

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Eighty-fifth session,
Geneva, 28-31 October 2008

QUESTIONNAIRE (Prepared by the secretariat)

This document presents a first analysis of the responses received from the Contracting Parties to the questionnaire. The Secretariat received 16 responses (out of 43 contracting Parties when the questionnaire was sent):

Background

The Inland Transport Committee, at its 69th session, indicated that its Working Parties would have to draw up, in cooperation with the secretariat, a draft expected accomplishment related to their work areas as well as indicators and appropriate methodologies, which would have to be submitted to the Bureau (refer to ECE/TRANS/192, par. 110, ECE/TRANS/WP.15/192, par. 8, and informal document INF. 31 submitted at the 82nd session of the Working Party).

As agreed by the Working Party at its eighty-third session, the secretariat prepared the following draft questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the availability of data which could be provided to the Inland Transport Committee as performance indicators.

On the basis of the responses received, the secretariat will present the Inland Transport Committee the data collected and indicate their availability and the opinion of WP.15 on whether the available data are considered to reflect efficiently its achievements.

Responses

The Secretariat received responses from 16 out of 43 Contracting parties when the questionnaire was sent: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and United Kingdom.

Countries did not always respond to all questions.

Malta acceded to ADR in May 2007 and the data received reflect the situation from the date of accession.

First analysis of the responses received: Availability of the data and comments

Data	Availability (percentage of the countries which provided the data or which could provide it during the biennial exercise)	Comments
1. Training and certificates		
1.1 Training of drivers of vehicles carrying dangerous goods		
1.1.1 Number of valid ADR certificates	80%	<i>Comments: Number of training certificates held by drivers. The result may vary depending on the date when the data is collected as it depends on the dates of the examinations sessions. Drivers may also hold certificates delivered in another countries.</i>
1.1.2 and 1.1.3 Training certificates delivered and renewed	93%	<i>Some countries (Finland, Lithuania and Romania) do not make difference in the registration of new and renewed certificates. Therefore, the data for new and renewed certificates have been gathered.</i>
1.2 Dangerous goods safety adviser certificates		
1.2.1 Dangerous goods safety advisers holding a valid vocational training certificate	73%	
1.2.2 Dangerous goods safety adviser certificates delivered	80%	
1.2.3 Dangerous goods safety advisers working for undertakings	60%	<i>The representative from Belgium suggests comparing the data for 1.2.3 with the number of undertakings for which the appointment of a dangerous goods safety adviser is required. However, the interpretation of these data would be difficult as the exemption for undertakings to appoint a dangerous goods safety adviser may differ from one country to the other (see 1.8.3.2 of ADR).</i>
2. Administrative controls of dangerous goods		

Data	Availability (percentage of the countries which provided the data or which could provide it during the biennial exercise)	Comments
2.1 Number of control operations according to 1.8.1.1 (spot checks)	80%	
2.2 Percentage of controls conducted according to 1.8.1.1 resulting in the observation of infringements	80%	
2.3 Percentage of controls conducted according to 1.8.1.1 resulting in the prohibition of a consignment or the interruption of a transport operation	60%	
2.4 Number of control operations according to 1.8.1.3 of ADR conducted in your country (checks on the premises of the enterprises)	46%	<i>The collection of these data and their interpretation may be difficult as for some countries (e.g. Finland) such control operations are not carried out on a systematic basis but in particular case (in case of an accident or after the observation of a defect). In addition, other countries like United Kingdom indicated that these controls are carried out by inspectors not under the supervision of the competent authority for the transport of dangerous goods and for purposes other than controls related to the transport of dangerous goods.</i>
2.5 Percentage of controls conducted according to 1.8.1.3 resulting in the observation of infringements	40%	
3. Approval of vehicles		

Data	Availability (percentage of the countries which provided the data or which could provide it during the biennial exercise)	Comments
3.1 Number of certificates of ADR approval issued by the competent authority	93%	
3.2 Number of type approval certificates for tank-vehicle, demountable tank, tank-container, tank swap body, battery-vehicle or MEGC issued by the competent authority	86%	
3.3 Number of design approval certificates for portable tanks issued by the competent authority	86%	
3.4 Number of type approval certificates for fibre-reinforced plastics tanks issued by the competent authority	–	<i>Only Finland declared having issued a type approval certificate for FRP between 2005 and 2007. These data</i>
4. Approval of packagings		
4.1 Total number of packaging design type certificates issued by the competent authority	66%	<i>Comments from UK: These data do not represent the packaging design type currently in use.</i>
5. Statistics		
5.1 Total ton-kilometers of dangerous goods moved	46%	<i>Comments from UK: Our understanding is that we are limited by community law about what statistics we can collect and this was a problem in 2005 when we did work for the Commission (see Evaluation of EU Policy on the Transport of Dangerous Goods since 1994 TREN/E3/43-2003).</i>
5.2 Number of notifications in accordance with section 1.8.5	73%	

General comments received:

Comments from Austria:

We are not very happy about the data required which aim to prove importance by the number of bureaucratic acts.

Transport statistics can be gained from EUROSTAT and national statistic agencies. Everything else should be more safety oriented. Statistics on dangerous goods accidents and incidents e.g. and their comparison with other traffic would demonstrate the success of WP.15's work better than indicators of the efforts caused by it.

Comments from Switzerland:

"Nous tenons à signaler qu'il n'a pas été simple d'identifier les personnes qui pouvaient collaborer pour fournir des réponses. Le secrétariat du WP.15 dispose de tous les courriers électroniques de chacune des Parties contractantes. En revanche le questionnaire contient des questions sur des sujets très divers qui concernent plusieurs administrations, des administrations à différents échelons ainsi que différents groupes de privés. De plus, il ne semble pas qu'un besoin existait de réunir toutes ces informations de sorte que, comme nous l'avions déjà signalé lors de la réunion de mai du WP.15, le résultat à ce jour et pour cette année ne peut être que partiel. Les données qui figurent avec des ">" sont des données incomplètes. Elles donnent cependant un ordre d'idée des seuils atteints. Pour ce qui concerne le point 5 nous n'avons de données que pour 2003. Nous pourrions éventuellement fournir des données pour 2009 en 2010.

Même si certaines informations vont certainement nous parvenir au cours des prochaines semaines, celles-ci seront encore incomplètes. Pour ces raisons et compte tenu de nos capacités nous ne pensons pas pouvoir compléter d'avantage cette année les informations que nous vous fournissons maintenant.

Nous vous prions de nous faire savoir si le questionnaire en question risque de ce répéter ces prochaines années. Ceci afin de nous préparer et surtout de préparer nos partenaires pour y répondre. En effet, compte tenu de l'effort nécessaire à chacun pour réunir des données qui apparemment ne sont pas nécessaires pour le travail quotidien, il va falloir prévoir un travail préalable d'information du sens de cette quête d'information avant de recommencer un tel exercice."

- - - - -