Economic and Social Council

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, 10-11 September and Geneva, 14-18 September 2020
Item 7 of the provisional agenda
Accidents and risk management

Information concerning the informal working group on the improvement of the Report on occurrences

Transmitted by the Government of France on behalf of the informal working group[*, **]

Summary

Executive summary:	Information concerning work in progress.
Action to be taken:	Decisions concerning future work.

Introduction

1.   As decided in previous sessions of the Joint Meeting, the informal working group met in Paris from 17 to 19 February 2020. During that session, it was agreed to have a short report to the March session of the Joint Meeting and to meet again in June in order to provide more complete documents to the September session of the Joint Meeting. Due to the Covid-19 crisis, this objective could not be met. The meeting could not be organized as decided. However, the informal working group will continue to work by correspondence to provide improved documents to the Joint Meeting in September.

2.   The purpose of this document is to briefly inform the Joint Meeting about the results of the meeting of the informal working group in February in Paris as well as updating the Joint Meeting about ongoing and future work. More detailed proposals will follow in informal documents as mentioned in paragraph 1.

3.   The meeting from 17 to 19 February was held in the International Union of Railways (UIC) building in Paris with participants from Belgium, France, Netherlands, Switzerland,

---

[*]   2020 (A/74/6 (Sect.20) and Supplementary, Subprogramme 2).
[**] Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2020/55.

Spain, United Kingdom, the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), the European Union (European Commission and European Union European Railways Agency (ERA)), Fuel-Europe, Liquid Gas Europe and UIC.

4.   The meeting was chaired by Mr. Pfauvadel from France.

5.   The Working Group approved the agenda. France reminded the progress of the informal working group and the previous meetings (Scheveningen, June 2019, Brussels, 3 October and 17 December 2019.

6.   The working group considered the following documents as a basis for the discussion:

-        Informal document INF.11 from the autumn 2019 session of the Joint Meeting;

-        Document from the Netherlands (discussion paper points (a), (b), (e) and (h) of Terms of Reference);

-        Document from France (discussion paper points (a), (b), (e) and (h) of Terms of Reference);

-        Report from the Common Safety Method on the Assessment of Safety Level and Safety Performance of Operators at National and Union Level (CSM ASLP) meeting in Brussel (17 December 2019); presentation from ERA.

The latter three documents are provided in informal documents INF.40, INF.41 et INF.42.

7.   Three drafts for a standardized report (ADR, RID, ADN) have been shared with the informal working group:

-        The ADR and RID reports have been improved considering all the comments received since the meeting in June in Scheveningen;

-        In complement to the report concerning RID and ADR already presented to the Joint Meeting, the work done by a group of ADN experts on 3 October 2019 allowed to draft a specific ADN accident report;

-        Some ideas from the ADN accident report have been considered to improve the RID and ADR reports: the data concerning vehicles and goods have been presented in the same table format as provided for in the ADN report.

Presentation of the work in progress on the CSM ASLP by ERA

8.   ERA explained the following points:

-        The list of elements that were developed in the beginning were not specific to transport of dangerous goods but as the work progresses points more specific to transport of dangerous goods are considered;

-        The difference between the System Proposal for Common Occurrence Reporting and CSM ASLP is that CSM ASLP requests to have a specific defined perspective;

-        CSM ASLP is interested in the monitoring of the collection of data from one single occurrence to the deliverance of information, on the assessment of data and sharing information between parties.

Documents from the Netherlands and France

9.   These documents allowed to initiate a discussion on points (a), (b), (e) and (h) of the terms of reference

Point (a) Clarify the purpose of reporting information on accident, and identify the use of the reported information

10.   The informal working group generally agreed that the information listed in the drafts produced by the informal working group contains all data necessary to understand an accident even in a single case study. They may further be used to accomplish also the goals relating to multiple occurrences and risk assessment. It was said that the report should be kept simple

but going from a three pages report to a six pages report doesn't appear to be a big issue for the informal working group.

11. However, some points will need to be clarified:

• The difficulty for operators responsible for providing the report to get all the information in a short time such as the one-month deadline mentioned in 1.8.5;

• It has been proposed to check each type of information listed in the draft standardized reports templates against this timing issue and distinguish them in the draft model report to be presented in future sessions;

• This would allow to redefine deadlines for sending the information in the reports as appropriate and also define who would be the first contributors and in which cases and who would be the complementary contributors;

• Distinguish between the contributors who should just answer to some questions when they are asked and the person in charge of the report.

Point (b) Clarify the participants responsible for sending the report and/or complementary information

12. There were no major objections to the ideas presented by the Netherlands and France.

Points (e) Propose measures to facilitate the collection of the report by competent authorities and transmission of relevant information to the ECE and OTIF secretariats and (h) Take into account the relevant IT tools, including the coordination with the development of Common Occurrence Reporting system (COR)

13. The subject of an automatized system has been raised. The Netherlands mentioned his digitalized system. As a competent authority, they have their own platform where they store data on a PDF format. The Netherlands precise that they are the collector of the data, not the owner.

14. According to that, it has been asked whether such a database should reflect only the description of the accident or also the causes and the measures that should be taken.

15. ERA said it was possible for each participant to use the national system and then to forward the information to a central system. In term of cost, we cannot ask small operators and countries which don't have a system to have one.

16. It was felt that the use of information technology tools, provided they would ensure appropriate data protection, would greatly help the collection of accident information.

17. A proposal from the ECE to the Joint Meeting concerning such tool was recalled by the Chairman (see document ECE/TRANS/WP15/AC1/2014/52).

Future work and next meetings

18. It was agreed that for this session of the informal working group only a short summary of the discussion should be provided to the Joint Meeting.

19. Some additional work is necessary to draft text that could be guidance material and/or an introductory note to 1.8.5, containing the principles discussed during this session of the informal working group.

20. A new clean version of the draft standardized reports will also be provided by France taking into account the comments of the informal working group.

21. Participants are invited to send proposals to France that agreed to collect them and work on some synthetic draft.