of operational staff but not the general public);
- 'Full-scale' trials (on-site, with the involvement of operational staff and the general public);
- 'Command-post' trials (without the involvement of staff, facilities and the general public); and
- Trials to check the audibility of alarm systems (with the involvement of staff, civil protection officials and the general public).

External emergency plans must include the following: analysis of land vulnerability, the outline of the intervention model, the location and functioning of alarm systems and availability of information to the public.
ITALY

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available

In Italy, municipalities are in charge of distributing information on hazards of Seveso establishments to the public and workers potentially affected. There are guidelines with criteria on the most appropriate way of disseminating this information, but the ultimate decision is made by the Mayor. This information is submitted to the provincial Government for updating the external emergency plans, at least once every 5 years. Normally, the forms of communication are brochures, posters and manuals, and in some cases through dedicated web pages, organisation of public meetings or the use of public information spaces and local radio or television channels. The costs are borne by municipalities, with collaboration from operators in some cases. Italy stated that this is done for all (567) upper-tier establishments in the country. The statistical breakdown provided by Italy is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities (100%)</th>
<th>“Active way”</th>
<th>“Passive way”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% (gathering and meetings or completing a questionnaire distributed by municipalities)</td>
<td>60% (brochures, posters and manuals, webpages, flyers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As municipalities are in charge of providing this information, the Government is responsible for making sure that this is actually the case. Italy mentions a survey in which the Government assessed this alongside other issues (such as the active/passive communication split mentioned above).

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)

Italy did not answer these optional questions.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards

Italy reported that their inspection system is not based on a systematic appraisal. Italy has not specified the timescales of their inspection system but judging by their response to other questions, less than half of the upper-tier and lower-tier establishments were inspected during the 3-year period.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)

Italy has not provided this information

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance

Italy took action on 90 cases, 53 of which were related to upper-tier establishments and the rest to lower-tier establishments. In the case of upper-tier, most of the actions were orders imposing technical upgrades or changing procedures within a specific deadline. In four cases, there were formal notices (2 of which resulted in partial restrictions and one in a full suspension of activities). As for lower-tier, the non-compliances were deemed as not critical. Italy has provided some examples to explain this.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections

Italy reported that none of the upper-tier establishments is inspected once a year. Around 20% of the upper-tier establishments and 49% of the lower-tier establishments were inspected during the 3-year period. This is particularly low, especially considering that Italy is the Member State with the third highest number of Seveso establishments.
### Italy

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

The Ministry of Environment identifies groups of establishments which are potentially subject to “domino effects” using the information provided by the Competent Authorities in each region. These Regional Authorities have the opportunity of assessing this in two instances: evaluation of safety reports (every 5 years), or for assessments related to changes at establishments that are deemed to increase the level of risk. The Ministry ensures that Regional Competent Authorities have all the necessary information to enforce measures to prevent domino effects in these establishments, such as facilitating information exchange, drafting contingency plans or conducting integrated safety studies.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

Italy has specific legislation which requires all land use planning to take into account the risk associated with establishments handling dangerous substances. Among other measures, it defines the safety distances between these establishments and residential areas. A risk assessment has to be undertaken and operators are not given authorisation to build and operate the site if they do not comply with all the requirements. The legislation also identifies the Competent Authorities and the role of the central, regional, province and local Governments. The Italian Government stated that it conducted a survey to identify land-use planning issues related to Seveso establishments and implemented legislative measures following the findings of the survey.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents  
Italy has not provided an answer to this optional question.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing  
Italy has not provided an answer to this optional question.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)  
Italy has not provided an answer to this optional question.
LATVIA

Overview of Latvia

Latvia provided an almost complete response with a few minor gaps.

Status of overall implementation:
According to their response, Latvia has fully implemented the provisions of the Seveso II Directive.

Key compliance issues identified:
None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Latvia.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 63 Seveso establishments in Latvia at the end of 2014, the same number as in 2011.

As shown in the chart to the right, Latvia exhibits more establishments per capita but much fewer establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The most common activities in Latvia are:
- fuel storage (51%);
- LPG storage (13%); and
- production and storage of fertilisers (8%).

Whereas fuel storage is one of the most common activities at EU level (11%), LPG storage and storage and fertilisers are infrequent (4% and 3%, respectively). Latvia is not a significant contributor to any of the categories.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Latvia did not reply to this optional question.
LATVIA

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
Latvia indicated that all upper-tier establishments have an external emergency plan.

Note: Total 29 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, Latvian competent authorities had tested the external emergency plans of all establishments except one. Latvia stated that the establishment was not tested due to the structural changes occurring in it during the 2012-2014 period. That establishment was tested in 2011 and 2015.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Civil alert and notification system tested twice a year (the implementation report does not provide a description of this system, only that it is regulated by Cabinet Regulation No 530 of 7 August 2007/ The text implies that sirens are one of the components but no additional detail was provided)
- Public consultation on the external plans; information on what the public has to do in case of alert; publication of external emergency plans on the local authority webpage

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
- Practical civil protection exercises in compliance with the legislation. The criteria for evaluating the exercises are described in Annex 3 of Cabinet Regulation No 772 of 22 September 2008 on types of civil protection exercises and the procedures for organising them. However, the implementation report does not enumerate or describe the actual criteria.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Operators prepare and distribute publications for residents with safety measures and what to do in case of an accident. However, it is not stated how this is done (e.g. leaflets, flyers, visits…). Public consultations on the establishments' civil protection and external emergency plans are run. Also, local authorities publish the external emergency plans online. Monitoring of how the information material is distributed is conducted by the State Fire and Rescue Service as part of annual fire safety and civil protection inspections.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Latvia has not provided information on this.
LATVIA

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Latvia has partially answered this question but it seems that it does not use a systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards. All upper-tier establishments have to be inspected at least once a year, whereas the rest have to be inspected at least twice every 3 years.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Latvia stated that between 2012 and 2015, administrative penalties were imposed 32 times. Also, four warnings were issued during the same period.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
Latvia indicated that all upper-tier establishments (29) are inspected once a year. Also, a total of 36 inspections of lower-tier establishments were undertaken (an average of 12 per year).

![Pie chart showing inspection frequency]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTE not inspected during reporting period</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTE inspected during reporting period other than annually</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTE inspected annually</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5 – Domino effects

The groups of establishments or installations where domino effects could be produced are identified by the Competent authorities on the basis of the information provided in establishments’ submissions, prevention programmes and safety reports. Authorities take into account the characteristics of those hazardous substances present at the establishments, staff, equipment technical plan, other risk factors (e.g. other establishments which do not fall under Seveso II but involve the handling of hazardous substances).

Question 6 – Land-use planning

Requirements on land use planning related to the establishments covered by Seveso II are laid down in Latvian regulations covering land use planning (in general) as well as other laws covering buffer zones (the names and codes are available in the implementation report submitted by Latvia). Land use planning procedures also cover the organisation of public consultations as part of a specific planning process. The Law on buffer zones lays down specific requirements limiting the development of residential areas and the planning of other activities in the vicinity of dangerous establishments, and placing restrictions on dangerous activities close to vulnerable zones. Latvia has provided a real example of how land use planning around Seveso establishments is managed with a link to the relevant documents.
### LATVIA

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</strong></td>
<td>Latvia has reported that many accidents occurred due to a human error. As a result, it was highlighted that training is very important so that staff comply with procedures and are also aware of all the internal protocols in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing</strong></td>
<td>Latvia reported the use of IT tools for monitoring the implementation of the Directive and for data sharing. The characteristics or format of these tools has not been explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)</strong></td>
<td>Latvia has not replied to this question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Member State summary sheet – Lithuania

LITHUANIA

Overview of Lithuania

Lithuania provided a complete response. The response submitted by Lithuania indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Status of overall implementation:

Key compliance issues identified:

None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
Lithuania reported one significant change during the reporting period. In 2014, a new authority was established (State Environmental Protection Service), which is currently responsible for implementing and enforcing Seveso II.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 42 Seveso establishments in Lithuania at the end of 2014. Except for one more lower-tier establishment, there has been no change in numbers compared to 2011.

As shown in the chart to the right, Lithuania exhibits fewer establishments per capita and much fewer establishments per km² than the EU average. In fact, Lithuania has the lowest density of Seveso establishments per km² of all EU Member States.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The most common activities in Lithuania are:
- fuel storage (26%);
- handling and transportation centres (14%); and
- production and storage of fertilisers (14%).

Whereas fuel storage is one of the activities with the highest number of Seveso establishments (11%), the other 2 are relatively minor, with 2% and 3% of EU establishments, respectively.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Lithuania stated that 11 Seveso establishments fall under the IED and that the inspection systems are integrated (inspections inform the implementation of several Directives at the same time) and that increases the efficiency of implementation of all the Directives involved.
LITHUANIA

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
Lithuania did not exempt any upper-tier establishment from having an external emergency plan. However, an external emergency plan was not drafted for one establishment. This is an establishment that started operating in 2015 and the plan was in the preparation phase when the implementation report was submitted.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
For one establishments the external emergency plan had not been tested during the reporting period. Although Lithuania did not indicate it, this is presumably the same establishment for which the plan is not ready (see above).

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Sirens installed in state institutions, relevant and tall buildings;
- A Cell Broadcasting system for residents near to Seveso establishments has recently been put in place (which sends a message to mobile phones without the need for registration); and
- Announcements through the local radio and TV channels.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Full exercises (every 3 years);
- "Functional" exercises (every 2 years, without coinciding with full exercises); and
- Table top exercises (every year except when the above are organised).

There are criteria on how these exercises should be organised, but there are not established criteria for determining that a plan is adequate.
LITHUANIA

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
The information was made actively available for 17 out of 18 upper-tier establishments. In Lithuania, operators and municipalities (those municipalities where establishments are and those bordering them) are obliged to prepare informative materials about the activities, possible hazards of an establishment, and recommendations on safety measures in case of a major accident. The information was provided as leaflets/flyers in all cases and online (operators' and/or municipalities’ websites). Also, the Competent Authority publishes non-confidential information on Seveso establishments. Lithuania provided a statistical breakdown of how the information is provided:

Authorities monitor that this is done through inspections and continuous monitoring of its quality and accuracy.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
The information for 17 out of 18 upper-tier establishments is permanently available. Lithuania has provided a statistical breakdown of how this is done:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator Notice</th>
<th>Competent Authority</th>
<th>Notice</th>
<th>Emails</th>
<th>Websites (Op)</th>
<th>Websites (CA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The inspection system is not based on a systematic appraisal. Upper-tier establishments are inspected once a year, whereas lower-tier establishments are inspected once every 3 years

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
The inspection programme is a legal document and is therefore publicly available. Inspection reports are available upon request.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Lithuania has provided data on the type and number of actions taken in each of the years of the reporting period. These have been mandatory instructions (179 in total), notices (27 in total), financial penalties (144 in total), and prohibition of use (2). The use of all instruments decreased or was the same in 2014 compared to 2012, except “mandatory instructions”, which increased around 40%.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
In line with their reply to question 4.a), Lithuania stated that all upper-tier establishments were inspected at least once a year, with the exception of one, which became operational in 2015 and was due to be inspected then. All lower-tier establishments were inspected at least once during the 2012-2014 period (higher than the EU average of 74%).
**LITHUANIA**

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Competent authorities are responsible for identifying domino effects. Currently, there is only one domino group identified (3 establishments). Although they have exchanged information on the substances and possible hazards (which is monitored by competent authorities), Lithuania highlighted that operators have not been proactive in cooperating with each other (e.g. arranging joint exercises). According to Lithuania, this is complicated due to the commercial conflict of interest between the establishments involved.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

Land use planning with regard to Seveso establishments is implemented by separate legislation. Two main laws control the location of Seveso establishments, the stakeholders to be involved in spatial planning, and the process to be followed, including the authorisation process (which involves a risk assessment and a public consultation). Lithuania has provided an example of where this has been done in practice.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents  
Lithuania has not responded to this question.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing  
Lithuania has not responded to this question.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)  
Lithuania has not responded to this question.
Overview of Luxembourg

Overall, Luxembourg provided an almost complete response with a few minor gaps.

Status of overall implementation:
Luxembourg’s response indicates that there are issues with key provisions of the Seveso-II Directive.

Key compliance issues identified:
No tests of any external emergency plan in the whole reporting period.
Luxembourg stated that the majority of its emergency staff are volunteers. Although this is not an issue in itself, it is uncertain whether they are adequately prepared to respond to a Seveso accident.
Luxembourg does not make available information on safety measures for the public likely affected by a major accident. Also, the information is only available to the public if they participate in the public consultation for Seveso authorisations or, in certain cases, online, although this does not cover all the information.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Luxembourg.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 18 Seveso establishments in Luxembourg at the end of 2014, two (lower-tier) establishments less than in 2011.

As shown in the chart to the right, despite the low overall number there are more establishments per capita and much more establishments per km² in Luxembourg than the EU average. Thus Luxembourg exhibits a high density of Seveso establishments.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
Luxembourg has indicated all relevant activities, for each establishment, instead of indicating only the main activity, resulting in a number (30) that is higher than the total number of establishments (18). The most common activities are:
- fuel storage with 7 establishments;
- "other facilities" (4 establishments); and
- a number of activities with 3 establishments each.

Both fuel storage and "other activities" are common activities at EU level, with 11% and 14% of all Seveso establishments in the EU.
Luxembourg has not answered this (optional) question.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For one establishment it was decided that an external emergency plan was not needed. Also, the external emergency plan was not prepared for another establishment as required. Luxembourg authorities are aware of the latter and stated that the plan is under development.

Note: Total 8 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
Luxembourg indicated that it had not tested any of the external plans. The reason behind this is explained in 2.e)

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Communication via radio, SMS or sirens in vehicles.
- Arrangements to cope with off-site effects from an accident are specific to each establishment and depend on the type of substance.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Whereas Luxembourg states that internal emergency plans are tested by the operators in coordination with local emergency services, external emergency plans are not tested. Most of the emergency services are composed by volunteers in Luxembourg and this makes it difficult for tests to be organised, according to the Luxembourg authorities. The fact that the emergency services are composed by volunteers is not an issue in itself, since it depends on their formation as emergency staff. The way the answer to the questionnaire is written implies that competent authorities are unsure of the preparedness of emergency services. Therefore, this would need to be assessed. Luxembourg stated that there are no defined criteria for determining whether the plans are adequate because the number of upper-tier establishments with such plans is low (7). The plans are assessed on a case by case basis.
LUXEMBOURG

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Information on the safety measures taken by operators, dangers and possible consequences of a major accident is made available as part of the authorisation of a new Seveso establishment or the modification of an existing one. This information is available online on the competent authority webpage alongside the inventory of hazardous substances and other documents such as the safety reports. Sometimes, the online information may be available to the general public and other times it may only be available in the operators’/Authorities’ intranet. If the latter is the case, the information can be made available upon request. The provision of this information is monitored via inspections and also when any Seveso establishment is opened or modified (authorisation). It should be noted that the public likely to be affected by a major accident is not preventatively informed of the appropriate security measures in Luxembourg.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Luxembourg has not answered these questions.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Luxembourg stated that inspections are done regularly (once a year for upper-tier) for all establishments. As a result, there is not a systematic approach to inspections.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Luxembourg has not answered this question.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Luxembourg has provisions for administrative sanctions (operating ban) and criminal sanctions (fines or imprisonment). During the reporting period, Luxembourg indicates that the only non-compliance issue was an operator that had purchased inadequate equipment. The operator was requested to change this equipment.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All upper-tier establishments were inspected annually and 9 out of 10 lower-tier establishments were subject to on-site inspections in the 2012-2014 period.

Question 5 – Domino effects

All new establishments and all modifications of existing establishments go through an authorisation process, in which domino effects are assessed. The operators of neighbouring establishments have to assess the impact of these new or modified establishments on their premises. The Luxembourger authorities recognise that they have a good overview of the domino effects in the country since the number of Seveso establishments is very low.

Question 6 – Land-use planning

For all Seveso establishments that may have an impact on their vicinity, safety distances have been defined and communicated to the competent authorities. These are taken into account by competent authorities when authorising new or modifications of Seveso
Question 7 – Further information (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</th>
<th>Luxembourg did not respond to this optional question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing</td>
<td>Luxembourg did not respond to this optional question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)</td>
<td>Luxembourg did not respond to this optional question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Member State summary sheet - Malta

MALTA

Overview of Malta

Malta provided a complete response with answers to all the compulsory and optional questions.

Status of overall implementation:

Malta’s response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:

None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

None were reported by Malta.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 12 Seveso establishments in Malta at the end of 2014, one more than in 2011. While the number of lower-tier establishments decreased during that period, upper-tier establishments increased in number.

As shown in the chart to the right, Malta exhibits more establishments per capita and especially much more establishments per km$^2$ than the EU average, which reflects a very high density of establishments in Malta.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

Only four activities are reported as the main activities for the Seveso establishments in Malta. These are:

- fuel storage (7 establishments);
- power generation (2);
- LNG production, bottling and bulk distribution (2); and
- LNG storage (1).

Two of these activities (fuel storage and LNG production, bottling and bulk distribution) are relatively common amongst European Seveso establishments (11% and 8%, respectively of all the Seveso establishments in the EU).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

Malta reported that 2 establishments are also covered by the IED, with no impacts reported in practice.
MALTA

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For none of the upper-tier establishments in Malta was it decided that an external plan was not needed. However, 4 of the 9 upper-tier establishments did not have an external emergency plan as required. Malta provided an explanation for this. Three of them became upper-tier establishments during 2014 and competent authorities have a period of time (2 years) to draw them up. This is period is longer in Malta than in other Member States. The plan of the other establishment was being finalised when Maltese authorities filled in the questionnaire.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, the external emergency plans of three establishments had not been tested. This represents 33% of the upper-tier establishments in Malta (compared to 25% at EU level). According to Malta, these are the same three establishments that became upper-tier in 2014 and have 2 years to complete their external emergency plans.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Most upper-tier establishments (number not stated) have a siren. Radio alerts; and
- Leaflets with measures in case of emergency are distributed in the areas that could be potentially affected by a major industrial accident. The leaflets also include contact numbers and radio frequencies.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Multidisciplinary field exercises involving the different rescue services; and
- Desk based exercises.

An analysis is carried out after each exercise with inputs from the entities taking part. Recommendations for improvements based on lessons learnt are made.
MALTA

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
The information (electronic and printed) was agreed with the members of the Competent Authority. Once agreed, it was distributed to the public by means of leaflets that were distributed door to door. The operators of 4 upper tier establishments publish the information on their websites. The leaflets for 4 upper-tier establishments were finalised and distributed during 2009. Malta stated that it has not been necessary to change them since the information is still valid. One operator published a leaflet during 2012 and another one was preparing a leaflet in 2014. Finally, three upper-tier establishments were classified as such during 2014 and have not published leaflets. Operators are in charge of distributing this information and bear the costs. Competent authorities are in coordination with operators when they are preparing the leaflets. Also, they make spot checks to monitor whether these leaflets have been distributed.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Information for all establishments’ (upper and lower tier) is kept up to date and permanently available through the competent authorities. Also, four operators publish the information on their webpages.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Malta does not apply systematic appraisal of major accident hazards for inspections as all establishments (upper-tier and lower-tier) are inspected at least once a year.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
The inspection programme was not made available to the public during the reporting period. According to Malta, there were no disclosure requests.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
There were no major accidents during the period 2012-2014. No ‘prohibition of use’ orders were issued. Following each inspection, a detailed report listing all the findings is prepared and agreed upon by the Competent Authority. A letter is then sent to the operator, giving a description of the issues identified, the measures to be taken and target dates for implementation.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All upper-tier and lower-tier establishments were inspected at least once a year in the last reporting period.

Question 5 – Domino effects

Establishments relevant for consideration of domino effects are designated by the competent authority if their consultation zones overlap. These establishments are required to exchange information on the effects of potential accidents and information on emergency plans. Malta’s implementation report describes an example of one of the cases.
**MALTA**

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

The provisions of Article 12 are fulfilled through supplementary guidance regarding accident hazard and hazardous substances. These guidelines set out policies on new hazardous installations, modifications to existing establishments and developments in the vicinity of existing establishments. The Land-Use Planning requirements are mainly based on the UK’s land-use planning methodology. For four specific establishments which have storage facilities of hazardous substances, three zones were established (inner, middle and outer), with different levels of urbanisation/developments permitted and different control levels.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
No accidents were reported.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
No specific IT tool was used during the reporting period.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No Seveso-like provisions were applied to other installations not falling under Seveso II.
20. Member State summary sheet - Netherlands

Overview of the Netherlands

Overall, the Netherlands provided an almost complete response with a few minor gaps.

Status of overall implementation:
The Netherlands response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
The external emergency plans of 37% of the upper-tier establishments were not tested during the reporting period. Also, the Netherlands did not provide a statistical breakdown of Seveso establishments.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by the Netherlands.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 406 Seveso establishments in the Netherlands at the end of 2014, down from 416 in 2011. This is due to a decreasing number of lower-tier establishments, while upper-tier establishments have slightly increased in numbers during that period.

As shown in the chart to the right, the Netherlands exhibit slightly more establishments per capita and much more establishments per km² than the EU average, reflecting a high density of establishments.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
No statistical breakdown using the SPIRS categories was available. The Netherlands applies a national classification of establishments. A statistical summary is not available.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
The Netherlands does not have detailed data on this, but considers that 'many' establishments are also covered by the IED. However the competent authority considers safety and emissions control to be distinct aspects.
Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 13 upper-tier establishments it was decided that an external emergency plan was not needed based on the technical safety data contained in the safety report. In addition, 10 upper-tier establishments failed to produce an external emergency plan as required by Article 11.1. For 4 of these, safety reports were submitted which will be used to draw up the external emergency plans. For the remaining 6, the competent authorities were reminded to draw up the plans promptly.

The Netherlands does not systematically draw up specific external emergency plans but rather disaster response plans that cover common accident scenarios.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 93 upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested (this represents 37% of the upper-tier establishments in the Netherlands, which compares to 25% at EU level). This is because some competent authorities adopt generic external emergency plans that set out basic scenarios which are then tested. The drawing up and testing of these generic external emergency plans is currently being coordinated at national level.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Operational crisis communication preparedness plans based on a regional crisis plans; national siren network (WAS);
- Nationwide system for alerting public via mobile phone alert (NL-alert);
- Information to the public on risks and options for action are available through the national risk map available on [www.risicokaart.nl](http://www.risicokaart.nl), the competent authorities websites and municipal websites; and
- Information through the regional emergency broadcasters, regional and municipal websites and social media (Twitter). National pool of crisis communication experts.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested using:
- Multidisciplinary field exercises involving the different rescue services;
- Desk based exercises; and
- Exercises conducted at the establishment by the disaster management coordinating teams.

The results of these exercises are used to improve the external emergency plans. Their adequacy is assessed taking into account the completeness, timeliness, accuracy and practical utility of the external emergency plan.
Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
The location of all Seveso establishments is available online\(^7\) including safety advice to the public. In case of accident, the public is warned by the competent authority by means of sirens and mobile phone alerts. Information on safety measures is also provided. Between 2010 and 2014, information from upper-tier establishments was actively made available to the public during 13 instances of major accidents reported via eMARS. No further information was provided on the approach taken with regard to other instances of major accidents. The Netherlands did not include any statistical breakdown as requested in the questionnaire nor information on ‘by whom’ the information on upper-tier establishments is made available. Based on previous responses, it is assumed to be the competent authorities. The information means used for informing the public and persons liable to be affected by a Seveso accident has been described in question 2.d) above. Furthermore online information is permanently available and competent authorities are in charge of keeping the websites updated.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Information on all establishments (upper and lower tier) is kept up to date and permanently available through a website that the competent authorities are in charge of maintaining.

Question 4 – Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The length and frequency of inspections are based on the systematic appraisal of the following criteria:
- number of units;
- number of activities presenting safety risks;
- nature of the substances present on site;
- ambient factors; and
- results from the previous inspection.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
The inspection programme is made available to the public online\(^8\) and summaries of inspection reports have been published since 2014.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Remedial actions and penalties can be imposed. In immediate risk situations, the authority can order partial or complete cessation of activities. However the response from the Netherlands does not indicate whether any of these actions were taken during the reporting period.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
90% of upper-tier establishments were inspected once every 12 months. The Netherlands reported data for each of the years of the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-tier annual inspection</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total upper-tier</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of upper-tier with annual inspection</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that The Netherlands apply systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) and as such it is it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually.

The remaining 32 upper-tier establishments were inspected at least once in the 2012-2014 period. In addition, 136 lower-tier establishments (88% of the total number of lower-tier establishments) were subject to on-site inspections in the last three years.

---

\(^7\) www.risicokaart.nl

\(^8\) www.brzoplus.nl
### Question 5 – Domino effects

Establishments relevant for consideration of domino effects are designated by the competent authority. These establishments are required to exchange information on the effects of accidents and information on emergency plans.

### Question 6 – Land-use planning

The Netherlands indicated that its national legislation on spatial consideration for the purpose of land use planning is perceived as being complex and is based on safety perimeters around Seveso establishments. The competent authority (Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment) is currently working on simplifying the spatial considerations in the decision making process.

### Question 7 – Further information (optional)

**7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents**
The Netherlands reports that all incidents are examined even those that do not meet the criteria of Annex VI, as lessons can be learned from them and recurrence can be prevented. Approximately 30 such incidents occur every year. No further information was provided.

**7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing**
The Netherlands has a joint IT platform used by competent authorities facilitating their collaborations (Gemeenschappelijke Inspectieruimte). On the platform they record upper-tier establishments and their inspections as well as any coercive and follow-up actions.

**7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)**

Pipelines and other non-Seveso activities are covered by the Dutch safety policy. No other activities was included in the response.
Overview of the Poland

Overall, Poland provided a complete response. 

Status of overall implementation:

Poland's response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:

None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

None were reported by Poland.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 392 Seveso establishments in Poland at the end of 2014, up from 360 in 2011. This is due to an increasing number of both lower and upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Poland exhibits much fewer establishments per capita and much fewer establishments per km² than the EU average, reflecting a relatively low density of Seveso establishments. In fact, Poland exhibits the lowest number of establishments per capita of all EU Member States.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

The most common activities in Poland were:
- wholesale and retail storage and distribution (45%);
- general chemicals (18%); and
- petrochemicals / oil refineries (7%).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

Poland stated that 135 of the 392 Seveso establishments are also covered by IED. Poland states that major accident prevention is assessed as part of the inspection of the integrated permits and there are no conflicts between the implementation of the IED and that of Seveso.
Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 10 upper-tier establishments Poland decided that an external emergency plan was not needed. Poland has not commented on this (6% of all the upper-tier establishments in Poland and 5% of all the establishments in this situation in the EU. This compared to 4% at EU level). Also, the external emergency plans of 6 other upper-tier establishments were not drawn up as required (3% of the upper-tier establishments in Poland, which compares to 9% at EU level). Poland has explained that this has happened in the case of new establishments and for those for which it was deemed that there were no off-site risks.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 3 upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested (2% of the upper-tier establishments in Poland, which compares to 25% at EU level). The reasons were local floods that led to a delay in the scheduled date, a request from the operator due to a change to the technological process and a delay due to the assessment of the operators’ documents, respectively. Poland explained that these external emergency plans were tested at a later date.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Alert system based on mobile telephones (text message system) and mass media, in connection with warning systems on the premises of the establishments; and
- Other arrangements are regular updates: Information on safety measures and methods of coping with major accidents to educational and social welfare institutions, healthcare establishments and other entities specified in the list included in the internal emergency plan of the establishment, as well as to other entities and institutions serving the public, which may be affected by the consequences of such accidents and to make this information available to the public.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
In Poland, external emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Tactical exercises with the involvement of emergency services and local governments; and
- Follow-up assessment on the basis of the results of the tests.

These tests are carried out at least once every three years. The areas assessed are the suitability of alert systems, the cooperation with other institutions during an accident, the availability of emergency services and measures included in the plan. The results are used to improve the plans. Costs are borne by Competent Authorities and operators.
POLAND

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
The information for 48 of 59 (81%) upper-tier establishments was made actively available during the reporting period. The regional Fire Service, Competent Authorities and the operators are in charge of providing information to the public and persons likely to be affected by a Seveso accident. Each regional representative of the State Fire Service has to provide an annual list of upper-tier establishments and dangerous substances in each of them within their territorial jurisdiction. Other information made available by the State Fire Service on its webpage is the decisions taken with regard to Seveso establishments, information on approved safety reports and external emergency plans, and instructions on emergency procedures. Operators are also obliged to inform those persons and institutions likely to be affected by a major accident at their establishments, usually in the form of open days, brochures and publications on their websites. Finally, local governments are obliged to inform the public (safety measures in the case of an accident), usually in the form of official announcement. Some local governments submit information on the risks and possible measures to schools, healthcare and social welfare institutions. Poland has not provided a statistical breakdown. Authorities check that the information is provided as stated above through inspections and when external emergency plans are tested (as the way the public is informed is described in them).

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Poland stated that up-to-date information is permanently available for 87% of the establishments. The information is provided by the State Fire Service (notices, websites) and the operators (website, notices on the establishments’ boards and in writing if requested by any member of the public).

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
In Poland, the frequency of inspection is fixed and is therefore not based on a systematic appraisal of major accident hazards. Upper-tier establishments are inspected once a year and lower-tier establishments are inspected once every two years.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
The information on inspection results, except data subject to the protection of personal data or constituting company secrets, is made available upon request.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Poland reported that the following actions were taken during the reporting period: decisions ordering tests (7), decisions ordering the removal of irregularities detected within a period of time (401), immediately enforceable decisions (7), orders to ensure operating compliance (254), cautions (133), financial penalties (31) and post-inspection recommendations.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All upper-tier establishments were inspected in the last reporting period on an annual basis. Also, 24 additional inspections of upper-tier establishments were carried out due to changes to the activities, substances or owner. The total number of inspections reported is higher than the total number of upper-tier establishments. Polish authorities have clarified that this happened because the total number of these establishments during the reporting period was higher than at the end. As regards lower-tier establishments, they were all inspected at least once every 2 years (as a result, some lower-tier establishments were inspected more than once during the 3-year reporting period).
**POLAND**

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Competent authorities designate groups of establishments on the basis of the extent of the hazard and consequences described in the major accident scenarios built with the information obtained from the establishments (safety reports and notifications). Ten establishment groups were designated during the last reporting period.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

The Polish Environmental Protection Law includes the consideration of Seveso establishments in spatial planning. As a result, the location of new establishments must comply with local land use plans, which prohibits their construction in the vicinity of inhabited areas. The expansion of existing facilities is limited to areas where it is deemed that there is no risk. All establishments must have a certain distance to residential areas. Also, the Competent Authorities regularly inform local governments of the existence of these establishments so they can consider it in spatial planning.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents  
Poland has not provided information on this.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing  
Poland has not provided information on this.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)  
Poland has not provided information on this.
PORTUGAL

Overview of Portugal

Overall, Portugal provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:
Portugal’s response indicates that most of the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are almost fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
A large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually or during the reporting period.

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Portugal.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 183 Seveso establishments in Portugal at the end of 2014, slightly less than in 2011 (189). This is due to a decreasing number of upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Portugal exhibits fewer establishments per capita and fewer establishments per km$^2$ than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The most common activities in Portugal at the end of the reporting period were:
- LPG storage (20%);
- general chemicals (19%); and
- LNG storage and distribution (15%).

Two of these activities (LPG storage and LNG storage and distribution are not particularly common in the EU (4% and 1%, respectively of the EU establishments). In fact, Portugal has over 40% of the EU establishments dedicated to LNG storage and distribution. As for general chemicals, it is a relatively common activity (12% of all EU establishments).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
No information was provided.
PORTUGAL

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan

Portugal did not decide to exclude the requirement for preparing an external emergency plan for any of the establishments. Three establishments (5% of the upper-tier establishments) failed to produce an external emergency plan as required. Portugal has not provided an explanation of why this is.

Note: Total 59 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested

At the end of the reporting period, 18 upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested (31% of total, slightly higher than the 25% at EU level). Portugal has provided an explanation for 8 of these establishments. According to them, 6 establishments have been or will be tested in other years (2 in each of 2011, 2015 and 2016). Also, one establishment became operational during 2014 and another one was in the process of being reclassified as lower-tier.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:

- System with sirens;
- Cars with megaphones; and
- Announcements on the radio.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans

External emergency plans are tested as follows:

- Multidisciplinary field exercises involving the different rescue services; and
- Desk based exercises which aim at assessing the plans without mobilising staff and equipment on the ground.

External emergency plans are considered adequate when they comply with the requirements described in the “Guideline for the preparation of external emergency plans” (Technical specification no7 available in www.prociv.pt). This is assessed by the Municipal Commission of Civil Protection and the National Civil Protection Authority. Plans are approved by the National Commission for Civil Protection.
Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
In Portugal, the municipal civil protection service produces and sends information regarding the steps to be taken after an accident to the persons potentially affected by an accident in upper-tier establishments. Also, municipalities inform citizens via their websites and through awareness campaigns at schools. Additionally, approved external emergency plans are published online. Operators also provide leaflets and reports with information, in connection with the testing of external emergency plans. During the last reporting period, the information from 81% of the upper-tier establishments was made available. Portugal has not provided any statistical breakdown of how the information is provided, but stated that authorities are in charge of doing so via public consultations (when preparing external emergency plans), their websites, official boards and campaigns at schools.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
No information was provided.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The length and frequency of inspections are based on the systematic appraisal of the following criteria:
- Results of previous inspections or establishments not previously inspected.
- Higher frequency for upper-tier establishments.
- Number of previous accidents.
- Priority given by Competent Authority due to the location, type of substances or quantities.
- Existence of significant changes to the establishments.
Also, Portugal has developed a new tool which will derive inspection priorities for 2016 and beyond. This is based on the quantity of dangerous substances, surroundings, domino effects, complexity of the facilities, compliance, inspection results, staff training and availability.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Portugal has not answered this optional question.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
During the reporting period, Portugal imposed penalties on two upper-tier establishments and five lower-tier establishments.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
Portugal has reported that none of the upper-tier establishments were inspected annually. 40 (68%) upper-tier establishments and 44 (35%) of the lower-tier establishments were inspected during the last reporting period (2012-2014). Note that Portugal applies systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) and as such it is it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually. Nevertheless, the numbers of inspections of upper-tier establishments appear relatively low.
**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Portuguese authorities identify establishments which are potentially subject to domino effects on the basis of the distance between them, quantity and hazard of substances and scenarios for potential major accidents. These establishments are obliged to exchange information on the activities they undertake, the substances handled and how hazardous they are, and mapping of the upper-tier establishment’s accident scenarios.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

Portugal indicated that spatial planning legislation includes the concept of “compatibility of the site” for operators that wish to establish a new Seveso establishment or make changes to an existing one. The system is designed to maintain an adequate distance between existing establishments and vulnerable elements. Also, the EIA and SEA laws have incorporated the consideration of Seveso establishments. Municipal spatial planning strategies are also required to take this into account, for which they are provided with technical support.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

- **7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents**
  Portugal has not answered this question.

- **7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing**
  Portugal has not answered this question.

- **7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)**
  Portugal has not answered this question.
23. Member State summary sheet - Romania

ROMANIA

Overview of Romania

Overall, Romania provided a complete response.

Status of overall implementation:

Romania’s response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
The two competent authorities in charge of Seveso implementation and enforcement were abolished and replaced. The implementation and enforcement of the Seveso II Directive is the responsibility of County Environmental Protection Agencies and by the County Commissariat of the National Environmental Guard as of 2014.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 303 Seveso establishments in Romania at the end of 2014, slightly up from 295 in 2011.

As shown in the chart to the right, Romania exhibits fewer establishments per capita and much fewer establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The most common Seveso activities in Romania at the end of 2014 were:
- fuel storage (15%);
- LNG production, bottling and bulk distribution (13%); and
- production, destruction and storage of explosives (11%).

Fuel storage is also one of the three most common activities among Seveso establishments in the EU (11% of the EU total). As regards LNG production, 8% of EU establishments were dedicated to this activity at the end of the reporting period. Romania is the EU Member State with the third highest number of establishments in this activity (8% of all EU establishments in this activity). A similar trend was observed for the production, destruction and storage of explosives. 4% of EU establishments belonged to this activity, while Romania is the country with the second highest number of establishments dedicated to this activity (15% of all EU establishments in this activity).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Romania did not reply to this optional question.
ROMANIA

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 3 upper-tier establishments (2%) it was decided that an external emergency plan was not needed based on safety reports and internal emergency plans (it was deemed that there would not be consequences beyond the establishments' boundaries). Also, 2 establishments (2%) that should have prepared one have not done so. Romania did not provide further details on the latter.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 2 upper-tier establishments' external emergency plans had not been tested. This is 2% of Romanian upper-tier establishments, which can be considered a low proportion compared to the EU average of 25%. Romania has not provided further comment.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- TV, radio announcements; and
- Specific response measures are described in each external emergency plan. Romania did not provide any example of this.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
In Romania, external emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Notification exercises;
- Partial tests with emergency services and decision makers; and
- Full tests at least once every 3 years involving authorities, public forces, private staff from the establishments, other operators (domino effect).

Romanian authorities apply criteria to test establishments based on periodicity (at least once every 3 years), risk at source, and training of staff or population. The suitability of the plan is evaluated assessing the following: informational flow, authorities' compliance with their duties, inter-institutional collaboration, operators' cooperation, response from the emergency services forces, availability of the resources required for intervention and organisation of public information.
ROMANIA

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
During the reporting period, the Romanian National Environmental Protection Agency developed and started operating the Integrated Environment System through which any interested person may obtain information on major accident risks, possible consequences and safety measures. As a result, this information is available for all the upper-tier establishments in Romania. A statistical breakdown of how this information was made available was provided by Romania:

- Operator’s leaflets (47.28%);
- Authorities’ leaflets (48.53%);
- Operator’s flyers (43.41%);
- Authorities’ flyers (45.59%);
- Operator’s E-mails (8.31%);
- Authorities’ E-mails (3.67%); and
- Authorities’ SMS (2.21%).

Note that usually the information is provided in more than one way. Therefore the sum of percentages of the various means is more than 100%.

The Romanian Government has a system in place for operators and authorities to report annually on this matter. Also, local authorities are in charge of monitoring Seveso operators monthly, including the submission of this information.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Romania has not replied to this question.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The length and frequency of inspections are based on the systematic appraisal of the following criteria:
- Characteristics of a possible accident.
- Available protection against hazards
- Conditions of the installation
- Surroundings

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Romania has not replied to this question.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
During the reporting period the Competent Authorities applied 2085 coercive instruments: 1537 written notices and 548 financial penalties. Romania has not reported prohibitions of use or suspending of regulatory acts for Seveso establishments.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
118 out of 120 upper-tier establishments were inspected annually in Romania during the last reporting period. Another 2 (Romania has reported that it had 121 upper-tier establishments at some point during the period) were inspected at least once from 2012 to 2014. Also, all lower-tier establishments were inspected in the 2012-2014 period.
**ROMANIA**

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Based on the information received from the operators, competent authorities designate the establishments that are considered to have potential for domino effects. There are organised common exercises for testing the external emergency plans with all operators belonging to the same Domino group. There are protocols in place between operators in these groups for common intervention in case of emergency situations and for the provision of public information. Competent authorities request operators to exchange relevant information between themselves. This is monitored via inspections.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

Romanian land use planning laws take into account the location of Seveso establishments. Also, land use planning authorities are informed of the location and legal obligation of Seveso establishments. The issue is also taken into account during the EIA procedure, in which authorities, the Technical Committee for Analysis and the public participate.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents  
No Information was provided

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing  
No Information was provided

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)  
No Information was provided
Overall, Slovakia provided a complete response.

**Status of overall implementation:**
Slovakia’s response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**
None

### Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of the information reported**

#### Question 1 - General information

**1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks**
None were reported by Slovakia.

**1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso**
There were 82 Seveso establishments in Slovakia at the end of 2014, compared to 80 in 2011.

As shown in the chart to the right, Slovakia exhibits fewer establishments per capita and fewer establishments per km² than the EU average, reflecting a relatively low density of establishments in Slovakia.

**1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments**
The most common activities in Slovakia were:
- wholesale and retail (30%);
- fuel storage (10%); and
- general engineering (9%).

Fuel storage is also one of the three most common activities among Seveso establishments in the EU (11% of EU total). However, the other two activities with the highest number of establishments in Slovakia are relatively less common in the EU. Slovakia has 9% of the establishments categorised as “wholesale and retail” in the EU.

**1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)**
Slovakia indicated that 31 establishments (38% of total) are also covered by the IED. No negative impact has been reported in the implementation of either Directive in these cases.
2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For only one upper-tier establishment the Authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not necessary. The explanation provided is that the site is far from the population and any potentially damageable structure and that appropriate security measures are in place. The other 43 upper-tier establishments had an external emergency plan.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, three upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested, which is 7% of the upper-tier establishments in the country (as opposed to 25% at EU level).

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Siren system in relevant locations;
- Local TV/radio and an “Information Point”; and
- Online inventory of information for the general public, notice board, leaflets. The information to be provided includes the source, scope and characteristics of the accident as well as measures to be taken and communication procedures. Although this last point was included as an answer to this question, it does seem to refer to preparatory or preventive information rather than response measures.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
Plans are tested once every three years. These involve:
- Staff and practical tests (part or full tests) based on selected scenarios, which may involve testing the emergency services.
Tests are set up according to defined priorities in each region, although Slovakian Authorities have not specified what these are. Slovakia stated that the Regulation implementing the Seveso II Directive includes the figure of the “Analysis Group”, which is in charge of evaluating external emergency plans and draft an “evaluation document”, the content of which is defined in the Regulation.
### Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
All upper-tier establishments' operators have to inform the potentially affected public about the nature of their operations, the possible risks and measures for reducing them. The public potentially affected is also informed of actions to be taken in case of an accident. The operator shall send this information to the district authority, state administration authority in the field of fire protection and the municipality potentially affected. Operators must also ensure the permanent availability of information to the public, including an up-to-date list of dangerous substances of the establishment. District Authorities may choose to inform the public themselves if there are several upper-tier establishments located in a threatened area. Up to date safety information is available to the public. Confidential data is not included in this information. Slovakia has provided a statistical breakdown of the information provided:

- website: 100.00%;
- official notice board of urban/municipal authority: 88.00%;
- information in the establishment (e.g. information board at the entrance to the establishment): 62.50%;
- leaflets: 62.50%;
- written information (by post to the public affected): 37.50%; and
- radio/television: 37.50%.

Note that usually the information is provided in more than one way. Therefore the sum of percentages of the various means is more than 100%.

Authorities verify that the information is actually available through inspections.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
All upper-tier establishments’ information is kept up to date and permanently available through a website.

### Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Slovakia has a mixed approach with legally-established inspection periods and a systematic approach based on major accident hazards. The inspection periods established are once a year for upper-tier (once every 1.5 years if authorities deem it necessary) and once every 3 years for lower-tier.

The systematic approach is agreed between the environmental inspectorate and the competent authorities, with priorities being:
- the conclusions of previous risk assessments, documents and inspections
- the quality management system of the establishment

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
During the reporting period, fines were imposed (the amounts are available in the implementation report). Also, corrective measures were imposed for administrative irregularities (i.e. documents not drawn up to the required standard)

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
Four upper-tier establishments (9%) were inspected once every 12 months. The rest were inspected at least once during the reporting period. The average interval between two inspections at an upper-tier establishments was therefore 15 months (1.25 years). As stated above, Slovakia aims at undertaking annual inspections. However, authorities may reduce the frequency to once every 1.5 years (18 months). In addition to that, 41 lower-tier establishments were also inspected. The number of lower-tier establishments inspected is higher than the total number of these establishments at the end of the reporting period. The Slovak authorities have clarified that this is because the number of lower-tier establishments was higher during the period than at the end.

---

SLOVAKIA

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Domino effects are prevented in Slovakia through several instruments:
- Distribution of the safety reports submitted by the upper-tier establishments’ operators to all authorities relevant to industrial accident prevention for their review. These reports shall include information on other establishments in the surrounding area.
- Competent authorities have the option of reassigning the category of establishments (lower-tier to upper-tier) if they consider that the proximity of those sites to others increases the risk of an accident. Also, they can impose additional measures to reduce the risk, including the exchange of information.
- Consideration of cumulative effects in the testing of external emergency plans. In this sense, seven of the emergency external plan tests involved including other establishments in the vicinity of the one being tested to assess the possibility of a domino effect.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

Slovakia stated that current spatial planning legislation includes the requirement to consider Seveso establishments. Also, authorities may require this when a permit is requested. Finally, when an operator intends to establish a new Seveso establishment or modify an existing one, an expert and public assessment is undertaken as per the relevant legislation on industrial accidents.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
Slovakia reports an accident in a Seveso establishment in which a person died. A wide range of prevention measures was developed after that (full version available in the implementation report):
- The staff was updated with the results of the commission investigating the issue;
- Training;
- Informing all carriers that any person in the establishment had to know about these findings;
- Ensuring the control of vehicles weighting more than 3.5 tonnes;
- Securing the removal of selected contaminated soil from the plant; and
- Updating the organisational guideline on occupational safety.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
The information system referred to in footnote 9 (question 3.a) is an IT platform operated by the Ministry of Environment and provides information on the Seveso establishments to the general public.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No response was provided.
25. Member State summary sheet - Slovenia

SLOVENIA

Overview of the Slovenia

Slovenia provided an almost complete response with only a minor gap.

Status of overall implementation:
The Slovenian response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
None

Number of establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
Slovenia reported changing one of the two Competent Authorities that have been mainly responsible for Seveso II implementation and enforcement. Due to a reorganisation in the Government, this will now be the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (previously: Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment). The other Authority is the Ministry of Defence (it has been assumed this has not changed, although it is not specifically stated). The questionnaire response also lists the tasks for which both Authorities are responsible. Nothing indicates that this has changed during the reporting period.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 61 Seveso establishments in Slovenia at the end of 2014, the same number as in 2011. However, while in 2011 more than half of the establishments belonged to the lower tier, the balance has shifted to upper tier in 2014.

As shown in the chart to the right, Slovenia exhibits a relatively high density of establishments with more establishments per capita and more establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
The activities with the highest number of establishments at the end of the reporting period were:
- LPG storage (20%);
- fuel storage (18%); and
- “other activities” (11%).

“Other activities” is the category with the highest number of Seveso establishments in the EU (14%). Also, fuel storage is the
SLOVENIA

third most common activity within the EU Seveso establishments (11% of all establishments). Also, the other main categories of activities in Slovenia is among the most common in the EU, as LPG storage represents 4% of EU establishments.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Slovenia stated that 25 Seveso establishments are also covered by the IED, without any reported impact.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
Slovenia reported that all upper-tier establishments (33) have an external emergency plan.

Note: Total 33 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
Slovenia stated that all external emergency plans were tested during the reporting period.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- A national public alarm system is in place in case the public cannot be warned by other systems;
- General instruction on how to act is available via the website of the Administration for Civil Protection and Disaster Relief (www.urszr.si). Also, national and regional information and notification centres ensure there is up-to-date information in case of an event through information bulletins and other media (TV, radio); and
- Procedures on how the public will be alerted are defined in the emergency plans of each establishment.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
All plans have to be tested at least once every three years. The tests can be theoretical, practical or both and may cover one or more parts of the plans. Testing methods include:
- Rescue and relief tests involving emergency response staff; and
- Review/testing of contents according to the Regulation implementing the Seveso II Directive in Slovenia.

The scope can be small (small number of staff covering something specific) or large (international exercises, defence protection exercises).
SLOVENIA

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Operators of upper-tier establishments are responsible for informing the public potentially affected. They do so by sending information to them by post. Operators also organise open days for the public to visit their premises. These two ways of direct communication between the public and operators are believed to be effective by Slovenia. Because of this, competent authorities have not prepared nor distributed any other material about Seveso establishments during the last reporting period. In addition to direct communication, the operators’ websites and announcement boards (at their premises) also contain this information. As such, the statistical breakdown provided by Slovenia indicates that 100% of the information is provided by operators (leaflets sent to affected persons, website, and announcement boards). Slovenia stated that this information was made available for around half of the upper-tier establishments (that is, around 16). The supply of this information is monitored as part of the inspection controls in place.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
This question was not answered by Slovenia.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Slovenia stated that their inspection system is not based on a systematic appraisal. In fact, all upper-tier establishments are inspected at least once a year, whereas lower-tier establishments are inspected once every 3 years.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Inspection authorities publish an annual report which is available to the public.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Slovenia reports having taken “corrective measures” against seven operators of Seveso establishments. These were requests to the operators to comply with certain administrative requirements, mainly related to the availability of information to the public. No action was taken as a result of accidents/incidents.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
All upper-tier establishments were inspected at least once a year in the last reporting period. Additionally, all lower-tier establishments were subject to on-site inspections in the three year period.

Question 5 – Domino effects

Establishments relevant for consideration of domino effects are designated by the Competent Authority based on data from the safety reports prepared by operators. Establishments within a distance of 700 m from each other are considered to have potential for domino effects. These establishments are required to exchange information on the potential effects of accidents and information on emergency plans, as well as on information provision to the public. This is monitored during inspections.
SLOVENIA

Question 6 – Land-use planning

Slovenia included the minimisation of the effects of major industrial accidents in its spatial planning policy. According to national legislation, there is a buffer distance between Seveso establishments and residential areas called the “influence zone”. Scenarios to define this zone (and possible sub-zones therein) are described in the decree on criteria to determine minimum distance between an establishment and locations, frequented by the public, and infrastructure. The decree categorises types of buildings and establishes their vulnerability, which is then assessed alongside the influence zone of each establishment.

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No information was provided.
26. Member State summary sheet - Spain

SPAIN

Overview of Spain

Spain has replied to the majority of the questions. However, it did not provide an answer to question 4a on inspections.

Status of overall implementation:
Spain response indicates that the majority of the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are implemented.

Key compliance issues identified:
The level of external emergency plans testing is relatively low. More than half of the plans have not been tested during the reporting period (16% of the non-tested upper-tier establishments in the EU. As an average, the proportion of external emergency plans tested in EU is 25%). Spain cannot confirm the type of approach of their inspection programmes (each Region has one), but in any case a large number of upper-tier establishments were not inspected annually or during the reporting period.

Overview of the information reported

Question 1 - General information

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks
None were reported by Spain.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso
There were 832 Seveso establishments in Spain at the end of 2014, up from 767 in 2011. Both lower and upper-tier establishments increased in numbers during that period.

As shown in the chart to the right, Spain exhibits fewer establishments per capita and fewer establishments per km$^2$ than the EU average. Hence, despite the large overall number of establishments in Spain, the number is relatively low for a country of Spain’s size.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments
Spain has provided a statistical breakdown of the activities covered by its Seveso establishments. This does not add up to 100% because 9% of the establishments are unclassified (Regional authorities did not provide this information to the national Competent Authority). The most common activity among Seveso establishments in Spain are:
- “other activities” (16% of the total number of establishments covered by Seveso in Spain);
- LNG production (12%); and
- bottling and bulk distribution and fuel storage (12%).

These activities are relatively common at EU level. “Other activities” are the most common category in the EU with 14% whereas...
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fuel storage and LNG production, bottling and bulk distribution cover 11% and 8% of European establishments, respectively. In the case of LNG production, bottling and distribution, Spain is the second Member State with the highest number of establishments (19% of them) after Italy.

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)
Spain has not replied to this optional question.

Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 4 upper-tier establishments Spanish authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not necessary. Also, a plan was not drafted for 32 other upper-tier establishments. Therefore, the total amount of upper-tier establishments without an external emergency plan is around 10%. Spain did not provide an explanation for this.

![Number of upper-tier establishments with EEP](chart1.png)

Note: Total 377 upper-tier establishments

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, the external emergency plans of 210 upper-tier establishments had not been tested. This is above half of the total number of upper-tier establishments in Spain. This compares to 25% at EU level.

![Number of EEP tested at least every 3 years](chart2.png)

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Multi-tonal sirens controlled by the Emergency Coordination Centre of each Region;
- Fixed public address systems and portable loudspeaker equipment belonging to public intervention services; and
- Warnings through radio and TV programmes as well as social media.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
External emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Desk-based analysis and assessment prior to approval of the plans; and
- Partial or full exercises involving part or all the rescue services.

The suitability and operability of the plans is assessed after each exercise in evaluation sessions attended by all participants and observers. These sessions highlight areas for improvement and corrective measures.
SPAIN

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Competent Authorities are responsible for informing the public in Spain. This is done through face-to-face campaigns targeted at specific sectors of the public within the potentially affected area. These campaigns also include leaflets and audio-visual material. Spain indicated that there are efforts to keep this information permanently available through the websites of the civil protection bodies of each region. As such, the information for 175 (47%) of the upper-tier establishments was made actively available to the public at least once during the reporting period. Given that 100% of the information is provided by Competent Authorities, Spain has reported a further statistical breakdown of the information provided on the 175 establishments:

- Leaflets/posters: 95%;
- Sessions/talks: 95%;
- Local TV/radio: 35%;
- Social media: 30%; and
- Personal letters: 20%.

Note that usually the information is provided in more than one way. Therefore the sum of percentages of the various means is more than 100%. The Authorities in charge of distributing the information assess its impact and effectiveness by means of surveys and polls. Also, they carry out an analysis of the number of visits to the web pages where the information is held and to the social media used.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
The information for 225 upper-tier establishments (60%) is kept permanently available. As indicated above, Competent Authorities are in charge of publishing and maintaining this information in their websites.

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
Spain stated that each Regional Competent Authority has its own inspection programme. Most of them did not provide information on the appraisal to inspections. As a result, Spain cannot confirm whether any of the Regions are using a systematic approach.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Spain has not replied to this optional question

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
Spain has adopted the following measures: disclosure requirements, disciplinary proceedings (16 in progress), partial operating ban of the establishment (1), and total suspension of operations of the establishment (1).

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
192 upper-tier establishments (51% of the total number of upper-tier establishments) were inspected annually. Another 103 (27%) were inspected at least during the last reporting period. Note that while some of the Regional Competent Authorities in Spain may apply systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) in which case it would not be absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually, the numbers still appear relatively low. As for lower-tier establishments, Spain reported inspecting 255 (56%) during the 3-year reporting period.

![](chart.png)
### SPAIN

**Question 5 – Domino effects**

Establishments relevant for consideration of domino effects are identified by the competent authority in each Regional Government, based on information from the establishments’ safety reports and on criteria established in the Spanish legislation (for details see the implementation report submitted by Spain). They communicate this to the Central Government and establishments in question. These establishments are required to exchange information on the effects of accidents and information on emergency plans. Also, the Regional Governments have promoted the creation of committees among operators involved in domino effects, in order to encourage information exchange and participation in joint exercises.

**Question 6 – Land-use planning**

In Spain, the Regional Governments adopt strategies or publish a report on spatial planning which covers this subject, the content of which is legally binding. The reports/strategies include risks that can be caused by new Seveso establishments located in populated areas and that of growing populations near industrial areas with Seveso establishments, as well as compatibility criteria. The criteria is stated to be based on international benchmarks and European guidelines on the subject matter, but no further details have been provided.

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

1. **7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents**
   None were reported by Spain

2. **7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing**
   Spain reported the launch of an IT database called the National Chemical Hazard Database. This contains information on Seveso establishments and provides Competent Authorities with knowledge regarding risk parameters; preventive and control measures; provision of information to the public; external emergency plans; and lessons learned.

3. **7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)**
   None were reported by Spain
27. Member State summary sheet - Sweden

Overview of Sweden

Overall, Sweden provided a complete response.

**Status of overall implementation:**

Sweden’s response indicates that most of the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**

Low level of tests of external emergency plans

---

**Number of establishments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Overview of the information reported

**Question 1 - General information**

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

None were reported by Sweden.

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 400 Seveso establishments in Sweden at the end of 2014, up from 381 in 2011. This is due to an increasing number of lower tier and to a smaller extent upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, Sweden exhibits much fewer establishments per capita but much more establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

No statistical breakdown using the SPIRS categories was available

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

No information was provided.
Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
Swedish Competent Authorities did not decide that external emergency plans were not necessary in any case. However, these plans were not drawn up for 14 upper-tier establishments (7% of all upper-tier establishments in Sweden, as opposed to 9% at EU level). Sweden stated that one of them closed down and four were new, whereas the other nine should have met this requirement. Sweden did not indicate taking enforcement measures against them.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 120 upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested (57% of the upper-tier establishments in Sweden, as opposed to 25% at EU level). Sweden did not provide any comment on this issue.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- Announcements on TV and radio, alarms. There are three types of messages: information, warning and ‘all clear’.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
All plans are meant to be tested at least once every three years. Type of tests reported:
- Partial and full practical tests involving emergency response staff. Sometimes, these are at large scale, involving several establishments; and
- Partial and full desk based exercises reviewing decision routes and management.

Small scale exercises may not be reported to Authorities, hence Sweden believes that the data on testing may be underestimated. There are not established criteria at national level to decide whether plans are adequate. Sweden is making efforts to improve its knowledge of inspection systems in order to improve and standardise these.

Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Municipalities are in charge of providing information to the public that may be affected by a major industrial accident, although costs have to be borne by the operators. Brochures are sent to the public, and announcements are made in local newspapers and the radio. Information about what to do in the case of such an accident is permanently available online (operators’ and municipalities’ websites). In total, the information was made available for 143 upper-tier establishments (68%). Although a specific statistical breakdown was not provided, it can be calculated. In 100% of cases, authorities (municipalities) provided the information to the public, whereas operators contributed to 26%. This was complemented by announcements in 10 county administrative boards and permanent information on the operators’ and municipalities’ websites. The submission of information is verified as part of the inspection procedures.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
Information not provided.
Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The length and frequency of inspections are based on the systematic appraisal of the following criteria:
- Administrative data;
- Characteristics of the surrounding area;
- Type of substances and quantities handled;
- Risk conditions;
- Existence of preventive measures;
- Information supplied to the public;
- Date of external and internal emergency plans;
- Date of the last inspection; and
- Occurrence of accidents.

This information is obtained from the safety reports.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
No information was provided.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
The main types of actions are injunctions and prohibitions. These can be combined with fines or penalties. The response does not indicate whether any of these actions were taken during the reporting period.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
30 (14%) of the upper-tier establishments were inspected at least once every 12 months. Another 159 were inspected at least once between 2012 and 2014. Note that Sweden applies systematic appraisal to determine inspection schedules (see 4.a) and as such it is not absolutely required to inspect all establishments annually.

In addition to that, 154 lower-tier establishments were inspected during the reporting period (81% of the 189 lower-tier establishments at the end of 2014).

Question 5 – Domino effects

Operators are obliged to consider domino effects. These shall be identified in the environmental impact assessment (prior to the establishment of the site) and safety report. Inspection authorities can assist operators in identifying domino effects. In order to do this, authorities use safety reports and other general information. In the case of EIA, the EIA Regulations are linked with the regulations implementing the Seveso II Directive, ensuring that operators take domino effects into account when drafting the EIA, which has to be approved. The implementation report contains an example of how information on possible domino effects was exchanged between various upper-tier Seveso establishments and how local authorities were also involved. An issue identified in the example is the operators’ different risk awareness, as some may identify domino effects while others may not consider the existence of potential issues.

Question 6 – Land-use planning

Sweden stated that its national legislation on spatial planning and environment contains basic requirements for the consideration of suitable locations for each purpose. This is complemented by additional guidance on appropriate safety distances between major hazard sites and other developments prepared by the National Board on Housing, Building and Planning supported by other Authorities.
### SWEDEN

**Question 7 – Further information (optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents</td>
<td>No information was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing</td>
<td>No information was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities</td>
<td>No information was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNITED KINGDOM

Overview of the United Kingdom

Overall, the United Kingdom provided a complete response.

**Status of overall implementation:**

The United Kingdom response indicates that the provisions of the Seveso II Directive are fully implemented.

**Key compliance issues identified:**

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of establishments:</th>
<th>Lower-tier</th>
<th>Upper-tier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the information reported

**Question 1 - General information**

1.a) Significant changes made to competent authorities or their tasks

Two relevant changes were reported by the United Kingdom, namely the introduction of a new agency in Wales (Natural Resources Wales) and the transfer of the Health & Safety enforcement responsibility at nuclear licensed sites to the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR).

1.b) Establishments subject to Seveso

There were 924 Seveso establishments in the UK at the end of 2014, down from 1086 in 2011. This is due to a decreasing number of lower-tier and to a lesser extent upper-tier establishments.

As shown in the chart to the right, the UK exhibits fewer establishments per capita but more establishments per km² than the EU average.

1.c) Activities of Seveso establishments

No statistical breakdown using the SPIRS categories was available. The UK has used a classification system based on NACE codes. 56% of the establishments in the UK were classified in the “manufacturing” section. 17% were classified under “wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles. A further 12% were classified in “transportation and storage”. More specifically:

- 15% (132) of establishments were classified under NACE class 46.71 (wholesale of solid, liquid and gaseous fuels);
- 9% (85) of establishments were classified under NACE code 20.59 (manufacture of other chemicals); and
- 9% (83) of establishments were classified under NACE class 52.10 (warehousing and storage).

1.d) Seveso establishments covered by the IED (optional)

The United Kingdom has not answered this optional question.
Question 2 - Emergency plans

2.a) & 2.b) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan
For 7 upper-tier establishments the UK authorities decided that an external emergency plan was not needed because their safety reports indicated that the consequences of a major accident would not extend beyond the sites’ boundaries. In addition to this, 20 upper-tier establishments failed to produce an external emergency plan. According to UK authorities, 11 of these establishments became upper-tier during 2014 and have one year to complete the plans. The remaining 9 establishments were due to complete them during 2015.

2.c) Upper-tier establishments without external emergency plan tested
At the end of the reporting period, 53 upper-tier establishments’ external emergency plans had not been tested (15% of the upper-tier establishments in the UK and 4% of the total number of upper-tier establishments in this situation in the EU). Of these, 18 were tested at the beginning of 2015, with other 7 due to be tested before the end of that year. 11 establishments became upper-tier in 2014 and did not need to draft these plans until a year later. UK authorities stated that they were seeking information about the remaining upper-tier establishments and would take the appropriate action once they have more information.

2.d) Arrangements for providing information to the public:
- There is no centralised alert system in the UK. The UK stated that its guidelines recommend the use of on-site alarms;
- Local TV and radio companies distribute information in an event of an accident;
- The police is responsible for warning and informing the public in the initial stages. Arrangements for response are integrated in local emergency plans (the description of alert systems could be done at that level);
- Those liable to be affected by a Seveso accident (i.e. all addresses within a “public information zone”) are provided with information via a letter and leaflet sent to their addresses. This contains information on what action to take in case of a major accident (although this was responded under 2.d), it is a preparatory measure rather than a response measure); and
- Arrangements for coping with off-site effects from accidents are integrated with wider emergency planning, which involves the participation of various authorities, namely the police, firefighters, Local Authority Emergency Planners, hospitals, Public Health Authorities. Each authority has a different role in an event of an accident.

2.e) Testing external emergency plans
In the UK, external emergency plans are tested as follows:
- Full tests (live exercises);
- Table-top exercises based on scenarios identified in the safety report;
- Walk-through exercises including visiting appropriate facilities such as emergency control centres (ECCs);
- Seminars facilitating discussion about the different organisations’ responses in particular circumstances during an emergency; and
- Control post exercises testing the communication arrangements during an emergency.
Testing is agreed locally to maximise the benefit of Local Authorities. UK authorities expect each of the elements above to be tested at least once every three years, recognising that some (e.g. ‘control post exercises’) should be tested more frequently.

The elements to be tested are the completeness, consistency and accuracy of the plans as well as the adequacy and competence of the equipment, facilities and staff involved. Criteria used to consider whether the plans are adequate are: whether the plan complies with the relevant article and annex of the Directive, whether it is informed by the major hazard scenarios provided by the operator, whether the relevant statutory consultees have been consulted, and whether it is coherent with the internal emergency plan. Also, it is assessed whether local authorities have followed the best practice guidelines.
Question 3 – Information on safety measures

3.a), 3.b), 3.c), 3.d) Information made actively available
Information on actions to be taken in the event of a Seveso accident are provided to all addresses in the public information zones (PIZ), which are determined according to the likelihood and effects of potential accidents at Seveso establishments. The information is supplied by the operator, which is informed by the authorities of the extension of its PIZ. Also, Local Authorities may distribute this information if agreed with the operator. The form and content is not specified, but it is expected that the text will be simple, understandable and accompanied by illustrations. If it is deemed necessary, authorities advise operators of the need for translating the information into other languages.

The UK has stated that almost 90% of its upper-tier establishments provide information within their PIZ. The UK has provided explanations for the 41 that have not done so. 27 do not have to inform the public (as there is no off-site risk or no population within their PIZ), 4 did not have external emergency plan at the end of the reporting period, and for 10 it was not clear whether the information had been provided. The UK has provided a statistical breakdown of how the information was provided:

- Operator’s leaflets/flyers: 34%;
- Email / SMS / Telephone Alert: 5%;
- Safety Booklet / Newsletter: 33%; and
- Other : e.g. Emergency/Safety Card, calendars etc.: 28%.

UK authorities ensure that this information is actually provided through their inspection procedures.

3.e), 3.f), 3.g) Information kept permanently available (optional)
No information was provided

Question 4 - Inspections

4.a) Systematic appraisal of major-accident hazards
The length and frequency of inspections are based on the systematic appraisal of the following criteria:
- Follow-up issues identified in the safety report or in a previous inspection; and
- Parameters such as the age of a plant, safety performance indicators, the prevention of loss of containment of dangerous substances or competence issues.

Competent authorities have a system to assist local authorities in deciding inspection priorities and define the establishments that will be inspected. Plans assess operators’ risk management by sampling and testing in critical areas.

4.b) Programme of inspections available to public (optional)
Not answered.

4.c) Actions taken in the event of accidents, incidents and non-compliance
The main actions used were prosecution (in the most serious cases), prohibition notices (which may be immediate or deferred), and improvement notices issued by inspectors. For minor breaches, verbal warnings, followed by a letter were used.

4.d), 4.e), 4.f) Data on on-site inspections
Between 86% and 89% of upper-tier establishments were inspected annually during the last reporting period. The majority (>89%) of the upper-tier establishments were inspected at least once during 2012-2014. In addition to this, 526 lower-tier establishments were inspected. Data was provided for each year in the reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-tier annual inspection</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total upper-tier</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of upper-tier with annual inspection</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5 – Domino effects

Domino sites are designated by the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) on behalf of each Competent Authority. A contour (consultation distance, CD) is allocated to each establishment for land use planning purposes and is the basis for defining domino groups where its physical boundaries overlaps with the CD of other sites. Authorities inform all ‘domino’ operators and encourage them to exchange information, often advising of the type of information that should be exchanged. The information should be incorporated in the safety report. Compliance with this is checked during the safety report assessment process. Also, authorities may require operators to inform them of the information that has been circulated to other members of the ‘domino’ group. Operators shall check whether action should be taken according to the new information received from other domino sites. Authorities shall check if the information has been incorporated in the review of the safety reports (upper-tier) and during inspections (lower-tier). The system has been in place for a number of years and is now being updated to incorporate additional requirements from Seveso III.

Question 6 – Land-use planning

Major accident prevention policy has been incorporated in land use planning through different Regulations applicable to each of the regions of the UK (England and Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland). In all cases, this was incorporated before 1996. Administration and enforcement lies with Hazardous Substances Authorities, which are often the Local Planning Authorities. They are in charge of giving consent to establishments willing to keep hazardous substances as well as to anyone interested in developing the land in the vicinity of Seveso establishments. HSE alone or with the relevant environmental authority (EA, NRW, SEPA, and NIEA) depending on the issues to be assessed determine the compatibility of the developments with their proposed location. For the developments, zones of influence of each establishments are defined (inner, middle, outer) and HSE has defined criteria of which are compatible within each zone. Authorities introduced an additional Development Proximity Zone (DPZ) at all sites with large-scale petrol storage tanks.

Question 7 – Further information (optional)

7.a) Lessons learned from accidents and incidents
No information was provided.

7.b) IT tools used for monitoring the implementation and data sharing
No information was provided.

7.c) Seveso like provisions applied to other installations and activities (e.g. pipelines, ports, marshalling yards, offshore)
No information was provided.