

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

7 August 2019

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

Geneva, 17–27 September 2019

Item 8 of the provisional agenda:

Accidents and risk management

Working Group Report on the Improvement of the Accident Report

Transmitted by the Government of France

Introduction

1. The working group met in Scheveningen in the Netherlands on 19 and 20 June 2019.
2. Experts from Belgium, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom and from the following organisations attended the working group: ERA, CEFIC, Liquid Gaz Europe, OTIF.
3. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Claude Pfauvadel from France.
4. The relevant documents from the Joint Meeting that were taken as a basis for the discussions were:
 - ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/152, Report of the Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods on its autumn 2018 session;
 - ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2018/26 (France);
 - Informal documents INF.31 and INF.31/Rev.1 from the autumn 2018 session;
 - Informal document INF.26 from the spring 2018 session.
5. Some delegations submitted documents for the working group (the documents are annexed to this report);
 - Document from France presenting a draft report (Annex 1);
 - Presentation on the improvement of occurrence reporting in relation to “railway common safety measures” (CSM) from ERA (Annex 2);
 - Document from Spain on accident reporting in Spain (Annex 3);
 - Presentation by the Netherlands on their accident reporting system and accident data (Annex 4);
 - Presentation by France (Annex 5).
6. The working group conducted its work according to the Terms of Reference, taking into account the relevant input from the workshop for risk management and in particular the list established by work group A.

The working group agreed on the provisional agenda, considered the different presentations first and then discussed some related points of the Terms of Reference.

The working group agreed that points for which written documents had been submitted would be discussed first, the other items would be discussed depending on the time available.

The draft proposal would be examined point by point and some time would be left at the end to decide on the future work.

Presentations

ERA

7. ERA presented its ongoing work (Annex 2). This work concerns railway safety in general, but includes the transport of dangerous goods. The aim of the work was to assess safety levels and performance (ASLP).

This also required the collection of appropriate information. ERA indicated that this project had been mandated by the EU and would be carried out according to the timetable defined by the EU. It should be finalised in 2020.

ERA expressed interest in working with the Joint Meeting in order to harmonise the way accident information are collected and stressed the collaboration with this working group created by the Joint Meeting, but pointed out that it was important to do this work within the short time frame allowed.

Spain

8. The document from Spain (Annex 3) was presented in three sections:

- a) Identification of the driver by means of personal and professional data
(full name and type of special authorisation to drive, ADR certificate)

The majority of the working group considered that it would be better to consider and deal with this proposal at national level because this is not related to the analysis of causes. In addition, there was a risk of individual interpretations, blacklisted persons, job losses...etc.

- b) Identification of all the companies involved in the transport chain that have asked for the contact data of the consignor, carrier, consignee, loader and unloader.

This remark has been introduced into the draft accident report.

- c) A section that included the technical, organisational and personal measures that would be proposed by the safety adviser to prevent accidents.

The Netherlands

9. The Netherlands gave a presentation on the way how accidents are reported to the competent authority (Human Environment Transport Inspectorate) for all inland modes of transport in their country, as well as some statistics (Annex 4). In this presentation, the Netherlands reminded the working group of the importance of collecting information about all accidents for single case studies as well as about accidents relating to multiple occurrences. The systems used in the Netherlands allowed for this and meant that lessons could be learnt from events of lesser importance and the consequences if such events reoccur.

France

10. France presented its database and explained how it works and how it is implemented. In order to comply with the obligation to send the accident report in accordance with 1.8.5, an advanced notification system in cooperation with the emergency services had been developed.

Cooperation with industry organisations was also very helpful and had been taking place in France for several years. It was noted that 60% of events are reported spontaneously.

General discussion

11. CEFIC, Switzerland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom made various comments about the necessity of making a distinction between the data needed initially and the data needed later in the process. It was also said that is very important not to mix up RID/ADR 1.8.3.6, the aim of which is to improve undertaking's internal procedures, and 1.8.5, the aim of which is to use the information to improve the regulations.

12. It was generally agreed that the work on improving the report should continue for the following reasons:

- To learn lessons for single occurrences (especially for very severe and typical accidents);
- To learn lessons for frequently occurring events, even if they do not seem important individually;
- To collect the relevant data for future risk analysis (as ERA will develop a regulation related to CSM in this direction in any case connection with ERA be kept in mind for this aspect).

It was also pointed out that point (d) would require these different aspects to be studied.

13. With regard to requirements relating to risk assessment and multiple occurrences, it was pointed out that it would be important to review the criteria for declaration in 1.8.5. It would be useful to know about accidents that do not involve leakage and the immediate risk of leakage as the likely cause of the accident. In particular the learning from repeated smaller accidents was emphasized and it was noted that in this case the declaration criteria would need to be revised too.

Furthermore in the case accident data is also used for risk assessment the knowledge of smaller events is necessary because risk assessment requires calculation of accident frequencies and conditional probabilities. To perform these calculations comparisons between actual severe accidents frequencies and the frequencies of precursors (often events smaller in nature) are necessary

14. The working group then considered the time period for establishing the accident report. Depending on the type of data required, it was indicated that the period may be adapted. One month may not be sufficient to collect some data, especially when related to consequences. According to the modifications the working group might propose, the reporting period could be adapted in relation to short term declarations and longer term completion of the report.

15. In order to encourage and facilitate the collection of data, it should be ensured that the data are not used for prosecution, furthermore privacy matters as well as data security are important and anonymity should be ensured. ERA also highlighted this "non-blame" culture that has been effective in other areas.

Discussion of the DRAFT report presented by France

16. Using the relevant data established by work group A from the workshop held at ERA, France had drafted such a report in a user-friendly format similar to the one RID/ADR 1.8.5.

17. The working group checked the draft point by point and made some modifications. However, there was insufficient time to include all the comments in the proposed model. ANNEX 1 shows the results of this discussion. Some modifications to the original proposal by France are shown in track changes and some further improvements that might be required are mentioned in comments that will have to be checked again and redrafted. France will carry out some additional work to implement and provide a revised, clean draft in an information document for the Joint Meeting.

18. It was been said that it would be necessary to add a part for ADN and that it would be more relevant to separate the different modes (RID/ADR/ADN) in order to provide a specific report for each mode.

Future work and meetings

19. France will carry out some further work to take account of the comments and provide a revised, clean version for the September Joint Meeting.

20. It was agreed that because of a very busy international agenda, the next meeting of this working group would not be possible in 2019. A meeting date in February 2020 was considered. France will check whether it can host the meeting and propose dates.

21. However, it was agreed to take advantage of some opportunity to meet during the current year in the margins of other meetings that are already planned, so that travelling costs could be reduced:

(a) To work on the inland waterways aspects, Belgium agreed to host a one day meeting in Brussels after an ADN meeting on 3 October;

(b) To check the links with the work on the CSM conducted by ERA, it was proposed to have a meeting 17 December just after the TDG committee meeting in Brussels (practical conditions to be defined).

22. The Joint Meeting is invited to take note of this report and its annexes as well as the proposed programme of work and comment as appropriate.
