United Nations ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2013/13

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
7 January 2013
English
Original: French

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, 18–22 March 2013
Item 8 of the provisional agenda
Any other business

Report on the results of the international survey on implementation of chapter 1.9 of RID/ADR/ADN by users of risk evaluation procedures in the transport of dangerous goods

Transmitted by the Government of Germany[1, 2]

Summary

Executive summary:	The small number of responses to the international survey and the lack of detail in most of those received mean that it is not possible to identify harmonized criteria for joint regulations for standardized risk analysis. The results do not explicitly demonstrate any wish on the part of the various countries for harmonization in order to standardize risk analysis.
Action to be taken:	Future action towards developing harmonized regulations for standardized risk analysis.
Related documents:	Informal document INF.19 (Germany), joint meeting in March 2011.

[1] In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2010–2014 (ECE/TRANS/208, para. 106, ECE/TRANS/2010/8, programme activity 02.7 (c)).

[2] Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2013/13.

Introduction

1. At the RID/ADR/ADN joint meeting (Bern, 21 to 25 March 2011), Germany had proposed an international survey on the implementation of chapter 1.9 of RID/ADR/ADN by users of the risk evaluation procedures for the transport of dangerous goods (see informal document INF.19 of the March 2011 session).

2. The objective of the survey was to support the development of harmonized regulations for standardized risk analysis. The survey was intended to collect, and ensure the transparency of, current implementation methods and the experiences of other Contracting Parties/States parties and identify other needs and opportunities at international level for harmonization of the concept of risk in the field of dangerous goods. It was intended to determine:

- Whether risk analyses are conducted in the dangerous goods transport sector by the Contracting Parties/States parties and, if so, which methods are used;
- Which hypotheses and specifications in particular are taken as a basis for implementing the risk applications;
- Which national characteristics are considered in the risk evaluation;
- Which calculation and dispersion models are used;
- Which problems have been identified in practice and what needs to be improved.

Questionnaire

3. The questionnaire (INF.19 of the March 2011 joint meeting) was subdivided as follows:

1. Transposition into national law;
2. Basics of risk analysis;
3. Clustering of hazardous substances/Definition of accident scenarios;
4. Accident effect models;
5. Statistical data;
6. Risk analysis procedure;
7. Computer-aided calculation models;
8. Risk evaluation;
9. Risk management;
10. Special case – Categorization of tunnels;
11. Other.

4. The Contracting Parties/States parties of international bodies dealing with dangerous goods were asked to respond before 31 October 2011. Because of the small number of responses, the deadline was extended to 31 January 2012.

Responses

5. Five countries responded: Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Switzerland.

6. The Netherlands gave specific and detailed answers to the questions. The other four responses were shorter and in part very general. The contribution of the Netherlands is presented in its entirety in informal document INF.7. The contributions of other countries are summarized in informal document INF.8.

Analysis of responses

7. The small number of responses and the lack of detail in the content of most of them make it, we consider, impossible at this stage to identify or even to develop harmonized criteria for joint regulations for standardized risk analysis.

8. The following interpretation of the responses received may have to be further clarified or corrected:

- We consider that the answers do not demonstrate any explicit wish on the part of the various countries for harmonization in order to standardize risk analysis;
- It may, however, be assumed that there is interest in technical exchanges on specific issues related to risk analysis that are problematic at national level (see below).

9. Some of the problems and shortcomings mentioned in the responses are given below:

- Data on risk analysis for the transport of dangerous goods (accidents involving dangerous goods, volume of transport, routes, etc.) are essential for risk analysis in the field of section 1.9.5 of RID/ADR/ADN. The Netherlands notes that there is a serious lack of such data in general. Sweden notes a particular lack of specific data for risk analysis for trans-shipment points and stations;
- The responses reflect an interest in discussions on the following technical aspects of risk analysis: indicators of damage, accident scenarios, etc. (see part 4 of the questionnaire – the Netherlands), evaluation of probabilities of the occurrence of, for example, an explosion of class 1 goods or leaks and their volume (Sweden);
- Sweden has the impression that the survey relates mainly to section 1.9.3 (b) of ADR.[3] In this context, it does not seem sensible to harmonize risk analysis in road transport as long as there are no marking requirements, in the form of signposting and possible restrictions. The questionnaire is more useful for rail transport (RID).

[3] 1.9.3. ADR

Additional provisions falling within the scope of 1.9.2 are as follows:

(a) [...]

(b) Requirements for vehicles to follow prescribed routes to avoid commercial or residential areas, environmentally sensitive areas, industrial zones containing hazardous installations or roads presenting severe physical hazards; [...]

Comments of Germany

10. The responses certainly do not highlight any explicit wish on the part of the various countries for harmonization in order to standardize risk analysis (see above), but the fact that restrictions concerning tunnels, among others, are incorporated into international regulations such as ADR would allow us to assume that harmonization aimed at the standardization of risk analysis should or must be sought in Europe in the long term.

Proposal: In order to clarify the purpose of the international provisions in this area and to encourage continued cooperation, we believe that the international regulatory bodies must establish and clearly demonstrate the real possibilities of use and expected actual safety gains that are derived from the results of a standardized risk analysis.

11. In some of the responses received, the lack of data on dangerous goods is clearly identified as a problem (see above). It is also clear in Germany that lack of data is the main obstacle in carrying out risk analyses. It would thus be desirable for all the existing national surveys on accidents to be accessible to all interested persons and, if possible, recorded in English, so they can be accessed and used. Furthermore, if risk analysis for the transport of dangerous goods is to be harmonized at international level, it is essential that the accident statistics should be accessible to all. Thus these statistical data should be based on harmonized secure survey procedures.

Proposal for further action

12. So that a clear opinion can be formed and, where appropriate, the present interpretation of the responses to the questionnaire rectified, the Contracting Parties/States parties are asked, during the March 2013 joint meeting, once again to consider future action to be taken towards the development of harmonized regulations for standardized risk analysis and, if possible, to decide on the following issues:

- Is there a wish for more thorough international regulations for standardized risk analysis?
- If yes, to what extent?
- How can this be achieved?