Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods   **14 September 2012**

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

Geneva, 17-21 September 2012
Item 6 of the provisional agenda
Reports of the informal Working Groups

Report of the telematics working group

Transmitted by the Government of United Kingdom

Summary	
Explanatory summary:	The working group discussed the possible uses of telematics in the dangerous goods context and next steps to achieve the objectives, with reference to the initiatives of the European Commission.
	It was agreed that a stepped approach to introducing such telematics provisions would probably be best. This should build on existing systems and remain optional, at least in the initial period.
	The first phase should focus on emergency alerts, as this was supported by all. The next priority would probably be to determine how telematics might provide a substitute for roadside checks of transport documents. The use of telematics statistical and other data in e.g. risk assessment processes should also be considered.
	Even with a minimal system, the issue of mandatory requirements ensuring at least proper communication of data remains to be resolved.
	The goal of paperless dangerous goods transport was seen as providing an incentive for adoption of the systems.
Action to be taken:	Continue consideration of the identified issues in the telematics working group, with a view to making a proposal for amendments to ADR.
Related documents:	INF 14, Joint Meeting, March 2012.

1.   The 10th session of the working group on telematics was held in Southampton (UK) on 3-4 September 2012. The session was chaired by Jeff Hart (UK).

2.   The following states took part in the discussions at this session: Belgium, Germany, France, Netherlands, Sweden and UK. Global Express Association (GEA), International Union of Railways (UIC), Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) and a representative of ISO TC 204 Working Group 7 also took part. Apologies were received from Luxembourg, Romania, the European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA), the International Road Transport Union (IRU) and the European Commission (EC).

3.   The terms of reference for the meeting were paragraph 25 of INF 14 along with the appended UK template. The agenda items were discussed in order.

Please recycle

Response from the European Commission

4.   Although unable to attend the meeting, the European Commission had provided written responses to the three questions formulated in paragraph 26 of INF 14, as follows:

1.   The eCall project is based on three different instruments. Firstly, a Commission recommendation to Member States that their mobile network operators should adapt their systems for eCall. Secondly, the vehicle type-approval legislation needs to be adapted to take into account the technical requirements for vehicles. Finally, under the ITS directive there would be specifications for emergency call response centres to update the systems in view of eCall. These elements take time to be adopted and the current plan is that they are there by 2015;

2.   As regards the tachograph and positioning issue, for protection of privacy only the start and end points of a journey could be recorded by a positioning system, no tracking could be done. However, this is still in discussion with the Parliament and the Council;

3.   For the ITS Directive, the most relevant would be the information system on lorry parking areas, which would need to consider the issue of parking of dangerous goods lorries.

5.   Delegates took differing views of eCall, but agreed that its functionalities might prove useful for dangerous goods purposes. ISO TC 204 Working Group 7 had begun work on a possible telematics ISO standard expanding to a more general TARV approach, and invited comment by January.

6.   Some delegates felt that architecture requirements would have to be identified before a system could be developed, but Germany responded that these were substantially set out in the paper they had provided before the last telematics working group. It was agreed to consider this further.

Telematics outcomes template

7.   Responses to the template proposed by the UK were received from AT, BE, DE, FR, NL, RO, SE, EIGA and Mr Bob Williams of the ISO TC 204 WG7[1]. The UK had also completed the template.

8.   The responses identified the following possible uses of telematics:

a)   **An aid to emergency response**. This received general support, although some delegates questioned how much value added it would represent. Emergency response was already rapid, although faster availability of information could improve the quality of response (especially in the event of a cab fire, destroying documents). There was some concern about responders being overwhelmed by calls to minor incidents/false alarms. Delegates also queried which data elements should be transmitted;

b)   **A data source for risk assessment processes** and a basis for advice to decision makers. No objections to this were raised. A few delegates considered that the data might already be available from other sources, but others said that

---

[1]   IT also provided a return, via the FR delegate who outlined the main points, but this arrived too late to be taken into full consideration.

telematics could provide a more cost efficient system of automatically generated statistics;

c) **A continuous real time position-identifying tool for traffic management**. Opinions were divided on this point, which might infringe data protection rights. Options included limiting it to Class 1 movements or for establishing that a dangerous load had crossed a national border;

d) **A means of streamlining requirements.** Some delegates believed that telematics could provide a real opportunity to ensure better implementation of dangerous goods movements, especially as regards movements through tunnels;

e **An enforcement tool**. There were differing views on this, although no support for a central database with continuous monitoring, as being too resource intensive. It could provide a more efficient alternative to checks of the transport document. There were some concerns about introducing rules which expressly ruled out enforcement use, effectively prohibiting preventative action;

and

f) To **bring existing paper based systems up to date**. Paper systems were increasingly being replaced by electronic alternatives, which often provided a faster and more secure access to data. Delegates expressed few views on this point, while pointing out that ADR did already make some provision for electronic alternatives.

9. The group noted that telematics were already widely used in the industry and dangerous goods requirements could probably be added on to existing systems fairly cheaply. Delegates agreed that dangerous goods telematics must function as part of a wider system and generally took the view that this could be implemented on an optional basis by individual companies, perhaps based on eCall. There would be some commercial advantages, for big companies at least, especially if this led to a paperless system. There was no support for a centralised database.

10. Industry agreed with these views, especially if the possible link to enforcement were excluded. The Global Express Association nonetheless explained that there could be some difficulties with putting data on to an electronic system, especially where multiple collections were involved.

11. The Netherlands offered to give a presentation on its work on the use of telematics at the next meeting and highlighted the need to focus on the current legislative base, to ensure that there were no actual barriers to the use of telematics. A proper cost benefit analysis should also be considered.

12. Mr Bob Williams of the ISO TC 204 WG7 presented a first draft of a standard ADR Telematics Applications for Regulated Vehicles (TARV). This would be circulated and could be adjusted in line with the conclusions of the Working Group. Comments should be submitted to Mr Williams by January.

Conclusions

13. The conclusions of the working group were as follows:

a) Dangerous goods telematics requirements could be phased in over time, starting with emergency response;

b) Other possible later developments could include risk assessment and enforcement (although the latter would only imply an alternative to the current random roadside checks, not an extended system);

c)   The use of such telematics should be optional for all movements, at least in an extended first phase, within a standard (ISO) framework;

d)   The report of the meeting would be passed to Mr Bob Williams of the ISO TC 204 WG7 to assist with development of the ISO Standard, while individual states remained free to add their own comments;

e)   The competent authority would determine who should receive the information;

f)   There should be no requirement for a central database.   In-house systems could be adapted as appropriate; and

g)   Telematics capability should lift the requirement to hold a paper transport document in the cab and this should be explicitly stated in ADR.

Future direction of the working group's work

14.   Future actions could include:

a)   Check ADR texts to ensure that there are no obstructions to introducing telematics/lifting the requirement for paper documentation;

b)   Consider how ADR might be amended to allow for use of telematics in emergency response and to replace roadside checks;

c)   Identify triggers for emergency calls;

d)   Investigate inland waterway mechanisms;

e)   Obtain further information on in house systems.

15.   Germany volunteered to task its consultants with drawing up a list for consideration and would also present the outcome of its proposed further study to a peer review group.

Primary key identifiers

16.   After some discussion, delegates agreed that this work should be suspended at the current time.

Consultants' work in Germany and France

17.   The work of the DE consultants had been covered under previous agenda items and France had nothing to report at this stage.

Any other business

18.   The UK Vehicle Certification Agency reported on its involvement with the EC's Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) and telematics study, which concerned possible tracking and tracing systems. A questionnaire had been sent out but the response rate had been poor. Equally a proposed workshop to be held in Brussels was cancelled through lack of interest. The draft interim report had already been submitted to the EC. The study was expected to conclude by mid October.

Date of next meeting

4-7 June 2013 in Munich