

Johan Gert, Task coordinator
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency
+46 (0)10-240 53 23
johan.gert@msb.se

Cross-border

Task A report



This project has been financed by the European Commission under the Civil Protection Financial Instrument. The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the project partners listed herein, and in no way represents the view of the European Commission or its services.



MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR



Table of content

1. Introduction	5
1.1 The main Cross-border project	5
1.2 Task As objective	6
2. Activities and methodology.....	6
2.1 Survey	6
2.2 Workshop	6
2.3 Agreements	7
2.4 Best practice.....	8
2.5 Studies	8
3. Results.....	9
3.1 Survey	9
3.2 Initial workshop	9
3.3 Analysis of the agreements.....	10
3.3.1 The Nordred agreement.....	10
3.3.2 Practical use of the agreements	11
3.3.3 Scope of application	11
3.3.4 Contact points.....	13
3.3.5 Notification of incidents/warning.....	13
3.3.6 Requesting assistance	14
3.3.7 Resource sharing and common missions.....	14
3.3.8 Border crossing.....	15
3.3.9 Host Nation Support (HNS)	16
3.4 Best practice.....	17
3.4.1 Austria, Germany, Switzerland and Italy.....	17
3.4.2 Croatia/Hungary	17
3.5 Study on existing cross-border cooperation	18
4. Conclusions and recommendations	19
4.1 Agreements	19
4.1.1 Wider scope – all situations and all phases	19
4.1.2 Contact points – national support function.....	20
4.1.3 Warning	20
4.1.4 Requesting assistance	20
4.1.5 Border crossing.....	21
4.1.6 Host nation support (HNS)	21
4.1.7 Alternatives regarding implementation.....	21
4.2 Preparatory activities	22
4.2.1 Meeting platforms	22
4.2.2 Risk analysis	22
4.2.3 Common training, education and exercises etc.....	22

Our date
2012-04-20

Registration No
2009-13491

4 (32)
Edition

5. Appendices	23
5.1 Appendix 1 Programme workshop 4-6 May 2010	23
5.2 Appendix 2 List of agreements	25
5.3 Appendix 3 Relevant questions for the agreement analysis	31

1. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to conclude the results reached in Task A (which is one of four tasks in the Cross-border project).

The focus during the first year of the project has been to examine and to identify the status of the present cross border cooperation. The project has identified the needs that are required to develop and enhance a wider cooperation on the local, regional and national level. The second year has been used to process the results into suggestions on how to enhance the cooperation.

1.1 The main Cross-border project

The Nordic ministers¹ for civil protection met in April 2009. In their so called Haga-declaration, the ministers identified several areas that can be further developed to improve the Nordic cooperation. One of the conclusions was to develop the existing cooperation concerning fire and rescue services, the so called Nordred² cooperation, into a wider civil protection perspective.

Natural and man-made disasters do not have any borders. Therefore the prerequisites for cross border cooperation at all levels should be analysed and reviewed with a view to further development and enhancement. This EU Cross-border project was initiated to stimulate such development.

The goal of the project is to create and stimulate a wider cooperation with all essential actors within the sector of civil protection. The cooperation should include all phases related to an incident, meaning before, during and after something happens. The results should give an added value for the local, regional and national levels as well as for the EU civil protection cooperation. The aim is to develop the existing cooperation and not create any duplication. This is done by eliminating obstacles and securing efficient and correct assistance and creating a framework that meets today's reality and tomorrow's challenges.

¹ The Danish Minister of Defence Mr. Søren Gade, the Finnish Minister of Interior Ms. Anne Holmlund, (represented by state secretary Antti Pelttari), the Icelandic Minister of Justice Ms. Ragna Árnadóttir (represented by councillor Ms. Dís Sigurgeirsdóttir), the Norwegian Minister of Justice Mr. Knut Storberget and the Swedish Minister of Defence Mr. Sten Tolgfors.

² Agreement between Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden on cooperation across state frontiers to prevent or limit damage to persons or property or to the environment in the case of accidents, 1989. Iceland acceded to the agreement on 5 April 2001 but the title of the agreement was not changed. (The agreement is henceforth called the Nordred-agreement.)

1.2 Task As objective

The objective of Task A was to identify the scope of the conceptual framework to enhance cross border operational cooperation for civil protection in Northern Europe. This framework should meet the future needs and challenges, and should be coordinated with the Community Mechanism for Civil Protection (including the Monitoring and Information Centre, MIC). As part of this objective the existing cross border cooperation agreements were to be reviewed and analysed. Task A was also responsible for conducting a survey and arranging a workshop in the beginning of the project in order to provide input on needs and ideas.

2. Activities and methodology

The project has collected relevant input and information on the present local and regional cross border cooperation and future needs. In order to achieve this, the project has arranged workshops and meetings, conducted interviews together with a survey and a study. The dialog between different actors and levels has been very important to ensure the relevance of the input and the usefulness of the results.

The existing relevant agreements have been collected and analysed. The project has also found some examples on best practice on cross border cooperation in other regions of Europe.

The analyses of the agreements and the other findings have been used to make recommendations on an enhanced cooperation.

2.1 Survey

In order to provide information about the current cooperation and to identify needs of development, a questionnaire was made. The questions touched upon the existing cooperation, whether there were any well-functioning areas, areas with specific challenges, areas needing improvement or new areas of possible cooperation.

The questionnaire was forwarded to various authorities responsible for civil protection on the local, regional and national level³.

The survey was conducted using the Internet and was distributed in the participants' four native languages: Norwegian, Finnish, Danish and Swedish.

2.2 Workshop

An initial workshop was held in Stockholm in May 2010. The results from the survey conducted earlier were used as input to the workshop. The purpose of the

³ The survey was sent out to Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland who are partners in the project. In the Nordred-cooperation, Island is also participating.

workshop was to provide essential facts and identify needs to the project, as well as to secure the involvement of the end-users. The workshop had participants from various authorities at local, regional and national level such as county boards, national and regional police organisation, health care, local fire and rescue services and national authorities from the participating countries. See also the workshop program, appendix 1.

The project and its purpose were introduced the first day. Some preliminary results, the survey and the first list of identified existing agreements were presented. During the second day the participants were divided into mixed groups. The groups gathered around separate tables with 4 different large paper sheets with a number of questions to be discussed. Each sheet was related to one of the four tasks in the project. The preliminary conclusions were presented and discussed during the third day. The four tasks conducted subsequent meetings to discuss the finding and the way forward.

2.3 Agreements

There are several agreements between the Nordic countries and their neighbours within the field of civil protection. The agreements are to a large extent bilateral and cover different aspects of cross border cooperation.

The nature of the agreements varies from very specific, covering for instance maritime search and rescue, to more general agreements, such as the Nordred framework agreement and the Barents agreement⁴. One more example is the Council Decision on Community Mechanism for Civil Protection⁵ on the EU level.

An inventory of existing agreements was done. All known operational cross border agreements were gathered with the requirement that at least one country in the project was Party to the agreement. Operational in this context means “*handling a situation, preparing for a situation or warning related to a situation*”. A situation can be something else than an accident, for instance a wider societal crisis. Primarily agreements on the national level were included. However, some interesting agreements on regional and local level were also incorporated.

Memorandums of understanding were excluded as well as agreements that only cover prevention.

⁴ Agreement between the governments in the Barents Euro-Artic region on cooperation within the field of emergency prevention, preparedness and response, 2008

⁵ Council Decision 2001/792/EC establishing a Community mechanism to facilitate reinforced cooperation in civil protection assistance interventions.

A total of 74 agreements (see appendix 2) were identified and structured in a spread sheet. This enabled a comparison between the different agreements, with regard to partners, purpose, responsibilities, and financial issues, point of contact as well as alarm- and warning routines.

The agreements were then classified based on their scope: general, municipal rescue services, mountain rescue and missing person searches, aeronautical and maritime search and rescue, maritime environmental protection, nuclear safety and others. The agreements were also tagged by the geographical area of application: national, partially national, regional and local. These categories were then used to limit the number of agreements to analyse. Only the 12 agreements with a general scope and applicability on a national or partially national level were further analysed.

The results from the survey and the workshop in Stockholm were used in analysing the agreements.

The Nordred agreement is a general framework agreement which all of the project partners are Parties to. This agreement has therefore undergone a more in-depth analysis than the other agreements. In the analysis of the Nordred agreement a comparison has been made, when relevant, with the Barents agreement. The reason for this comparison is that the two agreements are partly overlapping in the sense that the Nordred agreement applies to the above mentioned countries in their entirety, while the Barents agreement just applies to 12 administrative entities/provinces/counties which are defined as the Barents Region in Finland, Norway, Russia and Sweden. A comparison is also made with the other analysed agreements, but in a more general way. A reference to the Community Mechanism for Civil Protection, which covers the whole Nordic region, is included when relevant.

The results are presented in chapter 3.

2.4 Best practice

Best practice on European cross border civil protection cooperation has been sought in order to get inspiration and to find existing efficient solutions to enhance the Nordic cooperation.

In addition to direct contact, a questionnaire related to best practice has been sent to the EU Civil Protection Committee.

Examples of regional cooperation are mentioned in chapter 3.

2.5 Studies

Two studies were initiated.

The first study mapped the cross-border councils along the common borders and conducted interviews with experts on local and regional level.

The second study visited the cross-border councils and had essential dialogs with the experts about their situations and needs.

3. Results

3.1 Survey

The number of questionnaires sent out and to whom varied in the four countries. Due to this, it was challenging to compare the results. The response rate was as expected when using surveys, in this case around 50%. The conclusions from the survey are in line with and verify the results of the workshop.

The survey shows that lots of cooperation exists within the area of civil protection, such as operative cooperation, training, prevention, exchange programs, custom services, branch meetings and EU-projects such as "Border-Strategic Crises Management 2009 - 2011", Interreg and others. There are plenty of local and regional agreements concluded within the framework of the Nordred agreement.

Most responders answered that there are few or no obstacles in cross border cooperation. However issues like language, lack of knowledge, communication systems, different legislations and routines were mentioned.

The responders in the survey suggested several areas for future cross border cooperation such as education and training, sharing and creating common resources, joint risk and vulnerability analysis, warning systems and communication systems. In order to enhance the cross border cooperation several possibilities were mentioned, such as national framework agreements with a wider scope than today, common policies, exercises, better knowledge about each other's roles and responsibilities, procedures for receiving and giving assistance and a will to cooperate.

One responder concluded his answers with the following: "It takes time to develop good cooperation due to differences in language, organization, resources and culture, but it is all worth it."

3.2 Initial workshop

At the workshop, the participants highlighted many advantages that stem from cross border cooperation. However some challenges were identified such as free rider-type problems and a need for harmonized rules and regulations in some areas. The main issue discussed was the need for common risk analysis across borders, to be used as a basis for further cooperation. An enhanced Nordic cooperation can benefit from the political momentum. One way ahead could be updated and amended agreements between the countries.

The Nordic countries are to a large extent exposed to the same risks. They are exposed to a lot of the same natural hazards and the same types of large accidents as well as a shared future scenario regarding climate change and challenges due to extreme weather. Good examples of cooperation that have been mentioned are

equipment shared by the rescue services in the Haparanda/Tornio area and the Sweden/Denmark cooperation regarding teams handling hazardous materials and substances (HAZMAT-teams) during the 2009 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP15). The shared culture and experience create a fruitful environment for cooperation, and should be used as a basis for identifying common needs. Possible areas for further cooperation that were highlighted were development of material, common education (including teaching material) and exercises using the jointly developed material.

The need for common guidelines, routines and procedures was discussed. What kind of mutual methods, routines, terminology, standard operational procedures and such do we need? The risk of wasting resources in developing guidelines and routines that would actually not be put to practical use was acknowledged, and the benefit of mutual risk analysis and assessment of common needs was once again highlighted. It was agreed that the existing international collaboration and guidelines regarding for example host nation support (HNS), alarm routines and early warning should be taken into account.

In the discussion regarding implementation common training on all levels (local, regional and national) was raised as a central topic. The benefits of e-learning tools and shared training materials were also on the agenda, as well as the possibility of common exercises. The establishment of a common Nordic training centre was brought up as an option. One essential result of this workshop was the identification of a need for an action plan for implementation of the project's results, including establishment of a common Nordic training and exercise calendar.

3.3 Analysis of the agreements

3.3.1 The Nordred agreement

The Nordred agreement is a framework agreement. The intention is to complement other Nordic multilateral and/or bilateral agreements within the field of cross border cooperation. The aim is to facilitate mutual assistance in cases of accidents and to expedite the appointment of relief personnel and equipment.

The Nordred agreement can be used on all levels (national, regional, local). See for example article 3 which stipulates that *an authority* that is responsible for measures to prevent or limit personal injury and damage to property or the environment, may request assistance directly from a competent authority in another contracting state. The authority receiving a request for assistance is to decide if the assistance can be given.

Only general principles are covered, meaning that no details are regulated in the agreement itself. The Nordred agreement ensures that there is a legal foundation for cooperation. Regional/local authorities may enter into "sub-agreements" or other (operational) cooperation with their counterparts in a neighbouring state using the Nordred agreement as a basis. The possibility to enter into local or

regional agreements has been used for example between fire brigades in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

3.3.2 Practical use of the agreements

The survey and workshop carried out in the EU Cross-border project clearly indicates that the regional and local level to a large extent do not have the knowledge how to use the existing agreements to further develop operational cooperation within their field of responsibility.

Conclusions:

1. There exists a need to spread information on how to use agreements to ensure cross border cooperation. This can be done in different ways such as:
 - courses,
 - information sharing by for example using the Nordred web-page⁶,
 - explanatory notes to the agreements posted on the web-page etc.
2. An option is to amend the Nordred agreement to state the possibility to enter sub-agreements or mutual cross border cooperation on regional/local level more clearly⁷.

3.3.3 Scope of application

Incidents

The scope of the Nordred agreement is only related to accidents. The NORDRED-agreement covers cross-border collaboration with the aim of preventing or limiting personal injury and damage to property or the environment in the event of an accident or imminent accident see art. 1, section 1.

The Barents agreement describes the scope in more details than Nordred, but primarily seems to describe accidents:

“a situation(s), often hazardous, which occur(s) from a sudden event covering both minor and major incidents and accidents, such as traffic accidents, industrial incidents and accidents, explosions, fires, cave-ins, landslides, floods, or other man made or natural disasters, which caused or may cause personal injury or damage to property or the environment and that demands prompt action. The term emergency also refers to a situation of persons in distress or missing persons, that demands action such as organized search and/or rescue efforts.”

⁶ www.nordred.org

⁷ A good reference here is the Barents agreement article 3 which stipulates that the state competent authorities are responsible for the management and coordination of the agreement. However, regional and local competent authorities may also cooperate under the agreement within their competences, in accordance with article 3 section 2.

The scope of the Community Civil Protection Mechanism agreement seems to be wider as it covers “civil protection assistance intervention in the event of major emergencies”, article 1. The term “emergency” is not limited to accidents and the term “civil protection” can also be interpreted to cover more than accidents.

As was highlighted in the workshop, there can be a need for cross border assistance in other situations involving for example contaminated water, communication failure, electricity failure, blocked transports and extreme weather conditions such as cold and snowy winters, ash or smoke problems and rise of sea level.

The existing agreements, except the Community Civil Protection Mechanism, focus on accidents and fire and rescue services and do not cover the wider scope described in the Haga-declaration and the examples above.

A widening of the scope of the Nordred agreement is deemed to be in line with the EU's view on regional cooperation as a valuable complement to the Community Civil Protection Mechanism. The cooperation benefits from the proximity of the countries, as well as similar culture, equipment, legal systems and a long tradition of cooperation. An extended Nordred agreement has potential as an example of best practice, as well as a ground for innovations that can benefit the EU system.

Phases of incidents

Most of the analysed agreements are meant to be used when something has happened or is likely to happen in the very near future. This is clearly reflected in the Nordred agreement which covers cross border collaboration “with the aim of preventing or limiting personal injury and damage to property or the environment in the event of an accident or imminent accident” (see article 1, section 1).

This means that the Nordred agreement covers only events that are categorized as “accidents” or “imminent accidents”. Based on this, the agreement has been interpreted to cover only operational aspects, e.g. the response phase. It does not cover the preparatory phases, e.g. prevention and preparedness. It is only the Barents agreement that clearly states in article 2, section 2 that it covers the time span leading up to an (imminent) accident (including precautionary activities).

The need of pre-deployment of resources has been identified for individual situations with increased risk, for instance meetings with international leaders such as the COP15 in Denmark 2009. Pre-deployment is not mentioned in the agreements and has been interpreted as not being within the scope of the Nordred agreement. Today, according to the Nordred agreement, pre-deployment would only be possible if there is an imminent accident. Pre-deployment is discussed in a Nordic task group related to the Haga-declaration on increased Nordic cooperation. This issue needs to be further discussed and coordinated.

Preparatory activities such as meetings, training and education are frequently mentioned in the agreements. The Nordred agreement covers some preparatory activities. Article 6 (1) in the agreement covers information exchange. Paragraph (3) stipulates that meetings can be held when deemed appropriate. There are no

articles directly related to training and education, but article 6 (2) stipulates that to ensure practical implementation of the agreement, competent authorities in respective states are to maintain direct contact with each other. The Barents agreement of 2008 explicitly covers training, see article 2 and 4.

None of the analysed agreements explicitly cover the perspective after the response phase, such as lessons learned.

Conclusions:

1. There is a need to consider a wider scope in agreements to include also other situations than accidents.
2. There is a need to consider a wider scope in agreements to cover all phases related to an incident/accident - before, during and after – prevention, preparedness, response and lessons learned.
3. It is important to stress the need of preparing for cooperation in an agreement. Details in the preparatory activities ought to be addressed in routines and similar.

3.3.4 Contact points

Many of the agreements state that national points of contacts should be used for requesting assistance and resources. In addition the Community Civil Protection Mechanism provides a mutual point of contact, MIC.

At this point the Nordred agreement differs from most of the other agreements. The Nordred agreement does not establish national points of contact or other contact points on regional/local level. This is due to the fact that the agreement is a framework agreement and general in nature. The agreement is meant to cover several fields of cooperation. It is up to the various authorities concerned to establish contact with relevant authorities across borders. This can be regulated in sub-agreements.

It might be useful to have some kind of national support function as a supplement to the responsible authorities. The purpose is not to replace the direct contacts between authorities, but when needed to be able to give advise on use of the agreements and whom to contact in each country. It could be combined with the national EU-MIC contact point in each member state, in order to have synergetic effects.

Conclusions:

1. The Nordred agreement does not use national contact points since it is a framework agreement. Contact points between relevant authorities can be regulated in sub-agreements/operational arrangements if needed.
2. The use of national support functions can be further investigated.

3.3.5 Notification of incidents/warning

Most of the agreements regulate information and warning across the borders, although in different ways and details.

The Nordred agreement does not impose a duty to inform nor how to inform other parties in cases of accidents. If a state wants to inform another state of an accident, it is up to the responsible authority to ensure that the contact point in a neighbouring country is known. To ensure practical implementation of the agreement, competent authorities are to maintain direct contact with each other (see article 6(2)).

It can be difficult to regulate in agreements how to inform and whom to inform in a general way. In some cases, different organizations use the same agreements. However, this issue ought to be considered and the practical issues addressed in cooperation routines or similar. The national support function mentioned above might be useful in a warning situation.

Conclusion:

1. The Nordred agreement could be amended to ensure that a state informs a neighbouring state where there are incidents which can have consequences across borders.
2. Procedures on how to inform in case of an incident should be regulated in sub-agreements or in cooperation directly between authorities or organizations. It does not exist a common way to do this.
3. Warning routines related to the Nordred agreement can be addressed in the discussions on national support functions.

3.3.6 Requesting assistance

Most agreements use a national contact point for requesting assistance.

The Nordred agreement stipulates direct contacts between competent authorities in the requesting and the assisting states. See article 3 (1) which states the following:

“An authority in a contracting state that, in the event of an accident, is responsible for measures to prevent or limit personal injury and damage to property of the environment, may request assistance directly from a competent authority in another contracting state. The authority receiving this request is to decide if the assistance can be given.”

There are no detailed procedures on how to request resources.

Conclusions:

1. Detailed procedures on how to request assistance are not necessary in the Nordred agreement.
2. However to ensure effective cooperation the responsible authorities across borders should develop necessary procedures in advance.

3.3.7 Resource sharing and common missions

Almost all analysed agreements make it possible to utilize existing resources across borders. The agreements do not clearly state the possibility to establish

common resources across borders. No need to regulate this has been identified. It is still possible to establish common resources between relevant authorities without a specific statement in the agreements.

No agreements, except the Community Civil Protection Mechanism and the three agreements between Sweden and the Baltic states, mention common missions outside the Nordic countries. However, the Nordic countries participate in common missions through the United Nations International Humanitarian Partnership (IHP).

Conclusions:

1. There is no need to regulate common resources in the existing agreements. If two or more states would like to establish common resources this can be dealt within a specific agreement/MOU/arrangement for that purpose.
2. There is no need to regulate common missions in third countries, since there are other alternatives for such cooperation.

3.3.8 Border crossing

Border crossing issues are covered in most of the agreements. The Nordred agreement states the following in article 3(3):

“The state seeking assistance is to ensure that rescue resources etc. that are employed in an operation may be transported over the borders without being impeded by import or export formalities and that they are exempted from taxes, duties and other fees. Vehicles, rescue equipment and other supplies may be utilized in accordance with the regulations of the state lending assistance without the need to apply for any specific authorization.”

The Nordred agreement seems to cover the border crossing aspect in a satisfactory manner and more clearly than for example the Barents agreement. In the Barents agreement article 8 it is stipulated that the states shall apply the most simplified border crossing procedures possible (within its national legislation and international obligation) to response teams/resources.

However, both the survey and the workshop indicate and give several examples of practical problems, issues not foreseen, lack of knowledge and implementation. For example, Swedish resources were stopped at the Norwegian border in connection with the oil pollution accident with the vessel “Full City” 2009. Practical problems, for instance issues related to weapons and gas bottles, need to be identified and solved in advance in order to improve border crossing possibilities. Most problems are identified locally but involve national authorities and the solutions are of interest for other parts of the country. Relevant national authorities should identify and solve problems and spread knowledge on solutions and ensure that the authorities at the border are informed.

Conclusion:

1. No need to amend the agreements on border crossing issues.
2. Ensure that there is national legal foundation to ensure rapid border crossings in crisis.
3. There is a need to identify and solve practical border crossing issues.
4. Ensure that information on border crossing is well known among relevant authorities.

3.3.9 Host Nation Support (HNS)

Host nation support (HNS) is not clearly handled in the agreements. There are, however, certain articles implying that the host nation is responsible for ensuring as smooth cross border cooperation as possible. See for example the Nordred agreement:

Article 1 section 2 stipulates that states shall, as far as is possible, remove impediments to this collaboration.

Article 3 (3) stipulates that the state seeking assistance is to ensure that rescue resources etc. that are employed in an operation may be transported over the borders without being impeded by import or export formalities and that they are exempted from taxes, duties and other fees. Vehicles, rescue equipment and other supplies may be utilized in accordance with the regulations of the state lending assistance without the need to apply for any specific authorization.

Responsibility to plan, arrange and finance HNS ought to be regulated in the agreements. Details should be regulated in routines or similar documents. The regulation of HNS should be harmonized with EU and other international organizations, like UN, NATO, The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies etc. Some participants in the Cross-border project also participate in the on-going EU work regarding HNS.

Conclusion:

1. There is a need to regulate general principles of responsibility for host nation support in the agreements⁸. Details should be regulated in routines or similar.

⁸ Such details must rely on both national strategies on HNS and the forthcoming EU Guidelines on HNS for use within the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. To ensure a consistent level of detail for host nation support among the Nordic countries at local and regional level, it is important to take into account the overarching framework and refine the most essential aspects for these levels.

3.4 Best practice

3.4.1 Austria, Germany, Switzerland and Italy

Austria (Federal State) has a number of regional agreements concerning mountain rescue with Germany (Bavaria), Switzerland (Graubünden) and Italy (South Tirol). All agreements with fire units, ambulance units, mountain rescue service and helicopter ambulance services are organized on a local or provincial level which means that it does not exist any "Austrian regulation" between Vienna and the respective capitals controlling these agreements. The agreements, for example in the area of mountain rescue service, entail among other things:

- training and exercises between border units
- exchange of equipment (e.g. communication systems - radios),
- exchange of event information via dispatch centres,
- cross border support in case of larger events.

Contact person: Bernt Noggler.

3.4.2 Croatia/Hungary

Croatia and Hungary enhance their cross border cooperation in the Dravis 2 project. The objective of the project is to promote cross border cooperation in disaster management by introducing advanced technologies in order to better protect the environment, enhance the life quality of local communities and facilitate sustainable economic development in the region.

Activities in the framework of the Project are as follows:

- Development of a concept regarding information exchange and cross border cooperation in the field of disaster management,
- information exchange training,
- GIS measurements in the cross border area,
- two joint field exercises,
- making a forest fire prevention study,
- making a study on preparedness for a nuclear accident in the territory of the Osječko-baranjska County.

Development of this system will enable competent authorities on both sides of the border to accelerate making decisions that are crucial for an efficient protection in major accidents and disasters.

The Dravis 2 Project will advance cooperation in the field of early warning in the event of an imminent danger and lead to the introduction and development of GIS system in the territory of the Osječko-baranjska County. The Project will yield an overall risk assessment regarding nuclear threats in nuclear plants in a wide area.

The Project worth EUR 337 942.00 will be carried out in the next 16 months. The co-financing for the Project has been approved on the basis of the first tender for

draft projects within the IPA Program concerning Hungary-Croatia Cross-Border Cooperation 2007-2013.

Contact person: Igor Milic, Croatia

3.5 Study on existing cross-border cooperation

In order to have a good picture on existing local and regional cross-border cooperation, the project had a graduate student accomplish a study on existing cross-border civil protection cooperation along the Swedish boarder towards Denmark, Norway and Finland.

The study, which is based on both a document study and interviews, showed that there is an increase in interest for Nordic collaboration for Civil Protection. The purpose of the study was to examine if there is, within today's cross-border activities, a corresponding all-encompassing perspective covered by all phases and all societal bodies involved.

The study is qualitative and aims to examine and evaluate the forms of cooperation currently in place. 17 interviews were conducted with representatives of the local and regional levels, who in some way work with border collaboration. The inventory covered five regions: Skåne, Västra Götaland, Värmland/Dalarna, Jämtland, and Norrbotten. Three of these regions have border emergency response committees, which are a form of collaboration in which mainly the emergency services and county administrative boards are represented. The work in these three regions is the most advanced and the issues and problems that arise are common to them all. In the other two regions cooperation is more widespread and there is no real structure that involves all bodies. It is primarily the emergency services that cooperate with each other, but in some regions cooperation amongst them wasn't even functioning well.

On the border emergency response committees that have made the most progress there is a desire to expand cooperation from just emergency response to a wider level of cooperation focusing on a holistic approach to crisis management. This has, for example, been achieved by the Strategic Border Crisis Management project. The members of this project are the emergency services, and the county administrative boards from Västra Götaland, Värmland, and Norway, and the MSB and its Norwegian equivalent the DSB.

It was stated that the regional level has progressed somewhat with cross-border cooperation. A lot works well, but there is a clear need for further enhancements.

There is a need to utilize each other's resources and capabilities across borders to a much greater degree. There is a growing need for information, networking, and exchanges of experience and knowledge. Common risk and vulnerability analyses are other tools that the bodies involved feel that they will need to work with. These analyses could contribute to greater depth from a holistic approach, before, during and after an incident.

After serious consideration it is felt there is a need for greater cooperation regardless of region. The limited resources that exist today will never be able to cover the needs of a major incident or disaster. The support needed includes legal adaptations and forms of collaboration to broaden cooperation for civil contingencies at the local and regional levels. It is important that these issues receive governance, status and mandates as resources are not always suited to the tasks that arise at these levels.

Limitations cited include economics, ignorance about each other's organizations and working methods, and practical issues such as language and means of communication. Another shortcoming is that there is no structure in place today that holds all the various bodies together, just different bodies in different parts of the regions that have started cooperating across borders. To get a broader perspective and a holistic approach to cross-border work in the field of civil contingencies cooperation many more bodies need to become involved. The question is however, how large such an interaction forum could be, but more human resources is however the factor that is highlighted as necessary for facilitating the expansion of current collaboration.

That today's cooperation is so easy-going however is stressed as one of the reasons that border emergency response issues are not really being given priority. Forms of cooperation are felt to be a good starting point, but some kind of middle ground with humble governance and transparency may be needed, which in the form of a suggested common structure for cross-border cooperation might be a solution for stimulating a similar development.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The findings on cross border cooperation from the survey, workshop, agreement analysis, best practices and studies presented in chapter 3 of this report can be used in the work to further enhance cooperation, in accordance with the intentions of the Haga-declaration.

4.1 Agreements

4.1.1 Wider scope – all situations and all phases

The analysed agreements cover only cooperation in cases of accidents. There is a need to consider a wider scope in agreements to include also other situations. The agreements should also cover all phases related to a situation, e.g. the cooperation should benefit from a wider scope of the agreement covering the phases before, during and after an incident.

Agreements give a framework and set a legal foundation for cooperation. Core concepts and central issues are covered and principles for the cooperation are established.

There are lots of practical details that need to be addressed in cross border cooperation but these ought to be regulated in less formal documents such as sub-agreements, guidelines, routines etc. It makes them more adaptive to specific needs and less complicated to change. Examples of such details could be specific procedures for contact, warning, requesting and giving assistance, resource sharing and host nation support. Details regarding preparatory activities ought to be addressed too. The possibility to enter sub-agreements or mutual cross border cooperation on regional/local level may also be expressed more clearly in the Nordred agreement.

4.1.2 Contact points – national support function

The Nordred agreement does not use national contact points since it is a framework agreement. Contact points between relevant authorities can be regulated in sub-agreements/operational arrangements if needed.

However, it might be useful to have some kind of national support function as a supplement to the responsible authorities (network of duty officers). The purpose is not to replace the direct contacts between authorities, but when needed to be able to give advise on use of the agreements and whom to contact in each country. It could be combined with the national EU-MIC contact point in each member state, in order to have synergetic effects.

4.1.3 Warning

The Nordred agreement could be amended to ensure that a state informs a neighbouring state where there are incidents which can have consequences across borders.

Procedures on how to inform in case of an incident should be regulated in sub-agreements or in cooperation directly between authorities or organizations. It does not exist a common way to do this.

Warning routines related to the Nordred agreement can be addressed in the discussions on national support functions.

4.1.4 Requesting assistance

The Nordred agreement stipulates direct contacts between competent authorities in the requesting and the assisting states. There are no detailed procedures on how to request resources. However to ensure effective cooperation the responsible authorities across borders should develop necessary procedures in advance. These could for example be drafted as standard operational procedures adopted by the parties at local level.

4.1.5 Border crossing

Border crossing is already covered in the Nordred agreement in a satisfactorily manner and there is no need to amend the agreement on this issue. However, it is important to ensure that there is national legal foundation to ensure rapid border crossing when needed and solve practical border crossing issues. It is also very important to ensure that information on border crossing is well known among all relevant authorities.

4.1.6 Host nation support (HNS)

Responsibility to plan, arrange and finance HNS ought to be regulated in the agreements. Details should be regulated in routines or similar documents. The regulations of HNS should be harmonized with the work being done within the EU and other international organizations.

4.1.7 Alternatives regarding implementation

Agreements

There are several alternatives regarding the use of the findings from the analysis of the cross border agreements:

- The findings can be used to amend an existing agreement. The Nordred agreement might be the most suitable since it covers the Nordic countries. This would complement the EU cooperation since Nordred facilitates cooperation on local and regional level.
- Another alternative is to develop a new agreement with the wider scope. It can be either a complement to existing agreements or a new independent agreement on its own. In a new agreement the question of including other parties could be considered.

A complementary guide

The survey and workshop carried out clearly indicates that the regional and local level to a large extent do not have the knowledge on how to use the existing agreements to further develop operational cooperation within their field of responsibility. The amount of agreements is challenging to handle on local and regional level.

There exists a need to spread information on how to use agreements to ensure cross border cooperation. This can be done in different ways such as:

- Develop a guide regarding the applicability and use of the Nordred agreement, plus a commentary to the agreement. Such a guide could be made available on the Nordred web-page.
- Courses.

4.2 Preparatory activities

4.2.1 Meeting platforms

Meeting structure and platforms for cross-border and cross-sector collaboration on civil protection are important for promoting networking and initiatives for development of further enhanced cooperation across borders. Such meetings should be informal and act as a meeting place for relevant actors within the field of civil protection. These platforms should include private sector and voluntary organizations and stimulate a cooperation covering all phases. The purpose is to meet the need of utilizing each other's resources and capabilities across borders to a much greater degree. There is a growing need for information, networking, and exchanges of experience and knowledge. Common risk and vulnerability analyses are other tools that the bodies involved believe should be developed. These analyses could contribute to greater depth and a holistic approach - before, during and after an incident.

4.2.2 Risk analysis

One main issue discussed was the need for common and/or comparable risk analysis across borders, to be used as a basis for further cooperation.

4.2.3 Common training, education and exercises etc

Issues such as lack of knowledge, communication systems, different legislations and routines were mentioned during the workshop, study and the survey.

The participants suggested several areas for future cross border cooperation such as education and training, sharing and creating common resources, joint risk and vulnerability analysis, warning systems and communication systems. Several areas of interest have been highlighted such as common policies, exercises, better knowledge about each others roles and responsibilities and common education (including jointly produced teaching material).

In the discussion regarding implementation, common training on all levels (local, regional and national) was raised as a central topic. The benefits of e-learning tools and shared training materials were also on the agenda.

5. Appendices

5.1 Appendix 1 Programme workshop 4-6 May 2010

Marriott 4-6 May 2010

PROGRAMME | Workshop on the future cross-border operational cooperation for civil protection between the Nordic countries 2010

Project manager: Åsa Kyrk Gere, MSB

Tuesday 4 May

- 12.00 **Registration and lunch**
- 13.00 **Welcoming**
Introduction | Åsa Kyrk Gere
Practical information | Lena Halleback, MSB
- 13.30 **Background and prerequisites**
The Nordic region in focus 2009, what does that tell us?
| Bengt Sundelius, MSB
- 14.00 **Results from the conference - Nordred 20 years**
| Tiina Peltola-Lampi, FI
- 14.15 **Results of the survey**
| Johan Gert, MSB
- 15.00 **Break and refreshments**
- 15.30 **Results from the analysis of the present cross-border agreements**
| Ella Carlberg, MSB
- 16.00 **Discussions**
What do these empirical facts tell us about needs today and in the future regarding cross-border cooperation?
| Bengt Sundelius, MSB
- 16.30 **Something fun is waiting ☺**
- 19.00 **Dinner**

Wednesday 5 May

- 08.00 **Introduction**
- 08.15 **Workshop 1: Cross-border cooperation**
- 09.30 **Break and refreshments**
- 10.00 **Workshop 2: Risks and capacities**
- 12.00 **Lunch**

- 13.00 **Workshop 3: Common operational tools**
- 14.30 **Break and refreshments**
- 15.00 **Workshops 4: CB action programme**
- 16.30 **Finish**
- 19.00 **Dinner**

Thursday 6 May

- 08.30 **Reports from the mini workshops and discussions**
- 10.00 **Break and refreshments**
- 10.30 **Continuation**
- 11.00 **Proposals on way a head**
- 11.30 **Conclusion**
| Helena Lindberg, Director General MSB
- 11.45 **Lunch**

5.2 Appendix 2 List of agreements

General

1. Agreement between Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden on cooperation across state frontiers to prevent or limit damage to persons or property or to the environment in the case of accidents, 1989 (NORDRED-agreement)
2. Rådets beslut av den 8 november 2007 om inrättandet av gemenskapens civilskyddsmekanism (2007/779/EG Euratom)
3. Sverige-Litauen, samarbets- och beredskapsavtal
4. Sverige-Lettland, samarbets- och beredskapsavtal
5. Sverige-Estland, samarbets- och beredskapsavtal
6. Memorandum of Cooperation between the Swedish Rescue Services Agency and the Ministry of Ukraine in the Field of Emergencies Prevention and Response and Protocol Amending the Memorandum of Cooperation between the Swedish Rescue Services Agency in the Field of Emergencies Prevention and Response and the Ministry of Ukraine of Emergencies and Affairs of Population Protection from the Consequences of the Chornobyl Catastrophe
7. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the Government of the Republic of Finland on Cooperation within the Field of Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response
8. Operational Agreement between the Rescue Board of the Republic of Estonia and the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Finland
9. Agreement by and between the government of the Finnish Republic and the government of the Russian Federation about cooperation to avert disasters and prevent their consequences
10. Agreement between the Kingdom of Denmark and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding Mutual Assistance in the event of Disaster or serious Accidents
11. Memorandum between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Kingdom of Sweden in the field of Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response
12. Agreement between the Governments in the Barents Euro-Arctic Region on cooperation within the field of emergency prevention, preparedness and response, 2008

Municipal rescue services

13. Convention on the transboundary effects of industrial accidents
14. Protokoll, møte mellom kommandøren for Lapplands grenseovervåkningsseksjon, lensmannen i Lapska armens herred og lensmannen i Enare-Utsjoki herredi Republikken Finland, samt politimester i Sør-Varanger politidistrikt, politimesteren i Vadsø politidistrikt, politimesteren i Vestfinnmark politidistrikt og politimesteren i Troms politidistrikt i Kongeriket Norge
15. Inden for rammerne af den nordiske redningsoverenskomst er der indgået en samarbejdsaftale af 2002 mellem Københavns Brandvæsen og Malmö Brandkår
16. Efterforskning av försvunna personer och fjällräddning
17. Överenskommelse mellan Sverige och Norge för underlättande av räddningstjänsten i gränstrakter
18. Avtale mellom Norge og Finland vedrørende samarbeid om redningstjenesten i grenseområdene

Aeronautical and maritime search and rescue

19. Överenskommelse mellan Norge och Sverige för att förbättra flygsäkerheten i samband med flygning med militära luftfartyg
20. Agreement between the government of the kingdom of Sweden and the government of the kingdom of Norway concerning co-operation in respect of aeronautical and maritime search and rescue + operational agreement (OPA)
21. Avtal mellan Norge och Sverige om räddning av personal ur sjunken ubåt
22. IMO International Convention on Maritime search and rescue
23. ICAO Convention on International Civil Aviation Annex 12 Search and rescue
24. Operativt protokoll mellan de finska och svenska myndigheter som är ansvariga för sjö- och flygräddning
25. Operativt avtal mellan de myndigheter i Sverige och Litauen som är ansvariga för sjö- och flygräddning + Agreement between the government of the republic of Lithuania and the government of the kingdom of Sweden on co-operation in maritime and aeronautical search and rescue
26. Operational agreement between the Latvian and Swedish maritime and aeronautical search and rescue services

27. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Finland and the republic of Estonia concerning co-operation on maritime and aeronautical search and rescue
28. Operational agreement between the Swedish and Danish aeronautical and maritime search and rescue services
29. Agreement [between Finland and Russia] on cooperation in the field of search and rescue services in maritime and air transport
30. Avtale mellom Justits- og politidepartementet i Kongeriket Norge og Statens Luftfartsvæsen i Kongeriket Danmark om samarbeid innen flyredningstjenesten
31. Avtale mellom Norge og Sverige om samarbeid om søk og redning i forbindelse med luft- og sjøfart
32. Protocol on the Cooperation concerning Search and Rescue in the Bodø and Søndrestrøm Search and Rescue Regions between the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Justice and the Police and The Civil Aviation Administration of Denmark
33. Protokol om samarbeidet inden for flyveredningstjeneste mellom Statens Luftfartsvæsen, Danmark, og Luftfartsverket, Sverige
34. Avtale om samarbeide mellom ARCC Sweden og HRS Nord-Norge
35. Tilleggsavtale til protokoll om samarbeid innenfor flyredningstjeneste i Nordatlant-regionen mellom Justis- og politidepartementet i Kongeriket Norge og Statens Luftfartsvæsen i Kongeriket Danmark
36. Memorandum of understanding on responsibilities and cooperation in search and rescue matters between the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Justice and the Police and the Civil Aviation Administration, and the Maritime Authority of the Kingdom of Denmark concerning aeronautical and maritime SAR services in the North Sea and Skagerrak
37. Avtale mellom Norge og Russland om samarbeid ved ettersøking av savnede og redning av nødstedte mennesker i Barentshavet
38. Memorandum of Understanding on responsibility and co-operation in search and rescue matters between the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Justice and the Police and the Civil Aviation Administration and the Maritime Authority of the Kingdom of Denmark concerning aeronautical and maritime SAR services in the North Sea and Skagerrak
39. Overenskomst af 12. juni 1992 mellom Kongeriget Danmark og Forbundsrepublikken Tyskland om samarbejde vedrørende maritim eftersøgning og redning i Nordsøen og i Østersøen
40. Letter of Agreement on the cooperation in the search and rescue matters between the Civil Aviation Department of the Ministry of Transport and

Maritime Economy of the Republic of Poland and the Civil Aviation
Administration of the Kingdom of Denmark

41. Operational agreement co-operations between the maritime search and rescue services of the Republic of Poland and the Kingdom of Denmark in the event of maritime emergencies
42. Memorandum of Understanding on responsibilities for and co-operation in search and rescue matters between the Department of Transport of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Civil Aviation Administration and the Maritime Authority of the Kingdom of Denmark concerning aeronautical and maritime search and rescue services in the North Sea
43. Practical information and guidelines for working level cooperation between MRCC Southern-Norway Stavanger and H.M. Coastguard Aberdeen in maritime search and rescue operations
44. Samarbeide mellom Hovedredningscentralen Nord-Norge (Bodø) og Norra Finlands flygraddningscentral (Rovaniemi)

Environmental Incidents

45. Överenskommelse mellan Danmark, Finland, Island, Norge och Sverige om samarbete i fråga om bekämpning av förorening av havet genom olja eller andra skadliga ämnen (Köpenhamnsavtalet).
46. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Finland and the Government of the Republic of Estonia on Cooperation on Combatting oil Pollution Incidents (plus a protocol relating to it)
47. Joint agreement on marine pollution preparedness and response between Norway and the United Kingdom
48. DENER-planen, Danish-German Joint Maritime Contingency Plan on Combatting Oil and Other Harmful Substances, 22. februar 1993
49. SWEDENER, trilateral aftale indgået i november 2002 mellem Danmark, Sverige og Tyskland om samarbejde vedrørende bekæmpelse af forurening af havet med olie eller andre skadelige stoffer
50. Avtale mellom den russiske føderasjons regjering og kongeriket Norges regjering om samarbeid om bekjempelse av oljeforurensning i Barentshavet
51. Överenskommelse om samarbete vid bekämpning av förorening av Nordsjön genom olja och andra skadliga ämnen (Bonn Agreement) samt modifierat annex (Danmark, Norge, Sverige)
52. Konvention om skydd av Östersjöområdets marina miljö (HELCOM)

53. Miljöräddningsavtal (Norge)

Radioactive situations

54. Nordiskt samarbetsavtal i samband med strålningsolyckor.
55. Konvention om bistånd i händelse av kärnteknisk olycka eller ett nödläge med radioaktiva ämnen
56. Avtal med Norge om informationsutbyte och varsel rörande svenska och norska kärntekniska anläggningar mm.
57. Avtal med Danmark om informationsutbyte och varsel rörande svenska och danska kärntekniska anläggningar mm.
58. Avtal med Finland om informationsutbyte och varsel rörande svenska och finska kärntekniska anläggningar mm.
59. Konvention om tidig information vid en kärnenergiolycka
60. Agreement on information exchange between Finland and Norway on nuclear power plants and nuclear incidents.
61. Agreement on information exchange between Finland and Denmark on nuclear power plants and nuclear incidents
62. Agreement on early notification of nuclear accidents and on exchange of information and experience in the field of nuclear safety and radiation protection.
63. Agreement on early notification of nuclear accidents and on exchange of information and experience in the field of nuclear safety and radiation protection.
64. Agreement between Finland and Norway on exchange of information and early notification relating to Finnish and Norwegian nuclear facilities etc.
65. Avtale mellom Regjeringen i Kongeriket Norge og Regjeringen i den Russiske føderasjon om tidlig varsling av atomulykker og om utveksling av informasjon om atomanlegg.
66. Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on early notification of nuclear accidents and on the exchange of information on nuclear facilities
67. Avtale mellom Regjeringen i Kongeriket Norge og Regjeringen i Forbundsrepublikken Tyskland vedrørende spørsmål av felles interesse i forbindelse med kjerneteknisk sikkerhet og strålevern.

68. Avtale mellom Kongerike Norges regjeringen og Folkerepublikken Polens regjering om tidlig varsling av atomulykker og samarbeid innen atomsikkerhet og strålevern.
69. Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of Ukraine on early notification of nuclear accidents and on the exchange of information on nuclear facilities.
70. Avtale mellom Regjeringen i Kongeriket Norge og Regjeringen i det forenkte Kongeriket Storbritannia og Nord-Irland om tidlig varsling av atomulykker og om utveksling av informasjon vedrørende drift og ledelse av kjernefysiske anlegg.
71. Memorandum of understanding between the Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on early notification of a nuclear accident and exchange of safety related information concerning the operation and management of nuclear facilities.
72. Agreement on information exchange between Finland and Denmark on nuclear power plants and nuclear incidents
73. Avtal mellan den danska och den svenska regeringen om informationsutbyte rörande Barsebäcksverket

Others

74. Nordiskt hälsoberedskapsavtal
75. Letter of notification of association with the international COSPAS-SARSAT programme as a user state respective The international COSPAS-SARSAT programme agreement
76. EADRCC / Godkännande av Sveriges individuella partnerskapsprogram (IPP) för åren 2010-2011 inom ramen för Partnerskap för fred

5.3 Appendix 3 Relevant questions for the agreement analysis

Cross border – questions for the analysis of the agreements

Using the results from the workshop in Stockholm and the survey that we conducted in the participating countries we have formulated a number of questions that we intend to use as a basis for the analysis of the agreements. The questions are grouped into subcategories.

Conditions

Is the agreement user-friendly?

On what levels is the agreement to be used? Local, regional, national or international level?

Are the financial aspects regulated in the agreement?

Is operational language/communication and equipment regulated in the agreement?

Is the cooperation based on a risk analysis?

Before the event

Are preparatory activities such as meetings, information exchange, training and education foreseen in the agreement?

Is the agreement strictly operational or does it include preparatory measures (e.g. predeployment)?

Warning

Does the agreement regulate how to inform other parties in case of an incident (national/local)?

Contact

What does the agreement say regarding procedures for requesting resources?

Does the agreement enable the establishment of national points of contact?

Does the agreement enable the establishment of a mutual point of contact?

Resource sharing

Does the agreement enable the utilization of existing resources?

Does the agreement enable the establishment of common resources?

Does the agreement enable common missions outside the Nordic countries?

Border crossing

Does the agreement cover border crossing issues in a satisfactory manner?

HNS

Does the agreement enable host nation support?

Other concerns

Are there overlapping agreements?

Are there agreements missing in some areas?

Does the agreement cover all the phases (before/during/after) of an incident?

Does the agreement regulate precautionary activities?

Is the agreement applicable on emergencies in a wider sense, i.e. other than the salvage of lives, health, property and environment?

Does the agreement cover these following risks?

Animal disease, contaminated water, cyber attack, social disturbance, nuclear waste disposal, influx of refugees, the spread of infection, economic crisis, system failure, sun storm, political crisis, communication failure, pollution, overcrowding, IDP (internally displaced people), food issues, cold and snowy winters, ash or smoke problems, rise of sea levels, shortage of oil/energy/ water etc, electricity failure, blocked transports.