
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**

Geneva, 12-16 September 2022

Item 8 of the provisional agenda:

Accidents and risk management**30 August 2022****Publication of the conclusions of the bilateral meeting of
17 December 2019****Submitted by the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)***Summary*

Executive summary: For facilitating the understanding of informal document INF.8, the conclusions of the bilateral meeting organised by ERA and kindly hosted by Belgium between the UNECE/OTIF working group on the improvement of TDG Occurrence reports and the Working Party of the CSM ASLP are made available.

Related documents: Informal document INF.8

The conclusions of the meeting in subject are reproduced in the annex.

Annex

Minutes of Meeting

Coordination CSM ASLP/UNECE-OTIF WG on improvement of TDG Accident reports

Brussels, 17.12.2019

Welcome

ERA welcomed the participants and thanked NSA BE for their kind and efficient contribution to the organisation of the meeting.

Every participant introduced themselves and it could be noted that a quite balanced participation between the UNECE/OTIF WG members and the members of the CSM ASLP working party was reached.

The Chair of the UNECE/OTIF WG on improvement of accident reports reminded key steps of earlier developments including the preliminary work delivered by the TDG Roadmap. He indicated that the reporting of accident data is the remaining element of the initial TDG Roadmap program which should be completed to allow the full benefits of the Inland TDG Risk Management Framework and also more generally to better learn on TDG accidents.

ERA confirmed the need to complete the initial program and indicated that the document 'Provisional agenda with background information' distributed to the participants before the meeting is containing a quite exhaustive list of documents with links that are relevant for the meeting.

ERA indicated that the meeting is important to avoid inconsistent legal framework in the future in the field of reporting of accident and that the work of the UNECE/OTIF working group combined with the development of the CSM ASLP is a great opportunity to improve accident reporting and learning on accidents.

CSM ASLP Big Picture

ERA presented the main proposed elements of the future CSM ASLP regulation, which has now entered in the formal phase of development. It is emphasized that the Railways Interoperability and Safety Committee gave a positive feedback to develop the CSM along the lines reported in the 'Big Picture' document shared with the participants before the meeting.

After the presentation, the participants asked for clarification on the ownership of a CSM ASLP central information system and on where should be stored the information. ERA indicated that these aspects have yet to be defined (not addressed in the 'Big Picture') however in comparison with other sectors (for example EASA for aviation), the EU (maybe the Agency) could be the owner of the IT system. Interfacing with national systems is also to be considered. Some elements of answer can be found in the 'COR System Proposal' made available to the participants of the meeting. This topic will be covered in the CSM ASLP working party discussions, in a first step, from the perspective of system 'functions' that are necessary for the CSM ASLP implementation.

On the interaction between the CSM ASLP and the NIB's investigations, it was clarified that the CSM ASLP is not duplicating or replacing the NIB processes. However some information collected by the CSM ALSP (for example the description of chain of events) may be useful for NIBs tasks. This is described in the 'Big Picture' document.

The participants to the meeting considered that:

- The standardization in reporting of occurrences is needed and will be welcome
- The reporting should be simple (structured information) and should allow description of chain of events, including the effect of risk control measures on the chain of events

- It was recalled that the involvement of dangerous substance can be the starting point of a chain of events, or the consequence of a transport event. This is clearly described in the TDG RMF and should also be clear in the reporting of accidents.

Lists of reportable events / Reporting processes

ERA presented the draft list of reportable events foreseen in the context of the CSM ASLP and a comparative table showing the remaining differences with the list of events proposed in the draft UNECE/OTIF WG and also in comparison with the Inland TDG Risk Management Framework (TDG RMF).

Opportunities to improve the reporting should still be considered, for example, on railway terminology and on a more precise definition of different types of substance releases.

Some of the spotted differences have been discussed by the meeting participants and the following approach for further convergence was agreed:

- It is important that transport mode specific terminology (and definitions) are allowed, when they are well established already
- What is specific to rail system description/events should use the railway terminology (same approach applicable to other modes)
- What is specific to dangerous goods/carriage/containments/specific equipment should use the multimodal RID/ADR/ADN harmonised terminology
- TDG RMF may provide new inputs to the harmonised approach where relevant (for example categories of releases or categories of dangerous goods scenarios)
- For dangerous goods occurrences, the level of detail reported for events in each mode of transport, should be the same
- When information is structured and coded in IT system, there are opportunities for exchanges of information in several languages because of coding
- The use of coding may also allow accept slight differences in the wording used while the meaning would actually be covered by the same definition.
- The use of IT system by non-EU States is seen as feasible (conditions to be defined and confirmed) as some ERA's systems already allow for this possibility.
- It is also noted that RID/ADR/ADN reporting requirements are currently different than the one foreseen for the CSM ASLP, in terms of purpose, usage and reporting thresholds.
- However it should be an objective to allow operators to report information only once to comply with both sets of reporting requirements (CSM ASLP / RID). Additionally, it should be an objective to unify reporting thresholds.

Interfaces in reporting processes/Safety Information Sharing System

ERA described key elements of reporting processes that are under consideration for the future CSM, including the potential use of a 'information sharing system' where different authorised actors (access rules to be defined) can retrieve relevant data/information for implementing their roles and responsibilities.

It was indicated that already in the 'COR system proposal' TDG competent authorities have been taken into account as one of the ISS potential user.

The reporting process should start with a very simple notification and the allocation of an identification number to the notified occurrence. The ID is then used to create 'alerts' to relevant actors and/or to report supplementary information on the same event.

It is understood that the CSM ASLP will require operators to report information and it is foreseen that in many situations both RUs and IMs will send a report. Therefore it is assumed that a process of allocation of information concerning one single occurrence shall be developed in the sharing information system and that several reports from different parties can be notified in the system under a unique occurrence identification number.

Consideration will also be needed on the possibility to spot and to correct wrong reporting based on a clear validation of information process. It is foreseen that the authorities have a role to play

in this 'quality assurance' process. However this process does not have the objective to make arbitration between different reports or to allocate responsibility.

Several participants indicated that their authority is exercising a quality check on reported occurrence which can be associated with the request to report additional information.

It was also noted that it is not the purpose of the reporting or validation processes to determine causes and to assign guilt. This would be in contradiction with the railway safety Directive.

ERA confirmed that the question of anonymity/personal data will be taken into account when developing the functionality of the sharing information system.

Closure of the meeting

Both group members (CSM ASLP / UNECE-OTIF WG) considered that they should take into account the conclusions of this meeting in their respective workflows.

ERA thanked all the participants and the Belgium for their kind collaboration.