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To me, the meeting in Pieterburen in more than one respect has been a very impressive experience. Representatives from wildlife rehabilitation centres all over Europe came together. They shared a common concern regarding oil spills, the poor ability of governments and industry to prevent them and the unsatisfactory state of national and international preparedness and response when they happen. Regardless from which country the participants came from, their message was the same: something must be done. I feel inspired by the shared feeling of urgency and the expressed willingness to seek co-operation, to be stronger together!

The enormous expertise and pan-European field experience represented by that group as a whole struck me. It gave an enormous weight to the unanimous decision of the meeting to start working together and develop an international capacity that should tackle the problem.

As a politician, I have a good feeling about the process that has started in “Pieterburen”. I see that this initiative could make a real difference: it can lead to a safer and cleaner marine environment in Europe and elsewhere in the world. The initiative is well timed and very promising. Promising, because the problem of oil spills and other disasters is everybody’s problem, including industry and governmental parties. We, the developing international network of wildlife rehabilitators and their sympathising organisations, offer them a new alliance. A new approach! It must lead to better prevention and improved systems of preparedness and response. I am sure our signal will be taken seriously.

The decision by the group to form a Task Force that should develop a program of action I think has been an essential and important step in the right direction. Still there is a difficult task ahead, but it is of eminent importance that it will be a success. In my function as chair of the Sea Alarm Foundation I feel privileged to be able to contribute to that.

Good luck!
Let’s do it!

Erica Terpstra
Chairperson Sea Alarm Foundation
November 4 and 5, 2000, representatives of rehabilitation centres and international animal welfare organisations gathered in The Netherlands \(^1\). They discussed the need for cooperation at an international level in the rapid response to oil and other coastal contingencies affecting marine wildlife. The meeting was organised by Sea Alarm Foundation and hosted by the Seal Rehabilitation and Research Centre in Pieterburen. The participating rehabilitation centres were brought together on invitation, aiming to have an effective discussion group with a pan-European representation. The participating centres represented fourteen countries, including twelve EU Member States, Poland and Turkey.

\(^1\) See list of participants, Annex 1

The key note presentations allowed an overview of the problems faced by rehabilitation centres that are suddenly and often unexpectedly faced with an oil spill disaster that exceeds their local capacity, and what can be done at an international level. Hugo Nijkamp presented the results of the feasibility study by Sea Alarm (Nijkamp, H. and Lankester, K., 2000). The study gave insight into many details of a larger oil spill in which wildlife gets involved. The report demonstrates that the costs of rehabilitation of oiled wildlife can be reimbursed through mechanisms of liability. These are established by legislation. Only the US 1990 Oil Pollution Act has a far reaching mechanism that recognises the need and the costs to rehabilitate oiled wildlife. This legislation has resulted in oiled wildlife rehabilitation centres with international
reputation (IBRRC, Tri-State) and very advanced regional emergency networks for oiled wildlife (such as OWCN, California) in the US. Elsewhere in the world, the position of wildlife rehabilitation in contingency planning and liability schemes is poor, as is the level to which individual rehabilitation centres are prepared to (assist in) an oil spill emergency response (see figure below). Sea Alarm’s report concludes that international networks of co-operating rehabilitation centres are needed, worthwhile, supported by consulted key international players, and therefore feasible.

Civil liability schemes worldwide. Note that the situation in Europe is far from uniform.

Cindy Milburn explained that oil spill prevention is a key objective in IFAW’s work. But as long as spills continue to happen, IFAW is aiming at minimizing the effects of oil on wildlife, and this is an issue that requires cooperation at an international scale. The first steps towards realising a worldwide network for oiled wildlife rehabilitation were taken at the Effects of Oiled Wildlife Conference in Myrtle Beach, March 2000. IFAW had made sure that a special session was held at the end of that conference to evaluate the international experiences that many groups and individuals had brought forward during the Conference. Very important to this session was the experience with the Erika spill, November 1999 in France. The Erica disaster was an example of an international operation in which international assistance (from US, South Africa and UK) to local wildlife responders was organised. This operation, financially supported by IFAW, demonstrated deficiencies that can only be solved in a structural worldwide approach of the problem. The Myrtle Beach session resulted in a worldwide coalition of rehabilitters and organisations that aim at an effective oil spill preparedness with high quality standards worldwide. The present members of this coalition will meet again in Hastings, November 30, 2000 for further discussions how to establish the network and which technical and methodological needs should be fulfilled.

Tim Thomas introduced and read out a paper written by Jim Conroy ², who unfortunately could not attend this meeting. The mainframe that would increase preparedness of wildlife rehabilitters would be an international standard or model methodology. Emergency protocols that enable a rapid professional wildlife response according to international accepted standards are hardly available and have to be developed. Such protocols must be

²) The full text of Conroy’s paper is in Annex 2
recognised and endorsed by any national authority responsible for contingency planning. A project proposal to develop a model contingency plan for wildlife rehabilitation operation has been prepared this year and can be submitted to (EU?) funding.

Hugo Nijkamp presented some perspectives for international co-operation. He showed that a network of co-operation between rehabilitation centres at a worldwide level are underway. Also building a network at a (pan) European level would be a very feasible thing to do which could provide the international assistance in a 3-tiered system of response (see figure below). Obviously such a network should concentrate on developing standards, equipment and funding. Building prevention and preparedness is of eminent importance. Wildlife rehabilitators are at the “end of pipe” position in the chain of a national emergency response (see figure below). Before wildlife gets affected by a spill, many steps of prevention and preparedness have already passed, for the success of which others, i.e. mainly governments and industry, are responsible. Increasing the level of preparedness and developing response standards is clearly the responsibility of the rehabilitators community. But the prevention of spills to happen or wildlife to get affected in the first place, must be developed by governments and industry. Co-operative networks of wildlife responders and rehabilitators should therefore concentrate on the prevention issue and develop a strong recognised position to discuss prevention with governments and industry.

This diagram shows the need for a 3-tiered system of response. A quick and accurate international response must be developed as a form of preparedness to a situation where nor the local, nor the national wildlife response capacity is able to cope with the size emergency.

The diagram shows that an oil spill disaster develops in different steps. Each different step increases the emergency situation for wildlife (expressed by means of an Wildlife Emergency Index).
Development into a next step of emergency should be prevented, which can best achieved by an appropriate state of preparedness at all emergency levels. The diagram shows that wildlife rehabilitation is the “end of chain”, i.e. it becomes eminent when prevention and preparedness mechanisms at all previous stages have failed.

The first discussion concentrated on the possible role that an international network of wildlife responders and rehabilitators could have. What are the needs according to the participants, most of whom are working at the “grass root level” with different species, under different local conditions, within different European countries? Fourteen issues were raised (see next two pages), that together could be considered as building blocks of a programme of action for an internationally co-operating rehabilitators network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Written on Flip-over</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fill in Contacts industry Prevention Compensation scheme</td>
<td>The international network should fill in what is beyond the reach of any individual rehabilitation organisation. Examples are the contacts with industry, and improvement of the international agreements on compensation. Prevention was considered as a main issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rehabilitation versus &quot;bullet&quot; approach Good examples: → contra pro</td>
<td>There is a widespread philosophy that oiled wildlife should be killed immediately, and that rehabilitation is not in the interest of an animal's welfare. It was raised that the “bullet approach” philosophy is based on only one scientifically described example (guillemot) in which rehabilitation did not contribute to the overall survival of the affected animals. But there are different examples with other species demonstrating that rehabilitation made a significant difference in survival rate. It should be a task of the international network to provide species specific data on the (long term) results of emergency rehabilitation and critically evaluate pro’s and contra’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Challenge Identity small organisations</td>
<td>The challenge of the international network is that it should represent the identity of small organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Become powerful organisation Let industry give the appropriate info on Substances spilled “safety rehabilitators health”</td>
<td>The network should become powerful organisation, recognised by industry and governments. Only in that way you can achieve that industry will immediately provide the kind of essential information on a spill, like the chemical composition of the substances spilled. That is all in the interest of the responder’s health and safety. In turn, the wildlife responders through a recognised network organisation are able to provide industry and governments with useful data, information, expertise and internationally accepted methodologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Co-operative int. Body Representing small organisations Good network to activate right people</td>
<td>The international network should be a co-operative international body that represents small organisations. This network should be able to activate the right people within governments and industry. Also to get the right people on the spot of a spill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Biodiversity ← → “bullet approach”</td>
<td>Emergency rehabilitation does not stand in its own right. It is in the interest of national and international objectives concerning the conservation of biological diversity. A vulnerable population with a wide geographical range may be at risk from a number of different separate oil spills, shortly after each other. An international emergency rehabilitation network then has something to offer in terms of conservation. The bullet approach has not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written on Flip-over</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Services dept</td>
<td>The international network should act like a service department with different strands of activities that serve the common interests of the individual member organisations. This can become very powerful, when many ngo’s are represented. The network should represent the ngo’s and therefore does not take an impartial position in the dialogue with governments and industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful because powerful representation NGO’S NOT IMPARTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Who is responsible for what clarification</td>
<td>A powerful network can put pressure on national governments to clarify who is responsible for what in the potential event of a coastal emergency situation. The network should press for effective contingency planning and the inclusion of wildlife rehabilitation in the existing contingency plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Oil industry should pay for restoration Not follow economic language of industry</td>
<td>A powerful network should contribute to the discussion on liability schemes. Damage to nature and its restoration is currently not paid for by industry because it cannot be expressed in a monetary value. The network should be active in finding creative solutions to that end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Store (warehouse) Of equipment at central place &amp; manage it. Cooperate with oil response industry</td>
<td>An important service that the network should provide is the storage of emergency equipment in warehouses at a number of strategic locations. To this end, it could co-operate with the oil response industry, that maintains such warehouses all over the world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Educate awareness raising industry = tool Use training sessions of response industry</td>
<td>Education should be one of the strategic activities of the network. Educating staff of oil companies has already proven successful in creating understanding and respect for wildlife rehabilitation activities. The oil spill response industry regularly organises training sessions, and these could be extended with wildlife response modules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Solve “pricing” problem Rehabilitation costs by means of education</td>
<td>Education could also help to solve the problem of how to express loss of nature in monetary value (“pricing problem”). If industry understands the wider conservation context of a wildlife rehabilitation operation they would more easily be willing to accept the liability claims by rehabilitators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Species specific approach</td>
<td>The network should not operate on an abstract international level only. It has to become operational with species specific approaches. Each species needs its own specific rehabilitation treatment and its own protocols.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What is role Sea Alarm? what has already been done which are the gaps? Sea Alarm should not replace the small groups</td>
<td>It has to be clarified what exactly is the role of the international network “Sea Alarm”. What are the niches and relevant issues? What kind of work is already being covered by other organisations? Sea Alarm should not re-invent wheels. Neither should Sea Alarm become an organisation that “replaces” the small groups of which it should be the representative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impression of current work and facilities

By means of “five minutes presentations”, many participants took the opportunity to present their respective working fields, aims, and facilities. Presentations demonstrated the professional activities on the rehabilitation of birds and mammals in countries all over Europe (see figure below).

Participants in the Pieterburen meeting came from countries all over Europe, and shared their experiences regarding different regional seas. Also the Myrtle Beach Coalition (MBC) was represented.

Proposal work programme

From the way the fourteen issues of discussion were raised and supported appeared that there was consensus to form a network for co-operating at an international level. This network (to many synonymous to “Sea Alarm”, which confused others with the aim and the role of Sea Alarm Foundation) should aim at services to individual members of the network that no-one could afford to do at an individual nor national level. Following the discussions, a proposal was forwarded on how to develop Sea Alarm as an international network and service (mission statement) and how to give the executive body of such a network a mandate to operate on these issues, which were clustered in a worldwide and a European strand of activities.

Work programme discussions

The proposed work programme received both criticism and support when it was discussed. Criticism was mainly due to the confusing term “Sea Alarm”, which some participants held for Sea Alarm Foundation. Did Sea Alarm Foundation solicit a mandate from this meeting and also the Myrtle Beach coalition to claim a number of activities? It was clarified by the Sea Alarm Board that Sea Alarm Foundation is not aiming at developing as a network or as a new NGO. Rather the Foundation aims at supporting the process in which a network could develop not only for rapid response to oil spill and other marine disasters, but for prevention as well.

Support was expressed to the way the proposed work programme covered the fourteen issues and the comprehensive framework it provided to the different and complex tasks ahead. It was proposed that a Task Force should be working on specifying the work programme and fill it with a number of strategic activities for the years to come. Following these discussions, a number of decisions was agreed by the participants as a group.

Chairman of the Pieterburen meeting: Harm Rozie (NL)

---

3) See Annex 3 for an overview of the presentations
4) See Annex 4 for the text of the proposal
Decisions on co-operative work

Strategic model for coalition development
A strategic model for coalition development was agreed upon. It shows the gradual development of an international network or "coalition" which may have worldwide and regional components. To the development of this network a number of activities should be identified. Different activities must be prioritised, but each activity needs funding. To finance the activities, strategic sources must be found, which may be governmental, non-governmental or even industrial. To build the model and make it work, a Task Force is needed, which should be a representative group from the meeting. This Task force needs a mandate from the larger group to do the necessary work.

Funding strategy
Sea Alarm Foundation, by means of its Chairperson Erica Terpstra, expressed its concern to run out of budget before the critical steps towards building the network have been taken. It was agreed that the results of the meeting may be used by Sea Alarm Foundation to find funding for continuing the process.

Contacts with industry and governments
It was considered by the meeting that both industry and governments are a most important parties to co-operate with, especially considering prevention, the exchange of information and expertise. From some preliminary discussions with industry representatives, it appeared that there is a mutual interest should the international network become effective and representative. Quite firmly, the meeting agreed on the decision not to formally announce the existence of a network to the industry in this stage of network development. Interspill 2000 (end of November in Brighton) could have been an opportunity to let industrial parties know that wildlife responders are having an international network of co-operation. However, as this network is still in its infancy, such an announcement could easily have an aversive effect if industry would not take it seriously. "The first chance to make a big impression on industry should not be spoiled". However, it was agreed that the already existing contacts within the industry (e.g. ITOPF) should be briefed on progress informally. They should be consulted how strategic steps can be best taken towards a future dialogue and funding.

Representation
Unanimously, the participants agreed that the network should be more completely representing the existing wildlife rehabilitation community in Europe. Therefore it was decided that for a next meeting more groups should be invited.

Effects of Oil on Wildlife Conference
It was announced by IFAW that the 2002 Effects of Oil on Wildlife Conference will be held in Europe in stead of the USA. Everybody agreed that this Conference would offer great opportunities for evaluation of progress so far, and discussions with other relevant groups, like scientists and industry.
Task Force from left to right: Jan Ake Hillarp (S), Antonio Di Natale (I), Jeny Androukaki (G), Guillaume Gélinaud (F), Lenie ’t Hart (NL), Dick Jongman (NL), Jane Galloway (UK), Tim Thomas (UK) and Sally Hamilton (IFAW Brussels). Jim Conroy (UK) was not present.

Task Force and its mandate
Ten participants volunteered to form a Task Force that should elaborate on a strategic work programme. Sea Alarm Foundation offered to support the secretary to this group. The mandate includes the following activities:

1. identify the activities that are necessary to build an international network and activities that are ahead to fulfil the mission of this international network
2. prioritise the activities over a defined time schedule,
3. assess their budget demands, and
4. (if possible) identify sources of funding
5. Report back by means of a draft working programme

Representation and secretariat
By forming the Task Force, it was considered to have regional European representation (north and south) and a balanced representation of bird and mammal response groups. Also the Task Force is a mix of representatives involved in the Myrtle Beach Coalition movement and representatives of European grass root level organisations.

Product
The product by the Task Force should be a draft strategic work programme with a financial structure and a proposed funding mechanism.

Schedule
The Task Force had its first meeting just after closure of the meeting in Pieterburen. The following work programme was agreed:
1. Mailing by secretariat, including member list Task Force and a format to facilitate an electronic brainstorm session (week 43 check)

2. Electronic brainstorm session, to identify activities and their priorities (before 1 December)

3. Proposal work programme by secretariat, based on the received suggestions (1st week January 2001)

4. Meeting to discuss proposal (somewhere in January 2001, location: IFAW’s office in Brussels) and agree upon a “final draft”.

5. Dissemination draft report Task Force by secretariat (February 2001)

6. Organise and find funding for a second meeting of “Pieterburen”-network partners
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IFAW Brussels
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Belgium
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Germany
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Peter Lienau
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Cetacea@iper.net

1) Acquario di Genova
Dr. Antonio Di Natale
Costa Aquarium S.P.A.
Area Porto Ponte Spinola
16128 Genova
Italy
Phone: 00 - 39 010 23 45 221
Fax: 00 - 39 010 25 61 601
a.dinatale@acquario.ge.it.
Or:
2) Aquastudio
Dr. Antonio Di Natale
Via Trapani 6
98121 Messina
Italy
Phone: 00 - 39 090 46 34 08
Fax: 00 - 39 090 36 45 60
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Zeehondencrèche Pieterburen
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Lenie ’t Hart
Hoofdstraat 94a
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The Netherlands
Phone: 00 - 31 595 526526
Fax: 00 - 31 595 528389
pieterburen_seals@wxs.nl
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Diederik van Liere
Sterrenweg 3B
2651 HZ Berkel en Rodenrijs
The Netherlands
Phone: 00 - 31.105114386
Fax: 00 - 31.105115174
dvanliere@ifaw.org
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D. Jongman
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Phone: 00 - 31 519321903
Fax: 00 - 31 519321591
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Iwona Kuklik
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Phone: 00 - 48 58750836
Fax: 00 - 48 58750420
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Elio Vicente
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Albufeira, Algarve
Portugal
Phone: 00 - 351 289560305
Fax: 00 - 351 289560309
Elio.vicente@zoomarine.pt
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CRAMC- Centre de Recuperacio d' Animals
Marins de Catalunta
Oscar Cabezón
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Camí Ral, Premià de Mar 239
08330 Barcelona
Spain
Phone: +34 937524581
Fax: +34 937525710
cram@lix.intercom.es

Sweden
Jan Ake Hillarp
Matrosgata
S - 23931 Skanor
Sweden
Phone: 00 - 4640472369
Jan-Ake.H.Hillarp@skanor.vellinge.se
jan.hillarp@zeta.telenordia.se

Turkey
WWF Foca Pilot Project
Harun Güçlüsoy
K. Deniz Shil Cad 32
35680 Foça
Izmir
Turkey
Phone/fax: 00 - 90 2328123062
Sadizmir@rocketmail.com

United Kingdom
RSPCA
Tim Thomas
Causeway, Horsam
West Sussex RH12 1HG
UK
Phone: 00 - 44 1403264181
Fax: 00 - 44 1403218042
ttomas@rspca.org.uk

British Divers Marine Life Rescue
Alistair Jack
Briarbank
Scarfskerry
Thurso KW14 8XN
UK
Phone: (day) 00 - 44 1847851741
Phone: (night)00 - 44 1847851648
Fax: 00 - 44 385738671
USA
IFAW
Animals in Crisis and Distress Program
Cindy Milburn, Director
411 Main Street
Yarmouth Port
MA 02675-1822
USA
Phone: 00 - 1.508.7442091
Fax: 00 - 1.508.7442099
cmilburn@ifaw.org

Sea Alarm representatives

Harm Rozie (Chairman of Pieterburen meeting, board member Sea Alarm Foundation)

Jan Hoogstrate (Boardmember Sea Alarm Foundation)

Erica Terpstra (Chair Sea Alarm Foundation)
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C/o Hoofdstraat 94a
9968 AG Pieterburen
The Netherlands
Phone: 00 - 31.595.526526
Fax: 00 - 31.595.528389
sea.alarm@wxs.nl

Hugo Nijkamp
Argo Sea Use and Wildlife Consultancy
P.O. Box 3273
2601 DG Delft
The Netherlands
Phone: 00 - 31.6.218 77 218
nijkamp@argo-onda.com
or:
Argo Sea Use and Wildlife Consultancy
Quai aux Briques 22
1000 Brussels
Belgium
Phone: 00 - 32.2.5032590
Fax: 00 - 32.2.5027438

Not attending, but interested in follow-up:

Denmark
Fiskeri Museet Saltvandsakvariet
S. Tougaard
Tarphagevej 2
DK – 6710 Esbjerg V
Denmark
Phone: 00 - 45 76122000
Fax: 00 - 45 761220010

France
LPO
Laurent Brucy
Station Ornithologique de L’île Grande
2256
Pleumeur-Bodou,
France
Phone: 00 - 33 296919140
Fax: 00 - 33 296919105
laurent.brucy@lpo-birdlife.asso.fr

Norway
Lofotakvariet Seal Pool
Scenic Attractions
Storvågan
8310 Kabelvåg
Norway
Phone: 00 - 47 76 07 86 65
fax: 00 - 47 76 07 89 40
post@lofotakvariet.no

UK
Jim Conroy
CEH Banchory
Hill of Brathens
Banchory
Aberdeenshire
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UK
Phone: 00 - 44 1330 826300
Fax: 00 - 44 1330 823303
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Finland
Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute
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Eero Helle
P.O.Box 6,FIN-00721,
Helsinki
Finland
Phone: 00 - 358 2057511
Fax: 00 - 358 205 75 1201
eero.helle@rktl.fi

Särkänniemi Dolphinarium
Kai Mattsson
FIN- 33230, Tampere
Finland
Phone: 00 - 358 32488111
Fax: 00 - 358 32121279
kai.mattsson@sarkanniemi.fi

Finnish Environment Institute
Timo Asanti,
P.O. Box 140, Fin-00251
Helsinki
Finland
(Street address. Kesäkatu 6, 00260 H:ki)
Phone: 00 - 358 940300720
Fax: 00 - 358 40300791
Mobile phone: 050 565 8383
timo.asanti@vyh.fi

Russia
St. Petersburg State University
(Baltic Fund for Nature)
Roustam Sagitov
Univeritetskayd emb.7/9
St. Petersburg
Russia
Phone: 00 - 7 8123289620
Fax: 00 - 7 8123240885
baltic@teia.org,
sagitov@zool.bio.pup.ru

Estonia
Estonian Marine Institute
Ivar Jüssi
Viljandi st 18B
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Fax: 00 - 372 6 281563
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Annex 2

**RECENT ENVIRONMENTAL OIL INCIDENTS AND WILDLIFE REHABILITATION**

Over the past decade, several major oil spills, in particular Esso Bernicia, Braer, Sea Empress and Erica have highlighted the threat posed to wildlife, in particular birds, but seals and otters in some areas, and cetaceans are also at risk.

What has become clear from these incidents has been the lack of a co-ordinated approach to the collection, care, rehabilitation and release of oiled animals as well as the need to ensure that valuable material, such as carcasses are collected.

The immediate response to a spill in rightly to collect and try to clean oiled animals, but because of lack of a co-ordinated approach, there is often problems with who does what and where do we get the relevant expertise.

As far as I know, there are only two contingency plans for the rehabilitation of oiled wildlife, one for Shetland (operated by Sullom Voe) and one for Mobil (North Sea) Ltd, which I wrote nearly ten years ago.

During the Braer incident, the wildlife response team operated to both of these plans - each had its strengths and weaknesses, but the authors of both plans agreed that had the Braer become a major incident, and then we might have had difficulty in coping. As it was, allowing for various problems, which were highlighted, the Braer incident could be described as a very good training exercise.

Subsequent spills, in particular Sea Empress and more recently Erica have shown that many of the problems associated with wildlife rehabilitation have not been addressed and remain very much as they were at Braer.

So where do we go from here?

Firstly accepting that Rehabilitation is largely a welfare issue, one of the principal roles of any wildlife contingency plan should be to establish an environment in which those involved with the cleaning and subsequent care of the wildlife can be allowed to get on with their job, and should have no major concerns about the day-to-day management of the rehabilitation. Their job is care and welfare, the contingency plan should establish a means whereby this can be done effectively and efficiently.

So what do I see as the major problems?

Firstly with every incident, we appear to have to reinvent the whole operational process. Different countries have different (or no) expertise, and often individuals who have a key role to play are often not involved with the programme. This is a waste of time and resources. Also at the time of an incident, it is very much a ‘fire brigade’ response, i.e. we react to the incident as it develops, and there may be little time to think clearly what needs to be done.

Secondly, as soon as an incident occurs, hundreds of so called ‘experts’ might appear on the scene. Some of these do not have the experience to safely undertake rehabilitation work, and may not be prepared to operate under an umbrella wildlife response system - this can be a recipe for disaster.

Thirdly. In every incident there are questions of impacts - how have populations been effected? How many individuals have been killed? Etc. Monitoring of the effect of spills, must include a census (and where necessary a collection) of carcasses. This is a timely procedure, and arrangements for this must be in hand before the incident occurs. Too often important material has been lost, either by poor labelling (or no labelling) or by lack of collection. Part of this process should also include the identification of specific institutes who have specific interests in selected species; e.g. National Museums of Scotland are particularly interested in divers.
Fourthly. We need a clear set of protocols for cleaning; these should be based on the 'best available' data, and be produced by the relevant experts in the field. These should be reappraised after each incident and modified where necessary. All people operating as part of a joint wildlife response must agree to operate to these protocols.

Fifthly. Any national/international contingency plan must be agreed by both government and the oil industry.

What is the next stage?

If the concept of a pan-European contingency plan is agreed, then how do we implement it?

Firstly we must identify the key people who are necessary for rehabilitation programme. I see these as three:

- A scientific advisor;
- A rehabilitation co-ordinator;
- An administrator

How do we deal with inappropriately trained staff? A system of accreditation is set up, involving relevant experts in the field. Individuals or agencies who wish to be involved in clean up, must submit details of their expertise to the this committee for accreditation. While this may not stop non-accredited people turning up, it might ensure that they are not able to claim expenses etc from insurers. (This is especially true if the oil industry backs the plan).

Protocols: There already exist a number of protocols produced by relevant experts - these should be reviewed and a 'best treatment' manual is produced. All agencies operating within this rehabilitation programme should agree to use these methods.

Equipment: A 'minimum' equipment base should be established which can be accesses by any one in Europe when an incident occurs. It should be readily available, marked and be quickly deployed. It should therefore be maintained near one of the major oil spill operators, e.g. at Southampton. It should be designed and stored in such a way as to be easily transported by air or ship.

Carcasses: Detailed protocols for the collection, labelling and storing of all carcasses should be produced in advance, and be an integral part of the contingency plan. Such a system of recording can easily be lost in the case of an incident without contingency plans. Part of this should also include details of the institutes who have interests in specific species.

Research: There are still problems with survival of many rehabilitated species, we need to address this problem and identify key areas of research

Risk assessment: Lastly, we need to have an overall idea of what coasts in Europe are most at risk from oil pollution. Identification of key areas should highlight the problems of access to coasters etc in the event of an incident.

Operation: If the idea of such a plan is accepted, they how do we operate it? Firstly we need to find a source of funding. Secondly a small group of relevant experts should be asked to co-ordinate the ideas of interested parties and draft the plan. Part of this process should also involve discussions with the oil industry and government.

When the plan has been produced, it should be widely circulated. It should identify the key players who should be involved in any wildlife incident. These people should be asked to attend any oil spill and give their advice. They may not stay for a long period, but long enough for the operation to get up and running effectively.

Finally, in the ideal world an European rehabilitation office should be established, funded by ????, whose role is to ensure that the plan operates successfully and is regularly updated. Part of their remit should also be training.

J. W. H. Conroy
Annex 3

Summary of some presented papers

**Name organisation:** Bretagne Vivante - SEPNB  
**Country, city:** France, Séné  
**Species:** Seabirds  
**Region of activity:** Brétagne  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** Erika Spill (France), Treasure Spill (South Africa)  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Bretagne Vivante's experience with the Erika oil spill disaster was subject of the presentation. Although local organisations were the first to respond to the spill, it quickly turned out that facilities and experience were not sufficient. IFAW offered assistance, and co-ordinated the rehabilitation operation that was assisted by an international team of experts. It demonstrated the necessity of having an international wildlife team such as IFAW's. It also demonstrated the need for local organisations near high risk environments, such as France's Atlantic north coast to develop better preparedness. Bretagne Vivante now participates in a training programme within the IFAW network.

**Name organisation:** Delphinarium Riccione  
**Country, city:** Italy, Genova  
**Species:** Dolphins, whales and turtles  
**Region of activity:** Western Mediterranean Sea  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Since ever the Riccione Delphinarium combines the dolphin show with important initiatives, including education and rehabilitation. In addition to bottlenose dolphins which live in the Riccione Delphinarium, this structure hosts permanent exhibitions, audio-visual shows, shell collections and aquaria with flora and fauna of the Mediterranean habitat. The scientific and didactic aspects of this activity are co-ordinated by the Cetacean Foundation. Rehabilitation includes cetaceans and turtles.

**Name organisation:** Acquario di Genova, Aquastudio  
**Country, city:** Italy, Genova (Acquario), Messina (Aquastudio)  
**Species:** Dolphins and whales  
**Region of activity:** Western Mediterranean Sea  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** There are different examples of international co-operation.  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Italy has an effective national stranding and rehabilitation network. It consists of scientific institutes, dolphinarium with rehabilitation facilities and aquaria all over the country. There is a hot line facility standby 24 hours a day, and this is also for use outside Italy. The Italian network has given a mandate to participate in the European Sea Alarm network initiative.
**Name organisation:** SRRC Seal Rehabilitation and Research Centre  
**Country, city:** The Netherlands, Pieterburen  
**Active since:** 1971  
**Species:** Common seal, Grey seal, all kinds of marine mammals  
**Region of activity:** Dutch Waddensea and all countries in the world where help is requested.  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** Shetlands (Brear), Wales (Sea Empress), Uruguay (San Jorge), Germany (Pallas), Turkey (oil cleaning action), Mauritania (virus outbreak among monk seals), Kazakhstan (mass mortality) etc.  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** The SRRC uses and promotes the unique combination of a) rehabilitation of marine mammals, b) scientific research (with an emphasis on virological research) and c) education. The SRRC tries to start a dialogue with all groups which are involved in an area and therefore exert influence on an ecosystem. It is no use to fight groups like fishermen or industry: we share the interest in a healthy environment, and we are all responsible. So we have to involve the local people. We have to be prepared to many kinds of disasters: oil, chemicals, but also viruses. The SRRC has been invited to many places in the world; we shared our knowledge and as a result many local groups started their own rehabilitation centre. For them and others we will always be a helpdesk, and everyone is welcome in Pieterburen to learn rehabilitation techniques, feeding procedures etc.

**Name organisation:** Fûgelpits  
**Country, city:** Netherlands, Anjum  
**Species:** (Coastal) birds  
**Region of activity:** Netherlands  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** Assisted in 1997 in the Pallas-spill rescue operation and in 1999 Erika-spill response operation  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** There is still a lot of illegal behaviour of tankers at sea. For example at the Erika oil spill, many tankers have spilled their oil in the neighbourhood of the sunken ship, which resulted in a much larger and complex problem. The current initiative should become powerful in the sense that they can press for better legislation and reinforcement. A very important thing that has to be arranged with industry for the sake of a rehabilitator’s health is that they give prompt information about the chemical composition of the oil spilled. In the Erika incident, we found out that very toxic compounds were mixed with the oil after some weeks. In those weeks, hundreds of rehabilitators have been in contact with this oil. We strongly support this initiative to build an international network. But it has to develop into a powerful political lobby to tackle illegal an unacceptable behaviour of the oil industry’s transport sector.

**Name organisation:** Hel Marine Station  
**Country, city:** Poland, Hel  
**Species:** Birds and marine mammals  
**Region of activity:** Southern Baltic Sea  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Friends of Hel is a co-operative network in Poland that is active in rehabilitation of marine species, but also in a number of other activities. Friends of Hel is a common initiative of conservationists, fishermen and the recreation sector.
**Name organisation:** Centre de Recuperació d’ Animals Marins de Catalunya (CRAM)

**Country, city:** Spain, Barcelona

**Active since:** 1992

**Species:** Birds: none.
Mammals: Stenella coeruleoalba, Tursiops truncatus, Delphinus delphis, Grampus griseus, Globicephala melas, Ziphius cavirostris, Balaenoptera physalus. Reptiles: Caretta caretta (loggerhead sea turtle).

**Region of activity:** Catalonia

**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** CRAM was funded in 1992. We develop our work in three fields that are: 1) education & awareness raising, 2) investigation, and 3) recuperation & rehabilitation. Rehabilitation takes place in our centre in Premià de Mar, close to Barcelona. Our patients are sea turtles and marine mammals. In sea turtles, our main problems are along line fisheries, b) carapace fractures, c) entangled animals. We rehabilitate around 60 sea turtles per year, mainly during the summer months. The causes of strandings of cetaceans are very variable but in the last few years we have observed an increment of by-catches. The primary pathologic disease that we have found since 1992 are morbillivirus infection in striped dolphin.

---

**Name organisation:** EarthKind

**Country, city:** UK, Poole, Dorset

**Active since:** 1955

**Species:** Birds: Seabirds

**Region of activity:** UK and International

**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** 1996 Sea Empress, UK, 1998 Pallas, Germany, 1999 Erika, France, 2000 Treasure, South Africa

**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** The Treasure oil spill affected over 40% of the global population of African (Jackass) Penguins. IFAW mobilised their international oiled wildlife team, including EarthKind and over 130 wildlife experts from 60 organisations, representing all 5 continents. In total over 14,000 Penguins were washed. 17 large pens and 10 preening pools were constructed to accommodate the de-oiled birds. In total more than 17,000 birds were successfully rehabilitated and released back into the wild. The Treasure spill was the biggest wildlife rehabilitation attempt in history and an indication that international co-operation can and does work effectively. Hopefully it can also form a blueprint for future operations of this kind.

---

**Name organisation:** Zoomarine (Mundo Aquatico SA) and Rede Nacional de Recuperação de Mamíferos Marinhos (National Marine Mammal Stranding Network); Zoological Staff: 2 Full Time Veterinarians; 1 Part Time Veterinarian; 3 Biologists; 13 Trainers; 7 Assistants; 5 Technicians

**Country, city:** Portugal, Albufeira

**Active since:** 1991 (Zoomarine) and 1999 (Network)

**Species:** Birds: around 50 species of Anatidae and Psitacidae, as well as Sula bassana and Pelecanus crispus

**Region of activity:** Algarve, in South Portugal (Zoomarine) and the entire country (for the network)

**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** The only international experience involved a HOODED SEAL - *Cystophora cristata*, which was sent to Pieterburen, in Holland, for reintroduction in the wild, back in July of 1999

**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** The presentation given by Élio Vicente (1) introduced Zoomarine’s history (location, its marine mammal species and its specialised staff), (2) presented the National Marine Mammal Stranding Network (history, legal status, introduced the network members, showed its geographic organisation) and (3) gave an example of an successful rehabilitation (at Zoomarine, which involved international cooperation with Pieterburen)

**Name organisation:** KFV:s Riksförbund (Swedish Wildlife Rehabilitators Association)

Sture Jönsson (president); Karl-Erik Hammarberg, DVM (v.president);
• Anne-Marie Juhlin (secretary); Laila Boström, Jan Hillarp and Magnus Lanner (board members)

**Country, city:** Sweden, Kristianstad

**Active since:** The first KFV unit (KFV Kristianstad – Bromolla) was founded in Kristianstad in 1979.

The second unit was on the Falsterbo peninsula (KFV Skane sydvast) 1983. After that a network was formed by rehab groups in Sweden. In 1996 Sture Jönsson and Jan Hillarp initiated a national association of KFV organisations. In 1998 KFV:s Riksförbund was founded.

**Species:** Birds: All rehabilitators have permits for all birds.

Mammals: All rehabilitators have permits for hares, hedge hog and squirrel except for Jan Hillarp, who has permits for all mammals and birds.

**Region of activity:** Sweden, Swedish coast.

**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** None in international emergency assistance. International cooperation has been with the SRRC, Pieterburen, which has had one rehabber and two volunteers in training and helped with advice and deeds in the Swedish seal rescue work.

**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** I started as an organised wildlife rehabber about 1980. In 1983 the when the local nature conservation society started a KFV unit I became the rehabber. A KFV network evolved and we soon found a great need for education and yearly national seminars in wildlife rehab were held by the founding organisation in Kristianstad. The need for better cooperation between rehabbers and between rehabbers and regional and national authorities have increased, so in 1998 the KFV:s Riksförbund was formed. Now we are 20 associations with centres and some private rehabbers. We have made a national protocol for oiled birds approved of by the government and are working for educational standards for rehabbers.
**Name organisation:** MOm/Hellenic Society for the Study and Protection of the Monk Seal  
**Country, city:** Greece, Athens  
**Active since:** 1988  
**Species:** Mediterranean Monk seal Monachus monachus  
**Region of activity:** Eastern Mediterranean Sea  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** Rescue and Rehabilitation of Mediterranean monk seal pups in collaboration with SRRC. Exchange of information with SAD/AFAG and Foca Pilot project in order to react in case of emergency in Eastern Mediterranean.

**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Since 1988, MOm has been reacting to the threats that Monk Seal is facing, including the destruction of its habitat, the deliberate or accidental killing by humans, the overfishing, the pollution and other catastrophes. MOm has been activated in the research and protection of the species in Greece. Apart from field research, environmental education, establishment, management and safeguarding of protected areas, MOm has established and operates a Rescue and Information Network (RINT) with contacts throughout the Greek coastline. Through RINT, MOm receives information on the distribution, breeding and overall status of the monk seal population, as well as on emergency cases. MOm reacts, through a set of protocols, which ensures the effectiveness of the effort. These protocols include all actions from the receipt of an emergency call, the treatment of the animal and its eventual release or, in unfortunate cases, its necropsy. The rehabilitation takes place in the Seal Treatment and Rehabilitation Center in Alonissos, established since 1990 in mobile facilities, which will be soon replaced by permanent ones. In order to achieve its goals, MOm has been collaborating with all relevant national authorities and organizations in Greece, Greek and European Universities, international organizations, such as the SRRC, IFAW, EU DG XI, UNEP etc. In order to plan the reaction to a mass mortality in Greece, we should take into account the endangered status of Monachus monachus, the authorities involved, the inaccessibility of most of its habitat, as well as, the funds requested.

---

**Name organisation:** Seehundaufzucht- und Forschungsstation.  
**Peter Lienau (director), Fritz Rabenstein (1. Seal keeper), Heike Trei (veterinarian)**  
**Country, city:** Germany, Norden Norddeich  
**Active since:** 1971 (birds since 1994)  
**Species:** Common seal, Grey Seal, marine mammals in general + bird rehabilitation centre  
**Region of activity:** Wadden Sea of Niedersachsen, Germany  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** Fritz Rabenstein took part in Wales and Shetland`s rehabilitation of marine mammals, 170 ducks from “Pallas”  

**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Privat society, built up by hunters before government stopped hunting – 7 salaried employees, 50 honorary employees around the coastline and on the isles, 3 persons of the community service for 11 month, 30 volunteers a year  
Main work rehabilitation of common seals (30-80 seals a year). About 300 birds a year  
Seal station includes national park centre  
Important information centre (about 230.000 visitors a year)  
No money from the government – self-financed by donators + entrance fees
**Name organisation:** Finnish Forest and Park Service  
*Natural Heritage Services*  
**Country, city:** Finland Savonlinna  
**Active since:** 1980  
**Species:** Saimaa Ringed Seal  
**Region of activity:** Eastern Finland  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** No experience  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Landlocked and fragmented small (ca 220-250) population. Multi municipal oil destruction plan (1988-2002), and national oil destruction fund, both mainly for technological oil removal. One spill could threaten max. 20% of population. No possibilities to handle or rehabilitate several seals simultaneously. Seals should be handled at/near the lake - landlocked population is sensitive to diseases.

**Name organisation:** Underwater Research Society (SAD)  
*Mediterranean Seal Research Group (AFAG)*  
**12 Staff members are working in different locations,**  
2 in Foca, Izmir  
2 in Karaburun, Izmir  
4 in Bozyazi, Mersin  
3 in Ankara (co-ordination Office)  
**Country, city:** Turkey;  
in Ankara (co-ordination office),  
Foca & Karaburun in Izmir  
Bozyazi in Mersin  
**Active since:** 1987  
**Species:** Mediterranean monk seal (*Monachus monachus*)  
**Region of activity:** In case of emergency; All the national coastal strip (8,333 km)  
Focused in temporary basis; Izmir Provencal coastal borders & Cilician coasts  
**Experience in international emergency assistance and co-operation:** Only experience; organised a clean-up operation in 3 monk seal caves, polluted with an oil sludge due to tanker run aground, in Bodrum Peninsula, with an international assistance.  
**Short abstract of the presentation given at the meeting:** Turkey is a large peninsula country surrounded by 4 seas, Blacksea, Marmara Sea, Aegean Sea and the Mediterranean Sea with approx. 8.333 km coastline. The marine pollution can be regarded under two categories; 1- accidents (acute pollution) and 2- oily waste water release from ships (gradual pollution). In the last decade, we have very few oil spill accidents in wild coastal areas in Turkey. Two examples are as follows; 1) Chelon (an Italian NGO) reported to see bulk oil wastes on the well known Green Turtle Chelonia mydas nesting beach and estimates this fact to be a negative factor for breeding. 2) A ship had run aground on Cavus island, Bodrum Peninsula, SW coast of Turkey, during the summer of 1996 resulting in a medium scale oil pollution. The importance of Cavus island from Monk Seal point of view is that the island have 3 monk seal caves which consist of 50% of whole Bodrum Peninsula caves. Therefore, AFAG decided to take action for a Clean-up operation and removed 137 tons of oil sludge. In Turkey, SAD-AFAG is eager to take part in an international emergency network in order to reduce the negative impact of oil pollution at our costs provided that SAD-AFAG gets needed permissions from Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Turkey.
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Proposed framework of action

Sea Alarm = service body?

("representative")

Serving the common interest of “grass-root level wildlife rehabilitators” in the advance of international emergency cooperation

(Mission statement)

Scope

Two parallel tracks:

• European services (mandate from “Pieterburen meeting”)
  – Strict European matters (EU programmes, European Task Force, European network services)
  – Representation European grass root organisations in “Myrtle Beach Group”
• Worldwide services (mandate from “Myrtle Beach Group”)
  – Coverage “Industry” matters & dialogues
  – Coverage of “Conventions” and Liability schemes

Structure Sea Alarm?

• International board, representing “grass root organisations” and international animal welfare NGO’s
• Executive committee (managing and monitoring projects)
• Administration
• “Member list” of cooperating organisations
Fields of action? (1)

- Towards facilitating fast (international) response
  - Develop appropriate framework in support of local preparedness: databases on specific expertise, mobile equipment in warehouses, common approach of (use of) protocols
  - Hot line (24 hours open), connected to a Task Force that can be on the spot within 24 hours
  - Finance activities
    - Primary funding (activities in general and possible sourcing)
    - Administration of insurance claims (part of protocol)

Fields of action? (2)

- Represent interests grass-root organisations in wider (international) context
  - Develop “identity” and “recognition” in communication with governments and industry
  - Open doors within governments (national, EU Conventions, OECD) and industry (IOPE, industry owners, oil companies)
  - Improve position of rehabilitation in contingency planning and Conventions
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Model of action programme

This diagram shows a visionary development of an international wildlife emergency response network. Such a network may have global and regional (European) components. It may develop in different stages over a large number of years. Here only the next 5 years have been indicated. Development should be realized by a number of strategic activities. These have to be identified and prioritized within a medium term work programme. It is important to find strategic funding sources for each single activity. Such sources may be opportunistic (for instance making use of a EU call for proposals), or structural (one could aim at structural funding of the network by the oil industry, such as currently is the case in the USA). The diagram also shows the position of Sea Alarm Foundation (SAF), which aims at gradually putting itself out of business as soon as the international network is able to run on its own. Until that moment, SAF is prepared to play a supporting and facilitating role, e.g. providing a secretariat, opening (political) doors, generate funding.
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**Task Force Members:**

1. Jan Ake Hillarp (S)
2. Paul Kelway* (UK)
3. Lenie 't Hart* (NL)
4. Guillaume Gélinaud*(F)
5. Dick Jongman (NL)
6. Antonio Di Natale (I)
7. Tim Thomas* (UK)
8. Sally Hamilton* (B)
9. Jeny Androukaki (G)
10. Jim Conroy (UK)

*Members that are also involved in the worldwide Myrtle Beach Coalition

Secretariat: Hugo Nijkamp (NL/B)