

UNECE level crossing expert group

Safety data sub-group

Third meeting of the expert group

Geneva, October 23rd-24th 2014

Questionnaire response (1)

- 24 responses from 22 countries
 - 14 were in the EU, two the EEA and six others
 - Where two responses were from the same country, the most comprehensive has been used
- 12 countries say that they use the ERA/
Eurostat level crossing typology
 - However, overall, 21 collect data by type of level crossing
 - 13 countries record incidents as well as accidents
 - 19 address private as well as public level crossings
 - 13 collect national data in a way that allows accidents/incidents at individual level crossings to be considered

Questionnaire response (2)

- 14 countries address suicide and suspected suicide within their data
- 17 countries report that they are able to normalize data
- 2 countries do not include data for pedestrians (India and Belarus)
- 7 countries record that they do not keep data in accordance with Eurostat requirements
- Four countries who say that they do not could move to the Eurostat approach
- This leaves three that do not who also say they could not (France, Georgia and India)
- A large-scale retrospective collection of source data is at present not justified

What do the responses tell us?

- ERA/Eurostat approach is good practice
- Wherever possible use existing, readily collectable, data for analysis by crossing type
- Any benchmarking must be like with like
- UNECE countries that have not submitted their response should be encouraged to submit their data to widen the basis of analysis
- Non UNECE jurisdictions should be encouraged to engage with the work of this expert group through their response to a second distribution of a revised questionnaire



Author contact

Email:

aidannelson@comsafetypartners.com

Office: +44 1904 448439

Mobile: +44 7710 306784

www.lxinfo.org