



Secretariat

Distr.
GENERAL

ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/80
30 September 2002

Original: ENGLISH and FRENCH

**COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF
DANGEROUS GOODS AND ON THE GLOBALLY
HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION
AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS**

**Sub-Committee of Experts on the
Transport of Dangerous Goods**

**(Twenty-second session, 2-6 December 2002
agenda item 4 (a))**

NEW PROPOSALS

Outstanding issues

Transport and Security

**Comments made by delegations of the Joint Meeting
of the UNECE Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and the RID Safety
Committee on document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/65
Note by the secretariat**

Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/81 was submitted by the Government of the United Kingdom to the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting for comments at its 9-12 September 2002 session. The secretariat reproduces hereunder paragraphs 59 to 71 of the report (TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/90) for the Sub-Committee's information.

"Transport of dangerous goods and security

Informal document: INF.13 (United Kingdom)

- 59 The representative of the United Kingdom introduced a document (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/65) which he had submitted, along with the European Commission and other countries, to the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods for consideration at its next session (2-6 December 2002).
60. The aim of this proposal was to include in the United Nations Model Regulations a Chapter 1.4 on security provisions (with a table listing the most sensitive dangerous goods) and a Chapter 7.2 on provisions specific to the different modes of inland transport (by road, rail and inland waterway).
61. The representative of United Kingdom stressed the importance his Government attached to a rapid international implementation of these security measures and asked delegations attending the Joint Meeting to make preliminary comments.
62. The representative of Germany approved the principle of the proposal but said that it differed from the draft recommendations developed by a working group and under discussion in the European Union and tended to reflect the provisions of Anglo-Saxon law, in particular in assigning responsibilities to transport companies which they cannot take on since they do not possess the necessary information and since such responsibilities should rather devolve on competent authorities.
63. He stressed the necessity to consider the cost efficiency ratio of the proposed measures and the practical and legal difficulties relating to their implementation, in particular the compilation of a register of carriers (para. 1.4.2), the elements of a security plan (1.4.3.2), checks of the criminal records of staff by the employer (1.4.5), etc.
64. He hoped that the secretariats would check with their respective legal services whether security provisions of this nature could be included in the annexes to COTIF and ADR, bearing in mind the objectives of these legal instruments.

65. The representative of France supported most of the reservations put forward by Germany and pointed out the differences between the security recommendations and their transposition to binding legal instruments.
 66. The representative of the Russian Federation considered that the proposal by the United Kingdom was topical .He said that majority of the proposed provisions were already applicable in his country but that the question of routeing remained to be solved. Therefore he was glad that these discussions had been revived by the Government of the United Kingdom and that they could take place officially.
 67. The representative of Belgium considered that the proposed provisions were neither realistic nor adapted to the aim pursued. He hoped that the meeting would keep to its agenda.
 68. The representative of Portugal recalled the discussions on “Transport and security” at the last session of the Inland Transport Committee which had invited its subsidiary bodies to reflect on these questions (see ECE/TRANS/139, paras. 18 and 19), as well as the follow-up discussions at the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods session.
 69. The representative of Spain stressed the important role of the competent authorities in checks, such as those to which Chapter 1.8 of RID/ADR referred.
 70. The representative of Switzerland recalled that security requirements already existed in RID/ADR (see Chapter 8.4 of ADR, e.g. concerning supervision of vehicles).He said that they should eventually be taken into account so as to facilitate the introduction of new provisions and their application by the various participants in the transport chain.
 71. The representative of IRU considered that the register of carriers of sensitive dangerous goods referred to in 1.4.2 should concern all participants in the transport chain and not only carriers. He said that IRU was not opposed to security measures with a reasonable cost/efficiency ratio but he feared that this might lead to situations of unfair competition and discrimination among carriers in different countries."
-