




Report

2015 ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT OF SAFETY TARGETS

	<i>Elaborated by</i>	<i>Validated by</i>	<i>Approved by</i>
<i>Name</i>	Vojtech EKSLER	Jennifer ABLITT	Christopher CARR
<i>Position</i>	Project Officer	Head of Sector	Head of Unit
<i>Date</i>	23/03/2015	26/03/2015	27/03/2015
<i>Signature</i>			

Document History

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comments</i>
0.1	20/03/2015	Draft for internal review
0.2	23/03/2015	Final for management review
1.0	27/03/2015	Final for the EC and for the publication
1.1	28/04/2015	Amendment to Annex 1 (adjustment of table headings)

References

<i>N°</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Version</i>
[1]	Directive 2004/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council 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 (Railway Safety Directive)	2004/49/EC (Railway Safety Directive)	Amended by Directive 2008/57/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 on the interoperability of the rail system within the Community and by Directive 2008/110/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 December 2008 amending the Railway Safety Directive and by Commission Directive 2009/149/EC of 27 November 2009 amending Directive 2004/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards Common Safety Indicators and common methods to calculate accident costs
[2]	Commission Decision on the adoption of a common safety method for assessment of achievement of safety targets, as referred to in Article 6 of Directive 2004/49/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council	2009/460/EC (CSM)	OJ L 150/11, 5 June 2009
[3]	Regulation (EC) No 91/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council on rail transport statistics	(EC) 91/2003	Amended by Commission Regulation (EC) 1192/2003
[4]	Commission implementing decision of 22 July 2011 on a mandate to the European Railway Agency on the revision of common safety targets and related common safety method for period 2011-2015	C(2011) 5158	22 July 2011
[5]	Commission Decision on the second set of common safety targets as regards the rail system	2012/226/EU	23 April 2012
[6]	Commission implementing decision of 11 December amending Decision 2012/226/EU on the second set of common safety targets for the rail system	2013/753/EU	11 December 2013

Contents

1.	Executive summary	4
2.	Introduction	5
3.	Method for assessing achievement of safety targets	6
3.1.	Data	6
3.2.	Four-step assessment procedure.....	6
4.	Results of the assessment.....	8
4.1.	First and second step of the assessment procedure	8
4.2.	Third and fourth step of the assessment procedure	9
4.3.	Analysis of the results	10
4.3.1.	Trend in significant accidents.....	10
4.3.2.	Data limitations.....	11
5.	Conclusions	12
Annex 1	Intermediate results of the assessment (after second step)	13
Annex 2	Input data overview	20
Annex 3	Overview of annual assessments	21
Annex 4	Overview of the results of all annual assessments	22

1. Executive summary

This report presents the fourth assessment of achievement of the second set of Common Safety Targets (CSTs) and National Reference Values (NRVs) carried out in accordance with the Common Safety Method (CSM) defined in the Commission Decision 2009/460/EC [2], and in particular Article 4 of the Decision. The 2015 assessment is the sixth assessment of achievements of safety targets carried out by the Agency in accordance with the CSM. The assessment concerns 26 of 28 EU Member States that have a railway system, plus Norway.

The NRVs and the second set of CSTs were established using Eurostat (ESTAT) data for the years 2004-2009 and published as the Commission Decision 2012/226/EU [5] in 2012, which was later amended by the Commission Implementing Decision 2013/753/EU [6]. This assessment is based on Eurostat data for the years 2009-2013 that were retrieved from Eurobase¹ on 10 March 2015.

For all railway user categories, the respective National Reference Value (NRV) was lower than the corresponding CST; the NRVs represented the maximum tolerable level of the risk to which it refers for this assessment. As with the assessments carried out in the past, NRVs represented the safety targets that were subject to the assessment of achievements as described in the CSM.

The results of the assessment of achievements of NRVs indicate other than acceptable safety performance in four Member States with “possible deterioration of safety performance” as follows:

- › Bulgaria (Level crossing users);
- › Italy (Unauthorized persons);
- › Romania (Employees);
- › Slovakia (Employees, Whole society).

At the same time, the results of the assessment indicate that the railway safety performance remains acceptable at the EU level for all categories of railway users under consideration.

Despite the continuous limitation in data used for the assessment of safety targets (data submitted by Member States to Eurostat via their national statistical offices), the results obtained through this assessment should be considered as valid and a further investigation shall be made to identify causes of the negative results obtained.

Here, notably, the Member States for which there is a possible deterioration in safety performance in any category of user, shall, in accordance with Article 5 of the Method [2], send to the Commission a report explaining the likely causes of the results obtained.

¹ Statistical database of Eurostat: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database>

2. Introduction

This report presents the results of the annual assessment of achievement of National Reference Values (NRVs) and Common Safety Targets (CSTs) in accordance with the requirements of the Commission Decision 2009/460/EC [2], Article 3.1.3.

No later than 31 March each year the Agency shall report to the Commission on the overall results of the assessment of achievement of NRVs and CSTs.

The Common Safety Method (CSM) for assessing the achievement of CSTs and of NRVs is set out in Commission Decision 2009/460/EC [2] (hereafter also referred to as the Method).

This 2015 annual assessment, sixth annual assessment carried out by the Agency so far, concerns the assessment of the achievement of the second set of NRVs and of CSTs with reference to the data available for the period 2009-2013. The second set of NRVs/CSTs has been introduced in the Commission Decision of 23 April 2012 on the second set of CSTs as regards the rail system. It was amended in 2014 in the Commission Implementing Decision 2013/753/EU.

The values for the second set of CSTs were calculated on the basis of the data from 2004 to 2009, which were supplied to Eurostat by (statistical offices of) Member States (MSs) in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 91/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2002 on rail transport statistics [3]. They have been calculated using the methodology set out in points 2.1.1 and 2.3.1 of the Annex of the Method [2].

NRVs and CSTs were calculated for each Member State and for each of the following risk categories: Passengers (1.1 and 1.2), Employees (2), Level crossing users (3.1), Others (4), Unauthorized persons on railway premises (5) and Whole society (6). Similarly to the past assessments, the assessment was not done for the category of level crossing users (3.2)² due to the absence of relevant data in the Eurostat database.

² Assessment was carried out for the category of level crossing users (3.1) that uses different measurement scale.

3. Method for assessing achievement of safety targets

3.1. Data

To assess the achievement of NRVs, the Agency has used the Eurostat data for the five most recently reported years (2009-2013), in accordance with point 3.1.4 of the Annex of the Method /2/. The data of 2013 is the latest observed safety performance (OSP), as referred to in the first step of the assessment procedure.

The data was extracted from the Eurostat database on 10 March 2015 after consultation with the Eurostat. The data were sent by Statistical Offices of Member States within five months after the end of the reference period and for the 2013 datasets. According to the information from Eurostat, the data in datasets “rail_ac_catvict” and “rail_ac_catnubr” were last updated on 23 October 2014 and 30 October 2014 respectively and the data in dataset “rail_tf_trainmv” and “rail_pa_quartal” were updated on 10 March 2015 and 26 March 2015 respectively. These updates were taken into account in the assessment. The consistency of data was verified by ERA for year 2013 by comparing the Eurostat data with CSI data. In case of major differences³, the NSA was requested to verify and eventually correct the data reported to Eurostat. However, no corrections to data were done within the available timeframe. Instead, some missing data for traffic were uploaded on 19 March.

In some instances, data were not available in the Eurostat database by 20 March 2015; in these cases the CSI data were used instead. The CSI data were extracted on the 10 March 2015 from the Agency’s ERail-CSI database. In these cases, the CSI data were used instead. The Annex 2 to this report shows the overview of instances in which the CSI data had to be used in place of Eurostat values. The data for carrying out the assessment for the categories level crossing users, unauthorised persons and others were inferred as described in the Annex of the report on the development of the second set of CST, as they are not directly available in Eurobase.

In case of Croatia, a major revision of historical rail safety data took place in early 2015, resulting in amendment of accident and casualty data that were used for the determination of the NRVs and for this assessment. Since the data were formally amended at Eurostat only after 20/03/2015, it was not possible to revise the NRVs for Croatia in due time for the assessment.

3.2. Four-step assessment procedure

The four-step assessment procedure described in chapter 3 of the Annex of the Method has been applied for each of the six risk categories:

- › passengers (1.1 and 1.2);
- › employees (2);
- › level crossing users (3.1);
- › others (4);
- › unauthorised persons on railway premises (5);
- › whole society (6).

There are four steps in the procedure for assessing the achievement of NRVs; these are described in the flowchart in Figure 1, which is taken from the Appendix 2 to the Annex to the Method. The yes-arrows correspond to a passed result and the no-arrows to a failed result at each step.

The first step and first part of the second step are performed autonomously by the Agency using the Eurostat data. In the second part of the second step, the Agency has to use the input of the Member States concerned

³ Minor differences may exist due to the minor differences of the reporting scopes for CSI data and ESTAT data.

for the specifics of the single highest-consequence accident in the most recent years excluding the years used to set NRV.

The third and fourth steps are carried out by the Agency autonomously with the Eurostat data.

The detailed description of the content of the each step is available in chapter 3.2 of the Annex to the Method.




Figure 1 : Decision flowchart for the assessment procedure of CSTs

4. Results of the assessment

4.1. First and second step of the assessment procedure

The majority of Member States achieved a ‘passed’ result at either first or second step of the assessment for all risk categories considered indicating acceptable safety performance (see Figure 1). For 10 Member States and Norway, there was a ‘failed’ result for one or more specific risk categories in the intermediate second step (see Annex and Table 1)⁴.

Table 1 : Intermediate results of the 2015 assessment: Member States failing after two steps of the assessment method - after applying the 20 % tolerance.

Risk category	Passengers		Employees	Level crossing users	Others	Unauthorised persons	Whole society
	1.1	1.2	2	3.1	4	5	6
Failing after 2 nd step	Spain	Spain	Romania Slovakia	Bulgaria Norway*	Belgium Hungary	France Croatia Italy Norway*	Slovakia Norway*

According to the Annex of the Method [2] describing assessment method, if the tolerance of 20 % is not met, the Agency shall ask the safety authority of the Member State concerned to provide the specifics of the single highest-consequence accident in the most recent years excluding the years used to set NRV, here namely in the period 2010-2013.

The single highest-consequence accidents were identified in cooperation with Member States (Table 2). Only if this single accident occurring in the period 2010-2013 was more severe, in terms of consequences, than the most severe single accident included in the data used for setting the NRV (years 2004-2009), it could have been excluded from the statistics for the revised calculation. The overview in Table 2 shows whether this was the case.

Table 2 : Single highest-consequence accidents in the period 2010-2013 for Member States failing after two steps of the assessment

MS	NRV	Accident specifics (relevant highest-consequence accident in 2010-2012)	Excluded
ES	1.1 1.2	24/07/2013 – Train derailment close to Santiago de Compostella station (La Coruña) resulting in 77 killed and 69 seriously injured passengers.	Yes
RO	2	16/10/2013 – Train collision in the branch of the Regional Railway Centre of Operation, Maintenance and Repair Cluj, track section Saratel – Deda, resulting in 11 seriously injured employees	Yes
BG	3.1	15/04/2010 – Level crossing accident at km 290+285 of line Karlovo-Karnobat, between the railway stations Chintulovo and Sliveneading involving a taxi resulting in 2 persons killed and on person seriously injured (car occupants).	Yes
HU	4	13/07/2013 – Electrocution at Miskolc-rendező station resulting in 1 person killed (others)	No
BE	4	No such accident identified in the timeframe available for this assessment.	No
HR	5	All accidents to persons resulted in one casualty (fatality or serious injury)	No
FR	5	12/01/2013 – Accident to persons on the line Aix en Provence – Marseille resulting in 3 persons killed	No

⁴ The NRVs and CST for the risk category 3.2 were not established in the second set due to the lack of data reliability.

IT	5	19/10/2012 – Accident to persons in Viareggio Station resulting in 3 persons killed (others)	Yes
SK	2	01/04/2010 – Train collision in Spisska Nova Ves station, resulting in one killed and two seriously injured employees	Yes
SK	6	26/10/2012 – Train collision near Bratislava-Vinohrady, resulting in two seriously injured employees and 5 seriously injured passengers	No
NO*	3.1	29/04/2010 – Level crossing accident near Skoppum resulting in one fatality and one seriously injured level crossing users	Yes
NO*	5	24/02/2013 – Accident to person near Sandne resulting in one fatality (unauthorized person) 14/07/2013 - Accident to person near Vinstra resulting in one fatality (unauthorized person)	No
NO*	6	24/03/2010 – Accident to person in Sjursøya, resulting in three fatalities and four serious injuries (other person not at a platform)	Yes

The MWA were recalculated for NRVs of MSs where the single highest-consequence accident could have been excluded from the dataset. The final results of the second assessment step are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 : Intermediate results of the assessment: Member States failing after two steps of the assessment method (after exclusion of the single highest-consequence accident).

Risk category	Passengers		Employees	Level crossing users	Others	Unauthorised persons	Whole society
	1.1	1.2	2	3.1	4	5	6
Failing after 2 nd step	Spain	Spain	Romania Slovakia	Bulgaria Norway	Belgium	France Croatia Italy Norway	Slovakia Norway*

The values and the result of the second step are summarized in the Annex I.

4.2. Third and fourth step of the assessment procedure

Third and fourth assessment steps were applied to the above cases leading to a ‘passed’ result – acceptable safety performance – for the majority of cases, except the ones summarized in Table 4. Since the number of significant accident did not increase for any case in Table 3, the final result of the assessment is “possible” and not “probable” deterioration of safety performance.

Table 4 : Final result of the assessment after applying all four steps of the assessment method.

Risk category	Passengers		Employees	Level crossing users	Others	Unauthorised persons	Whole society
	1.1	1.2	2	3.1	4	5	6
Result after 4 th step: possible deterioration	none	none	Romania Slovakia	Bulgaria	none	Italy [Norway]	Slovakia [Norway]

Notes: (MS) means that the result cannot be fully relied upon due to data quality issues; [Norway] refers to the fact that it is not a MS so the CSM does not formally apply to it.

For **Bulgaria**, it was for the third time in the past three years that the second step returned negative result in the category of Level Crossing users (3.1). Since the number of accidents has decreased, the result of the assessment is possible deterioration of safety performance in the category of Level Crossing users (3.1).

For **Italy**, it was the second time in the past three years that the second step returned negative result for the category of Unauthorized Persons (5). Since the number of accident has decreased, the result of the assessment is: Possible deterioration of safety performance in the category of Unauthorized persons (2).

For **Romania**, it was the third time in the past three years that the second step returned negative result in the category of Employees (2). Since the number of relevant significant accidents has decreased, the result of the assessment is possible deterioration of safety performance in the category of Employees (2).

For **Slovakia**, it was the second time in the past three years that the second step returned negative result in the category of Employees (2). Since the number of accidents has decreased, the result of the assessment is possible deterioration of safety performance in the category of Employees (2). It was the second time in the past three years that the second step returned negative result in the category of Whole society (6); the result of the assessment for this category is thus possible deterioration of safety performance in the category of Whole Society (6).

For **Norway**, it was the third time in the past three years that the second step returned negative result for the category of Whole society (6). Since the number of accident has decreased, the result of the assessment is: Possible deterioration of safety performance in the category of Whole society (6). It was the second time for the category of Unauthorized persons (5). Since the number of accident has decreased, the result of the assessment is Possible deterioration of safety performance in the category Unauthorized persons (5).

This completes the second assessment on the achievement of the second set of CSTs and NRVs.

4.3. Analysis of the results

The sixth annual assessment of achievements of safety targets lead to acceptable safety performance in the category of passenger (1) and others (4) in all Member States. Possible deterioration of safety performance was identified in all remaining categories, while there was no probable deterioration of safety performance identified in any MS for any user category.

This is overall a positive result, comparable to the results of the assessments carried out in previous years.

Employees and unauthorized persons categories are the two categories in which other than acceptable safety performance has been identified most commonly across all annual assessments (see Annex 4).

At the level of Union, the safety performance remains acceptable in all categories users with decreasing trends in all accident categories.

4.3.1. Trend in significant accidents

Although not required by the legislation, the Agency used the procedure to give information to the Member States on the possible trends in the number of significant accidents. The third and fourth step of the assessment procedure was applied to examine the data for a trend in the number of significant accidents, which might suggest that safety performance should be looked at more closely in the future. The Agency applied these steps to the data for those Member States and risk categories, which had passed either the first or the second step. The results indicated a 'failed' outcome in the following Member States and risk categories (Table 5).

Table 5 : Member States in which there was statistically significant increase in accident risk in 2013

<i>Risk category</i>	<i>All significant accidents</i>	<i>Accidents involving level crossing users</i>	<i>Accidents to persons caused by rolling stock in motion</i>
<i>Trend in significant accidents neither decreasing nor stable</i>	<i>Portugal</i>	<i>Bulgaria Italy</i>	<i>Netherlands Portugal</i>

4.3.2. *Data limitations*

The result of the assessment in the category of others should be read with some caution, since there is a continuous discrepancy in data submitted to Eurostat and to ERA for some Member States. This is notably the case for Romania.

In the case of Croatia, a major revision of accident data took place in early 2015, after the discussions ERA. This has resulted in an amendment of past data. This amendment has however not been effectively realized at Eurobase by 26 March 2015 and could not be taken into consideration for this assessment.

5. Conclusions

The Agency finds that it is still not always possible to draw firm conclusions on trends in safety performance in all individual Member States in the framework of safety targets. The major limitation relates to the reliance on the Eurostat data used for the establishment of the second set of CSTs/NRVs and for this evaluation, as they are in some cases inconsistent with the data collected by the NSAs and reported to ERA (CSI data).

This 2015 assessment of achievements of safety targets identified “possible deterioration of safety performance” in four categories of railway users in four EU Member States.

In accordance with the Article 5 of the Method [2], the Member States that achieved a negative result in this assessment (with a possible deterioration of railway safety in one or more categories) “*shall send to the Commission the likely causes of the results obtained*”. Such explanation should include an analysis of the datasets reported to Eurostat and ERA.

The Commission may consider specifying the deadline and format of the report, since these are not provided in the Article 5 of the Method.

Annex 1 Intermediate results of the assessment (after second step)

	<i>Risk to passengers (1.1)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	37.30	0.00	Yes		
Bulgaria (BG)	207.00	14.97	Yes		
Czech Republic (CZ)	46.50	3.15	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	9.04	1.31	Yes		
Germany (DE)	8.13	1.03	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	78.20	0.00	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	2.74	5.47	No	1.72	Yes
Greece (EL)	54.70	0.00	Yes		
Spain (ES)	29.20	71.09	No	42.25	No
France (FR)	22.50	12.68	Yes		
Croatia (HR)	176.90	6.01	Yes		
Italy (IT)	38.10	13.53	Yes		
Latvia (LV)	78.20	0.00	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	97.20	0.00	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	23.80	0.00	Yes		
Hungary (HU)	170.00	70.69	Yes		
Netherlands (NL)	7.43	6.94	Yes		
Austria (AT)	26.30	15.23	Yes		
Poland (PL)	116.00	51.06	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	41.80	42.83	No	18.69	Yes
Romania (RO)	57.40	28.34	Yes		
Slovenia (SI)	25.30	0.00	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	62.10	9.55	Yes		
Finland (FI)	9.04	0.00	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	3.54	0.88	Yes		
United Kingdom (UK)	2.73	0.40	Yes		
<i>Norway (NO)</i>	2.83	0.00	Yes		

	<i>Risk to passengers (1.2)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	0.318	0.000	Yes		
Bulgaria (BG)	1.911	0.165	Yes		
Czech Republic (CZ)	0.817	0.053	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	0.110	0.015	Yes		
Germany (DE)	0.081	0.009	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	0.665	0.000	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	0.0276	0.064	No	0.019	Yes
Greece (EL)	0.503	0.000	Yes		
Spain (ES)	0.270	0.554	No	0.351	No
France (FR)	0.110	0.059	Yes		
Croatia (HR)	1.135	0.031	Yes		
Italy (IT)	0.257	0.090	Yes		
Latvia (LV)	0.665	0.000	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	0.757	0.000	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	0.176	0.000	Yes		
Hungary (HU)	1.650	0.778	Yes		
Netherlands (NL)	0.089	0.053	Yes		
Austria (AT)	0.292	0.143	Yes		
Poland (PL)	0.849	0.413	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	0.309	0.356	No	0.150	Yes
Romania (RO)	0.607	0.364	Yes		
Slovenia (SI)	0.362	0.000	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	0.883	0.122	Yes		
Finland (FI)	0.110	0.000	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	0.033	0.008	Yes		
United Kingdom (UK)	0.028	0.003	Yes		
Norway (NO)	0.033	0.000	Yes		

	<i>Risk to employees (2)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	24.60	0.00	Yes		
Bulgaria (BG)	20.40	3.76	Yes		
Czech Republic (CZ)	16.50	7.01	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	9.10	0.00	Yes		
Germany (DE)	12.60	9.76	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	64.80	0.00	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	5.22	0.00	Yes		
Greece (EL)	77.90	8.94	Yes		
Spain (ES)	8.81	0.00	Yes		
France (FR)	6.06	6.43	No	6.01	Yes
Croatia (HR)	73.65	50.32	Yes		
Italy (IT)	18.90	6.13	Yes		
Latvia (LV)	64.80	5.69	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	41.00	0.00	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	12.00	0.00	Yes		
Hungary (HU)	9.31	4.35	Yes		
Netherlands (NL)	5.97	0.00	Yes		
Austria (AT)	20.30	46.31	No	20.01	Yes
Poland (PL)	17.20	11.84	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	53.10	0.00	Yes		
Romania (RO)	22.30	30.33	No	35.09	No
Slovenia (SI)	40.90	5.42	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	2.71	60.12	No	24.15	No
Finland (FI)	9.21	0.00	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	2.86	0.00	Yes		
United Kingdom (UK)	5.17	0.18	Yes		
<i>Norway (NO)</i>	2.82	0.65	Yes		

	<i>Risk to level crossing users (3.1)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	138	79.4	Yes		
Bulgaria (BG)	141.6	158.0	No	201.92	No
Czech Republic (CZ)	238	112.2	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	65.4	76.3	No	39.63	Yes
Germany (DE)	67.8	47.3	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	400	151.1	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	23.6	0.0	Yes		
Greece (EL)	710	384.3	Yes		
Spain (ES)	109	39.9	Yes		
France (FR)	78.7	62.0	Yes		
Croatia (HR)	611.3	558.1	Yes		
Italy (IT)	42.9	43.8	No	43.39	Yes
Latvia (LV)	239	113.8	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	522	229.8	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	95.9	221.8	No	13.05	Yes
Hungary (HU)	274	199.3	Yes		
Netherlands (NL)	127	53.6	Yes		
Austria (AT)	160	142.3	Yes		
Poland (PL)	277	266.5	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	461	327.5	Yes		
Romania (RO)	542	385.8	Yes		
Slovenia (SI)	364	265.4	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	309	166.5	Yes		
Finland (FI)	164	41.6	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	64	65.6	No	59.24	Yes
United Kingdom (UK)	23	17.0	Yes		
<i>Norway (NO)</i>	21.6	45.7	No	30.51	No

	<i>Risk to others (4)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	2.86	93.81	No	5.52	No
Bulgaria (BG)	35.47	0.00	Yes		
Czech Republic (CZ)	2.41	0.00	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	14.20	2.50	Yes		
Germany (DE)	3.05	0.20	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	11.60	0.00	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	7.00	0.00	Yes		
Greece (EL)	4.51	89.37	No	5.26	Yes
Spain (ES)	5.54	0.00	Yes		
France (FR)	7.71	13.65	No	5.00	Yes
Croatia (HR)	7.28	27.45	No	6.51	Yes
Italy (IT)	6.70	5.58	Yes		
Latvia (LV)	11.60	0.00	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	11.60	0.00	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	5.47	0.00	Yes		
Hungary (HU)	4.51	32.20	No	11.65	No
Netherlands (NL)	4.70	0.00	Yes		
Austria (AT)	11.10	17.71	No	12.04	Yes
Poland (PL)	11.60	5.43	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	5.54	0.00	Yes		
Romania (RO)	2.83	0.00	Yes		
Slovenia (SI)	14.48	0.00	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	2.41	0.00	Yes		
Finland (FI)	14.20	0.00	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	14.20	0.66	Yes		
United Kingdom (UK)	7.00	0.00	Yes		
<i>Norway (NO)</i>	14.15	0.00	Yes		

	<i>Risk to unauthorized persons (5)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	72.6	45.4	Yes		
Bulgaria (BG)	900.2	357.3	Yes		
Czech Republic (CZ)	301	64.4	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	116	52.6	Yes		
Germany (DE)	113	109.0	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	1550	498.6	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	85.2	0.0	Yes		
Greece (EL)	723	375.3	Yes		
Spain (ES)	168	114.0	Yes		
France (FR)	67.2	88.6	No	81.64	No
Croatia (HR)	676.3	301.9	Yes		
Italy (IT)	119	159.8	No	153.13	No
Latvia (LV)	1310	734.0	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	2050	1113.0	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	79.9	110.9	No	10.34	Yes
Hungary (HU)	588	684.9	No	543.81	Yes
Netherlands (NL)	15.9	0.0	Yes		
Austria (AT)	119	42.2	Yes		
Poland (PL)	1210	866.6	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	834	444.2	Yes		
Romania (RO)	1388.2	929.3	Yes		
Slovenia (SI)	236	54.2	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	1758	1123.7	Yes		
Finland (FI)	249	83.2	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	94.8	64.3	Yes		
United Kingdom (UK)	84.5	47.5	Yes		
<i>Norway (NO)</i>	91.8	606.2	No	465.31	No

	<i>Societal risk (6)</i>				
	<i>NRV (*10e-9) [2004-2009]</i>	<i>OSP (*10e-9) [2013]</i>	<i>OSP [2013] < NRV [2004- 2009] Yes/No</i>	<i>MWA (*10e-9) [2009-2013]</i>	<i>MWA ≤ NRV*1,2 Yes/No</i>
Belgium (BE)	275	218.56	Yes		
Bulgaria (BG)	1440	530.35	Yes		
Czech Republic (CZ)	591	186.14	Yes		
Denmark (DK)	218	132.63	Yes		
Germany (DE)	203	167.01	Yes		
Estonia (EE)	2110	649.74	Yes		
Ireland (IE)	114	54.16	Yes		
Greece (EL)	1540	857.91	Yes		
Spain (ES)	323	620.63	No	249.94	Yes
France (FR)	180	181.33	No	170.58	Yes
Croatia (HR)	1467	823.46	Yes		
Italy (IT)	231	230.04	Yes		
Latvia (LV)	1660	853.44	Yes		
Lithuania (LT)	2590	1342.81	Yes		
Luxembourg (LU)	210	332.74	No	138.40	Yes
Hungary (HU)	1020	973.78	Yes		
Netherlands (NL)	148	60.26	Yes		
Austria (AT)	329	259.47	Yes		
Poland (PL)	1590	1183.97	Yes		
Portugal (PT)	1360	808.70	Yes		
Romania (RO)	1704	1380.55	Yes		
Slovenia (SI)	698	324.92	Yes		
Slovakia (SK)	1130	1357.23	No	1465.65	No
Finland (FI)	417	124.85	Yes		
Sweden (SE)	169	131.20	Yes		
United Kingdom (UK)	120	65.04	Yes		
<i>Norway (NO)</i>	51	113.88	No	91.55	No


Annex 2 Input data overview

The table below shows the instances in which the CSI data had to be used in place of Eurostat data, as they were not available in Eurobase.

<i>Data category</i>	<i>Country and year</i>	<i>Remark (ESTAT)</i>
Fatalities and serious injuries (rail_ac_catvict)	none	
Rail accidents (rail_ac_catnubr)	none	
Train movement for all trains Train-km (rail_tf_trainmv)	BE (2010, 2012, 2013) DE (2011, 2012) EL (2012) FR (2010, 2011, 2013) IT (2011) LU (2013) HU (2013) NL (2008, 2009, 2013)	Not published due to quality issues. Data are confidential. Data are confidential.
Train movement for passenger trains Passenger train-km (rail_tf_trainmv)	BE (2012, 2013) DE (2011, 2012) EL (2012) FR (2011, 2013) IT (2011) LU (2013) HU (2013) NL (2012, 2013)	Not published due to quality issues. Data are confidential. Data are confidential.
Train movement Passenger-km (rail_pa_quartal)	BE (2013) AT (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013) FR (2010)	Data are confidential.

Annex 3 Overview of annual assessments

This assessment is the sixth assessment of achievements of CSTs carried out by the Agency. The table below provides an overview of the specificities of all assessments made by the Agency so far in respect to the years considered for these assessments.



Annex 4 Overview of the results of all annual assessments

The results of all assessments carried out by the Agency are summarized in the table below.

Risk category	Passengers		Employees	Level crossing users	Others	Unauthorised persons	Whole society
	1.1 ⁵	1.2 ⁶	2	3.1	4	5	6
2010			<i>Romania</i>	<i>Romania</i>	<i>Romania</i>	<i>Romania</i>	
2011			<i>Lithuania</i>			<i>Romania</i> <i>Slovakia</i>	
2012						<i>Sweden</i>	
2013	<i>Slovakia</i>	<i>Slovakia</i>	<i>Romania</i> <i>Slovakia</i> Bulgaria		<i>Romania</i>	<i>Romania</i> <i>Slovakia</i> <i>Sweden</i>	<i>Romania</i>
2014			<i>Bulgaria</i> <i>Romania</i> <i>Slovakia</i> <i>Sweden</i>	<i>Bulgaria</i>	<i>(Croatia⁷)</i> <i>(Romania)</i>		<i>[Norway]</i>
2015			<i>Romania</i> <i>Slovakia</i>	<i>Bulgaria</i>		<i>Italy</i> <i>[Norway]</i>	<i>Slovakia</i> <i>[Norway]</i>

Note: For countries in **bold**, the result of “probable deterioration”, for countries in *italic* “possible deterioration” of safety performance. In all other cases, the result was “acceptable safety performance”.

⁵ Scaling base: passenger train-km per year.

⁶ Scaling base: passenger-km per year.

⁷ The assessment was carried out retrospectively for 2010 and 2011 for Croatia with the results showed here.