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SUMMARY

Executive summary: A time limit should be considered in which the report conforming to the model as prescribed in 1.8.5.4 has to be transmitted to the competent authority. Otherwise it is not certain whether and at what time the report will be made available. For the benefit of learning effect and statistics it is helpful to get data on accidents within in a reasonable time period.

¹ In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2006-2010 (ECE/TRANS/166/Add.1, programme activity 02.7 (c)).

Action to be taken: Amending 1.8.5.1

Related documents: - 

Introduction

1. The main objective of the notification of occurrences as mentioned in 1.8.5 is improvement of provisions on the basis of experiences in accidents. For this purpose the loader, filler, carrier or consignee, respectively, shall ascertain that a report conforming to the model prescribed in 1.8.5.4 is made available to the competent authority of the Contracting Party.

2. However, in RID and ADR no arrangement has been made for a time period in which such a report should be made available. Setting no time limitation is not helpful in getting the information.

3. In ADN it is arranged that the report shall be made available to the competent authority of the Contracting Party at the latest six months after the occurrence. We feel this time period is too long for transmitting a report “conforming to the model prescribed in 1.8.5.4”. Contrary to RID and ADR the phrase “conforming to the model prescribed in 1.8.5.4” is lacking in ADN.

4. In general we think it is wishful and feasible to deliver the information conforming to the model prescribed in 1.8.5.4 within one month after the occurrence.

5. At this moment in paragraph 1.8.5.2 no clear obligation exists for the Contracting Party to make a report to the secretariats of UNECE and OTIF. Some discussion in the Joint Meeting is welcome whether the provisions of 1.8.5.2 should be strengthened too.

Proposals

6. In RID/ADR, in 1.8.5.1 at the end, add the following phrase: “at the latest one month after the occurrence”.

7. In ADN, in 1.8.5.1, insert “conforming to the model prescribed in 1.8.5.4” after “report” and replace “six months” by “one month”.

Justification

Safety

8. We feel that reporting occurrences according to 1.8.5 should be improved. The safety will benefit from reporting occurrences within a reasonable time period. A report will be more reliable and more comprehensive, and consequently be more useful, if it is made soon after the occurrence in comparison to a report made months afterwards.
Feasibility

9. Making a report conforming to 1.8.5.4 and transmitting it to the competent authority does not seem to be very time consuming. In ADN it is made clearer what report is mentioned by referring to 1.8.5.4.

Enforceability

10. The enforceability would be improved by laying down more stringent rules on reporting.