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1. **Executive Summary:**

The National Transport Commission (NTC) has released a Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement (C-RIS) for comment in respect of the Draft Code for the land transport of dangerous goods. In November 2020, transport and infrastructure ministers approved the NTC’s recommendation to conduct a comprehensive review of the Australian Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road and Rail (the Code). Ministers also supported that the Code be expanded to include Class 1 Explosives and that the NTC incorporate into the Code principles from both:

• the Agreement for the International Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR)

• the Agreement for the International Transport of Dangerous Goods by Rail (RID).

The timeline indicated for implementation of the code is October 1 2026 and it is referenced that the current legislative framework and implementation of the Code by States and Territories are out of scope for the C-RIS.

In Queensland, the legislative provisions for the transport of dangerous goods by road are found in the [*Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act (TORUM) 1995*](https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/whole/html/inforce/current/act-1995-009) and the [Transport Operations (Road Use Management – Dangerous Goods) Regulation (TO(RUM–DG)).](https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/sl-2018-0107)

Section 6.4.1.3 of the C-RIS references the main costs for Government of implementing the draft Code would be expected to include:

• The adoption of the draft Code into State and Territory legislation. This includes costs associated with the preparation of drafting instructions for Parliamentary Counsel, drafting and printing costs.

• Industry communication and education including the development of guidance material.

• System costs associated with updating electronic information for changes to requirements for the transport of dangerous goods.

• Retraining of dangerous goods inspectors, Competent Authorities and Occupational Health and Safety Personnel.

• Updating databases and revising training manuals and documentation for changes to requirements for the transport of dangerous goods.

This would infer some form of harmonisation with or replacement of existing State legislation with National overarching legislation which raises some significant operational and Machinery of Government concerns.

***At the forefront clarification is sought around this initially as the C-RIS is not clear on the intention in respect of this key element.***

A preliminary review of the C-RIS has been conducted to identify potential impacts solely on road policing operations. Questions raised within the C-RIS have been provided with QPS Responses/Potential Impacts and are included in Section 3.

1. **Summary of main issues identified:**

* As detailed in the Executive Summary if the current legislative provisions are replaced by the proposed Code, this will have challenges in respect of powers as Queensland Police Officers operate as authorised officers under the TORUM and TO(RUM-DG).

* Costs and time associated with training of Queensland Police Officers in respect of the proposed provisions under the code would be significant and is in addition to ancillary costs associated with internal policy and legislative changes.
* 5.8.1.1 Q22 & Q24 – Removal of Emergency Information Panels (EIP) from IBCs is of a concern for first responders that are responding to an incident in the event that the Emergency Information Holder in the drivers cab is not accessible.
* 5.9 – C-RIS talks of AS2809 and the Code both addressing design and manufacture of tanks which will create ambiguity. It is suggested from a QPS perspective that one or the other should be adopted – not both.
* 5.10.2.3 - Separating stowage and restraint requirements for protecting dangerous goods from the load restraint performance standards that apply to all vehicles. QPS stance is that Load restraint performance standards should not be included in the Code and referenced back to NTC Load Restraint Guide 2018 to avoid duplication and confusion. The Code has also indicated a move away from vehicle gates due to the manual handling risks that the use of gates presents. A suitable alternative to gates needs to be identified.
* 5.11.1.1 – Ref 8.1.5 Dangerous goods of division 2.3, 6.1 or 8 will be required to carry an emergency escape mask, with the minimum requirement specified as an A2B2E2K2- P2 type in-lieu of Self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) – This should be provided to Queensland Fire and Rescue Services to comment upon. Concerns are in respect of safety for the heavy vehicle driver and ability for the driver to maintain safety for themselves in the event that they may be trying to extinguish a wheel end fire.
* 5.13 – Proposed requirements for diesel transport when more than the low volume threshold (3,000 litres) including placarding, emergency response equipment and transport documents – This would be a positive move but will also be a cohort that would create additional compliance workload. The C-RIS indicates that it will possibly not be included until post adoption of the Code.
* 5.13.3 - Class 1 explosives have been raised as to be incorporated into the Code with the caveat that it will possibly not be included until post adoption of the Code. Queensland Police Service needs to be involved in the consultation process in respect of Class 1 explosives due to the potential significant community and responding officer safety risk it presents.
* 5.13.6 – Licensing for dangerous goods drivers and vehicles. Proposes that drivers transporting dangerous goods requiring placarding undertake two-day TLILIC0001 training course, and pass the associated mandatory assessment instrument, suitable driving history and meet the requirements of a commercial driver under the Austroads Assessing Fitness to Drive medical standards. This would be a positive step for the Dangerous Goods transport industry.
* 6.3.2.4 – Q76 - In respect of Provision 7.1.7.4- ‘*Consignors of dangerous goods will be required to provide carriers with a list of the suppliers of coolant available enroute, which can be expected to a small increase in regulatory burden.’*  - Question is what processes are proposed to oversee compliance in regards to this provision?

1. **Queensland Police Service responses to C-RIS:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Questions | QPS Responses/Potential Impacts |
| **5 – Selected option** | |
| **5.4 Part 1 – General requirements** | |
| Q1. How will including information in the Code, that is currently only found in the regulations, help your organisation? | R1. The inclusions of information that is contained within the Code would provide a more consistent approach across industry and from a compliance and enforcement perspective would potentially remove ambiguity in interpretation. |
| Q2. Should the dangerous goods safety advisor role be made mandatory? | R2. Although the addition of making a dangerous goods safety advisor role mandatory is an added cost to industry it would improve compliance for industry to dangerous goods legislative provisions which would be beneficial. |
| **5.4.7 Chapter 1.10 – Security provisions** | |
| Q3. We seek to understand to what extent transport providers already have measures in place to ensure the security of dangerous goods and costs associated with this. In particular:  - Do you have a security plan in place for dangerous goods of security concern? If so, what costs are associated with the development and implementation of this per annum?  - What if any additional costs would be expected from complying with these security provisions? | R3. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q4. Do you consider the thresholds for high consequence dangerous goods, which would require the preparation of a security plan, are appropriate?  - If not, please explain why? | R4. Queensland Police Service would deem the thresholds for high consequence dangerous goods as acceptable and support a reduction of risk to transport operators, their employees and the community associated with the theft and/or tampering of dangerous during the transport/logistics process. |
| **5.6.2 Special Provisions** | |
| Q5. How many consignments of impacted goods do you consign per annum, on average? | R5. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q6. Can you provide an estimate of the annual savings in dangerous goods surcharges these concessions would provide your business? | R6. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.6.2.5 Australian specific special provisions** | |
| For all changes proposed for AU special provisions:  Q7. Are there any impacts you believe have not been identified and addressed?  Q8. If so, please indicate the applicable special Provision number(s) and the associated impact(s). | R7. Industry related AU provisions are not applicable to Queensland Police Service.  R8. As above not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q9. If your operations are impacted by the changes made to AU01, what industry do you operate in and what articles would be impacted? | R9. AU01 relates to the total exemption for ready to use pharmaceutical products and as such are not applicable to Queensland Police Service. The two levels of exemption proposed seem an acceptable solution to ensure industry is informed but minimum safety requirements are still met. |
| Q10. If any, what operational implications would there be for your industry? | R10. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q11. How many large capacity consignment/packages would this change impact per year? What proportion of total consignments does this represent? | R11. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q12. If possible, please provide an estimate of the additional costs associated with this change, including packaging, preparation of transport documentation, and marking and labelling costs. | R12. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.7 Part 4 – Packing and tank provisions** | |
| **5.7.1 Packing Instructions** | |
| For all proposed new or amended packing instructions applicable to your organisation (please include the provision number(s) in your response):  Q13. If your operations are impacted by these changes, what industry does your business operate in? | The proposed changes aim to promote transparency of the requirements and reduce inadvertent non-compliance so in principal the changes would be supported by Queensland Police Service.  R13. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q14. What are the implications on your operations? | R14. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q15. What is the volume of goods impacted by these changes? | R15. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q16. Are there any additional or reduced costs associated with the proposed new or amended provisions? | R16. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.7.2 Use of portable tanks and MEGCs** | |
| Q17. Will the proposed new provisions for tube-vehicles have any impacts on your operations? | R17. New provisions pertain to the degree of filling for tanks, filling conditions and test pressures, and special provisions applicable to the packing and filling of specific goods and classes. The impact for Queensland Police Service will be in relation to becoming conversant with these changes. |
| Q18. What is the volume of goods impacted by these changes? | R18. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q19. Are there any additional or reduced costs associated with the proposed new or amended provisions? | R19. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.7.3 Vacuum-operated waste trucks (vacuum tankers) and mobile explosive manufacturing units (MPUs)** | |
| Q20. Do you have any concerns with the inclusion of vacuum waste tankers directly in the ADG? | R20. Queensland Police Service would support the inclusion of vacuum waste tankers directly in the ADG as the proposed inclusion would make it easier for regulators to assess compliance and undertake enforcement. |
| **5.8 Part 5 – Consignment procedures** | |
| Q21. If the requirement for placards to be reflective is retained, what do you believe would be an appropriate transition time for compliance? | R21. Queensland Police Service would support this provision as it provides greater visibility for emergency responders, which can be expected to improve safety outcomes. |
| Q22. Are there any additional impacts/benefits from the removal of EIPs from IBCs that have not been considered? | R22. Queensland Police Service would not support the removal of Emergency Information Panels (EIP) from IBC’s due to the additional safety layers that this provides when responding to incidents. |
| Q23. What are the additional costs associated with the requirement to carry ‘Instructions in Writing? | R23. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q24. Do you have any comments or concerns with any of the changes to Part 5 of the Code? | R24. The proposal with Part 5 of the Code for the removal of ‘placardable unit’ with the transition to full alignment with the UN concept of packages and tanks, which commenced with introduction of ADG 7 is not supported. In the event of a major incident the ability for responding units to be able to identify EIPs on a load in the event of being unable to access Emergency Information holders inside drivers cabs is of paramount importance. Queensland Police Service acknowledges the cost impacts to industry of maintaining this process but believes that first responder and community safety outweighs any cost imposition to any party. The retention of EIP’s on containers is also paramount where loads become dislodged from transport vehicles either in normal transit or at point of collision. |
| **5.9 Part 6 – Design and construction of containment systems** | |
| Q25. If you design, manufacture or use tanks and tank vehicles, do you foresee using the ADR-style tank designs in your operations? | R25. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q26. If you use segregation devices in your transport operations, do you consider that the updated requirements for segregation devices, or packagings used for segregation will affect your operations? | R26. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q27. If yes, please provide information | R27. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q28. Do you have any comments or concerns with any of the changes to Part 6 of the Code? | R28. Queensland Police Service would support the adoption of industry to using the ADR-style tank designs in their operations due to the transport of substances not properly addressed by AS 2809. This would also support greater clarity in the design, construction, and use of different vehicles and containers, supporting greater consistency in practice and improved safety outcomes across Australia. If adopted AS 2809 should be rescinded and ADR-style tank designs would need to become all encompassing to cover design requirements. |
| **5.10 Part 7 – Provisions concerning the conditions of carriage, loading, unloading and handling** | |
| **5.10.1.2 Provisions concerning the carriage of packages** | |
| For all V codes proposed:  Q29. Are there any implications on your operations?  - If so, please indicate the applicable V code(s) and the associated impact(s). | R29. The restricting of carriage to closed or sheeted vehicles (i.e. a curtain sided vehicle with a solid roof structure supported by a headboard and tailboard), where transport in an open vehicle is considered to present an unacceptable risk is supported by Queensland Police Service. The requirement for closed vehicles as opposed to closed or sheeted vehicles, ensures controls are proportionate to the risk and do not unnecessarily impede transport. |
| Q30. Are there any additional or reduced costs associated with the proposed new or amended provisions?  - If so, please indicate the applicable V code(s) and the associated increase or reduction in costs. | R30. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.10.2.1 CV Codes** | |
| For all CV codes proposed:  Q31. Are there any implications on your operations?  – If so, please indicate the applicable CV code(s) and the associated impact(s). | R31. The proposed Section 7.5.11 of the draft Code is supported by Queensland Police Service as it provides additional provisions to prevent collapsing of stacked dangerous goods, which can be expected to increase safety outcomes for duty holders, the community, and emergency responders. |
| Q32. Are there any additional or reduced costs associated with the proposed new or amended provisions?  – If so, please indicate the applicable CV code(s) and the associated increase or reduction in costs. | R32. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.10.2.2 Segregation** | |
| Q33. Do you agree with the proposal to allow segregation to be achieved using partitions? | R33. Queensland Police Service would support the proposal to allow segregation to be achieved using partitions if the segregation device is of suitable design, construction, materials and strength for the intended service |
| Q34. If the proposal for partitions is retained, should they be permitted only for non-liquid dangerous goods? | R34. Queensland Police Service would support the proposal for partitions being retained only for non-liquid dangerous goods. |
| **5.10.2.3 Stowage** | |
| Q35. Do you agree with separating stowage and restraint requirements for protecting dangerous goods from the load restraint performance standards that apply to all vehicles (vehicle stability and loss of load)? | R35. Queensland Police Service does not support any shift away from load restraint performance standards that apply to all vehicles (vehicle stability and loss of load) including the removal for the mandatory use of gates. |
| Q36. If the load restraint performance standards are included in the Code, what measures should be in place to ensure they remain current with the relevant legislation)? | R36. Load restraint performance standards should not be included in the Code and referenced back to NTC Load Restraint Guide 2018 to avoid duplication and confusion. |
| **5.11 Part 8 – Requirements for vehicle crews, equipment, operation and documentation** | |
| For all changes proposed in Part 8:  Q37. Do you have any concerns or comments regarding the proposed changes. | R37. Providing clearer provisions relating to equipment substitution to reduce the number of wheel end fires that result in complete vehicle loss as more appropriate extinguishing agents would be carried is a supported approach. |
| Q38. If so, please indicate the applicable change and the associated commentary. | R38. Queensland Police Service supports the adoption of a simplified list of requirements to reduce the potential for inadvertent noncompliance. And requiring that duty holders carry additional equipment, so they would be better equipped to handle a greater range of scenarios, improving safety outcomes.  Queensland Police Service supports the minimum fire extinguisher requirements in the future code:   1. Extinguishers for the load area of a transport unit transporting a load above the small load threshold (the equivalent of a placard load in the current code):   – For a transport unit with a maximum mass no more than 4.5 tonnes, a single 2 kg extinguisher.  – For a transport unit with a maximum mass greater than 4.5 tonnes, for each vehicle that is transporting dangerous goods (whether alone or in a combination):  • In packages, one extinguisher of at least 4.5 kg capacity.  • In tanks or bulk containers, two extinguishers with a total capacity of at least 9 kg, one of which must be at least 4.5 kg.  2) Extinguishers for the engine/cab, regardless of  transport unit mass:  – A single extinguisher of at least 2 kg  capacity suitable for an engine or cab fire.  Queensland Police Service supports the permitting substitution of the load area extinguishers with an equivalent capacity of foam or water. It is noted that this has been included that these agents may be more appropriate for wheel and tyre fires.  Removal of the provision for having SCBA’s for dangerous goods of division 2.3, 6.1 or 8 and replacing with a filtering escape masks raises concerns for Queensland Police Service and requires comment from Queensland Fire and Rescue Service in respect of safety for the heavy vehicle driver and ability for the driver to maintain safety for themselves in the event that they may be trying to extinguish a wheel end fire.  Queensland Police Service would like input into any proposed new requirements for fixed fire-fighting systems on vehicles transporting ammonium nitrate due to two recent incidents involving vehicles transporting ammonium nitrate. |
| **5.12 Part 9 – Requirements concerning construction and approval of vehicles** | |
| Q39. Do you have any concerns regarding the proposed changes for vehicles? | R39. Yes |
| Q40. If so, please indicate the applicable change and the associated commentary | R40. The proposal to expect the continued tank design to AS 2809 and if a transporter needs a tank that falls outside of the provisions of AS 2809 that the Code would provide the rule-set for regulators and industry to apply is ambiguous. If AS 2809 is not all-encompassing then it either needs amendment or abolishment and replacing with the Code. Working against two separate sets of requirements is not beneficial from a regulator or compliance perspective nor is it in the best interests of industry.  It is noted that there is proposed transitional arrangements but these will be difficult to manage from a compliance perspective. |
| **5.13 Issues requiring further detailed consultation** | |
| Q41. & Q42. | R41. & R42. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q43. Please advise if you support the following requirements for diesel transport for more than the low volume threshold (3,000 L in this proposal)?  − Placarding of vehicles to provide hazard communication  − Emergency preparation, including developing a plan for incidents  − Fire extinguishers and emergency response equipment  − Transport documents and carrying emergency information  − Are there any other controls in transport you consider would be necessary? | R43. Queensland Police Service would support the following requirements for diesel transport for more than the low volume threshold:  − Placarding of vehicles to provide hazard communication  − Emergency preparation, including developing a plan for incidents  − Fire extinguishers and emergency response equipment  − Transport documents and carrying emergency information  Environmental hazards and risks also need to be addressed in respect of diesel transport above the low volume threshold. |
| **5.13.2 Mixed load EIPs for refined petroleum products** | |
| Q44. Which of the above two options do you prefer? | R44. Queensland Police Service supports Option 1. |
| Q45. Are you aware of any unintended consequences if Option 1 is adopted? | R45. No unintended consequences identified |
| **5.13.3 Incorporation of Class 1 explosives into the Code** | |
| Q46. If you transport Class 1 explosives, are there any provisions for the transport of these substances or articles in the draft Code that will significantly impact your transport operations? | R46. Queensland Police Service would like to be involved in the consultation phase in respect of Class 1 explosives due to significant movement of Class 1 explosives on Queensland Roads. |
| Q47. If you transport Class 1 explosives, are there any provisions for the transport of these substances or articles in the draft Code that you consider need to be included in the draft Code? | R47. Queensland Police Service would like to be involved in the consultation phase in respect of Class 1 explosives due to significant movement of Class 1 explosives on Queensland Roads. |
| Q48. Do you consider applying the high security risk load requirements to all explosives Category 3 loads appropriate? | R48. Queensland Police Service is of the belief that all three categories of explosives have high security risk load requirements applied to the transportation. |
| Q49. Do you undertake any transport of Class 1 explosives in tanks?  − If yes, please provide information about types and quantities | R49. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q50. Do you undertake any transport of Class 1 explosives in IBCs?  − If yes, please provide information about types and quantities. | R50. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.13.4 Transitional provisions of the draft Code** | |
| Q51. Do you support the NTC introducing more detailed transitional provisions into the Code? | R51. Queensland Police Service would require consultation in respect of any new proposed transitional provisions that can impact road or community safety provisions. |
| Q52. Do you have any concerns with the proposed principles for transitional provisions? | R52. As with any legacy provisions the transitional provisions need to be such that compliance can be easily maintained and that transitions are such that they are reasonable and not drawn out timeframes. |
| **5.13.5 Provisions for transport of small loads of dangerous goods** | |
| Q53. After reviewing the draft provisions in 1.1.3.6, please advise | R53. This is not a question and refers to Questions 54-62 |
| Q54. Should all infectious substances be subjected to a “0” threshold? | R54. Queensland Police Service would support all infectious substances be subjected to a “0” threshold and therefore require placarding. |
| Q55. Are there particular transport scenarios for Category B infectious substances that require a specific concession or exemption? | R55. Queensland Police Service would not support specific concession or exemption for infectious substances. |
| Q56. Should toxic or corrosive gases be subjected to a lower threshold than “250”?  - Note for comparison, ADR uses a threshold of “20” for these substances. | R56. Queensland Police Service would support maintaining ADR threshold for toxic or corrosive gases for the safety of first responders |
| Q57. Should self-reactive substances and organic peroxides be further divided up?  - Note for comparison, ADR assigns a threshold of “20” for types B & C, and any of these substances that require temperature control to remain stable in transport. | R57. Queensland Police Service would support maintaining ADR threshold for self-reactive substances and organic peroxides for the safety of first responders |
| Q58. Should aerosols be treated like other gases, and be subjected to a lower threshold for higher risk aerosols?  - Note for comparison, ADR assigns a threshold value of “20” for toxic and corrosive aerosols, and “333” for flammable aerosols. | R59. Yes aerosols be treated like other gases, and be subjected to a lower threshold for higher risk aerosols. |
| Q59. Do you consider that including the transport categories in the dangerous goods list will assist you to determine if a load is a small load or not? | R59. Queensland Police Service would support this as it would assist in respect of compliance and enforcement as well as emergency response. |
| Q60. The specific concessions for transporters of small loads are included in 1.1.3.6.6. Are there any concessions that you think are, or are not, appropriate to include? | R60. Queensland Police Service would like more consultation in regards to the specific concessions for transporters of small loads that are included in 1.1.3.6.6. |
| Q61. Do you consider there are other substances or articles that should be included in the “0” threshold category? Placarding is mandatory for anything included in this category. | R61. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q62. Do you consider there are other substances or articles that should be included in the “unlimited” threshold category? Placarding is not required for anything included in this category | R62. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **5.13.6 Licensing for dangerous goods drivers.** | |
| Q63. Do you support different requirements for driver and vehicle licensing? | R63. Queensland Police Service supports the approach that a driver transporting dangerous goods requiring placarding needs to:   * Undertake the 2-day TLILIC0001 training course, and pass the associated mandatory assessment instrument * Meet the Competent Authority's requirements for a suitable driving history * Meet the requirements of a commercial driver under the Austroads Assessing Fitness to Drive medical standards.   In respect of vehicle licensing Queensland Police agrees with the proposal:  1. Licensing required for:  a.) any vehicle transporting dangerous goods in tanks or bulk containers.  b.) any vehicle where transfer can take place while the containment system (including packages) is mounted on the vehicle.  2. A notification scheme for operators of vehicles that are transporting placard loads of dangerous goods that do not require a licence. |
| Q64. Do you consider that formal training for drivers would be useful in cases where a driver does not need a licence? | R64. As per above requirements where a vehicle is required to be placarded. |
| Q65. Do you support the introduction of a notification scheme for vehicles that don’t require a licence? | R65. As per above requirements where a vehicle is required to be placarded. |
| **6. What is the likely net benefit of each option?** | |
| **6.2.2 Impact Analysis** | |
| Q66. How many people within your business will need to be retrained to support compliance with the draft Code? What is the expected training cost per person? | R66. Queensland Police Service has approximately 12,500 sworn officers across Queensland that could all be called upon to respond to a dangerous goods incident. At a minimum Queensland Police Service would have between 2-4 thousand Highway Patrol and rural general duties officers that would require training in respect of compliance capability.  Due to the unknown final content of the Code and what the full effect on compliance capability will be it is difficult to ascertain what the expected training cost per person would be other than it would be a significant cost. |
| Q67. How much will it cost to update your systems to incorporate the proposed changes to the DGL and placarding thresholds? | R67. Costs to Queensland Police Service will be in the form of policy and procedural administrative and training costs. |
| Q68. How much will it cost to update processes and documentation? | R68. As detailed above a final determination is unknown at this stage of the consultation process. |
| Q69. Are there any one-off costs anticipated for your business? | R69. Again as detailed above a final determination is unknown at this stage of the consultation process |
| Q70. We are keen to understand the expected benefits and costs of key changes presented in Table 16, and particularly welcome any data or case studies to evidence these impacts. | R70. Reference EIPs for IBCs (Part 5.2) Draft Change: *‘The concept of a placardable unit has been omitted from the draft Code and all packaging (including IBCs) require standard marking and labelling only. This removes the requirements for IBCs to display EIPs.’* This raises concerns as detailed earlier in R24. In that the removal of EIPs from IBCs could place first responders in the event of an incident at risk if unable to get to drivers door Emergency Information holder. |
| **6.3 Transport Industry** | |
| Q71. How many people within your business will need to be retrained to support compliance with the draft Code?  What is the expected training cost per person? | R71. As per response R66. Queensland Police Service has approximately 12,500 sworn officers across Queensland that could all be called upon to respond to a dangerous good incident. At a minimum Queensland Police Service would have between 2-4 thousand Highway Patrol and rural general duties officers that would require training in respect of compliance capability.  Due to the unknown final content of the Code and what the full effect on compliance capability will be it is difficult to ascertain what the expected training cost per person would be other than it would be a significant cost. |
| Q72. How much will it cost to update processes and documentation? | R72. As detailed previously a final determination is unknown at this stage of the consultation process. Costs are subject to factors such as will the introduction of the Code see the legislative provisions for the transport of dangerous goods by road as found in the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act (TORUM) 1995* and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management – Dangerous Goods) Regulation (TO(RUM–DG)) no longer being applicable and be replaced fully by the Code? This is not detailed or made clear within the C-RIS |
| Q73. How much will it cost your business to update firefighting and emergency equipment to comply with the draft Code? | R73. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| Q74. What are the cost savings associated with the changes to the requirement for emergency escape masks? | R74. As detailed in R38. Removal of the provision for having SCBA’s for dangerous goods of division 2.3, 6.1 or 8 and replacing with a filtering escape masks raises concerns for Queensland Police Service and requires comment from Queensland Fire and Rescue Service in respect of safety for the heavy vehicle driver and ability for the driver to maintain safety for themselves in the event that they may be trying to extinguish a wheel end fire. |
| Q75. Are there any one-off costs anticipated for your business? | R75. A determination of one-off costs is unknown at this stage of the consultation process. |
| **6.3.2.4 Change in ongoing costs required to comply with the draft Code** | |
| Q76. We are keen to understand the expected benefits and costs of key changes presented in Table 18, and particularly welcome any data or case studies to evidence these impacts. | R76. In respect of Provision 7.1.7.4- ‘*Consignors of dangerous goods will be required to provide carriers with a list of the suppliers of coolant available enroute, which can be expected to a small increase in regulatory burden.’*  - Question is what processes are proposed to oversee compliance in regards to this provision?  Chapter 7.2 (V-codes) – proposed changes in respect of Chapter 7.2 will require a layer of compliance oversight.  Section 7.5.11 (CV codes) - Queensland Police Service supports the proposed changes in principle due to the increased public safety that would come from these changes – these changes will also require a layer of compliance oversight.  Section 8.1.4 & 8.1.5 - Queensland Police Service supports the approach to providing clearer provisions relating to fire extinguisher substitution being expected to reduce the number of wheel end fires that result in complete vehicle loss with more appropriate extinguishing agents would be carried. Queensland Police Service however does have concerns with the removal of the provision for having SCBA’s for dangerous goods of division 2.3, 6.1 or 8 and replacing with a filtering escape masks – this area needs to have QFRS input.  Section 1.10.3 - Queensland Police Service supports operators transporting high consequence goods being required to develop a security plan that addresses the security requirements for the loads being transported.  Provision 5.3.1.1.2 - Queensland Police Service supports the introduction of reflective placards.  Section 5.4.3 – The requirement for drivers to carry ‘Instructions in Writing’ in respect of actions to take in an emergency is a positive public safety change. |
| Q77. We seek data from each State & Territory on the number of dangerous goods inspectors and other staff that are actively involved in the administration and enforcement of the Code. | R77. Queensland Police Service has approximately 12,500 sworn officers across Queensland that could all be called upon to respond to a dangerous goods incident. At a minimum Queensland Police Service would have between 2-4 thousand Highway Patrol and rural general duties officers that would require training in respect of compliance capability. In addition Queensland Police Service has a dedicated Heavy Vehicle Enforcement Team (HVET) that travels across the state and sits in the office of Road Policing Task Force as part of Road Policing Regional Support Command.  HVET is very proactive in the Dangerous Goods Heavy Vehicle space. |
| **6.4 NTC, Regulators and Competent Authorities** | |
| **6.4.1 Impact Analysis** | |
| Q78. Referring to Section 3.3 Special Provisions, which remove the need for Competent Authority intervention (see Section 5.6.2.4), we’d like to understand from Competent Authorities:  − Approximately how many interventions of this type are currently made per year, on average.  − Approximately how much time is associated with each intervention, on average (i.e. the time it takes for a Competent Authority to reach an outcome/decision from when first approached).  − Approximate effort associated with each intervention, on average (i.e., number of hours by staff level and wage per hour). | R78. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service – competent authority’s in Queensland are Department of Transport and Main Roads and Rail Safety Regulation in respect of Rail. |
| Q79. By comprehensively addressing gaps and errors in the current Code, the NTC is expecting that this will reduce the number of industry submissions to Competent Authorities, in particular the number determinations. We seek data from Competent Authorities on the effort expended on each determination, on average (i.e., number of hours by staff level)? | R79. Not applicable to Queensland Police Service. |
| **6.4.1.3 Government costs associated with implementing the draft Code** | |
| Q80. We seek estimated costs from each State & Territory to implement the draft Code, as per the breakdowns provided in the list above. | R80. Unable to comment as outside of scope for Queensland Police Service to respond. |
| Q81. Are there any State or Territory specific impacts that need to be considered? Please provide details. | R81. Significant dangerous goods movements in the State of Queensland with large mining industry in regional Queensland and the tyranny of distance and remoteness provides challenges for both industry and Queensland Police Service when responding to adverse events or conducting compliance requirements. These challenges impact the service from both a cost and resourcing capability. |
| **6.5 Community and Government** | |
| Estimated number of dangerous goods accidents and incidents | |
| Q82. We seek any updates on the data set out in this section including data on the:  − The number of dangerous goods road and rail incidents.  − The proportion of incidents involving a fatality, serious injury, minor injury or spill.  − The costs associated with each type of incident above. | R82. Queensland Police Service will defer to other responding agencies to provide the data for this data sub-set. |