UNITED NATIONS **E**

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2009/25
12 June 2009

ENGLISH ONLY

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the
Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Bern, 8-11 September 2009 and
Geneva, 14-18 September 2009
Item 3 of the provisional agenda

REPORTS OF INFORMAL WORKING GROUPS

Report of the informal working group on telematics on its 4th session (Munich, 14 – 15 May 2009)

Note by the secretariat of the Intergovernmental Organization for International Carriage by Rail ((OTIF)[1, 2]

1. At the invitation of the Government of Germany, the fourth session of the informal working group on telematics was held in Munich (Germany) from 14-15 May 2009. The session was chaired by Mr. Helmut Rein (Germany).

2. Representatives of the following countries took part in the session: Austria, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The

[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)).

[2] Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2009/25.

European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), the International Association of Fire and Rescue (CTIF), the International Federation of Freight Forwarders Associations (FIATA), the International Road Transport Union (IRU) and the International Union of Railways (UIC) also took part.

3. On the day before the meeting, the German Ministry of Transport had organised a workshop on telematics applications in the international transport of dangerous goods. The chairman summarised the areas of application for telematics in the transport of dangerous goods that were developed in the workshop, as follows:

(a) electronic transport document (part A of the table);
(b) control of transport processes using "tracking and tracing";
(c) continuous monitoring of certain transport operations in the context of security;
(d) monitoring irregularities that might lead to incidents, and status communications following accidents/incidents.

Continuation of the work on the table

4. For this session, the Government of Germany had submitted a revised version of the "Who does what" table, incorporating amendments proposed by Belgium, Austria and UIC. Part A of the table lists all the information that has to be given in the transport document or in attachments to the transport document. Part B lists other information required in the dangerous goods regulations. Part C lists other information that could be provided using telematics applications.

5. The meeting agreed to check again the cells that had been amended on the basis of these proposed amendments.

6. Footnote 3) to the "competent authority" column ("also emergency services") was deleted, as a new column was included for "emergency responders".

7. The further explanations of the terms used in the "when is it needed" column proposed by the United Kingdom in the new footnote 3) to the table were adopted.

8. On the right-hand side of the table, in the "availability" column with the sub-columns "operational" and "in case of incident/accident" and in the evaluation column "use of telematics" with the evaluation sub-columns "technical feasibility", "better availability in case of incidents/accidents" and "operational advantages", the crosses were replaced by the letters "Y" (yes) or "N" (possibility of limited availability in the event of an accident/incident).

9. An explanation was also included to the effect that the square brackets used in the "how is it provided" column indicate that the information can also be provided by other means.

10. The "driver" column was expanded to "driver/crew", as in addition to the driver (locomotive driver, vehicle driver, captain of a ship), other members of the crew may be the recipient of information, e.g. the inland waterways expert.

Section B of the table

11. Line 46 "tunnel category" was considered necessary in addition to line 13 "tunnel restriction code", as the first relates to information on restrictive traffic signs for tunnels, while the second relates to restrictions based on the load. Various delegations were of the view that in connection with line 67 "tunnel restrictions: selection of an optimal route" in part C of the table, there might be operational benefits. However, other delegations were of the view that for an operational benefit, other information would have to be included as well, such as a general transport prohibition for dangerous goods on certain lines or speed restrictions for dangerous goods.

12. Lines 47, 48 and 49 were combined in a single line containing all the information that the rail transport undertaking must make available to the rail infrastructure undertaking.

Section C of the table

13. Section C of the table sets out information that is not currently required under the dangerous goods regulations, but which could improve safety if telematics were to be introduced. This would be information that can already be obtained from existing systems and which has already been included in the table in accordance with the working group's terms of reference. In this section, each cell contains an "S" if there is a safety benefit for the respective participant. An assessment as to whether there is an economic benefit for a particular participant has not been made as this would go beyond the working group's terms of reference. However, information should not be restricted to the vehicle driver, as this would lead to an unnecessary restriction of the technical possibilities and of the benefits to safety in those cases where, in the event of an accident, the vehicle driver is not in a position to pass information on.

14. It was again pointed out that at this stage of the work, all that was being checked was whether the new information in section C could improve safety. Including a piece of information in the table ensured that it would be taken into account when programming the system and would not cause problems of incompatibility at a later stage. A cost/benefit analysis would only be carried out at a later stage and the operational feasibility checked in order subsequently to enshrine the information to be transmitted in the regulations. When this was done, it would have to be remembered that this information is substance-related, as it would not be necessary, for example, to require the pressure or temperature to be monitored for all substances.

15. Lines 57 (alert-system for road vehicles – speed), 58 (alert-system for road vehicles – alcohol) and 59 (alert-system for road vehicles – other vehicle equipment malfunction) were deleted, as the majority of the working group did not consider this information necessary. However, it was also noted that the infrastructure manager should also provide the possibility of monitoring the speed.

16. Line 61 (alert-system for load – temperature control) was not restricted to road transport, because substances that currently require temperature control (certain organic peroxides and self-reactive substances) might also be allowed to be carried by rail in future if telematics applications for monitoring the temperature exist. However, as road transport already

has a requirement to monitor the temperature, this information should be transferred to Section B for ADR.

17. There was no agreement as to whether information on certain load conditions should also be transmitted to the enforcement bodies, as some delegates were of the view that only the emergency services could decide the location where it would be safe to deal with an irregular load condition, while other delegates thought vehicles could only be stopped by enforcement bodies with the appropriate sovereign powers.

18. The representative of the United Kingdom would provide a text for a footnote to the heading of section C to say that it must still be discussed whether the enforcement bodies should also be informed.

19. Line 62 (alert-system for loading – gas leakage) was split into two lines, firstly to cover the escape of gases from tanks and secondly to cover the formation of a dangerous concentration of gas in load compartments by the escape of gases from gas cylinders. However, it was also noted that although these systems are technically feasible, there are certain practical problems. Consideration could be given to restricting this to certain very hazardous gases.

20. Line 63 (alert-system for loading – closure door/device) was split into two lines, firstly to take account of the unauthorised opening of load compartments and secondly the unauthorised use of vehicles.

21. In lines 65 (alert-system for routing of dangerous goods), 66 (alert-system for position control (geofencing)) and 67 (tunnel restrictions: selection of an optimal route) it was not clear whether these are systems to provide assistance to drivers or tracking-and-tracing systems. The representative of Germany would examine this question again.

22. The representative of Germany said he was prepared to revise the table on the basis of the decisions taken at this session and to re-examine the right-hand side of the table (see also paragraph 8), which the working group had not yet discussed, and then send the table to all participants for their comments before it was submitted to the Joint Meeting. In the cells on the right-hand side of the table where any comments received might lead to the entries ("Y" or "N") being called into question, a question mark was entered in order to indicate to the Joint Meeting that this aspect still needed to be discussed at the next meeting of the working group.

Next meeting

23. The next meeting of the working group will be held from 21 to 23 October 2009 near Bordeaux.

Future work

24. Once the table has been finalised, the following areas in which telematics applications might become relevant should be looked at in more detail on the basis of experience gained through the workshop:

- electronic consignment note, dealing with the aspects under part A of the table;
- electronic transmission of load and vehicle condition and of incidents (part C of the table);
- geofencing" and considerations concerning traffic manipulation;
- security.

25. To carry out a cost/benefit analysis, consideration must first be given to what general telematics systems already exist or are being developed and how the requirements of dangerous goods transport can be integrated into these existing systems. On the other hand, consideration must also be given to how in-house systems can be integrated into systems in the transport sector. In addition, some thought must be given to the way in which data for electronic transmission have to be prepared on the basis of existing standards.

26. For the preparation of these questions for the purposes of the working group, studies will be needed, the results of which should be available in the near future. Mr J. Kaltwasser and Mr J.-P. Méchin were asked to draft proposals for such studies and to consider who should be integrated into this work in order to be able to arrive at a European solution. Carrying out studies would only be an interim step, in order to meet the work assignment of the terms of reference, but this would not prejudice the implementation of telematics.

27. It was emphasised that a link to the European Commission’s action plan to develop an intelligent transport system in Europe (see paragraphs 8 and 9 of informal document INF.4 from the Joint Meeting in March 2009) must be established in order to avoid the mistakes of the past that resulted from a lack of coordination of research projects, including at European Commission level.

28. The representatives of Germany and France said that they had the research resources to initiate studies. The participation of other States in terms of staff and funding would also be welcome.

Report to the Joint Meeting

29. It was agreed to inform the Joint Meeting (Berne, 8 – 11 September 2009, and Geneva, 14 – 18 September 2009) of the progress of the work by means of this report. The updated version of the table prepared by the representative of Germany would be submitted to the Joint Meeting as an informal document.
