



Conclusions from the Final Conference of BRISK and BRISK-RU

8 December 2011, Helsinki, Finland

Session I: Various policies – one goal: to ensure swift response to emergencies

- Even though there has been no major spill accidents during the recent years - the increasing maritime traffic volumes in the Baltic Sea call for measures to meet the risks of accidents;
- Pollution prevention and spill preparedness are two sides of the same coin;
- HELCOM is a successful framework for regional response co-operation in the Baltic Sea, supported by e.g. activities of EMSA, as well as a common and effective platform for joint initiatives within IMO;
- Pro-active ship route planning and liquefied natural gas (LNG) fuel are available measures for a safer and cleaner Baltic Sea;
- HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan, Integrated Maritime Policy, EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, Maritime Doctrine of Russia 2020 are policy tools for safer and cleaner Baltic Sea;
- The contribution to the HELCOM Ministerial Meeting in 2013 could cover: progress in hydrographic re-surveys, safety of navigation, results of BRISK/BRISK-RU, maritime spatial planning, promote the use of LNG and the Baltic Sea as a model region for LNG, especially in liner trades (and as a longer term solution).

Session II: Mapping the spill risks: joint model and common results

- An agreed risk assessment model accepted by all nine Baltic Sea countries within BRISK/BRISK-RU allows to fulfill some provisions of BSAP;
- The modeling results make it possible to compare risk of oil spills between Baltic Sea sub-regions;
- The model is an acceptable tool for conducting general evaluation of risk of oil spills,

- Previous, medium size accidents have proved high recovery capacity in the Baltic (up to 50%). However, for larger spills and in unfavourable conditions (e.g. darkness, high seas), the operational efficiency will decrease, which has been taken into account in the analysis;
- The location of existing response resources is adequate, however, there is still room for some improvement;
- Results of modeling can assist policy makers in the Baltic Sea countries in making decisions about necessity of risk reduction measures, and should be actively used and taken forward also after the finalization of the projects;
- There is a need for a joint accepted model for Net Environment Benefit Analyses (NEBA)
- It can be recommended to continue the BRISK/BRISK-RU projects to create a model for identifying gaps in emergency and response resources on sub-regional level.

Session III: Pooling resources: sub-regional co-operation to enhance pollution preparedness

- Different sub-regions have different traffic pattern and risks and thus tailor-made solutions are needed for the sub-regions;
- In some sub-regions it seems that risk control measures will have the largest effect (VTS, TSS), while in others improvements in response capacities are the most effective (e.g. capacities for shallow waters (to be checked against the input data on response capacities for coastal areas), in darkness, improvement & replacement of outdated equipment); This is also related to the measures that have already been put in place (e.g. GOFREP);
- In any case, response readiness is needed (including for shoreline pollution and oiled wildlife) if safety measures fail;
- To support decision-making, cost-benefit analysis of selected measures would bring additional information;
- BRISK results have already been used in other projects (sensitivity maps in Sea Track Web oil forecasting tool of HELCOM, also in a project for the Bothnian Bay (PÖK));
- Intermediate storage always needs to be solved in an oil spill operation;
- From recommendations to realization – already a number of new response vessels are under delivery and there is a need for pilot/investment projects (BRISK awaiting decision on an extension stage).