



Risk Mitigation Analysis in Truck Accidents Using Australian Maritime and Safety Authority (AMSA) Risk Matrix

Wahyudi Boliti^{1[+62852-4516-2087]}, Trifandi Lasalewo², Idham Halid Lahay³, Ludfi Pratiwi Bowo⁴

^{1,2,3} Department of Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia

⁴ Research Center for Transportation Technology, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia

wboliti@gmail.com

Abstract. This study examines the risk factor of human error as the leading cause of truck traffic accidents in Indonesia, using the Australian Maritime and Safety Authority (AMSA) risk matrix. Data from NTSC investigation reports were used to identify 12 human factors that contribute to accidents. The analysis showed that seven factors were in the high-risk category (red area), requiring immediate mitigation, while two factors were in the medium category and 3 in the low category. Some of the recommended solutions include improved SOPs, safety training and restrictions on working hours. The study also suggests further cost analysis to measure the economic impact of such risk mitigation.

Keywords: Truck accident, human error, risk mitigation, risk matrix, AMSA.

1 Introduction

The Global Report on Road Safety reports that in Asia, Indonesia is the third country with the highest number of deaths caused by traffic accidents, with a total of 38.279 deaths [1]. The proportion of causes of traffic accidents in Indonesia consists of 92% human factors, 5% vehicle factors, and 3% road infrastructure and environmental factors [2]. *Human error* is still the cause of accidents with the highest percentage. This is in line with the vital role of humans in the transportation process, making them prone to errors.

Today's development is directly proportional to the increase in demand for transportation facilities to meet the mobilization needs of the general public [3]. This also increases the level of air pollution and traffic density, which has an effect on the level of traffic accidents if road users do not follow safety standards when driving. One of the frequently used means of transportation is trucks. The Indonesian National Police Traffic Corps (NPTC) reports that freight cars are the third most frequently used land vehicle. Freight cars refer to four-wheeled vehicles whose primary function is transporting

goods such as trucks, pick-ups, and other commercial vehicles [4]. This number is followed by the number of truck accidents that occur. According to the Central Statistical Agency (CSA), Indonesia reported an increase in the number of traffic accidents by an average of 6,26% per year from 2018 to 2022 [5]. NPTC also reported that the total number of truck accidents in 2018 touched 4.487, while in 2017, the total was 4.398 cases [6].

According to the Statistical Book of the National Transportation Safety Committee (NTSC), human error is the leading cause of traffic accidents [7], [8]. Human error is a performance performed by humans that can negatively affect the system and reduce effectiveness and efficiency [9]. The losses caused by human error can greatly impact the system regarding both productivity and material.

Given this phenomenon, risk mitigation analysis is needed to reduce the level of risk posed by human error in traffic accidents. Risk management is the process of identifying and managing internal events and potential external threats that affect an organization's success rate [10]. This process can provide output in the form of continuous improvement and is often related to the decision-making process in an organization [11].

Therefore, this study was appointed to identify and manage the risks arising from human error in traffic accidents as a form of risk mitigation analysis using the Australian Maritime and Safety Authority (AMSA).

2 Methods

2.1 Australian Maritime and Safety Authority (AMSA)

In this research, the risk matrix standard used as a risk mitigation step is the AMSA standard. AMSA itself is a risk matrix that considers the relationship between two main things, namely likelihood and consequence. Likelihood is the frequency of failure of a particular event within one year. Table 1 explains each frequency value from the AMSA *risk matrix* [12].

Table 1. AMSA Risk Matrix Frequency

| Category | Description | Percentage | Opportunities per Year |
|----------------|---|------------|--|
| Almost Certain | Common occurrences | 95% | Weekly events |
| Likely | Known events that occurred | 60% | Monthly occurrence |
| Possible | Events that can happen and have happened | 40% | Occurrence up to three times in one year |
| Unlikely | Events that may have happened | 20% | Once a year |
| Rare | Events that are practically impossible to occur | 5% | Never happened |

Frequency values are obtained by looking at the contribution of the occurrence of each factor in each year. This value will later be averaged considering the data that will be used in the interval 2009-2023. Important note, the average is done on each factor that occurs at least once a year so that when the factor does not appear in a particular year, it will not be included in the average calculation process. The last step is to group each of the factor frequency values into the AMSA standard based on Table 1.

Meanwhile, *consequences are a category of consequences that can be caused by these failures. An explanation of each AMSA consequence category follows.*

a. Catastrophic

- Human : Many victims
- Financial : Total loss
- Reputation : Stalled operations and reputation badly damaged
- Environment : Environmental damage that very extensive

b. High

- Human : Death
- Financial : Big loss
- Reputation : Disrupted operations and temporary loss of income
- Environment : Environmental damage that great

c. Medium

- Human : Severely injured
- Financial : Significant loss
- Reputation : Operations were significantly disrupted, and reputation impacted
- Environment : Significant Environmental damage

d. Minor

- Human : Minor injuries
- Financial : Small loss
- Reputation : Minor disruptions occurred in operations
- Environment : Little environmental damage

e. Negligible

- Human : No injuries
- Financial : Losses are negligible
- Reputation : No side effects on operation
- Environment : Environmental damage can be ignored

The value of the relationship between frequency and consequence will be grouped into boxes that are distinguished by the color of the box as a sign of how urgent the factor needs improvement. The form of the AMSA matrix and the description of each color are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. AMSA Risk Matrix

| Likelihood | Consequences | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------|--------|------|--------------|
| | Negligible | Minor | Medium | High | Catastrophic |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | | | |
| Possible | | | | | |
| Unlikely | | | | | |
| Rare | | | | | |

Block Color :  : *Extreme*
 : *High*
 : *Moderate*
 : *Low*
 : *Very Low*

Based on the above information, it can be seen that the lowest level of emergency repair is the dark green color to the highest in color

3 Results

3.1 Factors Causing Incidents

This study used data from the NTSC LLAJ crash investigation report. A total of 36 data points were reported, with trucks being the leading cause of incidents. Although the amount of data is limited, the KNKT report has gone through a very detailed investigation and analysis, resulting in a comprehensive report. This research focuses on human factors, which are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Human Factors

| Code | Factors Contributing to Accidents |
|------|---|
| H1 | Braking failure |
| H2 | Ineffective coordination and communication |
| H3 | Gear replacement failures and mistakes |
| H4 | Do not use low-gear transmission. |
| H5 | Nor applying the defense driving method. |
| H6 | Not considering hazards due to familiarity with work. |
| H7 | Pre-inspection, testing, and maintenance are not optimal. |
| H8 | The ability and experience of drivers who are not yet qualified |
| H9 | Great panic |
| H10 | Work not by existing standards or rules. |
| H11 | Situational awareness |
| H12 | Sleepiness due to poor sleep quality |

3.2 Risk Matrix Construction Results

As explained in the previous section, the frequency value is taken from the average contribution of each factor in the period 2009-2023. This average result then became the first data required for the construction of the AMSA risk matrix which were demonstrated in Tabel 4.

Table 4. Frequency Value

| Factor Code | Frequency Value | Clustering Result |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| H1 | 2,286 | Possible |
| H2 | 2 | Possible |

| Factor Code | Frequency Value | Clustering Result |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| H3 | 2 | Possible |
| H4 | 2 | Possible |
| H5 | 1,5 | Unlikely |
| H6 | 1 | Unlikely |
| H7 | 1,67 | Unlikely |
| H8 | 1,286 | Unlikely |
| H9 | 1,33 | Unlikely |
| H10 | 1 | Unlikely |
| H11 | 1,2 | Unlikely |
| H12 | 1 | Unlikely |

The consequence value of each factor was carried out by interviewing experts (*expert judgment*) who are experienced in the field of traffic. This process needs a help of expert to analyze and select the relevant consequences of each factor based on AMSA consequence categories through questionnaire. The questionnaire also adopts the matrix form to get clear and precise construction results. The expert used in this research is a POLRI (Indonesian National Police) with the position of BA Directorate of Traffic who has 20 years of experience in his field, which can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Consequence Value

| Factor Code | Consequence Number Selected | Category of Consequence |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| H1 | 1 | Catastrophic |
| H2 | 4 | Minor |
| H3 | 5 | Negligible |
| H4 | 1 | Catastrophic |
| H5 | 4 | Minor |
| H6 | 2 | High |
| H7 | 2 | High |
| H8 | 1 | Catastrophic |
| H9 | 1 | Catastrophic |
| H10 | 1 | Catastrophic |
| H11 | 1 | Catastrophic |
| H12 | 1 | Catastrophic |

The interview results were directly constructed into a risk matrix with AMSA standards where the selection of this standard is due to the simplicity and accuracy of the AMSA risk matrix to analyze the risks that can be caused by truck accident factors by looking at the correlation between the frequency of these factors occurring in each year and the consequences caused when these factors cause accidents, which can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Risk Matrix Construction Results

| <i>Likelihood</i> | <i>Consequences</i> | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|-----------------------|
| | Negligible | Minor | Medium | High | Catastrophic |
| Almost Certain | | | | | |
| Likely | | | | | |
| Possible | H3 | H2 | | | H1,H4 |
| Unlikely | | H5 | | H6,H7 | H8, H9, H10, H11, H12 |
| Rare | | | | | |

4 Discussion

Of the 12 existing human factors, two factors, H1 and H4, fall into the Possible category with Catastrophic consequences, and H8, H9, H10, H11, and H12 belong to the Unlikely frequency category with Catastrophic consequences. All of these factors fall into the red area, which means that improvements and solutions are needed to reduce the risk level to a more acceptable level.

This proves the importance of conducting pre-inspections to ensure that all machines are in optimal condition and the vehicle is ready for use. For example, “braking failure” can occur due to brakes that are not functioning properly because they are not checked before operating. In addition, it can be triggered by not using a low gear transmission on downhill and uphill road contours. This serves to help reduce vehicle speed without having to use the main brake system multiple times. In addition, this is also influenced by the experience and skills of the driver. hence the importance of clear and qualified qualifications when selecting driver candidates in order to ensure safety and security at work. this is also useful to avoid the behavior of certain drivers who do not drive according to applicable standards due to their qualified knowledge and skills. later, all of this can lead to increased public safety and reduce economic losses to both the organization and the driver.

As for the other factors, they still fall into the tolerable areas, namely the yellow and green areas, such as H2 and H3 into the Possible frequency with Minor and Negligible consequences, respectively, H5 into the *Unlikely* frequency with *Minor* consequences and H6 and H7 into the *Unlikely* frequency with *High* consequences. This proves that although the frequency of these factors causing accidents is still relatively rare, the consequences are substantial and can result in fatalities with significant losses and many victims when these factors contribute to accidents that occur. Therefore, all existing factors will still be necessary to develop solutions.

Based on the results of the AMSA risk matrix construction, this study recommends several alternative solutions to reduce the risk level of all these factors, namely:

- a. Clarify and reinforce Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), including pre-work inspections and vehicle maintenance. Set consequences for violating or not implementing existing SOPs.
- b. Determining the qualifications of drivers must have a driver's license as the main requirement for workers. There is no tolerance for those who do not have a

- driver's license
- c. Organize regular driving safety training every certain period of time. Emphasize the consequences of not riding according to the rules.
 - d. Setting working hours in optimal time intervals without disadvantaging drivers.

5 Conclusions

Human error is still the most dominant factor causing truck accidents. This study aims to mitigate the risk of human factors as the cause of truck accidents through risk analysis using the AMSA *risk matrix*. The results show that out of 12 factors, seven fall into the red area, 2 fall into the yellow area, and three fall into the green area. Some solutions are also suggested to reduce the potential consequences that can be caused by those 12 human factors.

For future research, cost analysis of risk mitigation results can be an interesting new finding to see what percentage of maximum cost savings can be achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Funding

This research was funded by the Indonesian Ministry of Finance's LPDP and the National Research and Innovation Agency through the Research and Innovation for Advanced Indonesia Program, grant number B-839/II.7.5/FR.06/5/2023.

Institutional Review Board Statement

This study was conducted by the ethical guidelines and regulations applicable and approved by the Ethics Commission for Social Humanities–National Research and Innovation Agency [Number: 223/KE.01/SK/05/2023, Date of Approval: 12 May 2023].

References

- [1] S. Sahara, S. A. Azwar, and F. R. S. Madani, "Pelatihan Keselamatan Berkendara Sepeda Motor Dalam Menekan Angka Kecelakaan Lalu Lintas Bagi Siswa SMK di," vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 303–314, 2020.
- [2] Z. Siregar and I. Dewi, "Analisis Ruas Jalan Lintas Sumatera Kota Tebing Tinggi Dan Kisaran Sebagai Titik Rawan Kecelakaan Lalu Lintas," vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 63–73, 2020.
- [3] J. Pinayungan, H. Kusmanto, and I. Isnaini, "Implementasi Peraturan Menteri Perhubungan Republik Indonesia Tentang Standar Keselamatan Lau Lintas Dan Angkutan Jalan," *J. Adm. Publik Public Adm. J.*, vol.8, no. 1, p. 108, 2018, doi: 10.31289/jap.v8i1.1581.
- [4] Korlantas Polri, "Jumlah Data Kendaraan Per Pulau," *korlantas.co.id*, 2024. <http://rc.korlantas.polri.go.id:8900/eri2017/laprekappulau.php> (accessed Sep. 14, 2024).
- [5] Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia, "Statistik Transportasi Darat," 2022.
- [6] M. E. Arianto and S. Feriana, "Pengetahuan Keselamatan Berkendara, Masa Kerja Dan Peran Manajemen Dengan Perilaku Keselamatan Berkendara Pada Pengemudi Truk Bermuatan Semen Di PTEnergi Sukses Abadi Cilacap," *An-*

- Nadaa J. Kesehat. Masy.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 14, 2021, doi: 10.31602/ann.v8i1.3924.
- [7] Komite Nasional Keselamatan Transportasi Republik Indonesia, “Buku Statistik Investigasi Kecelakaan Transportasi KNKT,” 2022.
- [8] Komite Nasional Keselamatan Transportasi Republik Indonesia, “Laporan Semester I Tahun 2023,” 2023.
- [9] R. Patradhiani, M. H. Kurniawan, and M. Rosyidah, “Analisis Human Error pada Proses Produksi Batu Bata dengan Metode SHERPA dan HEART untuk Mengurangi Kecelakaan Kerja,” *Integr. J. Ilm. Tek. Ind.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 24, 2022, doi: 10.32502/js.v7i1.4660.
- [10] Saifulloh, R. Pamungkas, and D. A. Sari, “Analisis Manajemen Risiko Pada UMKM Keripik Singkong ‘SUGI’ Menggunakan SWOT dan Matrix Risiko,” vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 118–124, 2023, doi: 10.21111/agrotech.v8i3.9398.
- [11] A. P. Aisyah and L. Dahlia, “Enterprise Risk Management Berdasarkan ISO 31000 dalam Pengukuran Risiko Operasional pada Klinik Spesialis Esti,” *J. Akunt. dan Manaj.*, vol. 19, no. 02, pp. 78–90, 2022.
- [12] AMSA, “Risk Management in the National System : A practical guide to creating and maintaining an effective risk management system,” *Australian Maritime Safety Authority*, 2020. <https://www.amsa.gov.au/vessels-operators/domestic-commercial-vessels/risk-management-national-system> (accessed Jun. 10, 2024).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

