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, 17-21 March 2014

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

Future work

Report on occurrences during the carriage of dangerous goods in accordance with RID/ADR section 1.8.5

Transmitted by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands1, 2

Summary

Executive summary: The aim of this document is to invite comments for possible amendment of RID/ADR section 1.8.5.

Action to be taken: Invite comments and feedback.

Related documents: Report of the informal working group on an international accident database (Valenciennes, 10-11 October 2013). (ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2014/34)

Background and history

1. In the informal working group on an international accident database (Valenciennes, 10-11 October 2013), the use of the model report in 1.8.5.4 of RID/ADR/ADN was

---

1 In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2012–2016 (ECE/TRANS/224, para. 94, ECE/TRANS/2012/12, programme activity 02.7 (A1c)).

2 Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2014/23.
discussed as a basis for information to develop an international accident database. During this discussion, it became apparent that possible amendments in form and content to this report could be necessary, as well as a revision of the use of this report.

2. The aim of the international database is to provide a basis of evaluation of the nature and causes of accidents which involve dangerous goods in the various modes of transport. Depending on the further use of this database (e.g. as input data for risk analysis), different specific information should be captured in the 1.8.5 reports upon which the database is built. Possible questions in this regard are:

(a) Is it desirable to also use the report for incidents not meeting the criteria of section 1.8.5.3 (and to indicate this in such a case) to get a larger view on transport incidents? Should in such a case reporting be mandatory?

(b) Can the report be adapted to fit more readily in a digital format to use in the construction of a database?

3. Additionally, Belgium and the Netherlands have taken the initiative to propose a number of (non-exhaustive) suggestions to amend the 1.8.5 report itself in the future:

(a) Item 2: For road possible amendments include adding the type of road, the exact location (e.g. through a kilometre indication),… For rail possible amendments include further specifying the activities and processes (e.g. arrival/departure, shunting (loose, by gravity,…),…).

(b) Item 3: Include rail switches,…

(c) Item 4: Include low position of the sun,…

(d) Item 5: Include the possibility to number several events chronologically (e.g. collision followed by derailment and subsequent loss of product or fire), evaluate the overlap with item 7,…

(e) Item 7: Rearrange item 7 to distinguish between organisational issues, human errors (subdividing in faulty load securing,… or technical errors (subdividing between errors related to the infrastructure, the vehicle/wagon, the cargo (packaging,…),…). Adding a comments section for free text could be envisaged, as well as indicating if the cause of the accident was inside or outside (driving too fast, SPAD) of the technical and organizational processes.

(f) Item 8: Adding a comments section for free text could be envisaged.

Proposal

4. The Joint Meeting is invited to provide Belgium and the Netherlands with comments and feedback for possible amendments to section 1.8.5 for the use of the accident report and to give an indication on amendments to the 1.8.5 report itself.

5. Depending on the outcome of the discussion, Belgium and the Netherlands will develop a concrete proposal for the next session.