Table 1: Description of exercise

Description of exercise	Phase 2 or 3
Description of Method(s) used	The Accimap approach was developed by Rasmussen as a means of modeling this socio-technical context to identify the combination of events and decisions that produced an accident. Accimap analyses typically focus on failures across the following six organizational levels: government policy and budgeting; regulatory bodies and associations; local area government planning and budgeting (including company management) technical and operational management; physical processes and actor activities; and equipment and surroundings.
Accident(s) studied	Tianjin Port Explosion Accident on 12 August 2015
References used by the team, including tools, websites, publications.	See below in Table 4
Expectations of outcomes	I expected to be able to draw the accimap of the accident with gathering information on the events had occurred pre-accident, too.
	I expected to be able to draw the bow-tie of the accident.

Table 2: Findings relevant to the accident and report information

What was the result of this process? **e.g.,** **-findings** **-questions, gaps in information that you hope to resolve in the next steps** **-scope of the investigation**	**How did this phase meet your expectations?**
	Scope of the investigation reports: The reports of the investigation focus on technical factors and some organizational factors.

-limitations imposed by information available **-potential themes already emerging** **-gaps in information**	**Findings from report**: I found that most information on organizational factors could be found in one source and this job was easy. While organizational factors were well-developed in the documentation that I studied, the influences that affected off-site consequences are not well-discussed.
	Limitations of the report: It was quite difficult to get information from the past events. Also, the tool Bow-Tie and AcciMap did not make possible to catch all information in its format, I would have needed more room for my thoughts and findings but the tool has their limits.
	Gaps in information in the reports: There seem to be documents on consequences off-site, but not that much reflection about how mitigation strategy could be improved.
	Questions or gaps in information that you hope to resolve in the next steps : Pre-accident events and underlying causes or further information on WHY?
If you were an investigator or inspector, what questions would you ask the site following this analysis?	Did any staff on the site have questions about this?
	Did the operator or operators on site have a domino effects scenario? If so, what were the emergency response plans for this?

Table 3: Findings relevant to the method

Summary of experience working with the method(s)	I would use this method again. It worked with the information that I found to generate questions and start an analytical framework.	
Advantages	It can show various factors roundly and clearly, especially be good at	

	organizational and governmental factors.	
Disadvantages	When the factors are various, it can be disordered and complex.	
Advice for analysts/inspectors using this (these) method(s)	You need to know what you would like to use this tool, for example, if you focus on organizational and governmental factors, AcciMap is the perfect tool.	

Table 4: Reference materials - List of Links

Date	Title	Link	Comment
2015	Tianjin fire explosion accident investigation report	http://www.taihainet.com/news/txnews/cnnews/sh/2016-02-05/1666242.html	