Chemical Transport Leadership in a Converging Interconnected World
ECTA comprises more than 80 members in 14 countries. ECTA members are companies that are active in the chemical transport industry. ECTA members organize the land transportation of chemical goods irrespective of the transport mode used: road, rail, barge, short sea shipping, air. Membership includes road transport companies, commercial sections of rail transport companies, intermodal transport companies, barging and short sea shipping companies. ECTA member control and influence the Safety, Health, Environment (SHE) and quality aspects of the transport that they organize and endeavour to implement the ECTA guidelines in these areas. ECTA members are service providers to the chemical industry and are proactive towards their customers’ needs and their stakeholders’ interests.

European representation
ECTA provides the chemical transport and logistics providers with an authoritative and independent voice at European level. Within that scope it ensures that the industry’s views are effectively communicated to key audiences, authorities and institutions within Europe at regional, national, international and European level. ECTA elaborates in close cooperation with the European Chemical Industry Council (Cefic) guidelines on best practices in chemical logistics and invests in the European Safety and Quality Assessment System.
ECTA’s freshly introduced chairman, Antonio Montero, 36, heartily welcomed ECTA members at the Munich conference and gave an overview on the achievements as well as the main challenges that lay ahead of the European chemical transport sector.

Antonio Montero considers his new responsibilities as chairman of ECTA as a great honour and responsibility. He heartily thanked his predecessor Luc Haesaerts who presided the destiny of ECTA for seven years. “I wish to express my gratitude for all your efforts, hard work and your continued dedication to the Association,” Montero said. “All of us individually as ECTA members are indebted to you, and I personally look forward to receiving your continued support and enthusiasm to help us to achieve our goals.” Remembering the founding process of ECTA from 1997 on, Montero also recalled the joint efforts of Hub Van Gorp, Paul Evertse and Eric Yates in creating ECTA.

Today, ECTA stands for 84 member companies with a total turnover of 5,000 M € and a combined work force of 120,000 people in 30 countries, on 340 logistics sites. “Our Association represents the industry to the fullest and our members are the champions in chemical logistics by all modes of transport.” Besides transportation of liquid, powder and packed goods, ECTA members also manage tank cleaning stations and the storage and warehousing of chemicals. ECTA has been the first transport association to actively promote HSE initiatives between member companies and customers, improving standards for the industry and enabling the transport industry to speak with one voice. By creating and promoting BBS (Behaviour-Based Safety), ECTA became the sole transport organization to have created Euro-wide driver-training standards. “Our sector is light years ahead of the new EU training directive, as we already have exceeded all legal requirements to ensure safety on our roads.”

Forerunners by implementing SQAS
Montero pointed out that ECTA is also the only transport organization to have vigorously supported SQAS from its origins, through the many contributions from member companies. “Our members express their hopes that this tool will grow to become a wider platform, where both the chemical and the transport industry join forces, ensuring a safe chemical supply chain.” ECTA plays an important role in promoting and reinforcing the consultation of the data generated by its members in their respective SQAS assessments. “We need to capitalise on the assessment data, making our improvements more visible to ourselves and to the public and we wish to widen its scope to the complete chemical logistics chain,” Antonio Montero insisted. ECTA therefore strongly advocates the implementation of SQAS to its rail partners and various subcontractors.
“The environmental impact of our activities is another big challenge for all of us.” Proactively, ECTA held a conference on co-modality last year and strongly supports optimization and collaboration between LSPs. According to Mr Montero, ECTA wishes to be increasingly recognized as a ‘Responsible Care partner’ within the European chemical industry. “We need to speak out for our sector and we will continue to provide our members with highly appreciated ECTA learning events such as conferences, Academy days, interactive Forums and round-table dinners.”

ECTA members are global players
To show their pride and commitment, Antonio Montero invites all member companies to request the ECTA logo from the secretariat and use it on their website, “as a way of flagging our ECTA membership” and to “continue to push ourselves to constantly develop our services, our standards and our recognition within the industry.”

“My focus for ECTA is very much to unite us as one industry for Europe. We are proud of our accomplishments and expertise and willing to constantly improve our performance in order to be the best at a global level,” he said. The European chemical industry is currently developing into a major global industry, and so do their logistics service providers. “ECTA will help us to move with confidence to the same global standards as our customers. We are prepared to follow our clients any place, anywhere. ECTA’s members are premier league - and it’s up to us to ensure we play in the field we deserve.”
ECTA members have a vested interest in risk and safety management of land terminals especially since their drivers are daily on the terminal sites, but also to ensure proper responsibility is taken for the products and the environment. Together with its customer, Den Hartogh Liquid Logistics elaborated a check-list on terminal safety that covers a wide range of issues. This initiative could set off the creation of common assessment criteria for all carriers and terminal operators.

“At Den Hartogh’s, one of our drivers was involved in a fatal accident on January 2005, at our Moerdijk terminal”, Eric Van Beek recalled. “I was there, shortly after the accident happened. It was an extremely painful situation I would not wish anyone to experience!” This terrible accident brought up the broad issue of shared interest in terminal safety. What can a carrier do to protect his drivers at customers’ sites and at intermodal land terminals in general? What are the detailed risks that drivers are facing? How is it possible to reach a standard for total terminal safety when all terminals operate differently and the carrier is no contractual party at the terminal? Last but not least, how can carriers convince terminal operators to establish certain security standards?

The particular event did not only set off an in-depth investigation together with Shell, on the Moerdijk site, but a chain of preventive actions affecting the organisation, the equipment and operations overall was set in motion. “This made us realize that whatever we do on our own terminals has little impact on the safety of other terminals. We virtually do not know, what kind of risk we expose our drivers to at other terminals,” Mr Van Beek explained. “So, what can we do to minimise those risks in general?”

In a thoughtful step-by-step process, Den Hartogh Liquid Logistics developed a safety evaluation form for terminals, in collaboration with their customer Shell. Their long-term objective is and was to be able to evaluate each and every land terminal they use. “It is a slow and on-going process,” Eric Van Beek recalls, “as we load and unload at many different terminals.” Although resources are scarce, this type of time-consuming in-depth security audit “pays off on the long run,” he is convinced, “as we stimulate general improvements.”

Proposed Land Terminal Evaluation Form

“With Shell’s contributions, we developed a three pages Excel sheet form that we use to audit a land terminal,” Mr Van Beek continued, “It is kept simple (generating mostly Yes/No answers) and evaluates a total of 55 items covering six specific areas. “General questions”, for example, will investigate the general safety attitude on the site and the safety management, including monitoring of incidents. It holds questions on the drugs and alcohol policy, on the certification of the quality system as well as on housekeeping standards. “Access control” questions will yield information regarding the access control mechanisms in place, guard services and lighting on the site. The implementation of a security plan at the terminal, which is mandatory for high consequence dangerous goods (HCDG), is checked. Availability and the maintenance of equipment is part of the range of questions regarding "Container movement and handling", next to detailed questions on the actual handling procedures themselves. When it comes to "Shunting operations", questions such as proper usage of rail car hand

This initiative could set off the creation of common assessment criteria for all carriers and terminal operators.

Overall, items of the evaluation are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access control</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container movement / handling</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunting operations (rail)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Goods handling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery / mitigation measures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of people</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire/explosion/spill prevention &amp; control</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current list is “work in progress”, Van Beek insisted, and Den Hartogh’s management would be happy to share and discuss the contents with other ECTA members. New ideas to improve the check-list are welcome, including the question whether it could be simplified or shortened. Nevertheless, the main question according to Mr Van Beek remains: “Do terminals have a vested interest in working with us, transport companies, on the topic of terminal safety?” Carriers usu-
ally are not the terminals’ customers.

“As carriers, do we have real alternatives?” So far, he says, carriers only had the choice of becoming less efficient, or they simply had no choice: take it or leave it. “In other words, individual carriers do not really hold all that much power towards terminal operators.”

Despite the lack of direct contractual relationship, in his experience in applying the questionnaire on land terminal safety, Eric Van Beek reported that terminal management had always reacted quite positive to the concept of being reviewed on how they handle safety matters.

As a matter of fact, the chemical transport is only one part of land terminal activities and can be estimated at roughly 30% of the European land terminal throughput. “Translated into days, this would make approximately two days per week!” Eric continued.

The solution, according to Mr Van Beek, can only come from the sector as a whole. He is convinced that “united under the umbrella of ECTA, carriers would have a much greater push on terminal operators.”

“With the support of our association we can also dialogue better with the other involved parties”, he mused, “such as: the chemical industry, UIRR, organisations of terminal and intermodal operators”.

**Uniting efforts of ECTA members**

Mr Van Beek pointed out obvious advantages to such a common initiative. A uniform check-list could be established based on the questionnaire that is proposed by Den Hartogh Liquid Logistics. Results should be shared amongst ECTA members, so that one single assessment of a terminal would yield information to many LSPs for a given period. This helps avoiding multiple time-consuming procedures for both carriers and terminal operators.

This could also result in a far better geographic coverage of the terminal auditing scheme when all ECTA members chip in and provide their evaluations of land terminals to the common database from the many countries they are active in.

A vast debate needs to be launched amongst carriers, Mr Van Beek thinks. “Again, carriers need to take the first step in accepting to share individual assessment results and in trusting each other’s findings. On the long run, the terminal operators will understand the advantage of only going through one safety assessment, as one procedure will cover all major carriers and gives them most value for the effort to collaborate. Furthermore, it doesn’t cast them any money, at least at this stage of evaluation and as long as each ECTA member contributes his part of the evaluations freely.”

“ECTA could play a crucial role in this process,” Mr Van Beek suggests. ECTA could elaborate a common questionnaire or at least assist in creating a final version of the existing check-list. Eric Van Beek knows that it will take considerable efforts to have all ECTA members contribute to this common goal and use one single standardized questionnaire. But he invites everyone to consider the long term advantages and give it serious thought: ECTA-driven terminal evaluation could be the future solution to making terminals a safer working place, for everyone.

ECTA member companies can contact ecta@epca.be and obtain a copy of the checklist presented.
Interactive Forum of Participants
Land Intermodal Terminal Safety Evaluation Scheme

What are the current safety practices for drivers on land terminals? How can ECTA and its members organise a land terminal safety scheme? Koert Van Wissen and Hans-Jörg Bertschi reported back from the discussions in the break-out sessions.

Brainstorming in both groups of participants started from the very basic observation that transport companies nowadays operate Europe-wide facing different cultures and 25 languages. In some countries, such as Germany, rules and regulations are very strict whereas there is much less procedures in others. Existing regulations seem sufficient for transport operations from loading point to unloading point. “But when we get to an intermodal terminal, we virtually face a ‘black hole’,” Koert Van Wissen reported from discussions in his group. “There is an urgent need for dialogue!”

Current situation
Pictograms have become more important than ever to fill in the driver on what is going on at a terminal. But pictograms or handing out translations is not enough, according to transport operators. Exceptionally, some terminal operators already provide for mandatory training for drivers in order to get access to the terminal. Drivers learn how to act and behave on the site before getting their access pass. This is very much appreciated. Also, transport companies could organise training sessions with their own instructors. But at most sites, drivers just come up to the gate, drive in – and try to do their best, in a possibly risky situation. The participants recalled that it’s not only the driver who is at risk; there is potential risk on the environment and on the product itself. This raised the question of overall risk management on a terminal, insurance etc. It also would be helpful to gather data from ECTA’s member companies on accidental incidents and near misses, Mr Van Wissen suggested.

“We have to clearly differentiate between various types of terminals”, said the other group’s spokesman, Hans-Jörg Bertschi. “Some of our companies already run their own intermodal terminals and they are covered by SQAS and BBS. But most of the loading/unloading operations go through on our customer sites or, even more important, on third party terminals.” Depending on the terminal ownership, different approaches have to be discussed. But it seemed clear to everyone that the problem has to be treated as an overall priority by the industry instead of individually on each company’s level.

Urge for common standards
Nowadays, each terminal operates differently and common standards are rare. Standardization, definitely, would reduce risk massively. “From our experience,” Mr Bertschi concluded, “it makes sense to establish common standards of operations, because intermodal terminals are always an interface between different organizations and companies, from the haulier to the terminal operator, involving railway companies and others. There is an evident advantage in cooperating on terminal safety across the countries.
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It would make sense to establish common standards of operations, because intermodal terminals are always an interface between different organizations and companies, from the haulier to the terminal operator, involving railway companies and others. There is an evident advantage in cooperating on terminal safety across the countries.
would make sense to establish common standards of operations, because intermodal terminals are always an interface between different organisations and companies, from the haulier to the terminal operator, involving railway companies and others. The more companies involved, the higher the risk of misunderstanding and lack of information.”

According to the majority of participants, it is the right moment to move forward on the issue of terminal safety - and ECTA offers the best structure and organisation to do so.

“But we need to be careful and chose the right approach!” Capacities of terminals nowadays are constrained: “Some operators might prefer not to handle those products at all, in order to avoid dealing with safety education or other issues they might consider as unnecessary hassles.” However, a large number of terminal operators are aiming to cultivate a true safety management and this can be leading the way for their industry. There is an evident advantage in cooperating on terminal safety across the countries. Chances are better, if an overall European approach is chosen. “Chemicals including packed chemicals have a share of 30 % of today’s intermodal land transport. So let’s not forget that our request to the terminal operators to cooperate on safety standards does really make good sense!” Mr Bertschi said.

Action to take
Safety concerns are a very specific technical issue, especially with regard to handling dangerous products. General transport associations such as IRU, UIRR as well as the European Intermodal Association could be involved, but ECTA is considered the right group to push forward on this issue. “We will have much more leverage as ECTA than individually”, Koert Van Wissen insisted.

Would it be sufficient to extend the existing 14 questions within SQAS? “Probably not,” Mr Bertschi reported, “as we realised that the current SQAS only covers transport services - for each and every transport mode, but not the specific safety management input required for intermodal terminals.” It therefore would make more sense to create a questionnaire focused on intermodal terminals like the one established by Shell and Den Hartog, as it covers more than one single transport mode or service.

“Our proposal would be to set up a working group composed by ECTA, the chemical industry and some intermodal operators, because they are usually the customer of the terminals,” Mr Bertschi reported. “Terminal operators should ideally own their data and the processing”, Mr Bertschi said, “Safety management should be part of the main features of managing their terminal.” “We should start with minimal requirements for terminals and for drivers,” Mr Van Wissen suggested. The process should indeed involve discussions with railway companies, intermodal companies and the chemical industry. “But if this would eventually delay our action, then we should actually start from our side”, he concluded.
ECTA started working on a voluntary mutual Emergency Response (ER) scheme for the chemical transport industry five years ago. A dedicated working group came up with concrete proposals on a mutual assistance scheme destined for ECTA members, but no operational scheme has yet been agreed upon. Jos Verlinden urges the transport industry to commit to what he considers a Responsible Care approach by voluntarily establishing an ER operational scheme.

Jos Verlinden started his exposé by providing some basic information on different elements of the actual ICE ER scheme set up fifteen years ago by the chemical industry.

The information flow in case of transport emergencies is divided onto four levels:
1. Onboard: Labels, placards, and tremcards (which will disappear as a legal obligation in January 2009)
2. Recommendations on first actions to be taken by fire brigades on the scene (e.g. Cefic ERICards)
3. Data-bases and reference books at the fire brigade HQ
4. Product advice and assistance made available by the chemical industry through the ICE scheme.

The main objective of ER for chemical companies is clearly defined: Minimise the adverse consequences of their transports in case of accidents involving chemicals by setting up company emergency response schemes whereby use can be made of in-house resources, of mutual assistance amongst companies (ICE) and/or of contractual arrangements with third parties (specialised intervention companies or transport companies).

The legal basis for ER is laid down in the ADR directive, obliging the shippers’ safety adviser to “implement proper emergency procedures in the event of any accident or incident that may affect safety during the transport, loading or unloading of dangerous goods” (ADR 1.8.3.3, Annex I of Directive 96/35/EC).

The Cefic ICE Emergency Cooperation

Cefic developed the ICE ER scheme about 15 years ago, “as one of the spin-offs of the Exxon-Valdez accident”, Jos Verlinden recalled. ICE is a co-operative programme of the chemical industry to provide information, practical advice and, if necessary and possible, intervention equipment to the competent Emergency Authorities in case of an accident.

Three levels of support can be requested:
Level 1: Remote product information and general advice by telephone/fax/email
Level 2: Advice from an expert at the scene of the incident
Level 3: Full assistance with personnel/equipment at the scene of an incident

Principles of the ICE ER scheme

Jos Verlinden insisted on the fact that the owner of the product and the transport company involved in an accident are the first ones to deal with the incident. In most cases, they will be able to cope with the accident themselves. But in case of international transport, it might be difficult for the emergency services to get in contact with the responsible chemical or transport companies. For this reason ICE was developed as a back-up system to help the ER response services to get in contact with the right company and to obtain the information they need.

The basic elements of the ICE ER scheme are
• a list of products indicating which chemical companies can provide information or intervene for which type of products
• a list of chemical companies with location details and the level of response they can provide
• a map indicating the nearest chemical company that could help best.
This information is managed on a country by country basis. Recently, all the national data have been collected in one single data-base, co-ordinated (but not owned) by Cefic. “17 countries are covered by the ICE scheme at this moment,” Mr Verlinden explained, “but we have still some work to do in the East. Even in the West, a few countries are missing, but we are constantly working on this. Every year, one or two new countries are joining the scheme.”

He presented the list of 17 countries with the names of the national schemes and the location of the different national centres, some being located on chemical sites.

Cefic also keeps statistics on the number of interventions in different countries. In 2005, for instance, more than 2000 incidents were handled through these 17 national schemes. For most countries, the number does not exceed 50 interventions per year, only Holland the UK and especially Germany registered significantly more requests. But in Germany, everybody knows the system and calls on it for information - even in case of minor domestic worries.

Online ICE ER information
The international list of products and list of companies is now available on a dedicated website. This website contains product information and information on chemical companies who can provide assistance in transport emergencies as well as the contact details of National Centres and schemes. It also holds general information related to ICE, such as test results, the number of interventions, meeting reports. All this can be found on this dedicated internet site managed by Cefic. The site is pass-word protected and the data are owned by the national scheme administrators, not by Cefic, as Verlinden insisted. It’s the national scheme administration that decides whom to give access rights to their local data.

Benefits of the system are evident:
• On-line access to up-to-date information on support
• Minimisation of administrative efforts
• Transparency
Different levels of access are foreseen, depending whether it's general public, national scheme co-ordinators or national scheme contacts searching the site. The user can select the language in which he wishes to see the data, which is very important for local emergency crews.

ECTA ER Recommendations and Action Plan

After ECTA's October 2001 Berlin meeting and presentations on ER schemes by Colin Humphrey from U.T.T. and Jos Verlinden, an ECTA Emergency Response Working group was set up to review coordination in ER. The working group report and recommendations were finally presented by Colin Humphrey, chairman of the ECTA working group, in March 2004 as the “ECTA Mutual Assistance Scheme”.

“I still think that this report holds many useful proposals that should be picked up again when setting up an action plan in the near future.” Especially one point seems crucial to Mr Verlinden: “that the transport company involved in the incident needs to be involved in requesting assistance. From my experience, this is a very important element, because questions on liability, insurance coverage, costs always arise and these issues need to be well covered.” The best way to do so? “The requesting party should always put in writing that they ask for assistance from the other company.” In ECTA’s proposal from 2004, there is a clear definition of what needs to be included in such a request in order to avoid discussions afterwards.

“Unfortunately, we are behind the timetable and not much happened since March 2004,” Mr Verlinden regrets. In November 2006, an ICE ER workshop was organised by Cefic where transport companies participated as well. One of the basic outcomes of these workshops was “that the chemical companies underline that it is important that there is a link with the transport industry.”

“My proposal is to reconsider the 2004 action plan and to put something in place, very soon. ER is an important part of Responsible Care and I really think that it is urgent to put an operational scheme in place” Jos Verlinden summoned the auditory.
In order to investigate the motivations and attitudes of transport companies on the topic of emergency response (ER), ECTA and ITMMA (Institute of Transport and Maritime Management of the University of Antwerp) set up a study in cooperation with a Euro-wide group of tank transport companies called “Tank Combination Europe” (TankCeu). The main objective of the study was to identify the impediments and clarify the benefits to cooperation on ER between transport companies. According to Paul Wauters, benefits of cooperating on ER largely outweigh the inconveniences.

Paul Wauters introduced the study by giving his definition of Emergency Response (ER) as an “organization set up by the transport company in order to give to the authorities and/or the chemical industry the relevant expertise to minimize any adverse effects in case of accidents or incidents with chemicals.” Three levels of intervention are commonly defined, as Jos Verlinden already explained earlier (see p. 9).

“I want to insist that the relevant expertise we can provide is on transport issues only,” Mr Wauters said, “such as tank layout, equipment etc. As transport companies, we are not able to give relevant information on the transported chemicals. This is the sole and only responsibility of the chemical industry.”

**Tank Combination Europe (TankCeu)**

The companies participating in the study are all members of Tank Combination Europe (www.TankCeu.com). TankCeu is a European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG) founded in 1990 by small and middle-sized chemical transport companies. Today, its chemical division has 14 members and the food division holds 9 member companies.

The main objectives of TankCeu are on an economic level, Mr Wauters explained. TankCeu’s core business consists in maximizing the carrying capacity of the fleet and in minimizing empty legs. Furthermore, member companies purchase common transport services. “The second reason is the organization of the TankCeu Service Net (TSN) - which is precisely the subject of the present case study,” he continued.

**The TankCeu Service Net (TSN)**

Through their TankCeu membership, companies commit themselves to assist and help other members. Each TankCeu member is required to give his colleague of any other TankCeu member company the same assistance and help as applied to his own vehicles. Assistance is provided non-stop 24hours/7days and for each member company, a geographical
cally defined service area is assigned. Today, TSN covers all of Europe.

How does TSN work?
TankCeu members provide support to each other in case of logistic and daily problems such as assistance to a driver who is ill or has to pay a fine, technical problems etc. “But the most important,” explained Paul Wauters, “is mutual mandatory support in case of an accident with damage or bearing the risk of damage by cargo to people, goods and/or the environment.” Membership holds the clear obligation to provide ER services to any other TankCeu member.

Two TSN-coordinators are named per company. They also can represent and interfere on behalf of other TSN partners towards the national local authorities of their headquarters, if necessary. TankCeu members provide expertise on the three ER levels, and make trucks, tanktrailers or tankcontainers, pumps, compressors, hoses etc. available, handled by experienced personnel.
Participating to the TankCeu group involves the obligation to offer all the above support when called upon by another member.

Background of the survey
“In context of ICE, Cefic invited and invites the chemical transport industry to participate in a ER scheme. Many time-consuming discussions about opportunities and, more specifically, impediments have taken place since,” he recalled. Therefore, ECTA decided to start a survey in order to map the transport industry’s view on ER. The study started with TankCeu members thanks to the cooperation of the TankCeu secretariat in Rotterdam, and will further on include other ECTA members. The pilot survey was organized with the full academic support of the University of Antwerp who evaluated 11 fully completed surveys sent in by TankCeu member companies. “Although this is only a small sample, it offers a statistical basis for strong conclusions,” Mr Wauters believes.

Survey details on ER cooperation 2003-2006
Providing ER

The transport companies taking part in the survey had performed 24 emergency response interventions in the period 2003-2006.
82 % of the sample companies provided ER during these three years. The request came from TankCeu member companies in 43 % of the emergency cases, 21 % came from other LSPs, 14 % from authorities and 5 % from chemical companies.

What are the benefits of providing ER services for TankCeu members?

About 75 % of the survey participants consider cooperating within the TSN as an opportunity that contributes to their company’s positive image. As a matter of fact, for 90 % of the interviewees the existence of the ER scheme within TankCeu is an important benefit in their relation with customers. While generating income doesn’t seem as relevant, Paul Wauters underlines that between TankCeu members there is full confidence that encurred expenses and costs will be covered.
What are the impediments of providing ER services for TankCeu members?

Only for 30% of the surveyed TankCeu members, management of waste disposal after the ER seems to be a problem, for 70% it’s not. Insurance and liability issues are an important impediment for only 10%. Finances and administration is not considered an impediment at all, but ensuring a 24 h contact and finding skilled intervention personnel is an impediment for 10%.

Receiving ER

Only 73% of the 11 TankCeu members received ER in the past three years. 40% received ER from our own companies, 21% from authorities, 9% from other LSPs and 2% from chemical plants.

Current organization of ER

35% are in-house ER, 41% organized ER in cooperation with other LSPs and in 24% of the cases, companies outsourced ER to specialized third-parties.

Benefits of cooperation on ER

For TankCeu members, cooperation in ER had the following benefits:
An advance agreement on disposal of waste is considered a benefit for only 25%, whereas specialization in certain hazardous goods seems a high-ranked benefit (75%). All companies agree that ER cooperation is appreciated by their customers. Better geographical coverage and the exchange of experience are benefits for 90-95% of the interviewees.
Impediments for cooperation on ER

Unpleasant financial surprises are still considered an impediment for 25% of the interviewees, even within the TankCeu members who all know each other very well. 10% find it hard to work with companies who are not trusted. Making an agreement that covers all details is a problem for 23%. But eventual loss of a customer to an ER provider does not seem relevant. Only 5% think that it is hard to find suitable partners for ER and consider this an impediment.

Conclusions
Before presenting his conclusions, Paul Wauters insisted once more that ER is management by exception: “Priority is prevention!”

From the survey and his own experience, he concluded that the benefits of ER cooperation largely outweigh the impediments. “Our customers are the main drivers for offering ER and cooperating on ER,” he stated. But even within the transport industry it became obvious to him, that “there is a firm belief that ER contributes to a positive image for the company and the industry as a whole.” Last but not least, by providing a better geographical ER coverage, ER cooperation and commitment is also highly appreciated by local authorities: “They can rely on transport expertise of cooperating companies in case of accidents, even outside the home country of the involved LSP.”
The participants were invited to discuss on how to solve the following impediments to cooperation in an emergency response scheme:

1. Recovery and waste management
2. Financial commitment
3. Commitment on efforts and means vs. commitment on results

Discussions in both break-out groups clarified that a majority of participants supports the idea of developing an ER scheme within the transport industry. But conditions and responsibilities need to be very clearly defined beforehand. According to Andreas Zink, Vice-President of ECTA, the question of liability is the most important issue to be addressed in order to tackle the three impediments: “Very often, companies are not familiar or lack experience with a certain type of product or a certain type of equipment they do not use themselves.” In these cases, the only support companies can really commit to would be communication support.

Data on available expertise

“Before starting such an ER scheme Europe-wide within the transport industry, we need to develop a questionnaire and send it out to all the potential participants in order to determine their individual skills and capabilities of intervention,” Andreas Zink reported from the group he chaired. “E.g., are they able to help with leakage of tankcontainers etc...?” A thorough and complete data collection needs to be organised and set up, comparable to the ICE scheme as presented by Jos Verlinden. Next to a list of products should appear a list of companies who have the necessary expertise and who are able to deal with these products.

Ownership of product

Kees de Rijkje reported on definition problems when discussing possible ER cooperation within the second group. “We discussed questions like: When does a product become waste? How can we handle recovery of certain products?” When addressing the heart of the problem – liability and responsibility – the question of ownership arose: “We need to know who is the owner of the product, since the owner remains the responsible entity. Is it a well known chemical company, or an unfamiliar foreign exporter?” This also brought up the question of how to ensure the responsible company actually takes its full responsibility – as they should be the ones to formally require ER assistance, best in writing. Helping companies need a guarantee that an ER commitment does not translate into situations where “they just do something, probably never get paid for it and end up not knowing what to do with the waste.”

Instruction first

“If we consider a voluntary emergency response scheme between ECTA members, we need to act on instruction and develop communication schemes,” Mr De Rijkje suggested from his group’s discussion. Assistance could be given theoretically or practically, under close cooperation with the fire brigades or any other competent third party. Instruction comes first, responsible action next.

Possible commitments

Financial commitment is crucial. “We heard and talked a lot about the example of TankCeu Service Net”, De Rijkje reported. “Should we set up a Network of this kind? Would the ICE centre which is also involved in the emergency situation take responsibility of financial and other related items as representative of the chemical industry?” This needs to be looked at in detail. Participants made it clear that they can only subscribe to a commitment of efforts and means, with no guarantee on results. To be able to commit to means and efforts within ECTA, all members would need to respond to a questionnaire on available services, equipment and personnel.

Cooperation in ER

De Rijkje and Zink concluded on the first steps to be taken by ECTA: “Before we can answer positively to an ER scheme proposal as members of ECTA, we need to clearly identify the conditions and possibilities of intervention by our members. It is obvious, that not every member has the same capabilities. Therefore we need to organise ourselves.” The elaboration of such ER scheme will be supervised by the ECTA Board of Directors. All members are welcome to provide their voluntary inputs!
The ECTA round table dinners are a discussion forum on topics of importance to the sector and a great opportunity to meet and mingle. This year again, a select group of chemical transport company owners and managers enjoyed the speech delivered by Michael Kubenz, ECTA Board members, on “Driver shortage”.
“We urgently need to discuss how to attract newcomers to the profession, how to improve their working conditions and how to upgrade the overall image of drivers in the general public’s perception.”

Michael Kubenz on “Driver Shortage”
Undoubtedly one of the hottest issues at the moment was discussed at dinner, after the Munich conference day. Michael Kubenz, head of the German Association of Freight Forwarders and Logistics Operators and member of the ECTA Board, gave a concise overview on causes and possible remedies on the lack of drivers in Germany and Europe.

“Do not expect me to come up with any miracle solutions,” Michael Kubenz warned his peers before addressing the lack of drivers in the transport industry. “But take one thing for granted: the problem seriously needs to be addressed.” In Germany, he reported, road hauliers and transport contractors are desperately looking for qualified HGV drivers, despite a continuous high unemployment rate among truck drivers. He named multiple reasons for the difficult situation. For one, the general economic upturn coincides with an increased demand for transport services from the new EU member states. Besides, the new EU legislation on working hours has increased the demand for driving personnel since autumn 2006, and was topped by the new driving & resting times since April 11, 2007. “This means for us that e.g. loading and unloading times urgently need to be discussed with the chemical industry!” Kubenz added.

New EU requirements on qualifications of HGV drivers coming into force in September 2009 will furthermore add pressure on the job. Last but not least the lack of new recruits (formerly trained by the German Army) has a negative influence on the overall age structure of German drivers. The average age of today’s drivers is beyond 40 years; only 18.4 % are underneath the age of 35 and a small 2.5 % of them are 25 years old or younger.

Figures provided by the German job centres (Bundesagentur für Arbeit) show that young people do not consider drivers’ jobs very attractive anymore. One reason could be the overall decline of the job’s image in the public opinion, Kubenz suggested, the other being wages around 2 500 €, when drivers in Belgium and the Netherlands are paid around 3 500 €.

According to Kubenz the lack of drivers reached already 7 % in Germany, more than 50,000 jobs being vacant in the next few years. “Occasionally, goods had to be left behind or trucks could not leave a depot for lack of drivers, and the available drivers are stretched to their limits. Companies even postpone the purchase of vehicles because they cannot find anyone to drive them.” On the other hand, more than 30,000 of the 110,000 drivers registered as unemployed are professionally qualified drivers who followed specific training programs and courses. About 50,000 of them have no professional qualification. At the same time, their motivation to stay away from home for long periods has diminished. Many of the older drivers also lack the new technological, language and social skills. With the new requirements on additional qualifications besides pure driving entering into force in 2009, the shortage will furthermore increase. Finding suitable personnel is therefore not per se a question of quantity, but of quality. Drivers have to face high demands: “As a representative of the company he is responsible for a high-value vehicle and chemicals – mostly dangerous goods.”

With regard to the critical labour situation, not only in Germany, but all over Europe, the German Association of Freight Forwarders and Logistics Operators (Deutscher Speditions- und Logistikverband, DSLV) is strongly in favour of legally employing personnel from the new member states, even within a restraining quota-system. Unfortunately, the German government actually withholds employment of citizens from 10 of the 12 new member states, until 2011.

As a response, many companies started to run internal and external training schemes. DSLV also has intensified the dialogue with job centres and runs a joint pilot project in the Cologne area. Drivers are professionally trained for 4-6 months and offered permanent jobs after having successfully completed the course.

Michael Kubenz conclusions were an invitation to resolve the problem of driver shortage across national and company borders: “We urgently need to discuss how to attract newcomers to the profession, how to improve their working conditions and how to upgrade the overall image of drivers in the general publics perception.”
ECTA Membership:
• Contributes to the recognition of the chemical transport industry and its business needs.
• Gives access to first hand information on what is happening and evolving in the transport and logistics of chemical goods in Europe.
• Allows participating in the pro-active development and application of “Best Practices” in the transport and logistics of chemical goods in Europe.
• Creates a unique networking opportunity in the sector.

For more information, please contact the ECTA offices by using the contact form at our website www.ecta.be or tel. +32 2 741 86 81

ECTA a.i.s.b.l.
Tervurenlaan 270 • B-1150 Brussels • Belgium
Tel. +32 2 741 86 81 • Fax +32 2 741 86 82
www.ecta.be • ecta@epca.be

“ECTA is signatory association to the EU Road Safety Charter”