Comité économique et social européen
European Economic and Social Committee

European Economic and Social Committee

ECOROADS

2nd Workshop

Roads &Tunnels Safety Management: a comprehensive approach Limits, opportunities and steps beyond

Results of the first two field tests regarding Common Procedures

Carlo Polidori (AIPSS)

WP6 Guidelines and Recommendations (from the DoA)

"*Deliverable D6.1 : Preliminary Guidelines, with the draft of the standard procedures to be applied in the safety operations*".

Work package number [9]	WP6	**Lead beneficiary** [10]	5 - AIPSS
Work package title	Guidelines and recommendations		
Start month	11	**End month**	21

Objectives

To provide recommendations and guidelines for the application of the RSA and RSI concepts within the tunnel safety operations.
To enhance the application of RSA and RSI in open roads through the results obtained during the joint road safety operations.

Description of work and role of partners

WP6 - Guidelines and recommendations [Months: 11-21]
AIPSS, FEHRL, EUROPEAN TRANSPORT SAFETY COUNCIL, ERF, ASECAP, South East Europe Transport Observatory
Task 6.1 Preliminary version of the guidelines (Task Leader AIPSS)
AIPSS, FEHRL and SEETO will prepare the first draft of the guidelines, together with their associated institutes involved in this task. It will contain a structured list of items related to the possible joint operations, taking into account the PIARC recommendations, the proceedings of the first workshop and the Common Procedures defined in Task 5.1.
The preliminary version will take into account the feedback given by the first two road safety operations and the results of the second workshop; it will be used, together the amended common procedures, as a tool for the second and last set of joint road safety operations.

Task 6.2 Insertion of comments and fine tuning (Task Leader FEHRL)
Each report of the last three joint safety operations will be analysed, to find possible improvements for the Guidelines; such analyses will be discussed during the third workshop, where the scheme and the content of the final version will be commonly agreed.
The EC officers in charge of the possible recasting of the Directives will be continuously kept up to date about the preparation of the guidelines and will be invited to the workshops.

"*The preliminary version will take into account the feedback given by the first two road safety operations and the results of the 2nd workshop;*

it will be used, together the amended common procedures, as a tool for the second and last set of joint road safety operations"

ECOROADS

WP6 Guidelines and Recommendations

Section 1: Introduction

Given the “sensitivity” of the stakeholders, the introduction should clearly highlight the difference between the "experimental" visits and what the project finally recommends, by underlining that such recommendations are the results of two rounds:

"plan" ⇨ "do“ ⇨ "check" ⇨ "correct"

The output of the project is a summary of what we (the project partners) think can be practically done to enhance safety.

We have already clarified that this project does not aim to any modification of the two Directives, but aims at establishing a practical and effective approach to enhance safety

Our Guidelines should therefore be thought to be applied on **a "voluntary basis" and according to the current scheme of two clearly separated Directives**. This is also the way to achieve the maximum impact in the real world.

(in the ECOROADS2 proposal we plan to make it more "official" through a temporary international agreement between some Infrastructure managers)

"**Voluntary basis**" means that the Infrastructure Manager will pay **additional costs** for an operation targeted to enhance safety.

The final version of the Guidelines should take into the due consideration the two opposite needs:

- an effective inspection actually enhancing safety
- *cost* (in terms of time, money, resources and traffic operations) the Infrastructure manager has to face

Otherwise our report will remain "*just a piece of paper*"

"Voluntary basis" also means that tunnels outside TERN could be addressed, so the guidelines should foresee this possibility.

How?

e.g. by indicating different minimum number of items (and therefore expenses) to comply with. This will guarantee a wider possible application of the guidelines.

Does it make sense? Discussion is open

Description of deliverables
D6.1 : Preliminary Guidelines [12] Preliminary Guidelines, with the draft of the standard procedures to be applied in the safety operations. D6.2 : Final version of the Guidelines [21] Draft of the standard procedures to be applied in the safety operations

The preliminary guidelines will comply with the DoA , by reporting the the results of this workshop and the current version of the procedures.

Should the final version:

- recall the Pilot4Safety manual for operations in open roads (useful tool for some tunnel experts)?
- have a simpler organizational chart and flow of informations ?
- be composed by a “light” core part plus a series of technical annexes?

Thank you for your attention!

Discussion is open

Carlo Polidori
Italian Association of Road Safety Professionals
www.aipss.it
c.polidori@libero.it