



Enheten för farliga ämnen
Brita Skärdin
010 - 240 54 95
brita.skardin@msb.se

Sammanställning av det internationella arbetet inom området telematik-farligt gods

1. Mandat och mål för arbetet i arbetsgruppen för telematik-farligt gods
<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2007/wp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-108a3e.pdf>
2. Rapport från arbetsgruppsmöte i Hamburg, den 21-23 april 2010, med "Vem gör vad-matris!"
[http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2010/wp15ac1/INF.11%20\(e\).pdf](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2010/wp15ac1/INF.11%20(e).pdf)
3. Rapport från arbetsgruppsmöte i Bordeaux den 17-19 januari 2011
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_E.pdf

Presentationer i Bordeaux:

Project overview, Annex II

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_II_E.pdf

WP500 Data process modeling, Annex III

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_III_E.pdf

Regulation of telematics in dangerous goods transports" Project, Annex IV

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_IV_E.pdf

EGNOS/SCUTUM use, Annex V

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_V_E.pdf

French operational test, Annex VI

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_VI_E.pdf

Dangerous goods and eCall, Annex VIIa

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_VIIa_E.pdf

Accessing data on dangerous goods using eCall, AnnexVIIb

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_VIIb_E.pdf

IATA vision on e-freight, Annex VIII

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/RC_2011_INF_10_Annex_VIII_E.pdf

4. Rapport från Jointmötet i Bern i mars 2011, ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/122, pkt 59.

Informal documents:

INF.10 (OTIF sekretariat)

INF.9 (Germany)

59. The Joint Meeting noted the progress report on the work of the informal working group at its seventh session (Bordeaux, 17–19 January 2011). The next session would be held in Tegernsee (Germany) on 12 and 13 May 2011.

5. Rapport från arbetsgruppsmöte i München/Tegersee den 12-13 maj 2011 som presenterades som INF. 7 med bilagor vid Joint-mötet i Geneve september 2011.

<http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/ac1/inf130911.html>

6. Joint-mötet i Geneve september 2011 presenterade och diskuterade följande dokument:

INF 36, Comments on the report in INF.7(France)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF36e.pdf>

INF.28, Telematic applications: Easyguide to HGV eCall (CEN)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.28e.pdf>

INF.29, Telematic applications: HGV eCall HGV data concept (CEN)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.29e.pdf>

INF.30, Telematic applications: eCall HGV/GV, additional dataconcept specification (CEN)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.30e.pdf>

Generic information -eCall

http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/esafety/ecall/index_en.htm#eCall_Recommendation

INF.40 rev.1e, Outcome of the informal working group on telematics applications (Geneva 12 september 2011)

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.40_Rev1e.pdf

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2011/ 35, Proposal concerning identification of dangerous goods in telematic applications, (European Commission)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-2011-35e.pdf>

INF8, Comments on document 2011/35, (Germany)

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.8_e_.pdf

INF 23, Comments on proposals on the scope of the data set to be transmitted automatically (see ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2011/35 and INF.8), (Netherlands)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.23e.pdf>

INF.37, Comments on documents 2011/35, INF 8 and INF23 (France)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF37e.pdf>

INF.19, Comments on document ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2011/ 35 from the European Commission and informal document INF.8 from Germany, (UIC and CIT)

<http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2011/dgwp15ac1/INF.19e.pdf>

7. Rapport från Joint-mötet i Genève i september 2011,
ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/124, pkt 88-92

1. Group reports

Informal documents:

INF.7 (OTIF) (Report on the eighth session)

INF.40 (CEN) (Report on the ninth session)

INF.28, INF.29, INF.30 (CEN) and INF.36 (France)

(Documents submitted to the informal group at its ninth session)

88. The Joint Meeting took note of the progress of the informal working group, particularly on cooperation with CEN in developing the eCall project. The work would continue and another session was scheduled at the offices of UIC in Paris during the third week in January 2012. The Joint Meeting also encouraged France to continue its work on modelling along the lines of informal document INF.36.

2. Identification of dangerous goods in telematics applications

Document:

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2011/35 (European Union) (proposed by the European Commission)

Informal documents:

INF.8 (Germany)

INF.19 (UIC/CIT)

INF.23 (Netherlands)

INF.37 (France)

89. Opinions differed regarding the proposal by the European Commission. Several delegations considered that the proposed definition for identification did not correspond with what was required in the transport document. It was explained that the aim of the proposal was to define a primary key for the identification of information, providing unequivocal access to each line of Table A of Chapter 3.2. Such identification was required to draw up European Railway Agency (ERA) technical documents for the technical specification for interoperability relating to telematics applications for rail freight, in particular for the exchange of information between carriers and those responsible for managing the infrastructure. The proposal would not exclude the selection, as needed, of other, additional identification elements tailored for specific purposes, such as the provision of the data required in the transport document for the exchange of information between consignors and carriers.

90. Several delegations pointed out that many companies were developing different telematic application systems, and that it would be preferable for the identification key to be developed in a multimodal context, taking into account in particular the IMDG Code and the ICAO Technical Instructions and avoiding, if possible, aspects specific to European inland transport.

91. One possible solution could involve the designation of a single numerical code for each line of the Table. That could be discussed by the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.

92. It was agreed:

(a) To request that ERA refrain from introducing in the identification key any elements not required in the transport document, and thus to draw on 5.4.1.1.1 in defining the identification key;

(b) To bring the question to the attention of the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods. The representatives of France and the United Kingdom, working together, would raise the issue.

8. Rapport från arbetsgruppsmöte i Paris den 16-18 januari 2012 som också presenterades som INF.14 med bilagor (Annex I-II) på Joint-mötet i Bern i mars 2012.

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_Annexes_I-II_.pdf

Presentationer i Paris:

Annex III, Study on the Application of Telematics in Dangerous Goods Transport
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexIII_.pdf

Annex IV, Research Project of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexIV_.pdf

Annex V, Working Group Telematics 16-18 January 2012, Paris
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexV_.pdf

Annex VI, CEN Workshop Agreement SCUTUM - WG Telematic
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexVI_.pdf

Annex VII, GEOTRANSMD
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexVII_.pdf

Annex VIII, Twiif
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexVIII_.pdf

Annex IX, French Views on Deployment of eCall
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexIX_.pdf

Annex X, Trusted Multi Application Receiver for Trucks
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexX_.pdf

Annex XI, Digital Tachograph Network
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexXI_.pdf

Annex XII, Telematic WG Use Cases
http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/dgwp15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-12-BE-inf14e_AnnexXII_.pdf

9. Vid Jointmötet i Bern i mars 2012 presenterades INF.14, enligt ovan, men på grund av tidsbrist hade mötet inte tid att diskutera arbetsgruppens förslag.

Rapport från Joint mötet, ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/126, pkt 65-67,
<http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/ac1/ac1rep.html>

Informal document: INF.14 (OTIF Secretariat)

65. Owing to the lack of time, the Joint Meeting was unable to discuss in detail the group's conclusions or the associated informal documents INF.26 and INF.30.

66. The European Commission was invited to provide answers to the questions set out in paragraph 26 of the report for the next session of the group in the United Kingdom (Southampton, 3-4 September 2012).

67. The representative of Germany said that ISO was preparing a draft standard ISO 26683 on telematics which covered the transport of dangerous goods.

10. Rapport från arbetsgruppsmöte Southampton 3-4 september 2012 som presenterades som INF.32 vid Joint-mötet i Genève i september 2012,
<http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/ac1/inf170912.html>

Innan mötet i Southampton hade Storbritannien skickat ut en enkät till medlemsstaterna för att få in synpunkter på olika länder syn på ITS – lösningar i samband med transport av farligt gods. Följande länder svarade på enkäten:

Belgien, Frankrike Italien, Nederländerna, Rumänien, Sverige, Storbritannien, Tyskland och Österrike samt EIGA och Bob Williams från ISO TC 204 WG7.

Efter att alla synpunkter hade presenterats följde en mycket livlig diskussion som summeras enligt nedan i INF.32 pkt 8 – 10.

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 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. Vid Jointmötet i mitten på september presenterades INF.32 och Tyskland påtalade att de fortsätter arbetet med att se på hur en ITS lösning för utbyte av information mellan olika aktörer inom farligt gods området ska vara uppbyggd, arkitekturen.

Jointmötet hade i övrigt inga synpunkter på de slutsatser som arbetsgruppen i Southampton presenterade i INF.32. pkt 13

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.

Inriktningen för det fortsatta arbetet framgår av INF.32 pkt 14-15.

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.

12. Vid Jointmötet i mars 2013 behandlades inte telematikerbetsgruppens arbete eftersom det nästkommande arbetsgruppsmötet var planerat till den 3-5 juni i Tegernsee.

13. Arbetsgruppsmöte hölls i Tegernsee den 3-5 juni 2013. Rapporten med bilagor (INF.3) presenterades sedan vi Joint-mötet i september <http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/ac1/inf170913.html>

Vid mötet deltog följande stater och organisationer: Tyskland, Belgien, Frankrike, Nederländerna, Storbritannien och Sverige samt ERA, OTIF, CEFIC, IRU, ITCO, UIC, UIP och UNIFE.

Tyskland presenterade ett förslag på arkitektur för IT-system för överföring av information mellan olika aktörer i transportledet i samband med transport av farligt gods. Systemet bygger på att informationen ska vara decentraliserad dvs. information som redan idag finns i olika transportörers datasystem (inhouse-system) ska kunna användas. Om transportören inte har något system ska transportören istället kunna anlita en extern tjänst (service provider). Informationen ska sedan delas mellan de olika aktörerna genom interface.

Informationen ska vara väl skyddad och bara vara tillgänglig för ackrediterad personal, dels godkänd personal i transportledet. Dessutom ska personal inom räddningstjänst och tillsynspersonal ha en certifierad inloggning för att lätt komma åt informationen i samband med en räddningstjänstinsats eller i samband med tillsyn.

Systemet bygger dock på att det finns ett centralt system som är sammanhållande och identifierar varje enskild transport/transportdokument. Arbetsgruppen föreslog att EU kommissionen skulle kunna ta på sig denna roll. Det finns redan idag liknade system inom andra områden.

TAF TSI som är ett system som redan är på gång att införas för informationsöverföring vid transport av gods generellt på järnväg kommer att vara en del av det föreslagna systemet.

För första gången var telematikarbetsgruppen enig om att det föreslagna systemet är något att undersöka ytterligare eftersom det bygger på ITS-system som finns redan i dag.

Fortsatt arbete

Den beskrivna datamodellen är fri att använda och dessutom är Tyskland tacksam för synpunkter på rapporten och modellen.

Mötet diskuterade även tidplanen. ADR/RID 2019 kan möjligen vara en rimlig målsättning för att inför krav som regeltext eller i form av standarder. En viktig och olöst fråga är fortfarande, hur ska dessa bestämmelser/ standarder vara utformade?

Telematikarbetsgruppen kommer att ha nästa möte i anslutning till Jointmötet. Ett förslag är den 20 september. Arbetsgruppen planerade också att presentera arbetsgruppens förslag på EU-kommittémötet den 17 juli, se pkt 14.

14. På EU-kommittémötet den 17 juni i Bryssel presenterade telematikarbetsgruppen sin systemlösning och välkomnade samtidigt kommissionen att delta i arbetet. Sverige deltog vid mötet. Följande noteringar finns under pkt.6 i rapporten från EU-kommittémötet.

6. Any other business

d) Telematics in the transport of dangerous goods

Work on telematics for the transport of dangerous goods has been going on since 2007 in an ad hoc working group under UN-ECE and OTIF. One of the main conclusions emerging from this work is that further development necessitates a more centralised framework for the information systems.

FR indicated that at the next Joint Meeting of UN-ECE and OTIF on 17-27 September 2013 a half-day session is planned on telematics, probably on 20 September 2013. FR also reminded that this work originates largely from the interest of the Commission in this area. FR, DE and UK felt that the work has moved on sufficiently to identify the best architecture for the system. They indicated that a decentralised approach has limited scope to move forward this initiative and analysis on a common, a centralised system needs to be launched.

The Commission suggested that to identify the best way forward it will be necessary to gather the expertise on Intelligent Transport Systems and transport of dangerous goods in a small working group. Furthermore, the next committee meeting should devote a dedicated discussion on this matter. The Commission invited the Member State experts involved in this work to prepare a presentation for the next meeting.

15. Vid Joint-mötet i september 2013 deltog Josef Kaltwasser från AlbrechtConsult och Jean Phillippe Mechin från den franska myndigheten. Kaltwasser presenterade det tyska projektet och Mechin berättade om Frankrikes planer om ett 3 års projekt. Sverige presenterade i korthet de vi kommit fram till i studien av det tyska projektet, se [rapport](#) på MSB:s webbplats.

Rapporten från Tegersee presenterades också vid mötet i INF.3.

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2013/dgw_p15ac1/ECE-TRANS-WP15-AC1-2013-GE-INF.3e.pdf

16. Den 12 december 2013 hölls ett EU-kommittémöte i Bryssel, se utdrag ur rapporten nedan.

4. Telematics in the transport of dangerous goods

Work on telematic applications for the transport of dangerous goods has been carried out under the auspices of the Joint Meeting of United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the

Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail. The work has reached a stage where choices on the practical implementation would need to be taken. The working group presented its preliminary conclusions in the Joint Meeting of September 2013. It has become evident that the next steps of implementation cannot be ensured by the secretariats of the international organisations. However, at the EU context the project could be continued using the expertise available there.

Mr Helmut Rein (DE), co-chairman of the working group, and Mr Jean Philippe Mechin (FR) presented the results of the informal working group on telematics and the forthcoming pilot project. SE distributed a copy of a study reviewing to the IT architecture on the telematics application of transport of dangerous goods. The documents are available on the CIRCA BC website.

The UK recalled the benefits of this initiative, notably improving speed and efficiency of the response to accidents and replacing paper transport document with a data exchange system. The UK emphasised the working group's recommendation for the Commission to commit to providing the central services required by a trusted party. Without this commitment, the UK considered further work might not be sufficient to reach the objective of the initiative. However, with the Commission's co-operation, initiation of the necessary steps toward standardisation and interoperability could also be actioned.

The Commission indicated that it has a keen interest in the project, but there are still a number of practical issues to resolve.

SE expressed a doubt by highlighting the need for a comprehensive approach on the information flows along the logistic chain. The impact on small and medium enterprises should be studied carefully. National pilot projects would be necessary before any further decisions can be taken. SE announced their national project on telematics with focus on information flows. The project will also carry out a cost-benefit analysis. The work is planned to start next year.

AT reminded that the proposed system should be compatible River Information System (RIS) and warned about the possible complication due to the fact that the data is stored at the operators' systems and therefore statistical analysis related to transport of dangerous goods is not feasible. DK wish to have to have more information on the costs for public and private parties. DE and FR reacted to the comments, clarifying that the appropriate analysis of information flows was carried out on the supply chain from an intermodal perspective. Furthermore, the system will be limited to the largest operators at first, and small operators may participate using their information service providers. They underlined that the project is based on a realistic approach dealing only with information already requested by the regulations and using technology that is available.

The Commission (ITS Unit) pointed out that the proposed architecture is linked to different initiatives at EU level (Intelligent Transport Systems, eFreight and Information Technology initiatives). An efficient solution would work seamlessly with the existing systems and initiatives. For mandating a standard on

telematics for dangerous goods detailed information on the scope and objectives would be needed to draft an effective mandate. A working group could be established under the committee on the transport of dangerous goods to work on this issue.

Some Member States preferred to keep the discussion in the framework of the expert group under the Joint Meeting, involving the appropriate Commission services. FR recalled that next meeting of the working group will be an opportunity to present the results of the pilot procedure and to discuss further issues.

The Commission welcomed the initiative from RID/ADR/ADN Joint Working Group on telematics of dangerous goods and concluded that a further analysis, to be developed in cooperation with Member States' experts, is necessary to find the best way forward, most likely involving other Commission services having expertise in the area.

17. Vid Joint-mötet i mars 2014 diskuterades inte telematik däremot inbjöd Frankrike till arbetsgruppsmöte i Bordeaux den 3-5 Juni.
18. Rapport från det 12:te arbetsgruppsmötet, som hölls i Bordeaux den 3-5 juni 2014. Rapporten kommer att diskuteras som INF.6 med bilagor (Annex I-IX) på Joint-mötet i Genève i september 2014.
[INF.6 Rapport från mötet med Annex I](#), Fundamental ideas and information concerning the use of telematics for the land transport of dangerous goods, som diskuterades på EU-kommittémötet den 6 juni, se pkt 19.
[Annex III TAF-TSI idag](#)
[Annex IV GEOTRANSMD](#) som testar den tyska arkitekturen
[Annex V TACOT](#) EU projekt avseende färdskrivare
[Annex VI HITS](#) Camillas presentation
[Annex VII DOGIES](#) Tjeckiskt projekt om "early warning"
[Annex VIII GEOFENCING](#) Franskt projekt om trafikplanering/övervakning
[Annex IX HECATE](#) Spanskt projekt
<http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/ac1/inf150914.html>
19. Dagen efter Bordeauxmötet, den 6 juni 2014, hölls ett möte i Bryssel med EU-kommissionen, XX och representanter från Frankrike, Storbritannien och Tyskland. Gruppen presenterade den inlägga som arbetsgruppen tagit fram vid Bordeaux-mötet och som beskriver Joint-mötets ambitioner och vilja för det fortsatta arbetet, [Annex I i INF.6](#). Se utdrag ur rapporten från kommittémötet nedan.

6. Telematics in the transport of dangerous goods – state of play

The committee discussed the work on-going at the UN-ECE – OTIF Joint Meeting on telematics in the transport of dangerous goods. The Joint Meeting has developed system architecture applicable for carriage of dangerous goods, as a first step based on the idea of an electronic transport document. In case of need, such as an accident or a check by the authorities, this document would be made available to the relevant public bodies. Certain countries are initiating their national pilot projects in the area.

The next UN-ECE – OTIF Joint Meeting in September 2014 would present an occasion to analyse the next steps to take.

A short document was distributed to the committee based on the work finalised during the same week in Bordeaux in the ad hoc group under the Joint Meeting mandate.

DE indicated that private operators are creating different systems for their needs and a common interface allowing the systems to communicate would be necessary. A small working group to define a mandate for a standard in this area would be the preferred way forward. FR supported the intervention and added that in particular the interface allowing access of public bodies in case of need will not be offered by the market operators. Instead, the public sector must intervene. UK also endorsed the document and underlined that the work in the ad hoc group has reached the limits what it can do.

ERA considered that the technical specification for interoperability on telematics (TAF TSI) largely already covers the needs of the first stage of the dangerous goods telematics project, i.e. document interchange. However, accident or incident related management is not addressed by this work.

The Commission responded that it wishes to gather experience from the pilot projects to better understand the challenges involved. While it certainly wishes that the project will move onwards there are a number of technical and administrative challenges before a commitment can be accepted. Furthermore, Commission services specialised on Intelligent Transport System (ITS) need to play a central role in future developments. With the new Parliament and Commission starting this year the dangerous goods telematics project could be part of the new work programme.

20. Vid Joint-mötet i september 2014 presenterades rapporten från arbetsgruppsmötet i Bordeaux, INF.6. Mötet uppmanade EU att stöda fortsättningen av projektet. UIC reserverade sig dock mot förslaget att infrastrukturförvaltaren skulle vara delaktig i hanteringen av information.
21. Telematikprojektet diskuterades varken på Joint-mötet i mars eller i september 2015.
22. Telematikarbetsgruppen möttes i samband med ITS World Congress i Bordeaux 6-8 oktober 2015. Rapporten från mötet presenteras som INF.4 vid Joint-mötet i Bern den 14- 18 mars 2016, se punkt 23.

INF. 4 består av följande delar

- 1) Ett förslag på konsekvensanalys som Frankrike jobbat fram
[INF.4/Add.1](#)
- 2) Presentationer vid ITS World Congress
[INF.4/Add.2](#) Bakgrund och introduktion till arbetsgruppens arbetet
[INF.4/Add.3](#) ITS-aktiviteter inom UNECE och ITC (Inland Transport
Committée)
[INF.4/Add.4](#) ITS-aktiviteter inom EU – ITS direktivet, eCall, C-ITS
[INF.4/Add.5](#) Europeiska GNSS roll för transport av farligt gods
[INF.4/Add.6](#) CORE som demonstrator
[INF.4/Add.7](#) Det franska projektet GEOTRANS/MD som testar den
tyska arkitekturen (Kaltwasser)
- 3) Presentationer vid arbetsgruppsmötet
[INF.4/Add.8](#) TAF TSI Interface
[INF.4/Add.9](#) GEOTRANS MD

Förutom presentationerna enligt ovan samt en presentation av Henrik Sternberg av det svenska HITS/Transpensprojektet handlade mötet mycket om förslaget på konsekvensanalys som Frankrike vill få acceptans för. Dock litet intresse från övriga.

23. Vid Joint-mötet den 14 – 18 mars presenterade Frankrike [INF.51](#) och [INF.4/Add.1/Corr.1](#) som innehåller dels en vidareutveckling av konsekvensanalysen som diskuteras under arbetsgruppsmötet och dels ett dokument där UNECE föreslår ta på sig ett ansvar att hålla en databas för TP1 enligt Kaltwasser- arkitekturen. Förslaget är att hålla nästa möte i Geneve så att dataexperter på UNECE ska kunna delta.

Tyskland presenterade ett [INF.33](#) som redovisar den tyska nationella tolkningen av bestämmelserna i 5.4.0 i ADR om elektronisk dokumentation. Tyskland föreslår att nästa arbetsgruppsmöte hålls i Tyskland för att diskutera innehållet i INF.33 och deras tolkning av bestämmelserna.

Tyvärr diskuteras detta efter kl 17 på onsdag så det var begränsat med tid för kommentarer. Sverige hade dock invändningar dels emot konsekvensanalysen som vi inte tycker är tillräckligt ingående, långt ifrån alla kostnader finns med och dels hade vi invändningar mot de tyska nationella bestämmelserna.

Rapporten från Joint-mötet var följande:

52. The Joint Meeting took note of the latest developments in the work of the informal working group, including the proposed impact assessment of the implementation of the proposed architecture (INF.4/Add.1/Corr.1).

53. As it was suggested by France in informal document INF.51 that it would be economically worthwhile for the Contracting Parties to RID/ADR/ADN to have a single interface, called "TP1", having maximum geographical coverage, and that it would be desirable, if possible, for the interface to be hosted by ECE, the Joint Meeting supported the principle of holding discussions between the informal working group and the UNECE secretariat to consider the possibility of developing an access management interface (called "TP1" in the architecture proposed by the working group) and of its hosting by UNECE; to consider the relevant technical, legal and budgetary aspects; in this process, to consider the possibility of data exchange between the TP1 interface and the railways acting as a TP2 interface by cooperating with ERA; to consider solutions in the interim period, taking into account national initiatives that were in keeping with the spirit of the project, including by facilitating links between TP2 interfaces as long as the TP1 interface was not available and by verifying the pertinence of national initiatives in that respect; and to consider the relationship with other projects like eCall.

54. The Joint Meeting also noted the initiative of Germany concerning the possibility of using electronic transport documents in the country. Some delegations expressed disappointment that the initiative was difficult to implement in the context of international transport. However it was agreed to include this type of bottom-up approach in the terms of reference of the informal working group on telematics.