

Project name:

#014 BRISK

Minutes of the 5th BRISK Meeting 8-9.2.2011, Helsinki, Finland

0.1 The 5th Meeting of the Project on Sub-regional risk of spill of oil and hazardous substances in the Baltic Sea (BRISK) was held in Helsinki, Finland on 8-9 February 2011. The meeting was hosted by the Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE).

0.2 The aim of the meeting was to discuss:

- the Risk analysis;
- the status and development of the sub-regional response agreements;
- financial reporting and
- communication issues.

0.3 Mr. Peter Soeberg Poulsen, Project Manager of the BRISK Project, acted as Chairman of the meeting. Ms. Monika Stankiewicz, Professional Secretary, HELCOM Secretariat, and Mr. Ib Corneliussen Nielsen, BRISK Project Coordinator, acted as secretaries of the Meeting.

Agenda item 1, Opening

1.1 Ms. Mari Walls, Director of Marine Research Centre of the Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE), opened the Meeting. In her welcoming speech, Ms. Walls informed on the areas of work of SYKE and underlined the importance of the commitments of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan related to response to pollution at sea.

1.2 Lead Partner, Project Manager Mr. Peter Soeberg Poulsen also welcomed the participants.

1.3 All Project Partners took part in the Meeting. The list of participants is included in **Annex 1**.

Agenda item 2. Approval of the agenda

2.1 The Meeting adopted the agenda for the meeting (**Annex 2**).

Agenda item 3. Project status

3.1 Mr. Carsten Jürgensen, COWI, briefly reminded of the background and goals of the BRISK Project.

Agenda item 4. Risk analysis

4.1 The Meeting discussed the maps with risks of accidents and risks of pollution presented by Mr. Albrecht Lentz, COWI (**Presentation 1**). The maps show e.g. that there is a difference between the probability of accidents (groundings and collisions) and of spills. For instance, in the northern Baltic Proper and the central Baltic Proper (south of Gotland) there is a higher risk of spills comparing to risk of accidents, which is due to specific traffic pattern and the related consequences

of accidents. Also there are different risks of spills when existing VTS, TSS, etc. are taken into account.

4.2 The Meeting took note that illegal spills and spills from offshore platforms are included in the modeling; however they do not affect the overall risk picture. The Meeting agreed that the maps on risk of accidents and pollution can be considered finalized and can be made public as the outcome of the BRISK and BRISK-RU projects. The maps, and the data behind them will be made available from the HELCOM Secretariat for the use by the project partners. At the later stage the data will be uploaded to the HELCOM map and data service.

4.3 The Meeting took note of the comment by Russia that for each sub-region high risk areas should be determined by the countries themselves and the medium-size spills addressed accordingly. The Meeting welcomed the information by COWI that the broad range of sizes of spills has been included into the model, which makes it possible to select any spill size of interest in a specific sub-region for further analysis of the needed response resources.

4.4 The Meeting agreed that each sub-region should discuss and determine the most relevant spill size that the countries should be ready to respond to.

4.5 The Meeting took note of the picture of risks of collisions during winter season and the remaining time of the year. The Meeting recognized that no model exists for modeling the risks in ice situation. Applying models for open water on ice conditions gives a conservative estimate of the spill risks (on the safe side). As earlier agreed with the Finnish ice experts the BRISK model uses a winter with average ice conditions. The winter 08/09 was chosen, as agreed earlier (simultaneous observations from an average winter and AIS data).

4.6 Finland pointed out that for instance in the Gulf of Finland during a hard winter, TSS is not used and vessels are using the route more to the south. Thus such extreme situation is different from the average condition to be modeled in the present project. Consequently, the BRISK model will not comprise the aspects of risks in extreme ice, nor in other extreme conditions. Some aspects, such as risk of accidents in icebreaker convoys, has been taken into account though (a specific factor has been introduced into the model to represent this kind of accidents).

4.7 The Meeting found it important to validate the model, by comparing the number of collision candidates with real accidents to indicate the level of confidence and how close to reality the results are. The Meeting learned that such validation of the BRISK model against statistics has been made for risks of accidents except for the ice conditions. COWI confirmed that similar comparison will be done also for accidents in winter. The Meeting noted that it is not possible to do the validation for the risks of spills as too little statistics is available. Therefore, an advance model for consequences has been used within BRISK.

4.8 To reflect the above considerations, all constrains, assumptions as well as model validation against statistics should be included in the final report. The Lead Partner confirmed that such explanation will be part of the report.

4.9 The Meeting agreed that the risk analysis should be as accurate as possible. On the other hand, one should always bear in mind the final goal of the project which is to identify the gaps in response resources and draw investment plans.

4.10 The Meeting took note of the information by COWI that a memo describing the maps on risks will be finalized and distributed shortly. More detailed technical report will be prepared at the later stage and the Meeting welcomed the information that Mr. Jakub Montewka, Finland, agreed to contribute to the part of the report related to ice. The Meeting also invited Mr. Gennady Semanov, Russia, to contribute to finalizing the ice part of the report, which is pending the financing by the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM).

4.11 The Meeting took note of the status of the response part of the model presented by Mr. Carsten Jürgensen, COWI (**Presentation 1**), including as follows:

- the St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad port areas have been excluded as they are in specific responsibility of port authorities;
- routing measures enforced after 08/09 (Åland TSS and new VTS in Great Belt) have been included in the future scenario;
- oil rigs have been included;
- pumping rate vs. recovery rate - high-viscosity oil should be distinguished from other types of oil – this work is on-going within the working groups (re-location & increased response capacities);
- planned ships have been included in the 2020 scenario;
- ships with and without oil recovery will be handled separately;
- the model has been modified to reflect storage capacity (50% after 12 hrs); however this should be subject to further discussions and estimation within the working group on increased response capacities;
- EMSA vessels have been included.

4.12 The Meeting discussed how to reflect the real recovery rate and noted that various methodologies exist to calculate it. The Meeting took note of the suggestion by Russia that the model should calculate real recovery rate for each vessels. Mr. Carsten Jürgensen clarified that the model is not designed for that purpose (it is not an operational model) and this question should be dealt with within the working group on improved response capacities. Anyways, the way the recovery rate has been dealt with should be described in the final report. Russia noted that she couldn't follow such explanation and was still of the opinion that the model should give the information in question.

4.13 The Meeting agreed that the response vessels available to assist other countries should be modeled separately from resources available for national response only. For some countries, e.g. Russia, both the state-owned ships and private-owned ships are currently included. The Meeting requested countries to indicate which of the listed vessels are aimed for the national response, if any, and to inform the Secretariat accordingly as soon as possible, by **16 February 2011** at the latest.

4.14 The Meeting pointed out that the sea depth is a limiting factor for response ships - 10 m depth is normally the limit for open water vessels. The Meeting agreed that the shallow areas should be somehow taken into account when assessing the response capabilities. The Meeting further noted that the response in coastal areas is in many countries a responsibility of coastal communes/local authorities and smaller response vessels are not to be included in the model (they are not dedicated to international assistance).

4.15 The Meeting took note that four different types of oil are modeled, including vegetable oil to represent "oil-alike" hazardous substances.

Sensitivity maps

4.16 The Meeting discussed the sensitivity maps presented by COWI (**Presentation 1**).

4.17 The Meeting discussed in general the definitions of environmental parameters used for sensitivity mapping. Finland expressed the opinion that there are benefits of using definitions according to the Habitat Directive as these are legally binding, and are of relevance for instance in case of investigating and explaining real spill consequences.

4.18 Estonia made a general remark that scientific considerations of what is valuable from the conservation point of view should be distinguished from nature values having legal background, the latter ones having more relevance for management purposes. Additionally, Estonia referred to a standard methodology for environmental sensitivity mapping (environmental sensitivity index,

based on geology, biology and economy). COWI clarified that in principle such a system has been used in BRISK.

4.19 The Lead Partner stressed that the maps should serve the purpose of response to pollution, meaning that it is enough for a responder to know which areas to protect, and not necessary the reasons for it.

4.20 The Meeting concluded on the environmental maps, updated since the last meeting, as follows:

1. Rocky shore and stone reefs:

- stone reefs in the Danish straits are missing,
- southern part of the Russian Gulf of Finland are marshes, not rocks – to be further checked by Russia,
- Finland suggested separating these two habitats to be in line with the Habitat Directive;

2 & 3. Coastal lagoons and estuaries:

- the final sensitivity maps will be in a grid of 2km x 2km, which - according to Finland - will overestimate the sensitivity in areas where point data has been made available; according to Iflor Sweden some data for a coastal lagoons map is missing;

4. Bays:

- Tallinn, Parnu and Narva bays are missing from the map, Estonia will deliver additional information **by 2 March 2011**; the map was agreed in principle;

5. Underwater banks:

- it was discussed if this data layer should be deleted from the sensitivity analyses since it overlaps with map 8; Habitat Directive includes banks up to 20m in depth, however from the oil pollution perspective, shallower areas should be prioritized; it has been decided to keep sandy banks. For the area from 0 to 10 m depth a score for nursery of certain fish is given. For depth from 10m to 20m a smaller weight is given as it is less sensitive.

6. Sandy beaches:

- important due to human activities (tourism),
- FI mentioned that data for sandy beaches in Swedish archipelago is missing.;
- Estonia and Poland wish to check sandy beaches vs. rocky shores **by 2 March 2011**;

7. Seagrass meadows: agreed in principle;

8. Spawning areas (fish with demersal eggs): agreed in principle;

9. Nursery area on shallow water (<10m)

- it is good that the map represents not only commercial fish species but also coastal fish; the map was agreed in principle;

10. Offshore spawning areas for fish with pelagic eggs – now indicates sprat and cod spawning areas, agreed in principle;

11. Wintering areas for sea and shore birds: – Kaliningrad is missing;

12. Staging areas for migrating sea and shore birds:

- Kaliningrad is missing;
- the meeting noted that Schleswig-Holstein data is not included;

- Estonian data is missing; last year a LIFE project on Marine Protected Areas in the eastern Baltic Sea was finalized, which could have the needed data for Estonia; Estonia will provide the data **by 2 March 2011** (same for map 13);

13. Breeding areas for sea and shore birds: - Estonia –see map 12;

14. Moulting areas for sea birds – agreed in principle;

15. Marine mammals:

- porpoises has been left out (no fixed places, not sensitive to oil),
- Finland pointed out that porpoises is a Habitat Directive species, new studies have been initiated recently,
- also ringed seals are difficult to locate; it has been agreed that average ice edge could indicate ring seals locations; Finland will provide the data on extent of the ice for the Gulf of Finland and Gulf of Bothnia based on the data from the FMI **by 2 March 2011**,
- metadata should indicate which species are covered and additional explanation should be included in the final report; the map was agreed in principle;

16. Protected areas:

- some NATURA 2000 sites are missing in Lithuania, Lithuania will send the information **by 2 March 2011**,
- COWI will produce a more detailed map showing areas under specific protection regimes,
- there has been some discussion whether to include this map at all, and it has been agreed to check how this layer change the final sensitivity maps;

17. Aquaculture/fish farms – agreed in principle.

4.21 The Meeting agreed that it is important to reflect in the report the considerations related the costs of the investments in the existing response resources and how it is related to sensitivity of specific coasts. Finland offered to assist in formulation of such text.

4.22 The Meeting requested the countries for which the data is missing (as indicated above) or as necessary, to provide the data **by 2 March 2011**. The Meeting took note that some data for Kaliningrad is still missing, which will be checked with the NCM.

4.23 The Meeting requested COWI to include metadata in GIS files with maps as well as properly state the source/copyrights in the final set of maps. The Meeting requested the datasets to be distributed to the project partners for the final confirmation **by 16 February 2011**.

4.24 The Meeting requested COWI to clearly describe the reasoning for and the content of the maps in the final report.

4.25 The Meeting concurred with the comment by Russia that in principle all countries consider majority of their waters and coasts as sensitive, however from the responder's point of view it is important to have an overview map showing areas with the highest sensitivity. The Meeting welcomed the approach in BRISK to combine different environmental features, leading to seasonal sensitivity maps which prioritize some areas over some others.

4.26 Estonia raised the question of how the integrated sensitivity maps are being developed. It has been explained that the Working Group 2 will do some alternative weighting for environmental parameters.

Oil damage

4.27 The Meeting discussed the proposal on how to calculate the environment damage by oil based on the final sensitivity maps and the maps indicating oil impact (pollution) (**Presentation 1**).

4.28 The Meeting proposed to change the definitions from “impact” into “expected pollution” or “expected impact” and from “damage” into the “expected damage”.

4.29 The Meeting noted the comment by Russia that in her opinion the response scenarios in the Gulf of Finland should be done for impact, not for damage (as one cannot prevent oil stranding on the shore in this relatively small area).

4.30 The Meeting took note the information by the Secretariat that the information on the expected damage by oil is of interest to the newly established HELCOM Expert Working Group on Shoreline Response.

4.31 The Meeting suggested that as far as sub-regional and national scale is concerned, the impact maps will be used to rank and compare different response scenarios. For the overall Baltic picture, damage maps could be used.

4.32 The Meeting discussed how to deal with cases where no environmental data exists and how to distinguish those from low sensitivity areas. The Meeting noted that the integrated sensitivity map shown in the presentation is not updated yet, however all features of interest will be reflected in the updated map based on the existing information. The Meeting further pointed out that even if the data were missing, it would not have a major influence on the integrated sensitivity map.

4.33 The Meeting agreed that visualization matters could be discussed at the later stage.

Working Group 3 on “Relocation of response capacities”

4.34 The work under the Working Group 3 is led by HELCOM and was presented by Ms. Laura Meski, HELCOM Secretariat (**Presentation 2**). The Meeting noted that the basis for the further work of the group will be the estimation of risks of oil pollution (final map to be delivered by COWI) and the estimation of recovery rate.

4.35 The Meeting took note of the comment by Russia that she expected COWI model to indicate how the response resources should be re-located, based on the assessed risks.

4.36 The Meeting agreed that a scenario suggesting relocation of resources could not be produced as most of the countries consider the location of their resources optimal and due to the fact that the vessels are engaged in some other duties, not related to the pollution response.

4.37 The Meeting welcomed the approach presented by the Secretariat and made the following suggestions for the further work of the group:

- the fact that sometime the vessels are under repair and not available - some reduction coefficient could be used to reduce available assets; otherwise, the scenario will show the best possible situation;
- normal speed of the vessels (“cruising” speed), instead of maximum speed, would be closer to reality ; the countries should come back to the Secretariat **by 16 February 2011** to provide this information;
- countries are requested to confirm **by 16 February 2011** which ships can handle high-viscosity oil;
- Russian vessels not available to response operation in a foreign country should be excluded – Russia informed during the meeting which these vessels are;
- for Russian vessels mobilization time should be “0” for summer time and 2hrs for ice conditions;
- for recovery scenarios, specific, high risk spots should be selected for each sub-region, and only ships with recovery equipment are included;
- normally not all countries are alarmed at the same time – this should be somehow reflected;

- a scenario for HNS recovery could be included.

Working Group 2 on “Alternative sensitivity weighting matrix”

4.38 The Meeting welcomed the presentation by Ms. Meri Hietala, Finland, on the work being conducted within the group. The aim is to give a score to each of the maps which will lead to prioritization of the most relevant environmental parameters. As the outcome, two alternative weighting matrixes will be produced. Germany is investigating their possibilities for participating in this work. Sweden confirmed that they will be able to fill in the matrix, but might not be able to participate in the following discussions.

Working Group 4 on “Additional booms and skimmers”

4.39 The work of the Group is led by Poland. Mr. Marek Reszko presented the main ideas on how to proceed.

4.40 Russia was of the opinion that mathematical model should provide answers what response equipment is needed in sub-regions. The Meeting agreed that the information on the risk of spills, including the effect of using the existing response resources, is the first step, and such information will be delivered by the model. These results should serve the discussions in the sub-regions on what are the needed capacities.

4.41 Russia expected that the model will provide direct information on what equipment is needed (see also point 4.12). However, such a way would require experts to define what the acceptable level of pollution is. This would be very difficult for many reasons. However, it has to be made clear, also as the outcome of the project, that one can never recover the total amount of oil from the sea, especially in such confined areas as the Gulf of Finland. Thus we always have to be prepared for shoreline clean-up.

4.42 The aim of the working groups is to give recommendations for and feed into the model the hypothetical response scenario(s) to do some trial tests on the model. Based on this, the experts could judge in which direction to continue the identification of the needed response resources.

Working Group 5 on “Improved night visibility”

4.43 The Group is led by Sweden. There are technical systems to detect oil on water from the distance in darkness; however they have not been tested in real conditions. There are a lot of limiting factors in operating longer hours, such as crew fatigue and storage limitations. Therefore there will be only a small increase in capacities due to use of the equipment detecting oil in darkness. The countries are requested to inform if any such equipment is in use in their countries **by 16 February 2011** and to suggest how the capacities are improved due to that. The model currently is based on the assumption that the response action can be conducted during the 60% of the day.

Working Group 6 on “Recovery of oil from ice”

4.44 The Group is led by Finland. Ms. Mari Hietala presented the way forward to find out how the response capacities is reduced due to ice. The approach has been welcomed by participants. The second step would be to find out what combatting fleet we would need in each sub-region, and how to take into account some other useful capacities. Russia suggested to put ice conditions in three classes (ice concentration <30%, 30%<x<70%, >70%).

4.45 The deadline for finalizing the work of the working groups is **2 March 2011**. Russia indicated that participation of Russian experts is related to the financing from the NCM.

Agenda item 5, agreements

5.1 The Meeting took note of the overview of the status of the response agreements presented by the Lead Partner (**Presentation1**).

5.2 The Meeting welcomed the information that on 6 December 2010 a new official agreement between the governments of Russia and Poland was signed.

5.3 The agreement between Russia and Lithuania was signed in 2009, but the contingency plan is yet to be developed. Lithuania will inform the Lead Partner on any follow-up activities **by 16 February 2011**.

5.4 The bilateral agreement between Germany and Poland is still being discussed. A new procedure for its approval has started two months ago. The first draft has been circulated between the countries, and Poland and Germany will come back with information on the agreement to the Lead Partner **by 16 February 2011**.

5.6 The extension of SWEDENGER to the Polish waters (western coast) will be done after signing the bilateral agreement first. In order to proceed with elaboration of the draft of the amended SWEDENGER plan, a meeting will be organized by Germany. Germany will come back shortly with the suggestion for the date.

5.7 Regarding SWESTLAT, Sweden will soon call for a meeting to be held late March/beginning of April with the aim to start elaboration of the updated SWESTLAT. A bilateral agreement between Estonia and Latvia is expected to be signed.

Agenda item 6. Financial reporting

6.1 Ms. Karin Rothmann-Hansen, COWI, informed that the 3rd progress report is in the process of approval. The deadline for submission of the 4th progress report signed by the FLC is 15 March 2011. Some project partners have difficulties to fill in the shared costs, and the Lead Partner can always be asked for assistance in this and other matters.

6.2 Mr. Carsten Jürgensen, COWI, presented the status of spending on the project and partner level (**Presentation 1**):

- DK is well on its way regarding the spending,
- HELCOM expects 80% spending for the BL2 and there is a challenge with BL3 “travels”; after relocation the situation would improve;
- SE - after some earlier difficulties, the spending is improving,
- FI - there are some expenditures that could not be reported; more information on shared costs for specific budget lines has been requested from COWI to show for which parts of the project the money has been spent – the Lead Partner will provide the requested information; under-spending is expected;
- EE – high under-spending, more personnel costs can be expected due to planned engagement of more staff in the coast guard,
- LV – the situation is improving,
- LT has joined at the later stage, thus there is under-spending; the status of the University has changed and there are difficulties to meet the shared costs which will be discussed bilaterally;
- PL (MIG) – fine, travel budget overestimated, relocation needed;
- DE – high under-reporting, a bilateral meeting is planned within two-week time;
- PL (UM) – doesn’t expect to meet the budget 100%.

6.3 Proposals for relocation of the budget by each project partner should be submitted to the Lead Partner **by 28 February 2011**, which should include an estimation of how much money is expected to not be spent.

6.4 The Meeting noted the rules for re-allocation of the budget, which could include re-allocation between budget lines and work packages, but also between project partners (**Presentation 1**). In the latter case, best if the budget is changed between partners having the same % of shared costs. Irrespective how much money is spent, it is necessary to deliver all outcomes and to report declared own contribution (unless it has been relocated to another partner).

6.5 The Lead Partner reminded that if we are not reaching the budget, the payment of shared costs will be burden to the Admiral Danish Fleet.

Agenda item 7. Information and communication

7.1 The Meeting took note of the presentation by Ms. Ulla Ahonen, HELOM Secretariat, on the information and communication activities (**Presentation 3**).

7.2 The Meeting took note that there is a possibility to apply for having a BRISK event during the EU Maritime Day, 19-20 May 2011, Gdansk, Poland, and decided to organize the BRISK meeting as earlier planned on 18 May 2011 in Sopot, either as a regular project meeting or a risk assessment seminar, and to apply for the time slot on 20 May within the Maritime Day. The Meeting requested the Secretariat to assist in applying for the time slot.

7.3 The Meeting took note of the plans to produce a publication on the results of the risk assessment, which should include concise information and maps and should be presented in a manner attractive from the public point of view. This would require some input from COWI and the Secretariat will stay in contact with COWI in this regard.

7.4 Project partners are requested to send the information on communication and information activities as to be included in the progress report (indicators and report on activities under WP2) to the Secretariat **by 14 February 2011** for checking before the signing by the FLC, however observing the deadline for the submission of the signed 4th progress report (15 March 2011). Ms. Ahonen will come back with possible comments to the project partners **by 16 February 2011**. The partners have been reminded that they need to keep proofs of all information and communication activity.

7.5 The Meeting took note of the possibility to have a round table discussion related to BRISK and BRISK-RU during the Baltic Sea Day (21-23 March 2011) in St. Petersburg. The Lead Partner will check the financial possibility for organizing such a roundtable.

Agenda item 8. Other issues

8.1 Mr. Joni Katairanta, HELCOM Secretariat, presented the preferable format of the project GIS data to be received by HELCOM for the display and downloading in the HELCOM map and data service (**Presentation 4**).

8.2 The Meeting welcomed the information on the OIL RISK project presented by Mr. Robert Aps, Estonia, the aim of which is e.g. to have harmonized sensitivity mapping in the Gulf of Finland (**Presentation 5**).

8.3 The Meeting discussed the possibilities for the extension stage of the BRISK project, the aim of which would be to focus on investments in response capacities. The Meeting took note of the information that the Admiral Danish Fleet will not be able to continue as a lead partner due to retirement of the Project Manager Mr. Peter Poulsen. The extension stage could be led by some other organization. The countries have been requested to investigate their possibilities and willingness to participate in, as well as lead, the BRISK extension stage and to inform the HELCOM Secretariat (monika.stankiewicz@helcom.fi) accordingly **by 23 February 2011**.

8.4 Such expression of interest would serve to find out what are the possibilities for continuation of the activities and to inform JTS Secretariat accordingly.

8.5 The Meeting confirmed that all BRISK documents are made public (in the HELCOM Meeting Portal) after the meetings are held, except for draft, non-finalized maps produced within the risk assessment. A separate folder with the draft maps will be created in the Meeting Portal, access to which will be password protected. All final maps will be published.

8.6 The Meeting thanked Finland for excellent organization of the meeting.

Agenda item 9. Next meetings and closing of the meeting

9.1 The Meeting decided to hold the next meeting of the project on 11-12 April 2011, in Copenhagen (starting at 10.00).

Esbjerg 2011-02-15

Place, Date



Ib Corneliussen Nielsen, Project Coordinator

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS		
DENMARK		
Mr. Peter Soeberg Poulsen Project Manager	Admiral Danish Fleet HQ National Operations Maritime Environment P.O. Box 1483 DK-8220 Brabrand	Dir.Phone: +45 89433405 Fax: +45 89433427 Email: pol.con.den@sok.dk
Ms. Inge Nedergaard	Admiral Danish Fleet HQ National Operations Maritime Environment P.O. Box 1483 DK-8220 Brabrand	Dir.Phone: +45 89433136 Fax: +45 89433141 Email: sealift@sok.dk
Mr. Ib Corneliusen Nielsen	Esbjerg Safety Consult A/S Fiskerihavngade 30 DK-6700 Esbjerg	Dir.Phone: +45 75122412 and +45 40 45 60 96 Fax: +45 75121131 Email: mail@safetyconsult.dk
ESTONIA		
Mr. Mart Käbin	Police- and Border Guard Board Pärnu mnt 139/1 EE-15183 Tallinn	Dir.Phone: +372 6149174 Fax: +372 6149016 Email: mart.kabin@mail.ee
Mr Robert Aps	University of Tartu, Estonian Marine Institute Mäenaluse 14, 12618 Tallinn	Dir. phone : +372 5062597 Fax: +372 6718900 Email: ROBERT.APS@UT.EE
FINLAND		
Ms. Meri Hietala	Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) Marine Research Centre Marine Pollution Response Unit P.O. Box 140 FI-00251 Helsinki	Dir.Phone: +358 405341960 Fax: +358 954902478 Email: meri.hietala@ymparisto.fi
Ms Kirsi Kostamo	Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) P.O. Box 140 FI-00251 Helsinki	Dir. phone : +358 400 148 656 Fax +358 9 5490 2478 Email: kirsi.kostamo@ymparisto.fi
Mr. Jakub Montewka	Aalto University School of Science and Technology Department of Applied Mechanics Marine Technology Tietotie 1 A P.O. Box 15300	Dir. phone : +358 947023499 Email : jakub.montewka@tkk.fi
GERMANY		
Mr. Michael Akkermann	Central Command for Maritime Emergencies (CCME) Maritime Pollution Control/High Sea Section Am Alten Hafen 2 D-27472 Cuxhaven	Dir.Phone: +49 4721567481 Fax: +49 4721567490 Email: MAkkermann@havariekommando.de
Ms Birgit Böhme	Central Command for Maritime Emergencies (CCME) Maritime Pollution Control/High Sea Section Am Alten Hafen 2	Dir. phone : +49 4721 567 481 Fax : +49 4721 567 364 Email : havariekommando@havariekommando.de

	D-27472 Cuxhaven	
LATVIA		
Ms. Evija Smite	Marine and Inland Waters Administration State Environmental Service Ministry of Environment Voleru Street 2 LV-1007 Riga	Dir.Phone: +371 67408169 Fax: +371 67465888 Email: evija.smite@jjup.vvd.gov.lv
Ms. Laura Mazmaca	Marine and Inland Waters Administration State Environmental Service Environment Protection Division 2, Voleru Street LV-1007 Riga	Dir.Phone: +371 7408164 Fax: +371 7465888 Email: laura.mazmaca@jjup.vvd.gov.lv
LITHUANIA		
Mr. Nerijus Blažauskas	Klaipeda University Coastal Research and Planning Institute H. Manto 84 LT-92294 Klaipeda	Phone: +370 46 398838 Fax: +370 46 398845 nb@corpi.ku.lt
Mr Valdas Langas	Klaipeda University Coastal Research and Planning Institute H. Manto 84 LT-92294 Klaipeda	Phone: +370 46 398838 Fax: +370 46 398845 Email: vlangas@hotmail.com
POLAND		
Mr. Juliusz Gajewski	Maritime Institute in Gdansk Department of Operational Oceanography Dlugi Targ St. 41/42 PL-80 830 Gdansk	Dir.Phone: +48 583018724 Fax: +48 58320 32 63 Email: julgaj@im.gda.pl
Mr. Marek Reszko	Maritime Institute in Gdansk Dlugi Targ 41-42 PL-80 830 Gdansk	Dir.Phone +48 58 301 87 24 Fax : +48 58 320 32 63 Email: marek.reszko@sar.gov.pl
Mr. Wojciech Wasowski	Maritime Office in Gdynia Marine Environment Protection Inspectorate Chrzanowskiego 10 Str. PL-81 338 Gdynia	Dir.Phone: ++48 58 3553347, mobile +48 663885504 Fax: +48 586206743 Email: wojciech.wasowski@umgdy.gov.pl
RUSSIA		
Mr. Alexey Ivanchin	Central Marine Research and Design Institute (CNIIMF) Ltd. Kavalergardskaya str. 6 RU-191015 St. Petersburg	Dir.Phone: +7 812 271-81-53 Fax: +7 8122743864 Email: ivanchin@cniimf.ru
Ms Natalia Kutaeva	State Marine Pollution Control, Salvage and Rescue Administration of the Russian Federation (SMPCSA) 3/6, Petrovka St., Moscow, 125993	Phone : +7 (495)626 18 06 Fax.: +7 (495) 626 18 0 9 Email: kutaevang@smpcsar.ru
Mr. Gennady Semanov	Central Marine Research and Design Institute Kavalergardskaya Str. 6 RU-191 015 St. Petersburg	Dir.Phone: +7 8122711015 Fax: +7 8122743864 Email: semanov@cniimf.ru
Mr. Vladimir Poliakov	Baltic BASU Baltic Salvage & Towage Co.	Phone: +7-921-886-1361 Fax.: +7-812-784-0220

	1, Elevatornaya Square 198096, Saint Petersburg Russian Federation	Email: FLOT@BUKSIR.RU
Mr Nikolay Dmitriev	ECOPROJECT	Phone and fax: +78127035493 www.ecopro.spb.ru
SWEDEN		
Mr. Bernt Stedt	Swedish Coast Guard HQ Response Department P.O. Box 536 SE-371 23 Karlskrona	Dir.Phone: +46 455353453 Fax: +46 45510521 Email: bernt.stedt@coastguard.se
Ms. Else Timms	Swedish Coast Guard HQ Stumholmen P.O. Box 536 SE-371 23 Karlskrona	Dir.Phone: + 46 455 35 35 57 Fax: +46 45510521 Email: else.timms@kustbevakningen.se
HELCOM SECRETARIAT		
Ms. Monika Stankiewicz Professional Secretary	Helsinki Commission Katajanokanlaituri 6 B FI-00160 Helsinki	Dir.Phone: +358 40 840 2471 Fax: +358 207 412 645 Email: monika.stankiewicz@helcom.fi
Ms. Ulla Ahonen Project Officer	Helsinki Commission Katajanokanlaituri 6 B FI-00160 Helsinki	Dir.Phone: +358 400 315 790 Fax: +358 207 412 645 Email: ulla.ahonen@helcom.fi
Mr Joni Kaitaranta Data Administrator	Helsinki Commission Katajanokanlaituri 6 B FI-00160 Helsinki	Dir. phone : +358 468509206 Fax: +358 207 412 645 Email: joni.kaitaranta@helcom.fi
Ms Laura Meski Assisting Professional Secretary	Helsinki Commission Katajanokanlaituri 6 B FI-00160 Helsinki	Dir. phone: +358 40 162 2053 Fax: +358 207 412 645 Email: laura.meski@helcom.fi
CONSULTANTS		
Ms. Karin Rothmann Hansen	COWI A/S Parallelvej 2 DK-2800 Kongens Lyngby	Dir.Phone: +45 45972309 Fax: +45 45972212 Email: krh@cowi.dk
Mr. Carsten Jürgensen	COWI A/S Parallelvej 2 DK-2800 Kongens Lyngby	Dir.Phone: +45 459 71322 Fax: +45 45972212 Email: crj@cowi.dk
Mr. Albrecht Lentz	COWI A/S Parallelvej 2 DK-2800 Kongens Lyngby	Dir.Phone: +45 4597 1259 Fax: +45 45972212 Email: albl@cowi.dk
Mr Erling Povlsen	COWI A/S Parallelvej 2 DK-2800 Kongens Lyngby	Dir.Phone: +45 4597 2245 Email: ERP@COWI.DK

ANNEX 2

Agenda for the Fifth Meeting of the BRISK Project

9:00–15:00, 8-9 February, Helsinki, Finland

Day 1

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 9:00-9:15 | 1. Opening |
| | 2. Approval of the agenda |
| 9:15-9:30 | 3. Project status |
| 9:30-10:30 | 4. Risk analysis |
| 10:30-11:00 | <i>Coffee break</i> |
| 11:00-12:30 | 4. Risk analysis continues |
| 12:30-13:30 | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 13:30-15:00 | 4. Risk analysis continues |
| 15:00-16:00 | 5. Agreements |
| 18:00- | <i>Dinner in the restaurant Mamma Rosa</i> |

Day 2

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 9:00-10:00 | 6. Financial reporting |
| 10:00-10:30 | <i>Coffee break</i> |
| 10:30-12:00 | 6. Financial reporting continues |
| 12:00-12:30 | 7. Information and communication |
| 12:30-13:30 | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 13:30-14:00 | 7. Information and communication |
| 14:00-15:00 | 8. Other issues |
| | 9. Next meetings and closing of the meeting |