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Foreword



This is the fourth annual report by the Agency on the development of railway safety in the European Union. According to the reported data, the year 2009 was the safest year on the EU's railways for both passengers and rail staff since 2006.

However, the shadows of two major accidents remain in the minds of people in Europe: the fire caused by the derailment of the freight train in Viareggio (Italy) in June 2009 and the head-on collision of two passenger trains in Buizingen (Belgium) in February 2010. Common to both, we still do not know the real causes of these two accidents, almost two years after Viareggio and more than a year after Buizingen. As the national investigation bodies, which are required by the railway safety directive to carry out independent investigations, have not yet published their final reports, the implementation of comprehensive improvement measures is in jeopardy. The reasons for this may be different in the two countries, but both cases indicate that in practice the safety regulatory framework, as set out in the railway safety directive, is not working well.

After the Buizingen accident the Agency carried out an assessment of the activities of the national safety authority (NSA) and the national investigation body (NIB) at the request of the Belgian Special Parliamentary Commission. The Agency is now seeking to build a framework for assessing both NSAs and NIBs, ultimately leading to the improvement of the organisational process and working practices that are crucial for assuring the high level of safety of European railways.

In addition to the accidents mentioned above and despite a positive trend in most safety indicators, there are some areas of railway safety which do not show improvements in the short term. Among them, fatalities of unauthorised persons and persons on level crossings may require additional attention by all relevant authorities.

The Agency has been working with national authorities to improve the quality of reporting on common safety indicators (CSIs). For the last time, the authorities could report CSI data to the Agency using their national definitions. This practice makes it impossible for the Agency to draw major conclusions from the data that have been available since 2006. The four-year time series is proof of the improvement in data quality achieved in cooperation with the Agency, and provides an indication of the positive development of railway safety in Europe.

In 2011, the second set of common safety targets (CSTs) will be proposed by the Agency, providing a new yardstick for the achievement of stringent safety objectives on European railways. New targets may be challenging given the continual changes on European railways; however, the Agency will be there to support Member States in meeting their safety goals.

Monitoring and analysing the safety of EU railways is a fundamental task for the Agency, providing feedback on the effectiveness of safety regulations in rail transport. Only by permanently evaluating management processes and safety outcomes, is it possible to maintain a high level of safety on European railways. Economic difficulties, which the EU has experienced in the last years, together with the continuous opening of the EU railway market bring additional pressure to bear on the assurance of safety in railway operations. The railway safety directive has brought to each Member State an institutional and regulatory framework which, if properly applied, will prevent safety from being jeopardised in turbulent times like these. Yet, many Member States are still not making use of the practical benefits of these frameworks, but see them only as formal requirements. The correct implementation of the existing regulatory frameworks is equally as important as their correct transposition. The Agency, as a guardian of railway safety in the EU , will therefore continue its work together with the NSAs and NIBs in this area.

Anders Lundström
Head of Safety Unit

## Summary

Railways remain one of the safest modes of transport in the European Union (EU). Yet, some 1400 people still die on EU railways each year; most of the fatalities are unauthorised persons and level-crossing users. Trends derived from the common safety indicators (CSIs) indicate an overall improvement in railway safety since 2006. Both the number of people killed and the number of seriously injured persons fell in 2009.

According to the CSI data provided by the national safety authorities (NSAs) to the Agency, 1391 people were killed and 1114 people were seriously injured in 3073 railway accidents in 2009. These figures are by far the lowest among figures recorded since 2006.

The national investigation bodies (NIBs) notified the Agency of 197 opened investigations of accidents and incidents that occurred during 2010. The Agency also received 210 investigation reports during 2009 covering accidents dating from 2006 and onwards.

The review of the NSA annual reports for 2009 shows that the number of safety certificates issued by NSAs to railway undertakings (RUs) has slightly increased. However, from the current status in the Agency's database, it appears that there are still a number of countries which have not yet issued any safety certificates, while in some other Member States a combination of new and old legislation is still being used. This is alarming, since from 1 January 2011 all RUs are required to have a safety certificate issued according to the railway safety directive ( ${ }^{1}$ ).

## Safety of railway users

Passenger and employee fatalities make up $5 \%$ of all persons killed on European railways, suicides excluded. Single fatality accidents, such as unauthorised persons on railway premises being hit by rolling stock in motion or level-crossing accidents, form the major part of the fatalities. Collisions of trains, derailments and fires cause less than $3 \%$ of the fatalities.

Figure 1: Number of fatalities for different categories of railway user (2007-2009)


[^0]The total number of passengers killed for the period from 2007 to 2009 is 196, a small figure compared with the total number of 4390 persons killed on the railways. Some passenger fatalities occurred when passengers tried to embark or disembark from moving trains. The fluctuations in the number of reported fatalities of level-crossing users and unauthorised persons can be explained by changes in how the Member States classify these victims. Taken together, the reported numbers are stable during the period mentioned.

## Level-crossing accidents

The number of level-crossing accidents constitutes a substantial share of the total number of accidents. Member States reported 1284 level-crossing users killed in a total of 3063 level-crossing accidents during the three years 2007-2009.

There are about 124000 level crossings in the EU, so that on average there are 4 level crossings in each 10 km section of track. Only $41 \%$ are equipped with either manual or automatic protection systems. The costs associated with upgrading level crossings are substantial, so that it will take some time for these figures to show significant improvement, unless more priority is given to reducing this risk.

## Suicides on railway premises

The majority of fatalities on the EU railways are suicides. Over 2700 suicides were recorded in 2009; more than seven per day on average. The consequences are not only trauma for all parties involved, but also significant costs because of delays, rescue services, police investigations, etc. There are now innovative countermeasures available. Fencing in urban and other strategic places is proving effective.

## Unauthorised persons

The majority of the 852 unauthorised persons killed in 2009 were trespassers. These persons fail to realise the risk they are taking and the likelihood of fatal injury. Over $60 \%$ of fatalities and $40 \%$ of serious injuries happened to persons crossing or walking along tracks in unauthorised places; these numbers have not decreased over time. It can be difficult for the relevant authorities to determine whether the victim was a suicide or not; therefore these data need to be interpreted with caution.

## Other accident victims

The Agency has noticed an increase in the number of accident victims classified as others in 2009. We consider that this is partly the result of improved reporting as well as an improved understanding of the complexity of accidents.


# Reporting on serious and significant accidents 

European legislation requires Member States to report to the Agency on serious accidents and significant accidents occurring on their territory. The national investigation body (NIB) must investigate all serious accidents, notify the Agency of these investigations and, when closed, send the investigation report to the Agency. The national safety authority (NSA) must report all significant accidents as one of the CSIs.

The legislation provides the following definitions for these two groups of accident; significant accident covers a wider range of events than serious accidents (Table 1).

Over the past three years, NIBs notified the Agency about 187 serious accidents, other accidents and incidents per year on average, while the NSAs reported on average 3573 significant accidents per year (Table 2). Only $18 \%$ of investigated occurrences were serious accidents as referred to in Article 19(1). Thus only one serious accident is investigated by a NIB out of 36 significant accidents reported by NSAs under the CSIs.

Some NIBs also investigate accidents and incidents other than those for which investigation is mandatory according to the railway safety directive.

Table 1: Accidents reported to the Agency according to EU legislation

| Serious accident | Significant accident |
| :---: | :---: |
| Directive 2004/49/EC | Regulation (EC) No 91/2003 and Directive 2009/149/EC |
| 'Serious accident' means any train collision or derailment of trains, resulting in the death of at least one person or serious injuries to five or more persons or extensive damage to rolling stock, the infrastructure or the environment, and any other similar accident with an obvious impact on railway safety regulation or the management of safety; 'extensive damage' means damage that can immediately be assessed by the investigating body to cost at least EUR 2 million in total. | 'Significant accident' means any accident involving at least one rail vehicle in motion, resulting in at least one killed or seriously injured person, or in significant damage to stock, track, other installations or environment, or extensive disruptions to traffic. Accidents in workshops, warehouses and depots are excluded. <br> Significant damage is damage that is equivalent to EUR 150000 or more. |
| Accident investigation by NIBs | Reporting of CSIs by NSAs |
| Within one week after the decision to open an investigation the investigating body shall inform the Agency thereof. The investigating body shall send the Agency a copy of the final report ... normally not later than 12 months after the date of the occurrence $\left(^{2}\right)$. | Each year the safety authority shall publish an annual report concerning its activities in the preceding year and send it to the Agency by 30 September at the latest. The report shall contain information on: <br> the development of railway safety, including an aggregation at Member State level of the CSIs laid down in Annex I (3). |

Table 2: Yearly average number of events reported to the Agency (2007-2009)

| National investigation bodies (NIBs) | National safety authorities (NSAs) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 187 notifications of opened investigations | 3573 accidents and 16139 precursors |

[^1]
# Reporting by safety authorities 

## Reporting of accident statistics and indicators

The fourth set of common safety indicators (CSIs) was largely reported on time and with less need for correction than in previous years. The CSIs to be reported to the Agency are laid down and defined in Annex 1 of the railway safety directive. Member States are also required to report accident data to Eurostat. The revised Annex 1 of the railway safety directive was published on 27 November $2009\left({ }^{(4)}\right.$ and provides, for the first time, a set of safety indicators to be reported according to common definitions and calculation methods. The first reporting period has been specified as 2010; these CSI definitions will be applied when the NSAs report the 2010 CSI data to the Agency in 2011.

The work on improving data quality has continued in 2010 using a similar approach as developed in previous years and applied to the data reported for 2009. All the indicators have been checked for consistency and fluctuation, and a comparison with the Eurostat data has been carried out. For the first time a statistical test was applied to the data to determine whether the variations in the figures for 2006-2009 exceeded natural variation or not.

Data quality continues to improve; this year it has been possible to update some data reported in previous years; the CSI tables in the annex to this report replace the tables published in previous reports.

At the same time, the Agency has seen that the collection of CSI data has become more complicated in those countries where there are a large number of railway undertakings (RUs) and infrastructure managers (IMs). The NSAs in these countries may have limited control over the quality of data provided by the RUs and IMs.

## Reporting by investigation bodies

## Reporting of serious accidents and accident investigations

Independent accident investigation is a key element of learning lessons from accidents and incidents. Although all Member States established an investigation body, the Agency still has concerns as to whether the organisation and the procedures of the NIBs in some Member States comply with the requirements of the railway safety directive.

The directive requires the Member States to set up an independent accident investigation body that shall notify the Agency of any investigations opened, and to submit the full investigation report to the Agency when the investigation is closed. In 2010, the NIBs notified the Agency of 197 investigations opened and submitted 210 final investigation reports. The information is publicly available on the Agency's ERADIS database.

[^2]

## Safety performance

## Railway accidents

More than 3000 accidents are reported each year by the NSAs of EU Member States. Accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion and level-crossing accidents constitute around $75 \%$ of the total number of accidents on the railways, suicides excluded. Figure 2 shows the number of significant accidents per accident type in the period from 2007 to 2009. For all accident types, the number of accidents in 2009 was lower than reported in the two preceding years. A clear downward trend over the period 2007-2009 can be observed for derailments of trains, level-crossing accidents and fires in rolling stock. The numbers of accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion and other accidents have been more stable over time. The reason for this could be that these types of accidents are less easy to prevent.

In 2009, 142 collisions of trains were reported, representing a significant drop in this type of accident in comparison with the two preceding years. Similarly the number of train derailments dropped significantly in 2009, to 177 reported events. The main reason is that in several countries shunting movements were previously reported under this category. Nevertheless, on average a derailment is reported every second day in the EU, causing significant traffic disruptions.

Over the past four years, there has been a sound reduction in the number of rail accidents in Europe, which could most likely be attributed to the systematic work of railway authorities, RUs and IMs in the field of safety. Even taking into account the $3 \%$ drop in train-km as a result of the economic crisis hitting the EU in late 2008, the improvements in safety over the past years remain clearly visible. But vigilance is necessary, as an economic recession together with the market opening may have jeopardised safety investments.

Figure 2: Reported number of significant accidents per accident category (2007-2009)


## Fatalities and serious injuries

In parallel with the fall in railway accidents, the total number of fatalities, excluding suicides, has been decreasing steadily in recent years. There were slightly less than 1400 fatalities in 2009. However, the seriousness of accidents seems to have worsened, since on average there were 45 fatalities per 100 accidents in 2009, compared with 40 fatalities per 100 accidents registered in the two previous years. It is not possible to say whether this is a trend or if it is a result of natural variation. A significant drop in casualties (fatalities and injuries together) has been registered in 2009. While the number of accidents decreased by $18 \%$, the number of fatalities fell by $6 \%$ and the number of seriously injured persons dropped by $20 \%$. It has not been possible to establish why fatalities decreased to a lesser extent than serious accidents and serious injuries.

In Figure 3, showing the reported number of fatalities per victim type and year, there are big fluctuations in the reported numbers of fatalities among level-crossing users and unauthorised persons. However, by adding together the number of level-crossing fatalities and the fatalities of unauthorised persons, year by year, we obtain a series of 1361, 1309 and 1252 , which is a stable series of data. This may indicate that Member States are still in a learning process for classifying fatalities, and it is probable that this also applies for other indicators.

The total number of employee fatalities decreased from 38 in the three preceding years to 29 in 2009 . The number of passenger fatalities dropped to 37 . So, for the first time, the number of employee fatalities was below 30 , and the number of passenger fatalities was less than 40 in one year. Although 400 level-crossing users died in level-crossing accidents in 2009 ( $29 \%$ of all railway accident fatalities), this represented only $1.2 \%$ of all road user fatalities. Level-crossing safety might therefore be perceived as a marginal problem by the road sector, while it is a key problem for the railway - also because of its impact on railway operation.

Figure 3: Reported number of fatalities per victim category (2007-2009)


The majority of the reported fatalities are unauthorised persons and level-crossing users. This is shown in Figure 4, which also reveals that the most common accident is that of an unauthorised person hit by rolling stock in motion. Passenger fatalities account for less than $5 \%$ of the total number of deaths on railways. Some $2 \%$ of all fatalities on railways are employees.

Figure 4. Fatalities per victim type (2007-2009)


In addition to persons killed on railways, a large number of persons are seriously injured each year. In 2009, 1114 persons were seriously injured, a $20 \%$ drop in comparison with the two previous years (Figure 5). This drop is mainly driven by significant decreases in injury to employees and level-crossing users. The reported number of other persons seriously injured increased substantially in 2009, reflecting one single accident at Viareggio that led to 32 fatalities and 27 serious injuries among the population living in the vicinity of the crash site.

Figure 5: Reported number of serious injuries per victim category (2007-2009)


Similarly, as in previous years, a number of NSAs have reported changes in their reporting procedures or the definitions applied in the data collection. These are reflected in several figures such as Figure 5. For serious injuries, the reported numbers of injured passengers and unauthorised persons for the period from 2007 to 2009 show large variations beyond what might be expected from natural fluctuation.

Over the period 2007-2009 there were four seriously injured passengers per one killed passenger while the numbers of all seriously and fatally injured persons were on equal level. At the same time, there were two fatally injured unauthorised persons per one seriously injured person in the same category of victims. This reflects the vulnerability of persons when hit by a train, on the one hand, and the difference in the chance of survival for passengers and trespassers on the other hand.

The slight decrease in the number of victims in recent years, rail passengers in particular, is promising. The corresponding risk level for passengers in terms of victims per passenger-km has been decreasing at the same pace, as the volume of passengers has not changed over time.

## Suicides

Suicides are reported separately from accident fatalities. Suicides represent $66 \%$ of all fatalities and, together with the unauthorised person fatalities, constitute $72 \%$ of all fatalities occurring within the railway system. No trend can be derived from the available data, but as it appears, the number of suicides registered in 2009 is the highest value reported to the Agency (Figure 6).

The Member States use different methods for establishing whether a fatality is a suicide or not. The revised Annex 1 and its guidance will lead to a more harmonised approach to classifying suicides.

Figure 6. Suicides and other fatalities (2007-2009)


## Precursors to accidents

Given the fact that accidents on railways are rare, the monitoring of less serious events occurring on railways is an essential tool in a proactive safety management system (SMS). 'Precursors to accidents' are indicators measuring incidents that under other circumstances could have led to an accident. There are indicators for broken rails, track buckles, signals passed at danger, wrong-side signalling failures, broken wheels and broken axles (Figure 7). Over the period 2007-2009, Member States reported as many as 4.5 precursors per one significant accident. This gives an impression of the learning potential in monitoring them.

The reported number of track buckles shows substantial variations over time and it seems impossible to determine any underlying patterns for groups of countries. As a matter of fact, developments observed at country level vary greatly. Unusual weather conditions give a natural variation in the number of track buckles. The use of data quality control has, however, revealed that the observed variation in some Member States is the result of changes in reporting practice.

The number of broken rails is also sensitive to the weather conditions and may not fully reflect the quality of work done by IMs. The incidence of broken rails decreased substantially in 2009, but this fall most likely reflects drops in the number of broken rails registered in individual countries such as Poland (from 2396 in 2008 to 1506 in 2009) and Hungary (from 716 in 2008 to 10 in 2009). Since 2009, Poland has only reported broken rails causing a disruption to railway traffic.

Figure 7: Accident precursors in all countries and in the subsets of countries (2007-2009) (5)


[^3]The drop in the number of wrong-side signalling failures from 1458 in 2008 to 514 in 2009 is driven by the data for the UK, which contained only 6 events in 2009, compared with 901 events in 2008. The UK decided to apply predefined thresholds for certain precursors to avoid reporting less serious incidents. For example, the UK figures for signals passed at danger only refer to those cases when an infrastructure fault led to a signal displaying an aspect less restrictive than it should. This excludes all cases resulting from wrong-side track circuit, point, level-crossing and other failures.

To conclude, reporting of precursors remains a difficult task for Member States for two major reasons: legal definitions in force leave a relatively large space for interpretation and NSAs have difficulties in obtaining data from relevant stakeholders. When aggregating data only for those countries which have not changed their scope of reporting, a stable series can be seen (Figure 7). Given the learning potential of a regular analysis of precursors, the Agency will also in the future focus attention on the correct reporting of these events.

The survey on national definitions of broken wheels and axles, performed by the Agency in 2009, showed that most NSAs only reported cracks in wheels and axles that led to accidents. Only one country, Germany, included cracks detected during regular maintenance, which is in accordance with the guidance for the revised Annex 1 of the railway safety directive. Germany reported three cracks that led to accidents in 2008, and a total of 752 cracks detected. This means that the figures reported for broken wheels and axles, displayed in Figure 7, only reveal part of the situation. The survey also showed that problems with hot boxes are of more concern than cracks in wheels and axles.


## Accident costs and other CSIs

The data on the cost of accidents show wide variation and it is evident to the Agency that the Member States have problems in establishing reporting regimes for accident cost data. The revised Annex 1 of the railway safety directive will require the NSAs to use the willingness-to-pay approach based on estimates of the 'value of preventing a casualty' (VPC). They can either estimate a national value or use the reference values given in the Agency's guidance. It is believed that this will simplify the work for the Member States and will lead to a consistent and harmonised approach. Using the CSI data for 2007-2009 and fall-back values of costs for fatality and serious injury updated with GDP data, the Agency has made a calculation of accident costs.

Costs for preventing casualties (fatalities and serious injuries) were calculated for the past years as shown in Figure 8. By adding the national values together, we obtain a value of EUR 2 billion representing the economic burden of rail casualties in 2009 for all Member States.

The value of preventing a casualty (VPC) is composed of:
(1) value of safety per se: willingness-to-pay (WTP) values based on stated preference studies carried out in the Member State for which they are applied;
(2) direct and indirect economic costs: cost values appraised in the Member State, composed of medical and rehabilitation cost; legal court cost, cost for police, private crash investigations, the emergency service and administrative costs of insurance; production losses: value to society of goods and services that could have been produced by the person if the accident had not occurred.

Figure 8: Values of preventing casualties in euros (2007-2009)


## Infrastructure

Three CSIs concern railway infrastructure: one is a measure of the coverage of automatic train protection (ATP) systems on the lines; the second is the number of level crossings, normalised by the length of the network expressed in track-km; and the third gives information on the level of protection at level crossings.

Figure 9: Percentage of tracks equipped with automatic train protection (2007-2009) (6)


In 2008 (the data are more complete for this year), $58 \%$ of tracks were fitted with ATP in the EU ${ }^{7}$ ). A relatively high density of protection is typical in countries with extensive track usage such as the Netherlands, Italy and Germany. This can be seen in Figure 9.

In order to overcome the slow process towards interoperability, a new ATP system has been promoted by the European Commission. The European Train Control System (ETCS) is based on cab signalling together with spot and/or continuous track to train data transmission. It ensures trains operate safely at all times by providing a safe movement authority directly to the driver through the on-board driver's display and by continuously monitoring train speed.

## Automatic train protection

## Definition

Automatic train protection (ATP) means a system that enforces obedience to signals and speed restrictions by speed supervision, including automatic stop at signals.

## Guidance

Systems where track signalling information is substituted and/or supplemented by cab signalling are included. The part of the definition relating to 'automatic stop at signals' is intended to include also automatic stops at conflict points between clearance gauges.

[^4]The ETCS together with GSM-R, a GSM mobile communications standard for railway operations, are the two main components of the European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS). The ERTMS has been a success worldwide, but its implementation on EU railways is a lengthy process because of the high cost.

Figure 10: Number of level crossings per track-km (2007-2009)


On average, there are 4 level crossings per 10 track-km in the EU (8); only $31 \%$ are equipped with some form of manual or automatic protection ( 9 . The highest density of level crossings can be found in Scandinavian countries and in some central European countries (Figure 10). The lowest density is seen in east European countries and Spain. The proportion of level crossings equipped with automatic or manual protection varies greatly between countries (Figure 11). Only in four countries (Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway and the Netherlands) are more than three quarters of all level crossings equipped with manual or automatic protection. In six countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Spain, Lithuania, Latvia and the United Kingdom) less than $25 \%$ of level crossings are protected.

[^5]Figure 11: Percentage of level crossings with automatic or manual protection (2007-2009)


## Traffic volumes

There are two measures of rail traffic performance that are available for statistical purposes. The number of passengerkilometres and the number of train-kilometres. While the number of passenger-km at the EU level has remained constant over the past three years, the number of train-km dropped by $3 \%$ in 2009 in comparison with 2008, most likely as a result of the economic crisis.

Four countries with the highest passenger volumes (Germany, France, Italy and the UK) alone account for two thirds of all passenger-km ${ }^{(10)}$. Only Belgium, France, the Netherlands and Portugal managed to sustain growth in rail passenger volume over the past three years. In Figure 13, the total number of train-km - both freight and passenger train-km combined - is shown. This should be kept in mind when comparing values shown in Figures 12 and 13.

[^6]Figure 12: Number of million passenger-km (2007-2009)


Figure 13: Number of million train-km (2007-2009)


# Reporting accidents by the investigation bodies 

National investigation bodies have a legal obligation to report the investigation of serious railway accidents to the Agency. Each accident is reported twice: as a notification of the opening of an investigation and when the final report is sent to the Agency. Both records are available to the public in the Agency's public database of safety documents, ERADIS.

The Agency receives notifications for a majority of the serious accidents, although the notification of their occurrence is not always sent within one week after the decision to investigate. The compliance of Member States with the requirements for the notification and submission of final reports has been improving over time. In 2010, just over one third of notifications to investigate were in fact submitted within one week after the occurrence of the accident; an improvement compared with $18 \%$ in 2008. As the Agency does not yet systematically receive information on the starting date of the investigations, the date of the accident occurrence is used as a reference. It should be noted that the time between the occurrence and the decision to investigate can, in certain cases, be longer than a week.

The average number of days between the accident occurrence and the notification to investigate to the Agency has been decreasing over time: in 2008, it was 82 days, in 2009, 51 days, and in 2010, 37 days. This is a promising trend that will hopefully be sustained.

The final investigation reports should be made public as soon as possible, and normally not later than one year after the date of the occurrence. The average number of months before the final report is submitted to the Agency has also been decreasing over time, from more than 17 months for accidents occurring in 2007, to less than 10 months for accidents occurring in 2009. This significant progress made by NIBs is illustrated in Figure 14.

For some $5 \%$ of notified accidents, the Agency did not receive the final investigation report by the end of 2010. Some Member States report that this is due to a lack of resources. The average number of days between the accident occurrence and the submission of the final report was 325 days for accidents that occurred in 2009. Figure 15 summarises the progress in timely reporting that has been achieved by NIBs.

Figure 14: Average number of months for submission of final report (2007-2009)


Table 3: Average time span between accident notification and the submission of the final investigation report to the Agency (in days) (2008-2010)

| Average number of days between occurrence and ... | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\ldots$ notification | 82 | 51 | 37 |
| $\ldots$ final investigation report | 571 | 428 | 325 |

Accidents and incidents have been reported to the Agency since 2006. Each year the Agency has received notifications of at least 150 occurrences investigated by NIBs. Around $15 \%$ of the final investigation reports reached the Agency by the end of the year in which the accident occurred. An overwhelming majority of final reports are submitted to the Agency in the year following the occurrence of the accident. For example, for occurrences in 2009, 24 were closed and the report submitted to the Agency by the end of 2009. During 2010, the final investigation report was received for 117 out of the 170 occurrences in 2009 (red bars in Figure 15). By the end of 2010, 28 out of 197 investigations opened during the year were closed, i.e. $14 \%$ of investigations; this is similar to previous years.

Figure 15: Overview of reporting of accidents and incidents by NIBs to the Agency


## NIB annual reports

The NIBs are required to send an annual report to the Agency. In the course of 2010, the Agency received 23 annual reports for the year 2009. The reports show large variation in the number of investigations opened by NIBs; during 2009, the numbers ranged from 0 to more than 15 , and the number of recommendations issued following the investigation ranged from 0 to over 20.


Major
EU rail accidents in 2010

There have been more than 100 serious rail accidents on European railways over the past three years. Accidents in which people die do not usually escape the attention of the national media; this acts as a warning to both the authorities and the public about the potential vulnerability of the railway transport system. In the following section we summarise some of the serious rail accidents reported to the Agency by the NIBs that occurred in the EU Member States during 2010. The criteria for inclusion in this section are: seriousness of outcomes, date of occurrence (between 1 January 2010 and 31 December 2010) and relevance to EU regulations. Single accidents are ordered according to the number of casualties.

Only a short summary of the information available is presented. More information about the accidents can be found in the Agency's database of rail accidents, ERADIS (http://pdb.era.europa.eu).

| Event: | Head-on collision between trains |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Date, time and location: | 15 February 2010, 08:28, Buizingen (Belgium) |
| Outcome: | 18 fatalities, 83 serious injuries |

In the morning rush hour of 15 February 2010, two passenger trains collided at Buizingen station, 2 km north of Halle in Belgium. The accident forced one train to plough deep into the front carriage of the other, ripping open and totally destroying another carriage. There were some 300 passengers on the two trains and the accident caused the death of 18 people and a total of 171 injured ( ${ }^{11}$ ).

The devastation at the accident scene was enormous and there was also substantial damage to the overhead power lines, as two of the carriages were forced up into the air by the collision.


Image 1. Train collision at Buizingen station, Belgium Source : Belgian NIB.

[^7]| Event: | Accident to unauthorised persons |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date, time and location: | 23 June 2010, 23:23, Platja de Castelldefels (Spain) |  |
| Outcome: | 12 fatalities, 10 serious injuries |  |

A long-distance passenger train travelling at a speed of $140 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ hit people crossing the tracks at the Platja de Castelldefels station on the outskirts of Barcelona, causing 12 fatalities, 10 serious injuries and 7 slight injuries. The people hit were passengers who had got off the commuter train and were heading for the beach. The commuter train had been delayed by 10 minutes - had it been running on schedule, the accident would most likely not have happened. Many people had been expected to gather on the beach nearby to celebrate St John's Eve (mid-summer), particularly as there was a public holiday the following day.

Police officers were present at the station as a planned measure. The disembarking passengers started to cross


Image 2. Accident to unauthorised persons at Castelldefels station Source: Spanish NIB. the double tracks from behind the end of the train. The investigation has not found any failure relating to the infrastructure, the rolling stock or the train driver's behaviour. The layout of the station had been redesigned in November 2009; two weeks earlier the existing footbridge over the tracks was closed and replaced with an underpass. Presumably, some people had not known that the footbridge had been replaced by the underpass, or had not noticed the exit signs, so they crossed the tracks.

| Event: | Train collision | $\square$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Date, time and location: | 13 July 2010, 09:12, Kępice-Korzybie (Poland) | $\square$ |
| Outcome: | 13 serious injuries, considerable material damage |  |

A head-on collision between a passenger train and a freight train occurred on a single-track non-electrified line between Kępice and Korzybie. According to the initial results of the investigation, the passenger train left Korzybie station without permission, which led to a head-on collision with the freight train approaching the station. As a consequence of the accident, 13 persons were seriously injured, and 2 locomotives and 4 wagons were damaged. The collision took place about 500 m from Korzybie station, so fortunately the speed of both trains was below the speed permitted at the section. After the accident, railway traffic was stopped for 16 hours.

Taking into account the seriousness of the accident and the


Image 3. Collision of trains close to Kępice
Source: Polish NIB. fact that the safety systems were not working correctly on the line, the head of NIB Poland decided to investigate this serious accident using a team of independent investigators. Shortly after the accident, some provisional safety recommendations were issued by NIB Poland concerning the organisation of railway traffic on the line in order to improve safety.
$\square$
Event: Train derailment with consequent collision with obstacle Date, time and location: 28 June 2010, 16:43, Ustí nad Labem (Czech Republic)

Outcome: 1 fatality, 7 serious injuries
Three carriages of passenger train No 2316 derailed on the switch at the approach to Usti nad Labem station and hit a concrete wall. The accident occurred on the main transit line between the Prague and Decin stations.

The train driver did not reduce speed according to the entry signal and passed over the switch at a speed of $117 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ instead of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

The whole electric unit derailed and crashed into a concrete wall. The train driver died in the crash and seven passengers were seriously injured.

The total material damage was CZK 70914339 (over


Image 4. Train collision at Ustí nad Labem station, Czech Republic Source: Czech NIB.

EUR 2.8 million).

Event: Train collision
Date, time and location: 1 April 2010, 11:34, Spišská Nová Ves (Slovakia)
Outcome: $\quad 3$ fatalities, 1 serious injury
A shunting locomotive hit the last, empty wagon of a passenger train ready for departure at Spišská Nová Ves station. Preliminary investigation findings indicate that the shunting locomotive was at this time performing a dynamic braking test and should have been running at a maximum speed of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. At a switch, it unexpectedly changed direction, but surprisingly did not derail, despite running at a much higher speed than permitted.

There were six persons in the cab, possibly obstructing the view of the driver and reducing his ability to react. The cab occupants may also have fallen to the floor as the train passed over the switch, further adding to the reaction time of the driver.


Image 5. Train collision in Spišská Nová Ves station Source: Slovakian NIB.

Event: Train collision with a mechanical digger
Date, time and location: 12 September 2010, Kimstad (Sweden)
Outcome: 1 fatality, 2 serious injuries, major damage to train


A high-speed X2000 train collided with a mechanical digger which was on a track undergoing maintenance works. The collision occurred at a speed of $129 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

The investigation of the accident by the NIB is still under way; the first indications show that the cause of the accident was insufficient planning and risk analysis of the maintenance works involving the use of the digger on the track.


Image 6. Train collision with a mechanical digger in Kimstad station Source: Swedish NIB.

| Event: | Level-crossing accident |
| ---: | :--- |
| Date, time and location: | 15 April 2010, 11:32, Chintulovo (Bulgaria) |
| Outcome: | 2 fatalities, 1 serious injury |

A rather frequent type of level-crossing accident occurred involving a taxi and a passenger train travelling from Karlovo to Burgas. Despite the red-light signals, the car did not stop before the crossing and was hit by the oncoming train. All car passengers were injured, two of them fatally.

Some 400 level-crossing users are killed each year in the EU and it is quite common to register level-crossing accidents involving a large number of passengers in buses. In 2009, however, no such accident was reported.

According to the requirements of the railway safety directive, level-crossing accidents do not have to be investigated by NIBs, but a large number of them investigate and report them to the Agency, as in total they often lead to a relatively high number of casualties at national level.


Image 7. Level-crossing accident by Chintulovo
Source: Bulgarian NIB.

| Event: | Derailment of a freight train | $\square$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Date, time and location: | 16 June 2010, 03:07, Braz (Austria) |  |
| Outcome: | 1 serious injury, damage estimated at EUR 6.5 million |  |

On the late spring night of 16 June a runaway freight train passing through the Braz railway station derailed. The locomotive and 13 carriages crashed into the nearby gardens. The train consisted of 16 cars owned by a French operator and transported newly-assembled passenger cars from Romania to France. The cause of this accident was a failure in the braking system resulting from the loss of a rope, which ensures the safe positioning of the brake airline. The safety rope had fallen off, because it had not been attached properly.

While this accident only resulted in a slight injury to the train driver, its toll could have been much higher under


Image 8. Derailment of a freight train in Braz station Source: Austrian NIB. slightly different circumstances.

Event: Freight train collision and fire Date, time and location: 8 November 2010, 05:30, Białystok (Poland)

Outcome: No personal injuries, considerable material damage

A spectacular collision of two freight trains transporting petroleum products occurred at Białystok railway station, resulting in a massive explosion. According to the initial results of the investigation, the first train passed the stop signal when it entered the station, and hit the second train, which was leaving the station. The collision occurred on a switch and led to the derailment of both trains. There were no injuries, despite the fact that the fire also engulfed one of the locomotives. The material damage was considerable and the explosion was truly spectacular and visible from afar.

This accident was a reminder of the derailment of the freight train in Viareggio in 2009 that resulted in an explosion of a liquid gas and cost the lives of 32 people living in the vicinity of the track.


Image 9. Collision of freight trains at Białystok station Source: Polish NIB.

| Event: | Train collision |
| ---: | :--- |
| Date, time and location: | 25 July 2010, Stavoren (Netherlands) |
| Outcome: | No injuries, considerable damage |

An Italian grinding train ran through the buffer stop at Stavoren station and caused substantial damage to a store; however, there were no serious injuries. The train belonged to a Swiss operator; it was being driven by an Italian driver, who was piloted by a local Dutch train driver. A third person was also in the cab. The ATP system on the track did not intervene as the on-board system was not compatible with the track-side system. As the Italian driver was not familiar with the route, he was accompanied by the Dutch driver, who was distracted as he was talking with the third person and did not notice the trackside signs.

An investigation by the Dutch NIB is under way and involves five parties. It is looking into both organisational aspects and human factors.


Image 10. Train collision in Stavoren
Source: Dutch NIB.


# Managing safety 

## Assessing safety management systems

The railway safety directive requires national safety authorities to assess the safety management systems (SMSs) of railway undertakings (RUs) and infrastructure managers (IMs). If the SMS meets requirements set out in the railway safety directive the NSA can issue a safety certificate to an RU or an authorisation to an IM. This is known as Part A certification. The Part B certificate relates to the network specifics for the infrastructure and/or the vehicles used and operated. Part A certificates for RUs are valid throughout the EU, whereas the RUs will need to obtain a Part B certificate for each Member State in which they operate.

The Agency issued draft assessment criteria in 2007 for NSAs to use when assessing the SMS relevant for the Part A certificate. The criteria, that together with a set of principles for both the assessment process and the supervision regime, form the common safety method on conformity assessment (CSM CA), became regulation in 2010.

## Safety management system

A safety management system (SMS) is a documented process for managing risks, integrating the operation of the railway, the vehicles and the infrastructure. It helps to ensure that railway undertakings and infrastructure managers are operating safely and maintaining their part of the railway systems.

Harmonisation of the assessment of the SMS ensures that the market is open and competitive because each Member State will be adopting a consistent and transparent process for managing safety. The Agency has recently developed, together with the NSAs, guidance for SMSs. It is available on the Agency's website.


## Safety certification

Railway safety within the EU is built on the mutual acceptance of certificates and authorisations for RUs/ entities in charge of maintenance (ECM) and IMs issued in individual Member States. This requires a similar approach to certification and regulation, an equal level of performance and a high degree of mutual trust among NSAs and between other certification bodies. However, recent findings show a great variety in approaches and different levels of organisational maturity of NSAs in different Member States, which is hindering further development of an open European railway market.

A prime objective for the Agency is therefore to promote and support an accelerated harmonisation of the core certification and regulation processes that form part of the safety regulatory framework. There are a number of activities in the existing and future work programme of the Agency which will help to reach this objective.

In 2010, the common safety method on conformity assessment (CSM CA) was published ( ${ }^{(2) \text {, providing a }}$ clear process that NSAs can use to assess applications for certificates. It sets out specific criteria for the various components of an SMS and also establishes for the first time the principles of a supervision scheme that NSAs should have in place. In addition, it strengthens the requirements for NSAs to cooperate and coordinate their activities, which is particularly crucial for RUs operating in different Member States.

As a second important building block towards safe, European-wide transport of freight, the Agency has also drafted an ECM certification scheme that provides a harmonised framework for the mandatory certification of ECMs. This should help ECMs, RUs, certification bodies, as well as NSAs, to understand and accept their roles and responsibilities in the railway system.

The task force on freight wagon maintenance, which was a prompt response to the Viareggio accident in 2009, generated an unforeseen impetus within the railway sector. It established a platform for discussion and growing mutual understanding that all concerned parties - the railway sector, the NSAs as well as the Agency - would like to maintain and expand beyond the issue of broken axles.

[^8]
## Safety certificates issued

In 2009, 20 NSAs awarded certificates based on the requirements set out in the railway safety directive. The remaining NSAs either continued to issue certificates using the provisions of previous legislation (Directive 2001/14/EC) or a combination of both. Three NSAs have not yet issued any Part A/B certificates under the railway safety directive and have no applications pending.

Table 4: Safety certificates issued and pending by 18 February 2011

| No |  | Part A certificates |  | Part B ( ${ }^{*}$ ) certificates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Issued | Pending | Issued | Pending |
| 20 | NSAs have used Directive 2004/49/EC to issue certificates | 252 | 26 | 486 (**) | 497 |
| 1 | NSAs have applications for Part A certificates but not issued any | 0 | 6 | 1 |  |
| Total |  | 252 | 32 | 487 (*) | 497 |

Source: ERA ERADIS database and NSA annual reports.
${ }^{(1)}$ The Agency has no reliable information in its database on the number of Part B certificates issued. There is no requirement to notify the Agency when a Part B certificate is issued. The data here are taken from the NSA annual reports.
${ }^{(H)}$ One Member State issued 215 Part B certificates during 2009. This may include a number of certificates for shunting only.

## Safety regulation

In several Member States, the safety regulatory framework is still undergoing significant development. During 2010, the Agency continued the evaluation of the national measures implementing the railway safety directive in the Member States that it started in 2009 at the request of the Commission. The evaluation is expected to finish at the beginning of 2012, when the Agency will deliver a report to the Commission on its findings.

The Agency also evaluates the notifications of the national safety rules notified by the Member States in the Commission's public database NOTIF-IT ( ${ }^{(3)}$. This database includes rules previously registered in the Agency's ERADIS database and new national safety rules for most Member States.

The transparency and availability of the national safety rules that should be used by the RUs operating on the railway network and by the IMs is a necessary step towards the opening up of the market without creating safety barriers. The railway safety directive requires Member States to notify the Commission of new and amended rules $\left({ }^{(4)}\right.$. The Commission monitors the introduction of new national rules in order to prevent new barriers. The long-term objective of the railway safety directive is the gradual reduction of national rules in order to move to a more harmonised European approach to safety.

[^9]In 2009, the Agency published a report on the evaluation of the way in which national safety rules are published and made available in the Member States $\left({ }^{(5)}\right.$, as well as recommendations ${ }^{\left({ }^{16}\right)}$ to make these rules more easily accessible for all stakeholders, particularly applicants for safety certification. Improvements in this respect are expected from all Member States. In 2010 the Agency issued detailed advice for individual Member States ( ${ }^{7}$ ). In December 2010, the Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) agreed to set up a dedicated task force to facilitate a common approach and clarify systems of national safety rules and better practice of their management.

In 2010, the Agency delivered several technical opinions to the Commission in relation to some national rules adopted in consequence of an incorrect interpretation of the roles of different parties and of the tasks of the NSAs, as set by the railway safety directive. Moreover, transparency was missing when introducing these national rules. The Agency provided comments on the relevant findings to the NSAs.

## Common safety targets

CSTs are quantitative tools intended to monitor that current safety levels of the railways in the Member States are at least maintained. In the long term, they are also intended to help reduce the current differences in safety performance. Railway transport is the only mode of transport for which the framework of targets has been prescribed by European legislation.

In 2010, the Agency carried out the first assessment of the achievement of the first set of CSTs, based on a four-year time series of Eurostat data on railway accidents, covering the period from 2005 to 2008.

In 2011, the second set of CSTs and national reference values (NRVs) will be prepared by the Agency. They will be based on the six years of data, from 2004 to 2009, that were delivered to Eurostat by Member States according to Annex H of Regulation (EC) No 91/2003 on rail transport statistics. The second set of CSTs will be calculated using the method defined in the CSM on the assessment of the achievement of CSTs ${ }^{(18)}$. The revisions the Member States have made to Eurostat data will be taken into account. The next Safety Performance Report will contain a more detailed analysis of the results of these assessments.

[^10]

## Economic evaluation of safety

## Framework and perspectives

When proposing new safety regulations, the Agency has to evaluate the consequences of mandating safety measures under European law. Since the Agency was established, many safety-related recommendations have been passed and a harmonised approach to safety is gradually being developed. The Economic Evaluation Unit provides the Agency with appraisals and evaluations of recommendations and the technical specification for interoperability (TSI). It works closely with the Safety Unit in the development of its work and the methodologies that back up the conclusions.

## Scarce resources

A critical issue that is commonly addressed within the work of the Agency is the appropriate and economic use of scarce resources. The recent history and emerging revised structure of the railway sector mean that there inevitably will be trade-offs that need to be analysed. The techniques employed in economic analysis show where trade-offs exist. Examples concerning the use of scarce resources include train protection systems and passive safety provisions (crashworthiness, safe interiors). Calculating the cost of such safety measures and balancing them against the 'value of human life' or variants thereof is an approach that has been used in the past. While there are methodological and moral difficulties in determining the 'value of human life', it is an approach that has been used for more than 50 years in transport appraisal, and for more than 40 years in the railway sector. The Agency has found the use of variants, e.g. costs of avoiding fatalities, to be a useful indicator that can help in the justification of new systems, e.g. train protection systems. Using such approaches enables the correct 'economic signals' to be given and ensures that the safety recommendations are grounded in sound economic thinking.

## Better regulation

Systematic examination of Agency recommendations through impact assessment is in accordance with the

European Commission's strategy on better regulation. Indeed, impact assessment should contribute towards ensuring that new legislative initiatives are evidence-based and well-understood. In particular, impact assessment performed by the Agency describes the problems at stake for a given recommendation and identifies the aims to be achieved. It also sets out relevant options or variants that could meet those objectives. Subsequently, the impacts of the different options are analysed. The approach is consistent with the European Commission's impact assessment guidelines.

## Overview of activities

Over the past five years of activities a number of impact assessments have already been completed for different recommendations submitted to the Commission. In the safety area these have included (amongst others): common safety method for risk assessment, common safety method for conformity assessment, CSTs, certification for ECM and the derailment detection device. All the impact assessments performed to date are so-called ex-ante analyses that look at the possible future consequences of a given recommendation. The Agency is now starting socalled ex-post evaluation, where the focus is on examining the actual results. External consultants are currently performing such a study for the Agency on the results linked to the passengers with reduced mobility TSI.

## Studies in 2010

In October 2010, a major study was started to identify and categorise the key factors that have contributed to the decrease of the railway risk level over the last 25 years. Working closely with the Agency during the next 12 months, the contractor will examine empirically all of the relevant factors that have impacted upon safety over the last 25 years, in order to understand their relative efficiency and importance. Through better understanding and learning from the past, the Agency hopes to provide an improved basis for recommendations in the future. The findings of the study will be included in the next Safety Performance Report.

## Looking forward

The development of the safety performance of European railways is progressing well. The number of accidents and fatalities has continued to decrease. From 2011, the Member States are required to report safety indicator data according to common definitions, as laid down in the revised Annex 1 to the railway safety directive. This will give a better understanding of safety performance across the EU. The revised Annex 1 also provides a new set of indicators, with a comprehensive set of reference data that will enable more accurate analysis of safety performance in different Member States.

The use of common definitions will lay the foundation for the evaluation of performance against CSTs. During 2011, there will be a second assessment of the achievement of the first set of CSTs. Further, a second set of safety targets will be developed, using six years of Eurostat data. This work will also improve our understanding of the development of safety on European railways.

Although the correct transposition of the railway safety directive and the interoperability directive in national legislation is a fundamental prerequisite for the safety regulatory framework to work, it is increasingly clear
that the proper application of this framework is equally important. To address this issue, a framework for the crossaudit of NSA activities has been proposed, which combines an immediate acceleration of the harmonisation of NSA decision-making, including an opportunity for sharing good practice and lessons learned, with an overview of all NSA activities in the short to mid term. During 2011, we will see the development of this framework, initial training of cross-auditors as well as the organisation of pilot cross-audits. In 2012 this will be followed by further development and evaluation of the framework and the organisation of pilot cross-audits.

The investigation of accidents and incidents in the railway system is key to understanding and learning how to maintain and improve safety performance. The NIBs have been developing since the entry into force of the railway safety directive. Today investigation bodies are well established in almost all countries. Although the quality of the investigations is improving, there is still some way to go. During 2011, the survey of the organisation of the NIBs in practice will continue. This work will bring new knowledge and contribute to improving accident investigations and the learning process.
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List
CSI data tables
Table 1 - Fatalities by category of person

Table 2 - Serious injuries by category of person


| ID | Accident types | Victim types | AT | BE | BG | cT | Cz | DE | DK | EE | El | ES | F | FR | HU | U IE | ! | LT | LU | IV | NL | No | PL | PT | RO | SE | SI | SI Sk | K UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TK01 | Collisions of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 00 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 1 | 10 | $0 \quad 1$ | 19 |
| PK01 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - 5 |
| SK01 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | - 8 |
| LK01 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| UK01 |  | Unauthoised persons |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| OK01 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| TK02 | Deraiments of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 7 |
| PK02 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 7 |
| SK02 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| LK02 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| UK02 |  | Unauthorised persons |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| OKO2 |  | Other persons | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| TK03 | Level-crossing accidents | Total | 22 | 10 | 4 |  | 31 | 50 | 6 |  | 14 | 14 | 5 | 40 | - 22 | 220 | 19 | 8 |  | 4 | 12 | 0 | 35 | 18 | 22 | 9 | 0 | $0 \quad 17$ | $7{ }^{5}$ | 5367 |
| PK03 |  | Passengers | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 10 | - 5 |
| SK03 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| LKO3 |  | Level-crossing users | 22 | 9 | 4 |  | 31 | 50 | 5 |  | 12 | 14 | 5 | 38 | - 22 | 220 | 19 | 8 |  | 4 | 12 | 0 | 32 | 18 | 22 | 9 | 9 | 16 | 6 5 | -357 |
| UK03 |  | Unauthorised persons |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - 0 |
| OKO3 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| TK04 | Accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion | Total | 22 | 10 | 32 |  | 21 | 142 | 12 |  | 20 | 33 | 18 | 37 | 41 | 410 | 55 | 26 |  | 26 | 4 | 0 | 257 | 35 | 108 | 10 | - 21 | $21 \quad 35$ | $5{ }^{27}$ | 992 |
| PK04 |  | Passengers | 0 | 3 | 1 |  | 4 | 18 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 40 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 |  |  | 3 | 30 | - 58 |
| SK04 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - 22 |
| LKO4 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| UK04 |  | Unauthorised persons |  | 7 | 31 |  | 16 | 118 | 1 |  | 20 | 30 | 17 | 29 | - 37 | $37 \quad 0$ | 42 | 23 |  | 26 | 2 | 0 | 253 | 34 | 100 | 10 | - 12 | 232 | 24 | - 864 |
| OK04 |  | Other pessons | 22 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 3 | - 39 |
| TK05 | Fries in roling stock | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 0 |
| PK05 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| SK05 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| LK05 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| UK05 |  | Unauthorised persons |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| OK05 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| TKO6 | Other accidents | Total | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 |  | 00 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 049 | 90 | 86 |
| PK06 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 9 |
| SK06 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| LKO6 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| UK06 |  | Unauthorised persons |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 0 |  |  | 49 | 90 | 71 |
| OK06 |  | Other persons | 2 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - 2 |


| 10 | Accident types | Victim types | AT | BE | BG | CT | Cz | DE | DK | EE | El | ES | ค | FR | HU | IE | $\pi$ | LT | LU | LV | NL | No | PL | PT | RO | SE | S | Sk | UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TKO1 | Collisions of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| PK01 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SK01 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| LK01 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| UK01 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| O<01 |  | Other persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| TKO2 | Deraiments of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| PKO2 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| SK02 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| K002 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UK02 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OKO2 |  | Other persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TK03 | Level-crossing accidents | Total | 33 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 66 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 10 | 39 | 63 | 1 | 16 | 6 |  | 4 | 19 | 0 | 84 | 20 | 55 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 545 |
| PKO3 |  | Passengers | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| SK03 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 4003 |  | Level-crosing users | 33 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 66 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 10 | 38 | 24 | 1 | 16 | 6 |  | 4 | 19 | 0 | 81 | 20 | 55 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 501 |
| UK03 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| OKO3 |  | Otherpersons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TKO4 | Accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion | Total | 16 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 111 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 46 | 8 | 38 | 9 | 1 | 51 | 30 |  | 24 | 1 | 2 | 264 | 35 | 131 | 14 | 8 | 42 | 44 | 937 |
| PKO4 |  | Passengers | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 52 |
| SKO4 |  | Employes | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 |
| LKO4 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UKO4 |  | Unauthorised persons | 12 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 88 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 33 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 43 | 30 |  | 21 | 1 | 2 | 260 | 32 | 131 | 14 | 8 | 40 | 33 | 816 |
| OKO4 |  | Other persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 42 |
| TK05 | Fires in roling stock | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PK05 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SK05 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LK05 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UK05 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| O<05 |  | Other peesons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TK06 | Other accidents | Total | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| PKO6 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| SK06 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| L006 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| UK06 |  | Unauthorised persons | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| O<о6 |  | Other peesons | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


Table 3D - 2009 - Fatalities by type of accident and victim category

| ID | Accident types | Victim types | AT | BE | BG | CT | Cz | DE | DK | EE | EL | Es | 月 | FR | HU | $1 E$ | $\pi$ | LT | LU | LV | NL | No | PL | PT | RO | SE | S | Sk | K UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TK01 | Collisions of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 02 | 2 |
| PK01 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| SK01 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | - 3 |
| LKO1 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| UK01 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 02 | 4 |
| OK01 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| TK02 | Deraiments of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | - 30 |
| PK02 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| SK02 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| LK02 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| UK02 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| OK02 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 30 |
| TK03 | Level-crossing accidents | Total | 12 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 41 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 36 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 73 | 17 | 40 | 6 | 67 | 25 | 13 | 412 |
| PK03 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 2 |
| Sk03 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 3 |
| <<03 |  | Level-crosing users | 12 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 41 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 36 | 28 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 72 | 17 | 40 | 6 | 60 | 25 | 2513 | - 400 |
| UKO3 |  | Unauthoised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| окоз |  | Other persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 07 | 0 | 00 | 7 |
| TK04 | Accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion | Total | 21 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 5 | 127 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 715 | 3 | 38 | 63 | 1 | 45 | 25 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 4 | 292 | 15 | 107 | 13 | 13 | 47 | 38 | 933 |
| PK04 |  | Passengers | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 02 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 34 |
| SK04 |  | Employes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 01 | 0 | 01 | 23 |
| LKO4 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| UK04 |  | Unauthorised persons | 19 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 4 | 103 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 613 | 2 | 29 | 63 | 1 | 36 | 24 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 284 | 14 | 100 | 13 | 30 | 44 | $4{ }^{4}$ | 841 |
| OK04 |  | Other pessons | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 03 | 1 | 13 | 35 |
| TK05 | Fries in rolling tock | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| PK05 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| SK05 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| LKO5 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| UK05 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| OK05 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| TK06 | Other accidents | Total | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 9 |
| PK06 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 1 |
| SKO6 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| LK06 |  | Leve-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 |
| UK06 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 7 |
| OK06 |  | Other pesisons | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 1 |


| ID | Accident types | Victim types | AT | BE | BG | CT | cz | DE | DK | - EE | EE El | ES | F ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | FR | HU | IE | IT | LT | LU | U LV | V NL | No | PL | PT | T RO | SE | SE SI | SI Sk | K UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSO1 | Collisions of trains | Total | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | $4{ }^{10}$ | 100 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 00 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 0 |  | 0 | 04 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 00 | 00 | $0 \quad 1$ | 52 |
| PSO1 |  | Passengers | 1 | 0 | - |  | 1 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 00 | - 2 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 0 |  | 0 | $0 \quad 4$ | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 29 |
| 5501 |  | Emploves | 4 | 0 | - |  | 2 | 28 | 80 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 0 | - | - | - 1 | 21 |
| ${ }^{5} 501$ |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 00 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 0 |
| U501 |  | Unauthorised persons | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | -1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 1 |
| 0501 |  | Other peesons | 0 | 0 | - |  | 1 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 1 |
| TSO2 | Deraiments of trains | Total | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 01 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 17 |
| PSO2 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 140 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 01 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 15 |
| 5502 |  | Emploves | 1 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 2 |
| ${ }^{5} 502$ |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 0 |
| U502 |  | Unauthorised persons | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 0 |
| 0502 |  | Other persons | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 0 |
| TSO3 | Level-crossing accidents | Total | 26 | 19 | 7 |  | 49 | 45 | 45 | 2 | 32 | 1 | 16 | 613 | 25 | 50 | 17 | 8 |  | 7 | $7 \quad 2$ | 1 | 97 | 9 | 90 | - 8 | $8 \quad 10$ | 14 | 43 | 401 |
| P503 |  | Passengers | 0 | 2 | - |  | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 00 | , | 2 | 20 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 8 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 25 |
| 5503 |  | Emploves | 0 | 3 | - |  | 0 | 4 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 01 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 2 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 20 | 13 |
| ${ }^{503}$ |  | Level-crosing users | 26 | 14 | 7 |  | 49 | 39 | 92 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 15 | 513 | 23 | 0 | 16 | 8 |  | 7 | $7 \quad 2$ | 1 | 87 | 9 | 90 | - 8 | $8 \quad 10$ | 12 | 23 | 362 |
| U503 |  | Unauthorised persons | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - 1 | 10 | 0 | - | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 1 |
| 0503 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 00 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - - | - 0 | 0 |
| TSO4 | Accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion | Total | 38 | 8 | 52 |  | 36 | - 39 | 96 | 6 | 14 | 20 | 20 | 639 | 39 | 0 | 38 | 17 |  | 26 | 64 | 1 | 75 | 22 | 1280 | 7 | 713 | 320 | $20 \quad 19$ | 719 |
| PSO4 |  | Passengers | 10 | 2 | 29 |  | 11 | 14 | 44 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 81 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 20 | 0 |  | 0 | 02 | 1 | 0 | 8 | $8 \quad 28$ | 1 | 1 | - 6 | 61 | 176 |
| 5504 |  | Emploves | 14 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 5 | 51 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 15 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 | 8 | - 9 | 91 | 11 | 56 |
| ${ }^{1504}$ |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 |  | - | 0 | 00 | - - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 0 |
| U504 |  | Unauthorised persons | - | 6 | 23 |  | 25 | 20 | 00 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 422 | 20 | 0 | 16 | 14 |  | 25 | 52 | 0 | 75 | 12 | 12144 | 4 | 44 | $4 \quad 13$ | $3 \quad 14$ | 464 |
| 0504 |  | Other pessons | 14 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 01 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 2 | - | - 3 | 23 |
| TSO5 | Fires in rolling stock | Total | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 9 |
| PSO5 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | - - | - | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - - | - - | - 0 | 3 |
| 5505 |  | Emploves | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 2 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 5 |
| ${ }^{1505}$ |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 00 | 0 - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - - | - | - 0 | 0 |
| USO5 |  | Unauthorised persons | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 00 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | - - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - - | - - | - 0 | 0 |
| 0505 |  | Other persons | 1 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | - - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - - | - - | - 0 | 1 |
| TSO6 | Other accidents | Total | 5 | 79 | 0 |  | 0 | 55 | 54 |  | 0 | 0 | 01 | 44 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 02 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 00 | - 1 | 10 | 00 | 02 | 261 |
| PSO6 |  | Passengers | 1 | 59 | - |  | 0 | 48 | 80 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | 3 | 5 | 50 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 01 | 0 | 55 | - | 0 | 0 | - - | - - | - 0 | 172 |
| 5506 |  | Emploves | 0 | 11 | - |  | 0 | 1 | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 01 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 01 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | - 1 | 1 | - - | - 2 | 29 |
| ${ }^{506}$ |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 01 |  | - | 0 | 00 | - - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 1 |
| U506 |  | Unauthorised persons | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | 6 | 61 |  | 0 | 0 | 00 | ) 37 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - - | - | - 0 | 46 |
| 0506 |  | Other persons | 4 | 9 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | - | - | - 0 | 13 |


| ID | Accident types | Victim types | AT | BE | BG | CT | Cz | DE | DK | EE | EL | ES | ค | FR | R HU | IE | IT | LT | LU | U LV | NL | No | PL | PT | RO | SE | S | 5 Sk | SK UK | UK Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T501 | Collisions of trains | Total | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 80 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 031 |
| PSO1 |  | Passengers | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 03 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | $0 \quad 12$ |
| 5501 |  | Employes | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 01 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | $0 \quad 13$ |
| ${ }^{5} 501$ |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 0 |
| USO1 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 0 |
| 0501 |  | Other persons | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 03 |
| TS02 | Deraiments of trains | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | $12 \quad 16$ |
| PSO2 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 011 | 11.14 |
| 5502 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 01 | $1 \quad 2$ |
| 1502 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 |
| USO2 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 |
| 0502 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 |
| T503 | Level-crossing | Total | 34 | 53 | 8 | 0 | 042 | 63 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 9 | $9 \quad 35$ | 0 | 4 | 7 |  | 4 | 7 | 2 | 120 | 8 | $8{ }^{\text {B }} 70$ | 8 | 8 16 | $6 \quad 16$ | 16 | 1552 |
| PSO3 |  | Passengers | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 01 | 4 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 02 | 20 | $0 \quad 53$ |
| 5503 |  | Employes | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 01 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 10 | $0 \quad 16$ |
| ${ }^{5} 503$ |  | Level-crosing users | 34 | 24 | 8 | 0 | - 41 | 54 | 4 | 13 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 7 | $7 \quad 27$ | 0 | 4 | 7 |  | 4 | 7 | 2 | 107 | 8 | - 69 | 8 | - 15 | $5 \quad 13$ | 31 | 1483 |
| USO3 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| 0503 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 |
| T504 | Accidents to persons | Total | 15 | 20 | 21 | 0 | ) 58 | 83 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 20 | 1 | 28 | 82 | 1 | 34 | 6 |  | 13 | 2 | 0 | 95 | 23 | 114 | 6 | 9 | 920 | - 18 | $18 \quad 662$ |
| PSO4 | caused by rolling stock in motion | Passengers | 7 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 016 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 9 | $9 \quad 26$ | 0 | 10 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 22 | $2 \quad 132$ |
| 5504 |  | Emploves | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 140 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 01 | 12 | $2 \quad 38$ |
| L504 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 00 |
| USO4 |  | Unauthorised persons | 4 | 4 | 15 | 0 | ) 42 | 33 | 35 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 10.25 | 1 | 21 | 6 |  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 18 | B 106 | 2 | 8 | $8 \quad 17$ | 7 | $7 \quad 442$ |
| 0504 |  | Other peesons | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 30 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 8 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 07 | $7 \quad 50$ |
| TS05 | Fires in rolling tock | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| PSO5 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| 5505 |  | Employes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| LSO5 |  | Level-crossing users | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| USO5 |  | Unauthorised persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| OSO5 |  | Other pessons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| TS06 | Other accidents | Total | 7 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - 7 | 71 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 59 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 00 | $0 \quad 114$ |
| PSO6 |  | Passengers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 56 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | $0 \quad 59$ |
| 5506 |  | Emploves | 5 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - 3 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 0 | $0 \quad 42$ |
| L506 |  | Level-crosing users | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 0 |
| US06 |  | Unauthorised persons | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 00 | 07 |
| 0506 |  | Other pessons | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 05 |


Table 4D - 2009 - Serious injuries by type of accident and victim category

Table 5 - Total and relative no of suicides


| 0 | Accident tpes | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 | Collision of trains | 206 |
|  |  | 2007 |
|  |  | 208 |
| N02 | Deailments oftrans | 206 |
|  |  | 207 |
|  |  | 208 |
|  |  | 2009 |
| N03 |  | 206 |
|  |  | 2007 |
|  |  | 208 |
|  |  | 200 |
| 104 | Accidents to persons | 206 |
|  | in ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( mostion | 207 |
|  |  | 208 |
|  |  | 209 |
| N05 | Fieses inoling tock | 206 |
|  |  | 207 |
|  |  | 208 |
|  |  | 209 |
| 106 | Otheracicients | 206 |
|  |  | 207 |
|  |  | 2008 |
|  |  | 209 |
| N00 | Total noacieients | 206 |
|  |  | 207 |
|  |  | 208 |
|  |  | 209 |
| 801 | No of train-km | 206 |
|  |  | 207 |
|  |  | 208 |
|  |  | 2009 |


| 10 | Precursors to acidents |  | AT | BE | BG | ст | Cz | DE | DK | EE | EL | ES | ค | FR | HU | IE | 17 | LT | LU | LV | NL | No | PL | PT | RO | SE | SI | SK | UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 | Broken rails | 2006 |  | 115 | 7 |  | 0 | 124 | 0 |  |  | 74 | 65 | 11 | 768 | 8 | 361 | 1 |  | 1 | 34 | 51 | 3054 | 45 | 349 | 256 | 76 | 1 | 232 | 5633 |
|  |  | 2007 |  | 98 | 92 | 13 | 21 | 407 | 32 | 7 | 269 | 54 | 21 | 323 | 654 | 1 | 430 | 62 |  | 5 | 31 | 10 | 2484 | 39 | 319 | 187 | 57 | 5 | 192 | 5813 |
|  |  | 2008 |  | 281 | 67 | 8 | 4 | 536 | 14 | 7 | 223 | 70 | 19 | 309 | 716 | 3 | 84 | 1 |  | 4 | 31 | 36 | 2396 | 33 | 380 | 218 | 79 | 10 | 170 | 5699 |
|  |  | 2009 |  | 30 | 185 | 3 | 15 | 591 | 40 | 16 | 172 | 103 | 25 | 294 | 10 | 4 | 404 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 58 | 44 | 1506 | 35 | 414 | 235 | 94 | 15 | 146 | 4462 |
| 102 | Track buckles | 2006 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 72 | 1 |  |  | 186 | 10 | 171 | 3 | 5 | 6743 | 2 |  | 1 | 143 | 96 | 80 | 95 | 0 | 80 | 26 | 1 | 86 | 7803 |
|  |  | 2007 |  | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 6 | 0 |  | 171 | 7 | 177 | 4 | 1 | 3113 | 40 |  | 1 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 40 | 3 | 102 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 3820 |
|  |  | 2008 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 8 | 0 | 110 | 218 | 3 | 194 | 8 | 0 | 41 | 0 |  | 3 | 8 | 17 | 19 | 37 | 0 | 87 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 835 |
|  |  | 2009 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 2 | 111 | 89 | 415 | 1 | 163 | 0 | 3 | 677 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 37 | 22 | 44 | 3 | 115 | 8 | 1 | 28 | 1783 |
| 103 | Wrong-side signalling failures | 2006 |  | 1 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 544 |  | 0 | 6 |  | 290 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 |  | 4 | 617 | 1485 |
|  |  | 2007 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 277 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 245 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 6 | 550 | 1301 |
|  |  | 2008 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 277 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 39 |  | 0 | 18 | 1 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 12 |  | 2 | 901 | 1458 |
|  |  | 2009 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 75 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 44 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 1 | 6 | 514 |
| 104 | Signals passed at danger | 2006 | 15 | 55 | 5 |  | 60 |  | 756 |  | 1 | 93 | 18 | 35 | 8 | 35 | 24 | 124 |  | 4 | 292 | 78 |  | 24 | 425 | 194 | 15 | 78 | 352 | 2691 |
|  |  | 2007 | 12 | 81 | 15 | 5 | 26 | 727 | 568 | 2 | 1 | 93 | 22 | 112 | 12 | 31 | 15 | 60 |  | 2 | 275 | 73 | 4013 | 20 | 425 | 217 | 16 | 79 | 324 | 7226 |
|  |  | 2008 | 16 | 97 | 12 | 3 | 26 | 760 | 510 | 2 | 1 | 111 | 30 | 124 | 8 | 22 | 20 | 3 |  | 5 | 240 | 70 | 2653 | 24 | 396 | 275 | 15 | 75 | 316 | 5814 |
|  |  | 2009 | 20 | 75 | 3 | 4 | 39 | 355 | 531 | 1 | 5 | 94 | 20 | 133 | 7 | 17 | 15 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 214 | 105 | 13 | 12 | 432 | 362 | 12 | 75 | 260 | 2816 |
| 105 | Broken whels | 2006 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 19 |  |  | 1 | 14 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 52 | 137 | 1 | 1 | 8 |  |  | 0 | 243 |
|  |  | 2007 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 39 | 66 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 170 |
|  |  | 2008 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 6 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
|  |  | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| 106 | Broken axes | 2006 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 9 | 23 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 2 | 22 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 1 |  | 0 | 80 |
|  |  | 2007 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 28 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
|  |  | 2008 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 67 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
|  |  | 2009 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| R01 | No of train-km (million) | 2006 | 152.190 | 104.937 | 36.090 |  | 158.999 | 1013.500 | 80.541 |  | 19.01 | 185.00 | 50.900 | 508.000 | 106.787 | 18.242 | 377.00 | 13.827 |  | 17.122 | 133.000 | 47.392 | 221.737 | 39.264 | 94.900 | 132.295 | 18.980 | 50.978 | 535.757 | 4117 |
|  |  | 2007 | 155.000 | 103.587 | 36.030 | 6.533 | 152.890 | 1048.70 | 78.70 | 7.553 | 19.905 | 186.000 | 52.577 | 529.540 | 114.000 | 16.832 | 370.000 | 14.992 |  | 18.578 | 140.000 | 47.392 | 223.031 | 40.980 | 96.262 | 134.345 | 19.160 | 51.003 | 521.292 | 4185 |
|  |  | 2008 | 158.400 | 92900 | 35.075 | 5.540 | 174.961 | 1043.500 | 82000 | 7.131 | 21.164 | 193.000 | 53.259 | 541.000 | 109.000 |  | 366.863 | 15.817 |  | 19.525 | 139.000 | 46.841 | 224.359 | 41.760 | 96.145 | 138.194 | 20.098 | 49.332 | 549.067 | 4224 |
|  |  | 2009 | 152300 | 91.87 | 31.490 | 5.652 | 163.187 | 1002.917 | 82.150 | 6.820 | 19.613 | 188.00 | 50.019 | 504.000 | 106.286 |  | 350.549 | 14.053 | ${ }^{8.063}$ | 18.726 | 132.00 | 43.278 | 208.640 | 40.58 | 88.500 | 131.518 | 18.208 | 44.958 | 568.569 | 4072 |

Table 8 - Costs of all accidents

| 10 | Category | Years | AT | BE | BG | ct | CZ | DE | DK | EE | El | ES | F | FR | HU | IE | 17 | LT | LU | LV | NL | No | PL | PT | RO | SE | SI | SK | UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| coo | Costs of all accidents <br> (€) | 2006 | 0 | 0 | 1091619 |  | 3015487 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | \| 45366103 | 0 | 187308 | 750000 |  | 18036842 |  | 43424 | 0 | 34625211 | 4483573 | 52111923 | 638670 | 67145296 | 1944225 | 1160000 | 120266703 | 352554386 |
|  |  | 2007 | 0 | 0 | 674623 | 0 | 3844692 |  | 13740712 | 0 | 2119403 |  | \| 35316435 | 0 | 17 | 110000 | 0 | 18536814 |  | 339309 | 0 | 6375000 | 5370073 | 60250000 | 580504 | 79530122 | 0 | 1990000 | 18988101 | 418458804 |
|  |  | 2008 | 0 | 0 | 688371 | 13000000 | 10079369 |  | 23601892 | 179747 | 2193186 |  | 42242859 | 0 | 0 | 800000 | 0 | 20582744 |  | 3545660 | 91900 | 6975000 | 2855166 | 47696000 | 1541908 | 55490741 | 301987 | 2806375 | 12925668 | 48092759 |
|  |  | 2009 | 89876841 | 3949321 | 69466 | 234726 | 304901 |  | 47298709 | 711424 | 2122359 |  | 29818224 | 161167637 | 0 | 18799000 | 127238708 | 20818685 | 8163330 | 788522 | 54530488 |  | 221063433 | 32336397 | 678468 | 59503282 | 13692317 | 2124167 | 102233136 | 100005559 |
| co1 | Costs of deaths (€) | 2006 |  |  |  |  | 945111 |  |  |  |  |  | 42270504 |  | 33654 |  |  | 16896300 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 47240000 | 112 | 35775161 |  | 750000 | 80643600 | 22455442 |
|  |  | 2007 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 12623 |  | 12017760 | 0 |  |  | 34569918 |  |  |  |  | 17890200 |  | 1329 |  | 0 | 156296 | 54960000 | 2125 | 43306774 | 0 |  | 12992580 | 292842825 |
|  |  | 2008 |  |  | 16353 | 0 | 522252 |  | 21814744 | 0 |  |  | 40734897 |  |  |  |  | 19878000 |  | 11186 | 40200 | 0 | 14958 | 40540000 | 1081 | 31201398 |  |  | 11448875 | 26922994 |
|  |  | 2009 | 72426273 | 3408295 | 0 | 0 | 31325 |  | 38755814 | 6360702 |  |  | 27292384 | 144924430 |  |  | 114361378 | 19216374 | 8163330 | 14513 | 29972250 | 0 | 183303000 | 3007837 |  | 39929105 | 11742902 |  | 98861059 | 859511629 |
| C02 | Costs of injuries (€) | 2006 |  |  |  |  | 474373 |  |  |  |  |  | 3095599 |  | 559 |  |  | 1128100 |  | 951 |  | 31657 |  | 3934062 | 0 | 8724086 |  | 387000 | 5600250 | 23376637 |
|  |  | 2007 |  |  | 2523 | 0 | 6208 |  | 1722952 | 0 |  |  | 746517 |  |  |  |  | 586612 |  | 0 |  | 275000 | 24639 | 4310000 |  | 7412473 | 0 |  | 6944310 | 22031234 |
|  |  | 2008 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 99249 |  | 1787148 | 0 |  |  | 1507962 |  |  |  |  | 586612 |  | 740 | 3100 | 275000 | 63193 | 5030000 |  | 2675484 |  |  | 4073604 | 16102092 |
|  |  | 2009 | 17450568 | 5235170 | 0 | 234726 | 81285 |  | 4796913 | 588184 |  |  | 2525840 | 16243206 |  |  | 12877330 | 634508 | 0 | 206 | 2558238 |  | 13627882 | 226250 | 0 | 585628 | 1949415 | 0 | 3097932 | 90020590 |
| co3 | Costs of replacement or repair of damaged RS and railway installations (€) | 2006 |  |  | 1091619 |  | 1596004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1838231 | 750000 |  | 12442 |  | 40037 |  | 16389474 | 4483573 |  | 629858 | 21078727 | 1944225 | 20000 | 1607468 | 65945658 |
|  |  | 2007 |  |  | 572084 | 0 | 3724791 |  |  | 0 | 1933255 |  |  |  | 17 | 110000 |  | 60002 |  | 335235 |  | 3000000 | 5095912 |  | 317137 | 24775843 | 0 | 1890000 | 44406218 | 86220493 |
|  |  | 2008 |  |  | 634361 | 6000000 | 9410339 |  |  | 146102 | 618441 |  |  |  |  | 800000 |  | 118132 |  | 3340839 | 24300 | 3600000 | 2671815 | 75000 | 1490182 | 19510021 | 301987 | 263922 | 6228951 | 112284693 |
|  |  | 2009 |  | 175198 | 551005 | 0 | 17739 |  | 3745982 | 118331 | 1974940 |  |  |  |  | 12699000 |  | 967803 |  | 765812 | 2200000 |  | 24132551 | 0 | 643897 | 1371750 |  | 2124167 |  | 83795575 |
| C04 | Costs of delays (€) | 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 864 |  |  | 0 |  | 2436 |  | 18204080 |  | 939861 | 8700 | 1567322 |  | 3000 | 17951385 | 38677649 |
|  |  | 2007 |  |  | 100016 | 0 | 101070 |  |  | 0 | 186148 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 2745 |  | 3100000 | 93226 | 98000 | 261241 | 4035032 | 0 | 100000 | 8404773 | 17364252 |
|  |  | 2008 |  |  | 35657 | 70000000 | 47529 |  |  | 33646 | 1574745 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 192895 | 24300 | 3100000 | 105201 | 1376000 | 50645 | 2103839 |  | 167151 | 4505253 | 83316860 |
|  |  | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 143461 | 0 | 14952 |  | 0 | 47207 | 147419 |  | 0 |  |  | 6100000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7991 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34570 |  | 0 | 0 | 274145 | 6769745 |
| R01 | No of train-km (million) | 2006 | 152.190 | 104937 | 36.090 |  | 155.999 | 1013.500 | 80.541 |  | 19.011 | 185.000 | 50.900 | 508.000 | 106.787 | 18.42 | 377.000 | 13.827 |  | 17.122 | 133.000 | 47.392 | 221.737 | 39.264 | 94.900 | 132.295 | 18.980 | 50.978 | 535.757 | 4117 |
|  |  | 2007 | 155.000 | 103.587 | 36.030 | 6.533 | 152.890 | 1048.70 | 78.70 | 7.553 | 19.905 | 186.000 | 52.57 | 529.540 | 114.000 | 16.832 | 370.000 | 14.992 |  | 18.578 | 140.000 | 47.392 | 223.031 | 40.980 | 96.262 | 134345 | 19.160 | 51.003 | 521.292 | 4185 |
|  |  | 2008 | 158.400 | 92.90 | 35.05 | 5.540 | 174.961 | 1043.500 | 82000 | 7.131 | 21.164 | 193.000 | 53.259 | 541.000 | 109.000 |  | 366.863 | 15.817 |  | 19.525 | 139.000 | 46.841 | 224.359 | 41.760 | 96.145 | 138.194 | 20.098 | 49.332 | 549.067 | 4224 |
|  |  | 2009 | 152300 | 91.870 | 31.490 | 5.652 | 163.187 | 1002.917 | 82.150 | 6.820 | 19.613 | 188.000 | 50.019 | 504.000 | 106.286 |  | 350.549 | 14.053 | 8.063 | 18.726 | 132000 | 43.278 | 208.640 | 40.580 | 88.500 | 131.518 | 18.208 | 44.958 | 566.569 | 4072 |

Table 9 - Hours lost due to accidents


| 10 | Categor | Yeas | ${ }_{\text {at }}$ | BE | ${ }^{86}$ | ¢ | cz | DE | ok | E. | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Es | ค | FR | HU | IE | п | « | W | Lv | NL | No | PL | PT | R0 | SE | 5 | Sk | UK | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T01 | $\% \text { of track with ATP in }$ <br> operation | 2006 |  | 0.081 | 0.150 |  | 0.160 |  | 0280 |  |  | 0856 | 0.72 | 0.55 | 0.340 | 0.550 | 0.572 | 0.25 |  | 0.35 | 0.980 | 0.70 |  | 0.503 | 0.488 | ${ }^{0.706}$ | 0.640 | 0.151 | 0.043 |  |
|  |  | 2007 |  | 0.084 | 0.40 | 1.000 | 0.170 | 0.881 | 0.530 | 0.20 |  | 0866 | 0.749 | 0.585 |  | 0.050 | 0.90 | 0.250 |  | 0.46 | 0.90 | 0.70 |  | 0.508 | 0.50 | 0.656 | 0.545 | 0.151 | 0.042 |  |
|  |  | 2008 | 0.664 | 0.099 | 0.110 | 1.000 | 0.170 | 0.900 | 0.530 | 0.322 |  | 0870 | 0.70 | 0.463 |  | 0.050 | 0.915 | 0250 |  | 0.387 | 0990 | 0.70 |  | 0.513 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 0.670 | 0.185 | 0.042 |  |
|  |  | 2009 | 0.679 | 0.10 | 0.110 | 1.000 | 0.170 | 0.900 |  | 0.228 |  | 0874 | 0830 | 0.472 |  | 0.50 | 0.92 | 0349 | 1.00 | 0.464 | 0.90 | 0.70 |  | 0.513 | 0.483 | 0.640 | 0.670 | 0.185 | 0.042 |  |
| T02 | \% of train-km using operational ATP | 206 |  | 0.060 | 0.080 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.900 |  | 0.780 | 0.120 | 0.480 | 0.641 |  |  | 099 | 0900 |  | 0.90 |  |  |  | 0.418 | 0.330 |  |
|  |  | 2007 |  |  | 0.20 | 1.000 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.970 | 0.91 |  | 0.137 | 0.625 | 0.608 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.90 |  | 0.90 |  | 0.932 |  |  | 0.330 |  |
|  |  | 2008 |  | 0.039 | 0210 | 1.000 |  |  |  | 0.684 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.133 | 0.71 | 0.559 |  |  | 0.999 | 0900 |  | 0.900 |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.330 |  |
|  |  | 2009 |  | 0.042 | 0210 | 1.000 |  |  |  | 0.72 |  | 0.964 | 0.990 |  |  | 0.117 | 0.788 | 0.65 | 0.98 |  | 0990 | 090 |  | 0.90 |  | 0.930 |  |  | 0.380 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {T03 }}$ | Total number of Levelcrossings | 2006 | 6971 | 2037 | 820 |  | 8576 | 2037 | 1548 |  | 1270 | 2885 | 4430 | 16804 | 5981 | 1711 | 8383 | 436 |  | 657 | 2724 | 4300 | 17011 | 1297 | 5534 | 10541 | 965 | 2322 | 7211 | 134197 |
|  |  | 2007 | 6776 | 2180 | 820 |  | 8628 | 19011 | 149 | 328 | 1265 | 2811 | 3634 | 14651 | 5972 | 1126 | 7350 | 531 |  | 660 | 2720 | 3761 | 14219 | 1266 | 5625 | 10572 | 944 | 2307 | 7456 | 12002 |
|  |  | 2008 | 6773 | 2110 | 821 |  | 8551 | 18051 | 1563 | 329 | 1265 | 2699 | 3515 | 18507 | 590 | 1095 | 7663 | 523 |  | ${ }^{641}$ | 270 | 3987 | 1425 | 1229 | 5784 | ${ }^{11352}$ | 959 | 2265 | 6680 | 12914 |
|  |  | 209 | 6530 | 1913 | 819 |  | 8523 | 17508 | 1364 | 329 | 1305 | 2613 | 4061 | 18459 | 590 | 1069 | 7585 | 530 | 142 | 64 | 2699 | 3666 | 1463 | 1191 | 5181 | 1137 | 941 | 222 | 682 | 127478 |
| To4 | Total number ofLevel-crossings per track-km | 2006 | 0880 | 0328 | 0.160 |  | 0.737 | 0.391 | 0.432 |  | 0.424 | 0.168 | 0.502 | 0.45 | 0.74 | 0.555 | 0.462 | 0.199 |  | 0.161 | 0.49 | 1.052 | 0.598 | 0.369 | 0.271 | 0.686 | 0.440 | 0.46 | 0.28 |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 0.831 | 0.351 | 0.160 |  | 0.47 | 0.370 | 0.390 | 0.149 | 0.413 | 0.157 | 0.412 | 0.49 | 0.565 | 0.534 | 0404 | 0223 |  | 0.152 | 0.406 | 0922 | 0.49 | 0.359 | 0276 | 0.696 | 0.431 | 0.46 | 0.237 |  |
|  |  | 208 | 0.819 | 0.336 | 0.180 |  | 0.74 | 0.348 | 0.41 | 0.154 | 0.413 | 0.150 | 0.397 | 0.43 | 0.55 | 0.519 | 0.29 | 0.240 |  | 0.135 | 0.403 | 0.97 | 0.497 | 0.348 | 0284 | 0.706 | 0.438 | 0.488 | 0.212 |  |
|  |  | 2009 | 080 | 0.298 | 0.159 |  | 0.738 | 0338 | 0.370 | 0.152 | 0.425 | 0.145 | 0.459 | 0.401 | 0.559 | 0.499 | 0280 | 0243 | 0.366 | 0.187 | 0387 |  | 0.99 | 0.388 |  | 0.741 | 0.430 | 0.49 | 0.215 |  |
| T05 | \% of Level-crossings with automatic or manual protection | 2006 | 0290 | 0.792 | 0.42 |  | 0.412 | 0.540 |  |  | 0.610 | 0.350 | 0.190 | 0.40 | 0.615 | 0.170 | 0.753 | 0.764 |  | 0.640 | 0.677 | 1.000 | 0.390 | 0.393 | ${ }^{0303}$ | ${ }^{0.344}$ | 0.340 | 040 | 0.34 |  |
|  |  | 2007 | 0283 | 0.88 | 0.42 |  | 0.247 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.470 | 0.656 | 0353 | 0.194 |  | 0.59 | 0.93 | 0822 | 0.74 |  | 0.640 | 0.675 | 1.00 | 0.337 | 0.382 | 0305 | 0329 | 0.350 | 0.40 | 0.241 |  |
|  |  | 2008 | 0286 | 0810 | 0.570 |  | 0.27 | 0.590 | 0.550 | 0.99 | 0.72 | 0353 | 0.201 | 0.72 | 0.59 | 0200 | 0.835 | 0.750 |  | 0.60 | 0.76 | 1.00 | 0.337 | 0.373 | 0294 | 0310 | 0.330 | 0.487 | 0.246 |  |
|  |  | 2009 | 0298 | 1.000 | 0.580 |  | 0.247 | 0.550 | 0.557 | 0.998 | 0.561 | 0330 | 0206 |  | 0.59 | 0.206 |  | 0.72 | 0.754 | 0.60 | 0.76 | 1.00 | 0.389 | 0.397 | 0.000 | 0.216 | 0.384 | 0.45 | 0.36 |  |
| R03 | No of | 206 | 7924 | 6212 | 5119 |  | 11642 | 51959 | 3586 |  | 2997 | 17160 | 8830 | 30880 | 8007 | 210 | 18154 | 2187 |  | 4091 | 6550 | 4087 | 2846 | 3513 | 20385 | 15380 | 2192 | 4678 | 31594 | 27759 |
|  |  | 2007 | 8154 | 6215 | 5119 | 159 | 11554 | 33897 | 3720 | 2200 | 3060 | 17885 | 8816 | 29973 | 1057 | 2110 | 18195 | 2181 |  | 4353 | 670 | 4080 | 28499 | 3528 | 20385 | 15198 | 2192 | 4648 | 31515 | 28492 |
|  |  | 208 | 8197 | 6282 | 5116 | 159 | 11554 | 51851 | 3800 | 2133 | 3062 | 17960 | 8848 | 45951 | 1057 | 210 | 25720 | 2180 |  | 4731 | 670 | 4080 | 28673 | 3528 | 20348 | 1605 | 2192 | 4688 | 31534 | 32797 |
|  |  | 2009 | 8154 | 6426 | 5154 | 159 | 11554 | 51780 | 3687 | 2166 | 3070 | 17972 | 8847 | 46007 | 1057 | 2141 | 26174 | 2182 | 422 | 3396 | 6888 |  | 2886 | 3528 |  | 15349 | 2187 | 4688 | 3157 | 328845 |
| Table 11 - Management of safety - number of audits planned and conducted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Category | Years | ${ }_{\text {at }}$ | ${ }^{\text {BE }}$ | ${ }^{86}$ | ${ }_{\text {ct }}$ | Cz | DE | ok | EE | E. | Es | ค | Rr | Hu | IE | $\pi$ | u | u | iv | NL | No | Pl | PT | R0 | SE | 5 | sk | UK | Total |
| 401 | Total no of accomplished audits | 2006 |  | 0 | 2719 |  | 159 |  | ${ }^{33}$ |  |  | 731 | 44 | 1 |  | 21 | 1278 | 21 |  | ${ }^{131}$ |  | 55 | 0 | 2 |  | 319 |  | 6 | 720 | 6240 |
|  |  | 2007 |  | 0 | 3215 | 25 | 290 |  | 36 | 249 |  | 755 | 43 | 44 | 21 | 13 | 2157 | 27 |  | 1853 | 20 | ${ }_{6}$ | 0 | 6 |  | 188 |  | 0 | 189 | 9197 |
|  |  | 2008 | 109 | 0 | 3196 | 24 | 263 |  | 32 | 83 | 0 | 77 | 33 | 50 |  | 21 | 2158 | 29 |  | 265 | 20 | 72 | 0 | 1 |  | 156 | 4 | 1 | 47 | 7341 |
|  |  | 2009 | 220 |  | 2941 | 19 | 410 |  |  | 84 | 0 | 1365 | 26 |  | 41 | 18 | 2481 | 27 | 317 | 5 | 5 | 86 | , | 10 |  | 164 |  | 1 | 758 | 8928 |
| ${ }_{402}$ | Accomplished audits as percentage of required/planned audits | 2006 |  | 0.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.38 |  |  | 1.01 | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 1.05 | 0.98 | 0.81 |  | 1.19 |  | 0.70 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.93 |  |
|  |  | 207 |  |  |  | 085 | 1.10 |  | 1.57 | 1.00 |  | 1.01 | 0.67 | 1.00 | 0.71 | 1.00 | 0.56 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.74 | 000 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |  | 000 | 0.98 |  |
|  |  | 2008 | 0.96 | 0.00 |  | 0.59 | 1.00 |  | 1.33 | 0.94 | 000 | 1.02 | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.05 | 0.83 | 1.00 |  | 1.15 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 000 | 1.00 |  | 0.88 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.02 |  |
|  |  | 2009 | 0.92 |  |  | 0.76 | 1.00 |  |  | 095 | 0.00 | 1.12 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 1.29 | 090 | 0.85 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.77 | 000 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.74 |  | 1.00 | 083 |  |

Comments on CSI data tables
ERA has reviewed the reported CSI data and all large fluctuations have been checked by the reporting NSA. The table below includes comments for the data where, for example, fluctuations are due to changes in reporting procedures or where the national definition applied gives a value that deviates from the European average.

| Table | Country | Year | Variable | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 3C | CZ | 2008 | PK01 | The high number of passengers seriously injured and killed in 2008 is due to one serious accident, a bridge collapse and subsequent high-speed train collision (8 August 2008). |
| Table 3D | IT | 2009 | OK02 | The high number of other persons killed in derailments of trains in 2009 is due to one serious accident, a derailment of a train with dangerous goods. |
| Table 4A | EL | 2006 | PS03 | One significant level-crossing accident in 2006 explains the large number of passengers seriously injured. |
|  | BE | 2007 | SS06 | The figure includes work accidents. |
| Table 4C | CZ | 2008 | PS01 | The high number of passengers seriously injured and killed in 2008 is due to one serious accident, a bridge collapse and subsequent high-speed train collision (8 August 2008). |
| Table 4B | DE | 2008 | PS01 | The large number of passengers seriously injured is mainly due to one big accident. |
| Table 4D | BG | 2009 | US01 | The high number of unauthorised persons seriously injured in collisions of trains in 2009 is due to one serious accident in which a car was hit by a train while outside a level crossing. |
|  | IT | 2009 | OSO2 | The high number of other persons seriously injured in derailments of trains in 2009 is due to one serious accident in which a derailment led to an explosion of dangerous goods. |
|  | LV | 2009 | PS03 | The high number of passengers seriously injured in level-crossing accidents in 2009 is due to a single collision with heavy road-building equipment. |
|  | PL | 2009 | PSO4 | The high number of passengers seriously injured in accidents caused by rolling stock in motion in 2009 is due to the inclusion of persons hopping on or jumping out of trains in motion, in line with Annex 1 of Directive 2004/49/EC, from 2009. |
|  | RO | 2009 | US06 | The high number of other unauthorised persons seriously injured reflects a single event of a high-voltage accident to persons stealing goods from a wagon. |
| Table 6 | BG | 2006 | N01-N06 | The variable includes non-significant accidents. |
|  | DE | 2006 | N01-N06 | Data include non-significant accidents. |
|  | FI | 2006 | N04-N05 | Data include non-significant accidents. |
|  | FR | 2006 | N01-N02 | Does not include collisions/derailments on sidings. |
|  | HU | 2006-08 | N01-N06 | The fluctuation in the number of occurrences between 2006 and 2008 is due to a combination of a change in reporting procedures and a true change in number of events. |
|  | RO | 2006 | N01 | The variable does not include collisions with objects. |


| Table | Country | Year | Variable | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 7 | BG | 2006 | 101 | Only includes broken rails that result in more than 30-minute traffic delays. |
|  | DE | 2006 | 101 | Only includes broken rails with a subsequent dangerous situation. |
|  | DE | 2008 | 101 | The large number of broken rails was due to a severe winter. |
|  | DK | 2006 | 103 | National definition: All events when the signal changes expectantly, also to a more restrictive, are registered. |
|  | DK | 2006 | 104 | National definition: All events when a restrictive signal is passed are registered, also when there is no real danger and in many cases just by a few metres. |
|  | FR | 2006 | 101 | There was a change in reporting procedures between 2006 and 2007. Using 2007 reporting procedures, the figure would have been 346 . |
|  | FR | 2006 | 104 | There was a change in reporting procedures between 2006 and 2007. Using 2007 reporting procedures, the figure would have been 110 . |
|  | IT | 2008 | 101 | There was a change in reporting procedures between 2007 and 2008. |
|  | IT | 2006-08 | 102 | There was a change in reporting procedures between 2006 and 2008. |
|  | LT | 2006-07 | 101-104 | The fluctuation in the reported number of occurrences is the effect of a change in definition. |
|  | NL | 2006 | 102 | The large reported number of track buckles is due to an extremely hot summer causing a great deal of track buckles. |
|  | NL | 2009 | 101 | Breaks in welds and within points have not been included before 2009. |
|  | NO | 2006-07 | 101-102 | Varying weather conditions caused large fluctuations in this variable between 2006 and 2007. |
|  | NO | 2008 | 101, 105 | The change in reported number of events is due to an improved implementation of existing reporting procedures. |
|  | PL | 2006 | 103-104 | The infrastructure manager did not collect information on incidents and near misses before 2007. The information is therefore incomplete. Signals passed at danger were not collected. |
|  | PL | 2006-08 | 103-106 | There has been a change in reporting procedures, explaining the fluctuation in the reported number of events. |
|  | PL | 2009 | 101,102,106 | There was a change in definition in 2009. Broken rails that are not causing disruption of traffic are excluded from reporting. |
|  | UK | 2009 | 103 | A new criterion for including wrong-side signalling failure has been applied since 2009. The number now relates only to cases in which a signal has been displaying an aspect less restrictive than it should as a result of an infrastructure fault. |

Variable Comment
The large numbers are explained by a small number of serious accidents and improved reporting and data collection procedures.
The change is due to a change in definitions and reporting procedures
The change in the reported number of working hours is due to a change in reporting procedures. The figure is taken from Eurostat 2005 data.
The figure given is as per 31 December 2007.
The increase in the number of tracks with ATP in operation is due to modernisation of lines and closure of some lines over time.
The figure is excluding crossovers on main lines and is taken from Eurostat 2005 data.
The figure only includes audits conducted by the State Railway Technical Inspectorate.
The figure includes audits conducted by the IM, RU and State Railway Technical Inspectorate.
The change in the reported number of audits is due to a change in interpretation of the definition.
C00-C04

| R04 |
| :--- |
| R04 |
| R03 |
| R03 |
| R03 |
| T01,T02 |

우 후 훈

| Table | Country | Year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table 8 | LV | 2008 |
| Table 9 | RO | 2008 |
|  | UK | 2007 |
| Table 10 | BE | $2006-07$ |
|  | DE | 2006 |
|  | IT | 2008 |
|  | LT | $2008-09$ |
|  | PL | $2006-07$ |
| Table 11 | LV | 2006 |
|  | LV | 2007 |
|  | UK | 2008 |


| Austria | Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Innovation und Technologie Oberste Eisenbahnbehörde http://www.bmvit.gv.at | Bundesanstalt für Verkehr (VERSA) Unfalluntersuchungstelle des Bundes, Fachbereich Schiene http://versa.bmvit.gv.at |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belgium | Federale Overheidsdienst Mobiliteit en Vervoer Directoraat-generaal vervoer te Land Service Public fédéral Mobilité et Transports Direction générale Transport terrestre http://www.mobilit.fgov.be | Federale Overheidsdienst Mobiliteit en Vervoer Onderzoeksorgaan voor Ongevallen en Incidenten op het Spoor Service Public fédéral Mobilité et Transports Organisme d'enquête sur les Accidents et les Incidents ferroviaires http://www.mobilit.fgov.be |
| Bulgaria | Ministry of Transport - Railway Administration Executive Agency http://www.iaja.government.bg | Ministry of Transport - Railway Accident Investigation Unit http://www.mtitc.government.bg |
| Czech Republic | Drazni Urad - Rail Authority http://www.ducr.cz | Drážní inspekce - Rail Safety Inspection Office http://www.dicr.cz |
| Germany | Eisenbahn - Bundesamt (EBA) http://www.eba.bund.de | Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung Eisenbahn-Unfalluntersuchungsstelle http://www.bmvbs.de |
| Denmark | Trafikstyrelsen http://www.trafikstyrelsen.dk | Havarikommissonen for Civil Luftfart og Jernbane http://www.havarikommissionen.dk |
| Estonia | Estonian Technical Surveillance Authority http://www.tja.ee | Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications Emergency Management Department http://www.mkm.ee |
| Greece | Hellenic Ministry of Infrastructure, Transport and Networks Safety Authority for Railway Transport http://www.yme.gr | Hellenic Ministry of Infrastructure, Transport and Networks Committee for Accident Investigation http://www.yme.gr |
| Spain | Agencia de Seguridad del Transporte Terrestre http://www.fomento.es | Ministerio de Fomento Comision de Investigación de Accidentes ferroviarios http://www.fomento.es |
| Finland | Finnish Transport Safety Agency (TraFi) http://www.trafi.fi | Accident Investigation Board of Finland http://www.onnettomuustutkinta.fi |
| France | Établissement Public de Sécurité Ferroviaire (EPSF) http://www.securite-ferroviaire.fr | Bureau d'Enquêtes sur les Accidents de Transport Terrestre http://www.bea-tt.equipement.gouv.fr |
| Hungary | National Transport Authority http://www.nkh.gov.hu | Transportation Safety Bureau http://www.kbsz.hu |

National safety authority
National investigation body Railway Accident Investigation Unit
Railway Safety Commission http://www.mit.gov.it
Katastrofy tyrimu vadovas
National Investigation Body
http://www.transp.lt
Administration des Enquêtes Techniques
http://www.mt.public.lu/transports/AET/
Transport Accident and Incident Investigation Bureau (TAIIB) http://www.taiib.gov.lv
Dutch Safety Board nl
Accident Investigation Board Norway
http://www.aibn.no
de Seguranco e de Acidentes Ferroviários (GISAF) Autoritatea Feroviară Română (AFER) Autoritatea Feroviara Româna (AFER)
Romanian Railway Investigating Body http://www.afer.ro
Statens haverikommission
Ministry of Transport
Railway Accident and Incident Investigation Division
http://www.mzp.gov.si
Ministry of Transport Posts and Telecommunication
http://www.telecom.gov.sk
Rail Accident Investigation Branch
http://www.raibevk
http://www.raib.gov.uk
See the relevant authority or body in France or the United Kingdom for the
respective part of the Channel Tunnel.

## Key documents and references

Regulation (EC) No 881/2004 of the European Parliament and Council of 29 April 2004 establishing a European railway agency amended by Regulation (EC) No 1335/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008.

Directive 2004/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on safety on the Community's railways and amending Council Directive 95/18/EC on the licensing of railway undertakings and Directive 2001/14/EC on the allocation of railway infrastructure capacity and the levying of charges for the use of railway infrastructure and safety certification; amended by:

- Directive 2008/57/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008;
- Directive 2008/110/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008;
- Commission Directive 2009/149/EC of 27 November 2009 as regards Common Safety Indicators and common methods to calculate accident costs.

Regulation (EC) No 91/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council on rail transport statistics amended by:

- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1192/2003 of 3 July 2003;
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 1304/2007 of 7 November 2007;
- Regulation (EC) No 219/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2009.

The annual reports of all Member States' NIBs and NSAs submitted to the Agency.
All documents can be obtained through our web pages (http://www.era.europa.eu).

[^11]Headquarters in Valenciennes:

120, Rue Marc Lefrancq 59300 Valenciennes FRANCE

Tel. +33 327096-500

Conference centre in Lille:

Espace International
299, Boulevard de Leeds 59777 Lille
FRANCE
www.era.europa.eu



[^0]:    (1) $\operatorname{COM}(2004) 49$.

[^1]:    ( ${ }^{2}$ ) Article 24 of the railway safety directive.
    (3) Article 18 of the railway safety directive.

[^2]:    (4) $\operatorname{COM(2009)} 149$.

[^3]:    ${ }^{(5)}$ Besides excluding some countries due to changes in definitions, Austria is not included in the dataset for broken rails and Greece for track buckles, as they did not report relevant data for the entire period.

[^4]:    (9) CT is the abbreviation for Channel Tunnel
    (7) Exact value 57.7 \% for EU-27 excluding Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Poland.

[^5]:    ( ${ }^{8}$ ) Exact figure for 2009 is 0.392 level crossings per track-km in EU countries excluding Romania and Luxembourg.
    $\left({ }^{9}\right)$ Exact figure for 2009 is 0.413 (41.3 \%) for EU countries excluding France, Italy and Portugal.

[^6]:    ( ${ }^{10}$ ) Exact value for 2009 is $67 \%$ (excluding Channel Tunnel).

[^7]:    $\left({ }^{11)}\right.$ These figures differ slightly from the initial values, which were also given in the Agency's 2010 Safety Performance Report. The final figures were communicated to the Agency in late 2010.

[^8]:    ${ }^{(12)}$ Commission Regulation (EU) No 1169/2010 on a common safety method for assessing conformity with the requirements for obtaining a railway safety authorisation and Commission Regulation (EU) No 1158/2010 on a common safety method for assessing conformity with the requirements for obtaining railway safety certificates.

[^9]:    ${ }^{(13)}$ https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/risdb
    ( ${ }^{14}$ ) Article $8(2)$ and (4) of Directive 2004/49/EC.

[^10]:    ( ${ }^{15}$ ) 'Evaluation of the way in which national safety rules are published and made available', supporting paper to final report (ERA/INF/02-2009/SAF).
    ${ }^{(16)}$ ) 'Recommendation to the Commission for the publication of national safety rules in order to make the relevant information more easily accessible' (ERA/REC/04-2009/SAF).
    $\left({ }^{17}\right)$ 'Evaluation of the way in which national safety rules are published and made available', final report (ERA/REP/04-2009/SAF).
    ${ }^{(18)}$ Regulation (EC) No 352/2009 on a common safety method on risk evaluation and assessment.
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