Draft Code for the land transport of dangerous goods – Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement (C-RIS)

Submissions close on Tuesday 24th December 2024.

**Details of person submitting comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name:** | Shannon Zavec | | | |
| **Email:** | Shannon.zavec@watercorporation.com.au | | **Mobile** (optional): |  |
| If you are submitting comments on behalf of an association or organisation, please provide the following details. | | | | |
| **Organisation name:** | | Water Corporation WA | | |

C-RIS questions. Please enter your comments in the row below each question.

***Note:*** *you are not required to answer every question.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.4.6.1: Administrative controls – key changes | |
|  | How will including information in the Code, that is currently only found in the regulations, help your organisation? |
| Technical information is better placed in a code rather than in regulations. Inclusion of technical information in a code presents the following advantages:   * *Flexibility*: There is more flexibility in updating a code, as it is not bound by process requirements to change regulations. * *Law*: Regulations should provide the general legal framework and principles, whereas a Code provides specific technical requirements to comply with the regulations. * *Expert Review*: The Code is updated at least every two years by the NTC with input from technical experts at CAP and from industry. The regulations are not expected to be reviewed or updated as frequently as the Code. * *Consistency*: The state regulations should reference the technical information in the Code, ensuring national consistency. | |
|  | Should the dangerous goods safety advisor role be made mandatory? |
| The dangerous goods safety advisor role should not be mandatory. There is no data to indicate how many dangerous goods safety advisors will be needed or what training is required. Mandating the role in the Code may lead to unnecessary financial and operational risks to carriers.  We don’t envisage that the Regulator would want to administer or manage an accreditation system for dangerous goods safety advisors. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.4.7.1: Security requirements – key changes | |
|  | 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? |
| Currently, the Water Corporation do not provide ‘security plans’ as described in the draft Code for the internal transport of high consequence dangerous goods.  However, we do acknowledge and abide by the current requirements outside of this Code in the form of the National Legislation i.e. chemicals of security concern.  Costs associated with this new requirement would be difficult to estimate, due to several criteria listed in chapter 1.10. | |
|  | 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? |
| There may be some unintended consequences with the class lists and thresholds in the table. Some specific dangerous goods in classes that are not of security concern may be captured, while others that are of security concern may not be captured.  Whilst we acknowledge the simplicity of the class system, substances that require a security plan are best dealt with by UN number, not by class. There should not be an increase in administrative burden on companies without a significant positive increase in security outcomes. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.6.2.2.1: Special provisions that provide full or partial exemptions | |
| For each concessional exemption applicable to your organisation (please include the special Provision number(s) in your response). | |
|  | How many consignments of impacted goods do you consign per annum, on average? |
| Water Corporation provides water and wastewater services throughout Western Australia.  For chlorine gas alone, approximately 1,800 deliveries per annum of 33kg and 70kg cylinders are undertaken by our logistics contractor. From pre-determined base sites our internal teams then transport these cylinders to their required locations. | |
|  | Can you provide an estimate of the annual savings in dangerous goods surcharges these concessions would provide your business? |
| Removal of special provision AU07 would not provide an annual saving; in fact, our costs would increase due to an increased frequency of trips having to be undertaken by us and our transport providers. The additional fuel consumption costs by our providers would be passed on to our business for each additional trip. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.6.2.5.1: Australian specific special provisions | |
| For all changes proposed for AU special provisions: | |
|  | Are there any impacts you believe have not been identified and addressed? |
| The draft Impact Statement doesn’t address increased greenhouse gas emissions or the potential for an increase in accidents associated with increased transport activities.  Changes such as the removal of AU07 would increase the potential for transport accidents (due to increased driving and transport) and emissions of greenhouse gases.  There is no data, statistics or evidence provided to justify an increase in regulation for UN3077 and UN3082 (removal of AU01).  Additional impacts could arise from potential safety risks if exemptions are not consistently applied. A periodic review mechanism should be introduced to help address any unintended consequences. | |
|  | If so, please indicate the applicable special Provision number(s) and the associated impact(s). |
| AU07, AU01 | |
| For AU01 | |
|  | If your operations are impacted by the changes made to AU01, what industry do you operate in and what articles would be impacted? |
| The Water Corporation provides water and wastewater services throughout Western Australia, and many of our sites store and/or use chemicals designated as UN3077 or UN3082.  Numerous articles impacted: Reagents, Herbicides, Pesticides, Resins | |
|  | If any, what operational implications would there be for your industry? |
| Currently, Class 9 UN3077 and UN3082 products are not dangerous goods for storage and licencing. This is because the State’s Dangerous Goods (Storage and Handling of Non-Explosives) Regulations exclude these products by referencing the special provisions of the ADG code. If the special provision AU01 is removed from the ADG Code, the products with UN numbers 3077 and 3082 will be DGs in WA and might need to be included in the DG site licences, be stored in a bunded location, and be included in the risk assessments that support the licences.  It also means that the quantities of these products will have to be considered when calculating the threshold quantity for a site to require a DG licence. | |
|  | How many large capacity consignment/packages would this change impact per year? What proportion of total consignments does this represent? |
| Unknown at this stage. | |
|  | 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. |
| The costs would also need to factor in the time to train people, as well as the preparation of transport documentation. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.7.1.1: Packing instructions | |
| For all proposed new or amended packing instructions applicable to your organisation (please include the provision number(s) in your response): | |
|  | If your operations are impacted by these changes, what industry does your business operate in? |
| Water Industry; we do, however, transport new and used batteries between some sites and depots etc.  P003 and P801 for batteries of UN 2800 | |
|  | What are the implications on your operations? |
| Training and understanding of PP16 and SP 295/598 | |
|  | What is the volume of goods impacted by these changes? |
| Approximately 1 tonne per annum | |
|  | Are there any additional or reduced costs associated with the proposed new or amended provisions? |
| Costs associated with training of staff | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.7.2.1: Use of portable tanks and MEGCs | |
| If you transport dangerous in tube-vehicles: | |
|  | Will the proposed new provisions for tube-vehicles have any impacts on your operations? |
| N/A | |
|  | What is the volume of goods impacted by these changes? |
| N/A | |
|  | Are there any additional or reduced costs associated with the proposed new or amended provisions? |
| N/A | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.7.3: Vacuum-operated waste trucks (vacuum tankers) and mobile explosives manufacturing units (MPUs)** | |
|  | Do you have any concerns with the inclusion of vacuum waste tankers directly in the ADG? |
| N/A | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.8.1.1: Consignment procedures** | |
|  | If the requirement for placards to be reflective is retained, what do you believe would be an appropriate transition time for compliance? |
| This could be linked to the lifetime of the vehicle, or approximately 10 years, to allow carriers adequate time to implement reflective placards. | |
|  | Are there any additional impacts/benefits from the removal of EIPs from IBCs that have not been considered? |
| EIPs are useful for emergency services and are primarily for their use. Removing them from IBCs during transport doesn’t seem like a good safety outcome for the public either.  Currently, EIPs remain on IBCs after the transport delivery has been completed and therefore provide an additional layer of safety from a storage and handling perspective. | |
|  | What are the additional costs associated with the requirement to carry ‘Instructions in Writing? |
| Training, and costs associated with the time to update documentation. | |
|  | Do you have any comments or concerns with any of the changes to Part 5 of the Code? |
| 5.2 – The removal of the ‘placardable unit’ concept seems counter-productive to an end-to-end safety management system.  ‘Placardable’ quantities are a useful trigger for other things apart from placarding e.g. safety equipment requirements, segregation etc.  To simply rely upon standard markings and labelling for packagings, and remove EIPs from IBCs for example, doesn’t assist the end users who are the ones storing and handling these chemicals.  EIPs are useful for emergency services and are primarily for their use. Removing them from IBCs during transport doesn’t seem like a good safety outcome for the public either.  5.4.3 - The Code should not include requirements for “Instructions in Writing” and should not be mandated. In an emergency, detailed written instructions are of little value to the driver. The driver should be trained in the use of the emergency equipment.  The driver already has the Australian New Zealand Emergency Response Guide 2021 (ANZ-ERG), Transport Emergency Response Plan (TERP) and Safety Data Sheets. The introduction of another document shouldn’t be required as the ANZ-ERG is far more detailed and contains more specific information.  We’re not aware of any data, statistics, or evidence to support an increase in regulation in this area. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.9.1.1: Desing and construction of containment systems** | |
|  | If you design, manufacture or use tanks and tank vehicles, do you foresee using the ADR-style tank designs in your operations? |
| The Water Corporation has previously had a design approval granted by the WA DG transport regulator; this was for a single compartment 750 litre HDPE road tank vehicle (PDU) for the transport of sodium hypochlorite (class 8). | |
|  | 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? |
| N/A | |
|  | If yes to Q25 or Q26, please provide information |
| We would be reliant upon the designer understanding implications of the ADR-style tank design requirements, should we ever need to undertake this type of project again. | |
|  | Do you have any comments or concerns with any of the changes to Part 6 of the Code? |
| In Clause 6.15.1, there are errors with the references in the clause:  Change 6.11.2 to 6.15.2  Change 6.11.3 to 6.15.3  Change 6.11.4 to 6.15.4 | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.10.1.2.1: Provisions concerning carriage of packages** | |
| For all V codes proposed: | |
|  | Are there any implications on your operations?   * If so, please indicate the applicable V code(s) and the associated impact(s). |
| Possibly V12 – Water Corporation does transport some products assigned V12 that are in IBCs, and therefore we would be affected. Many entries with V12 are Class 8 corrosives i.e. Hydrochloric acid and Sodium Hydroxide used in water treatment.  Having to transport these products in only closed vehicle types would require an external transport company to do this for us OR we would have to purchase or retrofit a suitable vehicle. | |
|  | 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. |
| V12 - Costs associated with training our people to understand requirements, paying an external transport company to undertake the moving of the IBC(s), purchasing or retrofitting of vehicles. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.10.2.1.1: Provisions concerning loading, unloading and handling** | |
| **For all CV codes proposed:** | |
|  | Are there any implications on your operations?   * If so, please indicate the applicable CV code(s) and the associated impact(s). |
| CV13 could potentially impact us when transporting products assigned:  UN 3082 ENVIRONMENTALLY HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, SOLID, N.O.S.  UN 2212 and 2590 Asbestos  Please note, there seems to be an error associated with CV13;  The draft Impact Statement states “CV13 is assigned to Class 6.2 (other than UN 3373), **liquids** with a primary or secondary hazard of 6.1 and UN Nos. 1811, 2212, 2315, 2590, 2923, 3077, 3082, 3151, 3152, 3245, 3432 and 3537 to 3548.”  However, the DG list provided as an excel sheet (attachment G) incorrectly shows some solids with primary hazard 6.1 subjected to CV13 i.e. UN1690 sodium fluoride solid. | |
|  | 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. |
| Costs associated with training our people to understand requirements | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.10.2.2.1: Segregation** | |
|  | Do you agree with the proposal to allow segregation to be achieved using partitions? |
| The proposed use of partitions for the segregation of foodstuffs and chemicals could present an increased risk and a reduction in safety.  Also, with regards to the section on segregation:   * The opening sentence of 7.5.2.1 implies the segregation table and text applies to packages only. The definition of package on page 27 does not include tanks. Consider adding the words “and tanks” after “packages” throughout Section 7.5.2. * Segregation in the draft Code is based on placards or labels. Consideration should be given to situations where the dangerous goods are unlabelled/unplacarded or incorrectly labelled/placarded. It should be based on what dangerous goods are being transported rather than just the label. * Mixed Loading Table section 7.5.2 contradicts the removal of AU07 (the table states mixed loads of chlorine gas and class 8/9 is permitted). * Section 7.5.4(b) should include Class 8 corrosive dangerous goods (No. 8). * Section 7.5.4(c) the distance stated for segregation of foodstuff “by a space of at least 0.8m”; providing a specific number related to distance doesn’t seem to be the best option here. It should be based on either being compatible or not. | |
|  | If the proposal for partitions is retained, should they be permitted only for non-liquid dangerous goods? |
| We do not support the proposal to allow the use of partitions as a segregation tool just because a product is a non-liquid. Segregation is best achieved by the utilisation of a number of means, not just one alone. From a safety perspective, the requirement would be better off using “and” not “or” as the options for segregation. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.10.2.3.1: Stowage** | |
|  | 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)? |
| Dangerous goods loads pose a higher risk on the road than general freight. Therefore, dangerous goods loads should comply with the load restraint guide that applies to all vehicles, and additional restraint requirements to help mitigate risks associated with the transport of these materials. | |
|  | 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? |
| The draft Code and working paper 10 propose to remove the requirement for gates to function as a secondary mechanism to contain dangerous goods that come loose on a load.  While the Code and working paper state that these changes would not result in any negative impacts or reduction in safety outcomes, the data and/or modelling to support this claim has not been referenced/provided in those documents.  Another method to ensure secondary containment of the load should be considered for dangerous goods, if gates are not the best solution from an WHS perspective. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.11.1.1: Requirements for vehicle crews, equipment, operation and documentation** | |
| For all changes proposed in Part 8: | |
|  | Do you have any concerns or comments regarding the proposed changes. |
| ADG Review Paper 12 states, "During earlier consultation, there was significant support for simplifying the extinguisher requirements, but there was also opposition to basing the extinguisher requirements entirely on vehicle mass alone."  This earlier feedback should be pursued and the use of other criteria instead of vehicle mass for determining fire extinguisher requirements should be considered. There are many hazards and factors that need to be considered. Fighting fires involving dangerous goods depends on circumstances and the properties and quantities of the dangerous good. The Code needs to include this as part of risk-based fire extinguisher requirements, rather than vehicle mass alone.  It is suggested Clause 8.1.4.1.1 be deleted and Clause 8.1.4.1.2 amended to remove the 4.5 tonnes. This would remove the criteria for under 4.5 tonnes GVM/GCM as this is not in the current Code and linking fire protection to GVM/GCM is not risk based. This would make the clause simpler to enforce, understand, and train by not splitting fire protection up into below 4.5 tonnes and above 4.5 tonnes.  There are many new requirements for our consideration that will incur a training time and cost impact, specifically chapters:  8.2 training of vehicle crews  8.3 miscellaneous requirements to be complied with by the vehicle crew  8.4 requirements concerning the supervision of vehicles  8.6 route planning for vehicles carrying dangerous goods; and  8.7 transfer of dangerous goods. | |
|  | If so, please indicate the applicable change and the associated commentary. |
| Personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements should be considered on a case-by-case basis for any given chemical, its properties and credible emergency situations that could unfold.  The draft Impact Statement suggests removal of SCBA and replacing these with a filtering escape masks. This could be problematic under certain situations i.e. fuming liquids with toxic inhalation risk.  Clause 8.1.4.3.2  Insert “firefighting” before capacity.  Clause 8.1.5.2  Inclusion of safety standards and minimum requirements around the required safety equipment.  Clause 8.1.5.3  Change “and” to “and/or”. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **5.12.1.1: Requirements concerning construction and approval of vehicles** | |
| For all changes proposed: | |
|  | Do you have any concerns regarding the proposed changes for vehicles? |
| Yes (Reference 9.0) | |
|  | If so, please indicate the applicable change and the associated commentary. |
| The tank and vehicle should be considered as a whole, rather than two separate approvals.  Consideration of both vehicle and tank should allow for the assessment of stability angles, overhangs, distances from vents to ignition sources (brake lights), amongst other things, which would not be possible when considered separately.  The Impact Statement doesn’t provide any data, reports or statistics that demonstrate that the approval of a dangerous goods vehicle without a tank would provide added safety benefits.  Further justification is needed as to the inclusion, other than alignment with the ADR. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.13.1.5: Regulation of diesel as dangerous goods for transport** | |
| For all changes proposed:  *NOTE: As discussed in the C-RIS, this will be subjected to further investigation. Responses to these questions will be used to determine the appropriate course of action for this work.* | |
|  | If you transport diesel for your own use or supply, what is the maximum quantity you transport at one time?   * If you typically transport more than 3,000 L of diesel at one time, please advise what volumes are typical, and what purpose you transport it for? |
| N/A – only minor quantities transported, typically less than 1,000L. | |
|  | If you are a fuel transport company, do you transport loads of diesel only (without Class 3 flammable liquids) in tanks or tank vehicles that do not have a dangerous goods design approval issued by a Competent Authority?   * If you use tanks without an approval, please advise why, and the type of tanks you use? |
| N/A | |
|  | 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? |
| All the above requirements for diesel transport above 3000 L are supported.  It is suggested an additional requirement that diesel tankers follow route planning be included (Chapter 8.6).  A diesel tanker incident in a tunnel could lead to a devastating fire that endangers both public safety and infrastructure. Significant diesel tunnel fires could be difficult to extinguish due to high heat retention and the complexity of access within tunnel systems.  A diesel fire can reach temperatures high enough to damage structural tunnel components, leading to costly repairs and potentially rendering the tunnel unusable for extended periods. This could significantly disrupt transport networks, as tunnels often serve as arterial roads.  Considering these risks, ensuring diesel road tankers follow route planning is a necessary precaution that prioritises human safety, protects property, and minimises the potential for a disastrous environmental incident that could have far-reaching consequences. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.13.2.1: Mixed load EIPs for refined petroleum products** | |
|  | Which of the following two options do you prefer?   * **Option 1** Retain the Provision 5.3.2.1.3 as redrafted above. * **Option 2** Limit the use of 5.3.2.1.3 to refined petroleum products of Class 3 and GHS Category 4 flammable liquids |
| Option 1. | |
|  | Are you aware of any unintended consequences if Option 1 is adopted? |
| No. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.13.3.4: Incorporation of Class 1 explosives into the Code** | |
| The NTC is seeking information on the inclusion of Class 1 explosives into the ADG Code: | |
|  | 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? |
| N/A | |
|  | 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? |
| N/A | |
|  | Do you consider applying the high security risk load requirements to all explosives Category 3 loads appropriate? |
| Yes. | |
| Additionally, the NTC is seeking data or information on the following: | |
|  | Do you undertake any transport of Class 1 explosives in tanks?   * If yes, please provide information about types and quantities. |
| No. | |
|  | Do you undertake any transport of Class 1 explosives in IBCs?   * If yes, please provide information about types and quantities. |
| No. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **15.3.4.1: Transitional provisions for the draft Code** | |
|  | Do you support the NTC introducing more detailed transitional provisions into the Code? |
| Yes. Detailed transitional provisions reduce compliance uncertainly and will allow carriers time to implement the new requirements of the Code. | |
|  | Do you have any concerns with the proposed principles for transitional provisions? |
| No. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.13.5.4: Transport categories** | |
| For all questions, please provide any supporting information you have to assist us in finalising these provisions. | |
|  | After reviewing the draft provisions in 1.1.3.6, please advise: |
| It is suggested the word “unlimited” be removed from the table in 1.1.3.6.5 and replaced with “Always a small load”. | |
|  | Should all infectious substances be subjected to a “0” threshold? |
| No comment. | |
|  | Are there particular transport scenarios for Category B infectious substances that require a specific concession or exemption? |
| No comment. | |
|  | 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. |
| No. | |
|  | 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. |
| No. | |
|  | 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. |
| No. | |
|  | 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? |
| No. | |
|  | 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? |
| No. | |
|  | 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. |
| No. | |
|  | 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. |
| No. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.13.6.2: Driver licensing** | |
| NOTE: As discussed in the C-RIS, this will be subjected to further investigation. Responses to these questions will be used to determine the appropriate course of action for this work. | |
|  | Do you support different requirements for driver and vehicle licensing? |
| Yes. It is not appropriate to apply dangerous goods vehicle licencing to non-tanker vehicles.  It is, however, appropriate to have a dangerous goods driver licence for some of these loads, such as portable tanks. | |
|  | Do you consider that formal training for drivers would be useful in cases where a driver does not need a licence? |
| Yes. A driver has regulatory responsibilities and needs to be made aware of these obligations. | |
|  | Do you support the introduction of a notification scheme for vehicles that don’t require a licence? |
| No. This increases the regulatory burden for little or no benefit. It is unknown what the jurisdictions would do with the notification data, if anything at all. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.2.2.4: Change in one-off costs required to comply with the draft Code (suppliers, manufacturers and consignors)** | |
|  | 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? |
| Approximately 80-100, costs are unknown at this stage. | |
|  | How much will it cost to update your systems to incorporate the proposed changes to the DGL and placarding thresholds? |
| Costs are unknown at this stage. | |
|  | How much will it cost to update processes and documentation? |
| Costs are unknown at this stage. | |
|  | Are there any one-off costs anticipated for your business? |
| Costs are unknown at this stage. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.2.2.5: Change in ongoing costs required to comply with the draft Code (suppliers, manufacturers and consignors)** | |
|  | 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. |
| It would appear the impact statement (certainly for change AU07) doesn’t acknowledge that with extra transport activities, there will be additional impacts to the environment from increased vehicle emissions.  In fact, the word emissions or reference to it doesn’t appear in the impact statement at all.  There seems to be a focus on minimising incidents that effect the environment, in the context of spills/leaks and additional cleanup and disposal costs for chemicals.  There doesn’t seem to have been thought given to the balance of (credible) transport risks and the optimisation of fuel usage and costs, whilst also aiming to minimise emissions to the environment.  Unfortunately the draft impact Statement doesn’t acknowledge or understand that due to some of the proposed changes, there will be far more time spent driving on the roads (this is an increased risk to drivers). To suggest there will be a “reduction in dangerous goods transport incidents” without providing data or evidence seems at odds with the road statistics of this country. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.3.2.3: Change in one-off costs required to comply with the draft Code (transport industry)** | |
|  | 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? |
|  | How much will it cost to update processes and documentation? |
|  | How much will it cost your business to update firefighting and emergency equipment to comply with the draft Code? |
|  | What are the cost savings associated with the changes to the requirement for emergency escape masks? |
|  | Are there any one-off costs anticipated for your business? |
|  | N/A for Q’s 71 - 75 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.3.2.4: Change in ongoing costs required to comply with the draft Code (transport industry)** | |
|  | 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. |
| N/A | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.4: NTC, Regulators and Competent Authorities** | |
|  | 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. |
| N/A | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.4.1.2: Reduced complexity and difficulty in administering compliance with the Code** | |
|  | 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). |
| N/A | |
|  | 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)? |
| N/A | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.4.1.3: Government costs associated with implementing the draft Code** | |
|  | We seek estimated costs from each State & Territory to implement the draft Code, as per the breakdowns provided in the list above. |
| WorkSafe WA (the WA DG Regulator) would need to update all State regulations, codes of practice, guidance notes, application forms, inspection forms and procedures, and train their staff.  If the NTC does not provide its own app for the new Code, WorkSafe WA would also need to significantly modify its Dangerous Goods Decoder App. | |
|  | Are there any State or Territory specific impacts that need to be considered? Please provide details. |
| Yes. Four issues specific to WA:  1. WA exclusively licences road tank vehicles.  2. Exemption for mobile processing units (MPUs).  3. Approved emergency responders.  4. Misleading advertisements on a portable tank or a tank vehicle.  Further information is available at [Dangerous goods safety information sheet - Differences between the WA Dangerous Goods Safety and National MSI](https://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/Documents/Dangerous-Goods/Differences-between-the-WA-Dangerous-Goods-Safety.pdf)  And [Design approval requirements for bulk containers used to transport solid dangerous goods](https://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/Documents/Dangerous-Goods/DGS_IS_DesignApprovalRequirements.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.5.1.1: Avoided dangerous goods transport incidents due to improved compliance with the draft Code (avoided costs to the community and government)** | |
|  | 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. |
| Please see [Safety statistics and other reports](https://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/Safety/Safety-statistics-and-other-16213.aspx). | |