

SAFETY MONITOR

ETSC's Newsletter on Transport Safety Policy Developments in the EU

■ Across the modes	1
■ Road Safety	2
■ Maritime and Inland Waterway Safety	6
■ Air Safety	6
■ Safety of Railways	7
■ International Events Diary	8



MAY 2003 EDITION No. 47

Bureau de dépôt - Afgiftekantoor: 1040 Bxl 4

SUMMARY

Council of Ministers

- Extended the transition period for the mandatory requirement of rear mirrors and supplementary indirect vision devices in its common position (p.2)
- Backtracked on confidential reporting in civil aviation (p.6)

The European Commission

- Chaired the eSafety Forum: a confirmation that new technologies for road safety are not yet mature nor cost-effective (p.2)
- Published its transport grants work programme and call for proposals for 2003 (p.1)
- Added new data on children killed or injured in road accidents in the CARE database (p.3)

The European Parliament

- Has to decide whether or not to provide vulnerable road users with the best available protection (p.3)
- Is discussing safety requirements for tunnels of the Trans-European network (p.5)
- Voted on the reports for phasing out single hull oil tankers and for training of seafarers (p.6)

European Transport Safety Council

- Is mounting its annual Best in Europe conference in Brussels on 10 June on the subject of Targeted Road Safety Programmes in the EU (p.8)



ACROSS THE MODES

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

2003 Grants Work programme

The DG Energy and Transport of the European Commission has published its grants work programme for 2003 in the field of energy and transport and the related call for proposals (See at: http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/energy_transport/home/calls/proposal_en.htm). The deadline for application is 10 June 2003. The total of funds, amounting to 7, 4 meuros are to be allocated as follows:

- transport safety: 7, 2 meuros
- sustainable mobility policy: 0, 2 meuros

The European Commission intends to finance projects for improvements of road safety in the European Union, the candidate countries and the European Economic Area by means of studies, campaigns, the establishment of best practices and demonstration activities in the following areas:

- user behaviour
- vehicle technology
- road infrastructure
- road technology
- information and databases and,
- evaluation of national road safety policies



ROAD SAFETY

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Mirrors and supplementary systems for indirect vision

The Council of Ministers adopted unanimously its common position on 8 April 2003 (*See Safety Monitor 40*). The main changes to the Commission proposal were those made to the length of the transition periods and the reordering of the technical annexes.

The Commission expressed regrets to the Council that the transition period of 36 months prior to the mandatory application of the requirements relating to the type-approval of mirrors and supplementary devices for indirect vision does not cover all categories of new vehicles and components, and that a transitional period of 72 months was chosen for passenger cars, light vans and their components.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

eSafety Forum: a confirmation that new technologies for road safety are not yet mature, nor cost-efficient

On 22 April, the first plenary meeting of the eSafety Forum was held in Brussels (*See Safety Monitor 44*). This Forum has been created to bring together stakeholders to discuss how to implement the 28 recommendations of the eSafety working group's final report of November 2002. Chaired by the European Commission, the meeting brought together 150 representatives from the industry, public authorities and the Commission.

The meeting consisted of a plenary session in the morning and discussions in the four established working groups (e-Call, Accident Causation Data, Human-Machine interaction and Business Rationale) in the afternoon.

The discussions focused on the main obstacles for implementation of new technologies for road safety and how to measure and "sell" their societal benefits.

The heart of the problems has been well described by Mr. Louis Schweitzer, European

car industry (ACEA) President and Chairman. He pointed out that these new technologies were too costly and consumers were not prepared to pay for them (around 2,000 euros for collision mitigation or adaptive cruise control systems). In relation to that, he stressed the need to develop low-cost devices which do not yet exist. He also stressed that the effectiveness in real life conditions of many new technologies was still to be tested. He gave the example of ABS systems, which in fact delivered much less than expected.

In his intervention, Malcom Harbour MEP (EPP-ED, UK) raised the issue of how to engage voters on public investments for new road safety technologies. With this in mind he stressed the need to establish a link between eSafety and the EU target of halving road deaths by 2010.

Speaking about the EuroNCAP consumer testing programme, he said that its extension to active safety measures would allow consumers to see the "best available active safety measures".

John Berry, DG Energy and Transport Official, spoke recently about this subject in another meeting in Brussels. He stressed that EuroNCAP needed to be cautious and carefully consider which methodology to use in order to rate cars on their primary safety performance. He also emphasized the difficulty of presenting these results to consumers since quantifying the life saving potential of such primary safety measures had been problematic in real world terms. (*See Safety Monitor 44*).

After acknowledging the extensive costs of these new road safety technologies, the Business Rationale working group tried to find justifications for their implementation. Few, unconvincing ideas were suggested: the social costs of not implementing them, leaving aside the costs and focusing on how many lives could be saved.

Four new working groups have been established covering international cooperation, real-time traffic and travel information, research and development priorities, and road maps.

The next meeting of the eSafety Forum will take place in Madrid on 17 November on the occasion of the Intelligent Transport Systems and Services (ITS) World Congress.

Non-industry experts believe that the single most effective way of reducing crash injury risk in the short to medium term by vehicle design is by improving crash protection. This was confirmed by the final report of the eSafety working group on road safety which pointed out that “the penetration of new technologies to all vehicles will also take a long time, and even in the best of cases will be incomplete by 2010”.

Improvements in the passive safety of vehicles implemented at EU level have shown large benefits, at least for car occupants, over the last decade and there are many further improvements that are highlighted in the ETSC report *Priorities for EU Motor Vehicle Safety Design* (available on ETSC’s website at: <http://www.etsc.be/rep.htm>).

New effective technologies would help to deliver a possible 2020 target but in the meantime we have well-researched existing vehicle technologies which are ready to go now, have good casualty reduction potential and could help to deliver the existing 2010 target of halving road deaths.

The European Commission has a multifaceted role to play in this field, including facilitating a Europe-wide consensus on priorities and activities and supporting the relevant research and development.

ETSC would like to stress the importance that public investments go to cost-effective measures. Commissioner Liikanen, speaking on eSafety at the German Car Industry Technical Congress on 2 April 2003, said that “Wherever possible, deployment of new technologies should be market led”. This approach causes great concern amongst independent safety experts. It is important that the development of new technologies for road safety should be led by casualty reduction potential rather than commercial issues.

ETSC hopes that those considerations will be taken into account in the forthcoming European Commission Communication on “Information and Communication Technologies for Intelligent Vehicles”.

New cars tested in EuroNCAP: highest technical requirements possible for occupants but not for pedestrians

Two new cars gained the maximum rating of 5 stars for occupant protection in the EuroNCAP testing programme (www.euroncap.com). These two cars also met the new EuroNCAP protocol for audible seat belt reminders.

ETSC welcomed this new improvement in occupant protection, a level of protection that pedestrians and cyclists still are deprived of. It is astonishing to see that the car industry can meet the highest technical requirements for occupant protection, while it is so reluctant to meet the equivalent requirements when it comes to the protection of vulnerable road users (The 2 cars above only gained one star out of four for pedestrian protection).

These results have been unveiled in advance of the major Euro NCAP launch in London on 26 June 2003. Approximately 15 new cars will be tested.

New data on children added to the CARE Database

New graphics on children (6-11 years old) killed or seriously injured in road accidents, for each hour and day of the week (rated by population in the age group) have been added to the European CARE Database (See at: http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/transport/home/whatsnew/index_en.htm).

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Are MEPs going to request the best available crash protection for vulnerable road users?

Pedestrian protection is back on the European Parliament’s agenda (See *Safety Monitor 46* and ETSC’s website at: www.etsc.be/pre.htm). Three parliamentary Committees (Transport, Environment and Internal Market) are involved in the discussions.

Transport Committee: Have MEPs forgotten what they requested for vulnerable road users with a large majority on 13 June 2002?

The rapporteur Herman Vermeer (ELDR, NLH) presented his draft report to the RETT Committee on 21 May.

The rapporteur said that EEVC were sound tests but not perfect and could be replaced by better

ones. Herman Vermeer added that he was in favour of a technical feasibility assessment on EEVC. He also recommended relinquishing the European Parliament's control on the Directive by deleting the requirement that an introduction of alternatives or the outcome of the EEVC feasibility shall be submitted to European Parliament's approval.

Dieter Koch (EEP-ED, D) also questioned EEVC and asked the Commission for the scope of the feasibility study. In reply, the representative of the European Commission, Paul Weissenberg, Head of the Single Market Directorate of DG Enterprise, stressed that EEVC were "the best available testing methods at the moment" and that there was "nothing yet around at the moment" to replace them. However, he confirmed that EEVC would be subject to a feasibility assessment.

Mark Watts (PSE, UK) said that "what we are talking about is a scandal" and stressed that he had always been supportive of full compliance with EEVC but that a majority for this was lacking in Parliament.

Eva Hedkvist Petersen (PSE, S), rapporteur on the voluntary agreement last year, said that she had some concerns with the draft Directive which was not entirely consistent. She recalled that the European Parliament requested compliance with EEVC or other test methods giving an equivalent level of protection in its Resolution (**Plenary majority: 261 favorable votes, 16 against and 17 abstentions at the June plenary session, See Safety Monitor 42**).

Unfortunately, this is neither what the European Commission has proposed when it subjected EEVC to a feasibility assessment with the possibility to implement active safety measures, such as better braking or collision avoidance in replacement of safer car fronts, nor what the European Parliament is currently discussing.

The report is expected to be adopted in June in RETT Committee and in July in plenary.

Environment Committee: challenged the RETT Committee by getting rid of the feasibility study on EEVC with a large majority.

The rapporteur Bart Staes (Greens/ALE, B) presented his draft opinion to the RETT Committee in April 2003.

The rapporteur proposed in his opinion to delete the feasibility assessment on EEVC, to allow for

alternative test methods giving an equivalent level of protection and to allow active safety measures but only as additional measures.

The ENVI Committee strongly supported the rapporteur (final vote: 27 in favour, 2 against and no abstentions) and stressed that "the other tests used should in any case result in the same level of protection as the EEVC requirements and give protection against injury in all the body regions covered by EEVC".

A comment on the side: Before presenting his report, Bart Staes informed the ENVI Committee about the strong interest of the car industry for his report. In fact, the car industry managed to get a copy of his unofficial report two hours after it was sent to the translation services of the European Parliament. He said that he wrote to the President of the European Parliament to ensure that such things would not happen again.

Internal Market Committee:

The rapporteur Malcom Harbour (EPP-ED, UK) tabled two amendments in his draft opinion asking for new test standards and active safety measures. The opinion of the JURI Committee is expected to be adopted at its meeting on 10 June.

ETSC urges the European Parliament to stick to its June 2002 Resolution where it requested EEVC or other test methods offering at least the same level of protection as EEVC requirements as the certain final goal of this Directive.

It would be difficult to understand why the European Parliament, which acknowledged in its Resolution that "EEVC should be regarded as the institution which is in the forefront of research in road safety world wide and particularly in the field of pedestrian protection", would agree to subject EEVC to a feasibility study one year later. Vulnerable road users would not understand that MEPs step back and compromise on the implementation of the best available pedestrian crash protection to accommodate industrial convenience.

"Will the Parliament stick to its Resolution, or will it submit to the dubious arguments of European car makers. These are the two questions that decide over the level of political will to make the lives of European citizens safer." said ETSC Director Dr Jörg Beckmann.

Safety requirements for tunnels of the Trans-European Road Network: a need for safety audits

The Transport Committee held a first exchange of views on the draft Directive on the safety requirements for tunnels on the Trans-European Road Network at its April meeting (*See Safety Monitor 44*).

In discussions, many MEPs criticised the very detailed content of the European Commission's proposal and the costs involved, particularly regarding the building of new tunnels.

Mark Watts (PSE, UK) asked the European Commission if in terms of fatalities per km, tunnels are the most dangerous part of the Trans-European Road Network (TERN). He added that more should be done on dissemination of best practices and suggested the publication of a design guide.

Mr Heinz Hilbrecht, Director for Inland Transport at DG TREN, answered that tunnels were considered as high risk spots in terms of traffic volume and added that a study on black spots was foreseen in the framework of the forthcoming EU Third Road Safety Action Plan.

The rapporteur Reinhard Rack (EPP-DE, AU) stressed that tunnels were certainly not the most dangerous part of the TERN but there was a public demand to act on tunnel safety. Therefore, he included a number of amendments in his draft report presented to the RETT Committee on 20 May 2003.

Many of his amendments focused on the administrative structure and the responsibilities and competences of the different bodies. The rapporteur also tabled an amendment to encourage Member States to implement similar safety standards for tunnels outside the TERN. He further pointed out that traffic regulation measures, including road-closures and speed restrictions, should not be neglected since they could help to significantly raise safety levels.

The European Parliament is expected to vote on the draft report in July in RETT Committee and in September in plenary session.

The Transport Council held a first exchange of views on this issue at its March meeting. It took note of the views expressed by some delegations in particular regarding the proposed classification scheme, the timetable for the implementation, as well as the financial implications.

ETSC welcomes the initiative of the European Commission to propose a Directive on minimum safety requirements for tunnels in the Trans-European Road Network. Safety requirements in road tunnels are needed in order to reduce the risk of future accidents.

ETSC believes that the safety of tunnels Directive should seek to achieve harmonization in signing, marking and rules for users and advocates for safety audits so that decisions on expensive infrastructure measures can be taken case-by-case rather than being imposed as an overall requirement.

In a common position paper with the European Federation for Transport and Environment (T&E), ETSC stressed that individual safety audits shall be required for each existing and planned tunnel of the TERN of at least 500 m length. Safety audits would need to address the organizational aspects of accident prevention as well as adequate and timely accident response.

ETSC also thinks that the Directive shall establish a list of safety performance indicators that could be uniformly recorded by all tunnel operators and analysed centrally by the EU for a certain period of time providing a basis for possible target setting.

Training for professional road drivers

The European Parliament adopted in plenary on 8 April 2003 the Council's common position on training for professional road drivers with few amendments.

In the debate, the rapporteur Mathieu Grosch (EPP-DE, B) stated that "extra training for drivers would lead to greater safety on the roads". Eva Hedkvist Petersen (PSE, S) added that legislation on driving time was also important for increasing road safety (*See Safety Monitor 45*).



MARITIME & INLAND WATERWAY SAFETY

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Phasing out of single hull oil tankers

The April RETT Committee of the European Parliament adopted the report of Wilhelm Piecyk (PSE, D) on the phasing out of single hull oil tankers (*See Safety Monitor 46*).

The RETT Committee called for the accelerated phase-out of category 3 tankers, which are smaller and are often operating in regional traffic. It demanded that these tankers be phased out by 2010 instead of 2015 as initially proposed by the European Commission.

The report is expected to be adopted at the plenary session on 2-5 June in Strasbourg.

The March Transport Council agreed on a general approach towards the accelerated phasing out of single hull oil tankers. The Presidency will make contacts with the European Parliament with the aim of reaching an agreement in first reading in the co-decision procedure by the end of June 2003.

Minimum training requirements for seafarers

The April RETT Committee of the European Parliament adopted unanimously the report of Bernard Poignant (PSE, F) on the proposal for a Directive on minimum training requirements for third countries seafarers.

The period of 12 months proposed for Member States by the rapporteur to implement the legislative proposal has been approved by the RETT Committee (*See Safety Monitor 46*). Besides, the RETT Committee stressed that although the country recognition principle would be the general rule, it should be permissible to withdraw the recognition of certificates issued by individual maritime training institutes that failed de facto to comply with the IMO Convention on Standards and Watchkeeping (STCW).

The report also proposed that the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) would issue a supplementary multilingual European certificate attesting the conformity of all certificates. The aim of such certification would be to simplify the checks carried out for the purpose of port state control.

The report is expected to be adopted at the June plenary session in Strasbourg and the rapporteur hopes to reach an agreement with the Council at first reading.



AIR SAFETY

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Occurrence reporting in civil aviation

The outcome of the conciliation procedure on the Directive on occurrence reporting in civil aviation was agreed by the European Parliament delegation on 27 March (*See Safety Monitor 46 and 44*).

The amendment on confidential reporting was completely redrafted in order to foresee, in addition to the mandatory reporting system, a voluntary one. Such a voluntary system will "collect and analyse information on observed deficiencies in aviation which are not required to be reported under the system of mandatory reporting, but which are perceived by the reporter as an actual or potential hazard".

The new article also stressed that if a Member State chooses to put in place a system of voluntary reporting, it shall establish the conditions for the the disidentification of voluntary reports.

The joint text established by the conciliation committee has been adopted by the European Parliament plenary house and the Council on 13 May.

ETSC believes that confidential human incident reporting systems can play an important role in improving air safety and has, for many years pointed to the need of an EU-wide system which could be established at little cost (*See ETSC's briefing on confidential incident reporting in aviation at: www.etsc.be/bri/htm*).

Despite the fact that the European Parliament, the European Commission and representatives of civil aviation staff strongly favoured confidential reports for a better understanding of the human factors linked to aviation accidents, it is disappointing to see that the Council of Ministers backtracked on such an important issue for safety.

Safety of third country aircrafts

The March Transport Council reached a political agreement on the draft Directive on the safety of third country aircrafts using community airports (*See Safety Monitor 43*).

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

European action plan for the prevention of runway incursions

An Action Plan with around fifty recommendations designed to reduce the risks of runway incursions is currently being implemented across Europe. The Action Plan is a wide initiative including among others Eurocontrol and the International Civil Aviation Organisation.

The phenomenon of runway incursions is considered to be one of the most serious problems threatening aviation safety. Data collected during this initiative indicated a possible incursion every 3 to 4 days in the European regions.

The European Commission and Eurocontrol, in partnership with the Joint Aviation Authorities, also signed a grant agreement to strengthen the aviation sector in South East Europe in terms of air traffic navigation and air safety.

Single European Sky

The rapporteurs for the creation of the European Single Sky, Claudio Fava (PSE, I) and Marieke Sanders Ten Holte (ELDR, NTH) presented their draft recommendations for second reading to the RETT Committee on 21 May 2003 (*See Safety Monitor 46 and 45*).

Both rapporteurs were not satisfied with the Council's common position and intended to retable key amendments suggested by the European Parliament in first reading. They both underlined once again that the Single European Sky should guarantee the highest level of safety.

The European Parliament is expected to vote on the draft recommendations in RETT Committee in June and in plenary in July.



RAIL SAFETY

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Second Railway Package

The March Transport Council reached by qualified majority a political agreement, the French, Belgian and Luxembourg delegation voting against, on its common position on the "Second Railway Package" (*See Safety Monitor 45*).

With regard to safety, the common position contains the following elements:

- On the issue of notification procedures for new national safety rules which require a higher safety level than the Common Safety Targets (CST), a Member State - before adopting such a rule - shall consult all interested parties in due time and shall inform the Commission which shall submit the draft safety rule to a special Committee for its opinion.
- If the Commission finds that the draft rule is incompatible with Common Safety Measures (CSM) or with achieving at least the CST, or that it constitutes a means of arbitrary discrimination or a disguised restriction on rail transport operations between Member States, a Decision, addressed to the Member State concerned, shall be adopted.

Moreover, the Commission intends to present by the end of 2003 a Directive proposal relating to the introduction of a European driving licence for train drivers.

ETSC NEWS

BEST IN EUROPE 2003

ETSC is mounting its annual Best in Europe conference on 10 June 2003 in Brussels on the theme of Targeted Road Safety Programmes in the EU.

The target set by the European Commission to halve annual EU road deaths by the year 2010 presents a huge challenge but an enormous opportunity to put knowledge into practice at international, national and local levels. Against the background of developing an EU Road Safety Action Programme and an increasing number of Member States taking steps to set numerical targets, Best in Europe 2003 looks at best practice in targeted road safety programming in the EU.

During this event, ETSC will also launch its new state of the art review "Methods for assessing risk and setting targets in transport safety programmes".

The final programme, as well as a registration form, are available on ETSC's website at: http://www.etsc.be/eve_next.htm. For further information, please contact: Michèle Bullaert, Events Officer, Tel: +32 (0)2 230 41 06/40 04, Fax: +32 (0)2 230 42 15, Email: m.bullaert@etsc.be

INTERNATIONAL EVENTS DIARY

28 Sept - 1 Oct 2003 **2003 World Congress on Railway Research**, to be held in Edinburgh, Scotland, Contact: Congress secretariat, Tel: + 44 (0)20 8743 3106, Fax: +44 (0)20 8743 1010, Email: wcr2003@concorde-uk.com, Website: www.wcr2003.co.uk

8-10 October 2003 **The European Transport Conference (ETC)**, to be held in, Strasbourg, France, Contact: Association for European Transport, Ms Scally Scarlett, Tel: + 44 20 7348 1978, Fax: +44 7348 1989, E-mail: info@aetransport.co.uk, Website: <http://www.aetransport.co.uk>

ETSC is grateful for the financial support provided for the Safety Monitor by:

- DG TREN European Commission
- BP
- KeyMed
- Railtrack Group
- Rail Safety
- Scania
- Shell International
- Bombardier Transportation

ETSC Board of Directors:
Professor Herman De Croo
Professor Manfred Bandmann
Professor G. Murray Mackay
Professor Kåre Rumar
Pieter van Vollenhoven

Executive Director: Dr Jörg Beckmann
Editors: Dr Jörg Beckmann/ Marie Defrance

For information about ETSC's activities and membership, please contact:
ETSC, 34 rue du Cornet - Hoornstr. 34, B-1040 Brussels.
Tel: + 32 2 230 4106, Fax: +32 2 230 4215,
E-mail: information@etsc.be, Internet: www.etsc.be

The contents of the Safety Monitor are the sole responsibility of ETSC and do not necessarily reflect the views of sponsors.
© ETSC 2003 Bureau de dépôt - Afgiftekantoor: 1040 Bxl 4