



Document title	SAT 2.0 report by Poland
Code	4-4-Add.2
Category	INF
Agenda Item	4 - EWG OWR activities
Submission date	25.5.2020
Submitted by	Poland
Reference	

Background

This document contains the filled in Self Assessment Tool (SAT 2.0) by Poland as an addition to document 4-4.

Action requested

The Meeting is invited to discuss the SAT reports with the aim to have the final report submitted to RESPONSE 28-2020 in November 2020.

	To be initiated	Important gaps to be filled	Strong basis	Excellent
Planning and integration	<input type="checkbox"/> Only an oil spill response plan exists; it may or may not have reference to OWR <input type="checkbox"/> No authority so far has taken responsibility to oversee (the quality of) wildlife response and preparedness <input type="checkbox"/> There is no common rationale for (the development of) an integrated OWR plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> It is recognised that OWR needs a plan; meetings have taken place, but no draft document written as yet <input type="checkbox"/> One authority has taken responsibility to take a lead on plan development, but other relevant authorities are not engaging as yet <input type="checkbox"/> A scenario/risk analysis has resulted in a clear picture of what is needed and who needs to do what	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A mature plan has been developed on the basis of scenario analysis, but not (fully) formalised or integrated as yet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All relevant authorities are engaged with the OWR plan, by formal decision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All relevant parties (Authority-NGO-Private) have been brought around the table and have divided and agreed roles, responsibilities and development tasks	<input type="checkbox"/> OWR plan formalised and fully integrated with all relevant oil spill plans (at sea response, coastal response, regional plans), and implemented via a multi-year programme and budget <input type="checkbox"/> Annual activities demonstrate full commitment with all signatories of the plan and significant preparedness improvements thanks to training and exercises in which all signatories participate <input type="checkbox"/> Progressively the preparedness is increasing according to plan and agreed budget: Risks are managed
Exercises	<input type="checkbox"/> No OWR exercises take place <input type="checkbox"/> There is no actor who is interested to organise OWR exercises <input type="checkbox"/> The importance of exercises such as table tops, field exercises and facility exercises is acknowledged but not acted upon	<input type="checkbox"/> Exercises have had an ad hoc character and were not related to a plan or training programme <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife aspects are exercised by one or more parties but not by everyone together <input type="checkbox"/> Ad hoc exercises were limited to table tops and/or simple field exercises	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exercises take place coherently every year and look at different aspects of a response <input type="checkbox"/> Exercises are attended by all stakeholders together but there is no clear relation with training <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exercises are structural, but a large mobilisation exercise testing the build-up and operations of a facility has not been held to date	<input type="checkbox"/> Exercises take place according to a pre-defined schedule that directly relates to the agreed plan <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife aspects are exercised by all stakeholders together and aiming at letting trained officers working <input type="checkbox"/> There is a full diversity of scheduled exercises (table top, field, facility) as part of a formal plan-related exercise programme
Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Roles and responsibilities in a wildlife response are not clarified and not discussed between stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> There is no in-country expertise available to provide training courses <input type="checkbox"/> There are parties interested in being trained	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some but not all stakeholders have assumed their roles in a wildlife response and train their key personnel to be able to take responsibilities according to clear job descriptions <input type="checkbox"/> The need for training at different levels (hands-on or managers) is recognised, but actual training is limited to basic hands-on (e.g. volunteers) only level. <input type="checkbox"/> Training is provided, but not to international standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> Roles and responsibilities are defined as job descriptions as part of an agreed plan and a training programme has been agreed and is centrally coordinated, delivering key personnel from different organisations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training is recognised and taking place for both hands-on personnel and managers <input type="checkbox"/> Training packages aim at international standards, and an increasing number of staff is already qualified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Trained personnel from different stakeholder organisations are offered regular opportunities to exercise together, to practice their skills in realistic scenarios <input type="checkbox"/> A centrally coordinated training programme aims to deliver responders at all levels and ensure various individuals can take key roles in the higher management positions <input type="checkbox"/> Trained staff are fully qualified according to international standards and have reached levels where they can assist with training other responders or a response abroad
Equipment and facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> The role of facilities in OWR is recognised, but plans to realise them have not been developed or tested. <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment stockpiles are unknown or absent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is clear what facilities are needed for different purposes in a wildlife response. At this stage, only small size facilities can be used or developed, equipped and staffed, serving only for relatively small incident scenarios <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equipment stockpiles are available in-country, but an analysis of their completeness has not been made	<input type="checkbox"/> The use and development of facilities has been described in the plan and procedures and criteria are available for scaling up facility size to a desired maximum level that can be equipped and staffed <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment stockpiles and lists of equipment and consumables have been drawn up as well as an updated list of manufacturers and providers	<input type="checkbox"/> The use and development of fit-for-purpose facilities is the subject of specific exercises in an exercise programme in which the performance of contractors and responsible organisations is regularly tested and evaluated <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment mobilisation in relation to facility build up and field activities is regularly tested and evaluated as part of an exercise programme
Euthanasia (incl. mass euthanasia)	<input type="checkbox"/> Euthanasia has not been considered as an explicit response option, and resources not identified nor developed <input type="checkbox"/> No stakeholder discussions have been held to define criteria for euthanasia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Euthanasia is considered as a response option but guaranteed/contracted providers with certified resources are not in place <input type="checkbox"/> Criteria (when and how) for euthanasia have been agreed between stakeholders but a risk-based gap-analysis has not been carried out	<input type="checkbox"/> A plan includes species specific options for euthanasia, and certified resources for each have been identified and contracted <input type="checkbox"/> Agreed guidelines for euthanasia have been developed and provide guidance for different regions and worst-case scenarios	<input type="checkbox"/> The plan for euthanasia is structurally and regularly exercised and demonstrate that the identified resources can also deal with worst case scenarios <input type="checkbox"/> All stakeholders have agreed to the guidelines and well-developed communication strategies are in place for informing the public, not only in worst case scenarios.
Partnering and funding	<input type="checkbox"/> No dedicated central funds are explicitly available for wildlife preparedness development <input type="checkbox"/> It is recognised that wildlife impacts or response can be controversial in terms of public reactions, but no multi-stakeholder activities have been organised to date to explore common ground and solutions <input type="checkbox"/> There is a high reliance on OWR resources from abroad, but the procedures to invite and integrate responders from abroad have not been discussed or described.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funds are available to the extent that some ad hoc activities can be financed; there is no multi-year approach nor budget available <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder meetings have been discussing wildlife impacts and options for a response, and it is clear that different views and approaches are possible, but no actions have been taken to find solutions in bridging different opinions <input type="checkbox"/> Oiled Wildlife Response resources from abroad that could assist, have been identified and discussions take place on mobilisation procedures, but no formal procedure has been agreed nor described.	<input type="checkbox"/> A multi-year budget has been created to finance a number of activities, contracts and equipment investments. But it is still expected from various key stakeholders to contribute in-kind to the agreed preparedness level <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder processes have led to the agreed objectives and strategies for an OWR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The assistance from OWR resources from abroad have been described as part of the wildlife response plan. Tier-3 mobilisation however is not part of an exercise programme.	<input type="checkbox"/> A multi-year budget has been created that allows one or more key stakeholders to coordinate an all-encompassing programme and overseeing investments, training and exercises, and provide professional staff to undertake key roles and responsibilities in the management of a response; a key authority oversees that targets are met by the programme <input type="checkbox"/> A response will involve a broad range of stakeholders in the response activities, ensuring different viewpoints are respected and publicly communicated as of one voice so that the public is likely to support the response and its decision taking <input type="checkbox"/> The assistance by OWR resources from abroad is described as part of the wildlife response plan and mobilisation procedures are regularly exercised and tested.

Figure 2: Diagram in which scores can be put




Figure 3: Example

