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Situation in Romania

- General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations
  - Since 2004
  - Civil Protection Command + Military Fire Fighting Corp
- Responsible for implementation of fire fighting, civil protection and Seveso legislation
Competent Authorities for implementation of Seveso legislation

Central Level
- Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests / RS
- National Environmental Protection Agency / RS
- National Environmental Guard
- Ministry of Internal Affairs / DES
- General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations

County Level
- Environmental Protection Agency / RS
- County Commissariat of the National Environmental Guard
- County Inspectorate for Emergency Situations
Responsibilities of the authorities

- Examination of the documents drawn up by the operator (Notification, MAPP, SR, IEP)
- Inventory
- Domino Effect
- Draw up of EEP
- Notice
- EEP Testing
- LUP
- Inspections
- Information to the public
- Investigation of accidents
- Reporting
National Seveso inventory

Repartition of UT establishments after type of activity

- Chemical installations
- Fuel storage (including heating, retail sale, etc.)
- General chemicals manufacture (not included above)
- LNG storage and distribution
- LPG production, storage, bottling and bulk distribution
- Other activity (not included above)
- Petrochemical / Oil Refineries
- Extractive industry
- Plastic and rubber manufacture
- Power generation, supply and distribution
- Processing of metals ferrous & non ferrous
- Production and storage of fertilizers
- Production, destruction and storage of explosives
- Water and sewage (collection, supply, treatment)
- Wholesale and retail storage and distribution (excluding LPG)
Inspection experience

• Does your authority mandate the use of process safety performance indicators for your Seveso sites?
  • The use of SPIs is not mandatory in our legislation. It is only a recommendation for performance monitoring
  • CA use Guidelines for SMS which has specific questions for performance monitoring
    • "Negative" indicators:
      • Number of the accidents, almost accidents, anomalies, / Number of the hours of stop not programmed,
      • Number of breakdowns found in the systems or critical equipment,
    • "Positive" indicators:
      • Number of hours for safety revision of projects and changes, / Resources for programmed maintenance, / Number of technical inspections,
      • Resources used to the activities of analysis of the risks and studies of reliability, / Resources used to the activities of information, formation and training,

• If not, do you know if any of your sites have SPIs?
  • Mainly upper tier establishments & multinational / corporate establishments

• Do you consider SPIs in the inspection if they have it? If yes, do you consider them e.g. for dialogue, as evidence (evidence of what?), etc..
  • Yes, as evidence of Performance monitoring
What sites should use SPIs

- Do you think SPIs are useful for sites?
  - Yes, if there are developed and used in the right way and specific for the site
- Are they useful for the Seveso inspection?
  - Yes, it is the easiest way to obtain an overview of the establishment safety and give a clue to the authorities for further planned or unplanned inspections
- In your opinion, are there sites which are not currently using SPIs which could benefit from their use?
  - Yes, but is up to the operator. We as authority can only recommend them to use it.
Good and bad practices

• Give an example of good practice
  • SPIs connected with hazard and risk assessment
  • Using SPIs as an early warning of potential process and safety problems
  • Closing the cycle of the SPIs – using them for the corrective actions of the establishment safety

• Give an example of bad practice
  • Using the SPIs only as a reaction to the request of CA (i.e. to show some figure during the inspection)
  • Producing SPIs only to report good results (irrelevant) and not connected with the process safety
Thank you for attention!