



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/69
21 July 2003

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

**Joint Meeting of the RID Safety Committee and the
Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**
(Geneva, 13-17 October 2003)

SAFETY ADVISERS

Report of the informal working group on safety advisers

Transmitted by the International Road Transport Union (IRU) */

As agreed by the Joint Meeting at its last session (Bern, 24-28 March 2003) an informal working group on safety advisers met in Geneva from 9-11 July 2003 at the invitation of IRU. Delegates from twenty countries and four non-governmental organizations participated. The meeting was chaired by Mr. S. Rasmussen (IRU).

The following documents were tabled for the discussions:

INF. 49 (24-28 March 2003 Joint Meeting session)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/26 (IRU)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/15 (Serbia and Montenegro)
INF. 22 from IRU
INF. 23 from Belgium
INF. 39 from France
Information paper from Austria, distributed at the opening of the meeting

*/ Circulated by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT/III/2003/69.

The proposals and reflections to be dealt with by the Joint meeting in Autumn 2003 are summarized in the following 10 points (the text in bold type needs to be decided by the Joint Meeting):

1. Referring to document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2003/15 from Serbia and Montenegro the working group was of the opinion that the proposed extension of 1.8.3.3 was superfluous as the existing wording of the article already covered the subjects proposed.
2. Discussions about proposals related to security issues were postponed until the introduction of security measures in RID/ADR was eventually decided.
3. The working group exchanged views about the conditions for obtaining the initial certificate. It was made clear that according to 1.8.3.8 only the prescribed examination must be approved by the competent authorities. Some members were of the opinion that a harmonisation of the training requirements was desirable, but the majority of the members found a re-opening of this discussion, which had already taken place in the EU, was difficult due to the fact that training systems varied so widely. Passing the examination was considered to be sufficient proof for qualification. During the discussions members pointed out that disequilibrium might exist between the duties of the safety advisers and the level of examination.
4. Discussions about further harmonisation of the examinations prescribed in 1.8.3.8, mainly related to their level of difficulty, led to a proposal to organise a forum between experts from contracting parties in order to exchange experience and knowledge regarding the questions and case studies used. At the same forum the wish for a databank with questions and case studies used could be further explored. **The working group recommends to the Joint Meeting to accept the French invitation for organizing such a forum in 2004.** In this context a reference was made to 1.8.2.1 about mutual support.
5. Questions posed during the meeting related to 1.8.3.1, such as the need for consignors/consignees to have a safety adviser, were considered to fall out of the scope of the working group.
6. Discussing the existing text of 1.8.3.16 regarding the renewal of certificates (....."its holder has followed refresher courses or passed an examination") it was reconfirmed that the method of revalidation is decided by the competent authority.
7. Discussing the requirements and conditions for the renewal of certificates arguments were presented for a flexible system with both training courses and/or examination as method of revalidation. Entering into detailed discussions regarding proposals for minimum duration of training courses, varying between one day and more than one week, it was noted that the situation and the considerations in the contracting parties varied considerably. No possibility of reaching consensus existed.

That is why it was eventually concluded unanimously that the only viable solution could be reached by the following wording of 1.8.3.16.1:

"The certificate shall be valid for five years.

The period of the validity of a certificate shall be extended from the date of its expiry for five years at a time where, during the year before its expiry, its holder has passed an examination. The examination shall be approved by the competent authority”.

This proposal is recommended for acceptance by the Joint Meeting. All members agreed to submit this proposal to the Joint Meeting, but some reserved the position of the representatives of their authorities at that meeting.

8. By this decision of the working group and the above statement under 6. no need exists for short term solutions regarding renewal of certificates at international level.
9. Based on the proposal in INF. 23 from Belgium the following **1.8.3.16.2** is suggested:

“The aim of the examination is to ascertain that the holder has the necessary knowledge to carry out the duties set out at 1.8.3.3. The knowledge required is set out at 1.8.3.11(b) and shall include the amendments to the regulations introduced since the award of the last certificate. The examination shall be held and supervised on the same basis as in 1.8.3.10 and 1.8.3.12 to 1.8.3.14. However, the holders need not to undertake the case study specified in 1.8.3.12(b)”.

The working group recommends the adoption of this text by the Joint Meeting.

10. The report was presented to and adopted by the members of the working group.
-