



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

### Why European Directives?

#### The first reason to think about a directive ....

Chemical plant of the company Imesca, neighbor of the city of Seveso (≈ 22000 people)

09.07.1976 4:00 p.m. start of production of Trichlorophenol in vessel 101

10.07.1976 2:30 a.m. main reaction seems to be completed

6:00 a.m. crew changes, somebody stops the mixer of vessel 101

≈ 0:30 p.m. main reaction in vessel 101 starts again, increasing fast

0:37 p.m. safety valve of vessel 101 opens

over ≈ 30 min emission of ≈ 3 kg TCDD (Dioxin)

first days after inside an area of ≈ 1x6 km plants shrivel

> 3000 animal die

> 200 people hospitalised

and the public ignores the real reason

8 days later company statement : "TCDD was released"



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

#### Main reasons of the accident

Lack of communication between the crews ↔ SMS Insufficient cooling capacity (reaction) ↔ PHA

Main reasons for the size of the effects

Insufficient cooling capacity (emission time) ↔ PHA

No information to the public ← EAP

Ignorance of the production by authority

**INSPECTIONS** 



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

#### **Timeline**

**Seveso (1976)** 

**Seveso Directive I (1982)** 

Bhopal (1984) Basel (1986)

Seveso Directive II (1996)

**Awareness behind both Directives** 

"Whereas major accidents can have consequences beyond frontiers ....."



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

### Main objectives

Prevention of major accidents Limitation of their consequences

## Main strategic tools ↔ Operator

Major-accident prevention policy (Article 7)
Safety report (Article 9)
Emergency plans (Article 11)

# Main strategic tools ↔ Authority

Domino effect (Article 8)
Land-use planning (Article 12)
Inspections (Article 18)



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

# Why a checklist?

Questions ↔ examples at one view.

Logical order can be shown simply.

Concrete results are quickly available.

Can lead directly to necessary actions.



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents
Assistance Programme for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) and South-Eastern Europe (SEE)

## Why only Yes / Limited / No?

How should a missing calculation of effects be weighted against a missing management of change?

Numerically weighted questions are very exhausting.

What percentage is to be reached for acceptance?

The result is often not unique.



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents
Assistance Programme for Eastern Europe, Caucasus and

### Consequences of Limited and No

#### Limited

This part of the document needs to be improved until the next inspection.

#### **One No**

The entire document is not acceptable, it must be revised immediately.

The questions need to be formulated very carefully.



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

### Why divided into three "C"?

Completeness

This part of the document is essential.

#### Correctness

This part of the document is available, but is it correct?

#### Credibility

This part of the document is available, but is it correct?

**Correctness and Credibility ← "Crosscheck" for Completeness** 



Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents