



Swedish Civil
Contingencies
Agency

Test of the application of the checklist for contingency planning for accidents affecting transboundary waters

Chisinau, 23-24 March 2015

Aim

- There is a need for JEG to have the checklist evaluated in a “real context”
- JEG would like the participants of this TTEX to use the questions related to the checklist as a basis for testing and possibly adjusting the checklist

The checklist is divided into two parts

- Is the separation of the checklist into two parts efficient?
- Are there any questions missing in the checklist? If so, which?
- Are there any questions in the checklist that are not relevant? If so, which?



Definitions

- Are there any definitions missing? If yes, what should be added?
- Should any definition be further clarified? If yes, what should be clarified?
- Are the definitions correctly placed? If not, what should be moved?



General impressions

- Is the checklist useful for your purposes? If not, what needs to be added?
- Is there anything else that needs improvement? If yes, what should be improved?
- Is it clear for what kind of threats the checklist should be used? If not, what should be added?
- Does the checklist cover all possible threats and threatening objects? If not, what should be added?
- Is it clear how the prioritization of threatening object should be done and how this should be reflected in the final result? If not, what should be added?

Evaluation

- Use the questionnaire provided by JEG to evaluate the Joint Contingency Plan for the Danube Delta
- After the TTEX, present your findings in the plenary and hand over your written comments to a JEG member (or to UNECE secretariat)
- Comments should be provided by late 24 March (or at another date agreed with JEG or UNECE)