

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INF.11 E/G

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, 1-10 September 2003)

Report of the meeting of the working group on RID/ADR 1.1.4.2.2
(Hambourg, 10-11 June 2003)

Transmitted by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International
Carriage by Rail (OTIF)

OTIF



**ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR
LES TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES**

**ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR INTER-
NATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL**

**Office central
Zentralamt
Central Office**

A 81-02/3.2003

**INF. 11
11.08.2003**

Original : DE

Report of the meeting of the working group on RID/ADR 1.1.4.2.2

Hamburg, 10/11 June 2003

Par souci d'économie, le présent document a fait l'objet d'un tirage limité. Les délégués sont priés d'apporter leurs exemplaires aux réunions. L'Office central ne dispose que d'une réserve très restreinte.

Aus Kostengründen wurde dieses Dokument nur in begrenzter Auflage gedruckt. Die Delegierten werden daher gebeten, die ihnen zugesandten Exemplare zu den Sitzungen mitzubringen. Das Zentralamt verfügt nur über eine sehr geringe Reserve.

For reasons of cost, only a limited number of copies of this document have been made. Delegates are asked to bring their own copies of documents to meetings. The Central Office only has a small number of copies available.

1. At the Joint Meeting in Berne (24 – 28 March 2003), it was decided to hold a working group to revise the provisions of RID/ADR 1.1.4.2.2 concerning the transport document/consignment note for carriage in a transport chain including maritime or air carriage (see also document OCTI/RID/GT-III/2003-A, paras. 40 – 45).
2. At the invitation of Germany, the working group met on 10 and 11 June 2003 in the Federal Office for Maritime Transport and Hydrography (BSH) in Hamburg. Head of Division, Mrs. Ingelore Hering, welcomed participants. Mrs. Hering took this opportunity to present BSH and the work it does.
3. The meeting was attended by representatives of 9 Contracting States, OTIF and 8 non-governmental international organisations (see Annex 1 for list of participants). Mr. Rein (Germany) was unanimously elected Chairman.
4. At the beginning of the meeting, the following arrangements were made concerning the working group's method of working.
 - a. The terms of reference are set out in paragraph 43 of document -/2003-A.
 - b. Germany would prepare the report of the meeting for the Joint Meeting.
 - c. Amendments that were to be decided by the competent bodies for the other transport modes should, as far as possible, be introduced in those bodies by the delegates from the relevant mode attending this working group.
 - d. Before that, the results of the working group would have to be dealt with in the Joint Meeting.
 - e. The base document for the working group was revision 2 of the paper drafted by FIATA (Schenker Stinnes Logistics) dated 6.6.2003.
5. Before looking at the FIATA paper, some remarks concerning the principle were made:
 - a. The priority was to resolve problems in RID/ADR. As a next step, problems in the regulations covering other transport modes should be resolved.
 - b. Representatives of air and maritime transport asked (the latter by e.mail) that any proposals for amendments be introduced via the UN.
 - c. It should be set down what the carrier has to do if mistakes are noted in another transport mode's transport document. This mainly concerned maritime transport.
 - d. One organisation was in favour of creating a uniform transport document for all modes.
6. The following pieces of information in the transport document/consignment note were discussed individually, with the result in each case as follows.

7. Language

In principle, only German and French are permitted in rail transport. The only exception is in transport to and from the United Kingdom. The provision in RID 5.4.1.4.1 should therefore be amended such that for transport in a transport chain, English is permitted in journeys to and from sea ports and airports, as the current possibility of dealing with this using tariff agreements is not used sufficiently.

UIC was asked to submit an appropriate proposal to the next session of the RID Committee of Experts in Bucharest.

8. Sequence

The question of sequence was discussed again. Only some of those present thought it necessary that this aspect should again be discussed in the UN in order to reach a uniform solution. Representatives of States were free to submit suitable proposals to the UN.

9. UN number

No problems.

10. Proper shipping name

The lists of substances in the various regulations at the moment contained numerous differences. These were currently being brought out by FIATA. The results would be sent to the FIATA participants. It was requested that all modes align the proper shipping names with the UN and that in future, amendments should only be made via the UN.

11. Technical name

There were numerous differences between the UN Model Regulations and RID/ADR in how special provision 274 was assigned. The working group supported the US initiative to check this matter at UN level on the basis of a rationalized approach. RID/ADR would then have to be aligned accordingly, i.e. in RID/ADR, special provision 274 should only be assigned if this were also the case in the UN.

12. Class, subsidiary hazard, packing group

With regard to the subsidiary hazard, there were minor derogations between RID/ADR and the IMDG Code. FIATA would take this into account in a revised version of the working paper.

Otherwise, there were no problems.

13. Hazard identification number

RID requires the hazard identification number to be entered in the consignment note when it is shown on the orange-coloured plate. This means that for maritime transport containers, no such entry is to be made in the consignment note. In road transport, ADR does not require this entry, but the hazards are sufficiently described in the written instructions. As there are no written instructions for rail transport, the entry in the consignment note was required.

Opinions differed on whether to retain the entry in the consignment note. This matter must be brought to a decision in the RID Committee of Experts.

In the case of tank-containers from sea transport, 1.1.4.2.1 can be applied. 5.3.2.1 and consequently 5.4.1.1.1 (j) do not then apply. Thus no information on the hazard identification number is to be provided.

14. Consignor/consignee

At present, providing information on the consignor is regulated under the provisions of CIM. Because of the amendments being made there, the equivalent provisions should be incorporated into RID, as has been done in other cases. The RID Committee of Experts would have to take a decision on this.

The same applied to the information on the consignee.

15. Special agreements

ADR 5.4.1.1.1 (i) requires a declaration as required by the terms of any special agreement. There is no equivalent requirement in RID. The working group recommended that RID be aligned with ADR.

16. RID box in the consignment note

For transport in accordance with RID, a cross has to be inserted in an "RID" box in the consignment note. The question as to whether this was still required should be examined in the RID Committee of Experts.

17. Date the document was prepared

The working group agreed that there were no objections to harmonizing with the UN with regard to including the date (see UN Model Regulations, 5.4.1.3). Reintroducing the shipper's certification was not up for discussion.

18. Shipper's certification

There was a controversial discussion on the need for the shipper's certification. Forming a final position was postponed until after the subject had been dealt with as a whole.

19. Number and type of packages

For rail transport, the requirement for this information is regulated under CIM. These provisions should be incorporated into RID by a decision of the RID Committee of Experts.

20. Total quantity of dangerous goods

The need for this information was assessed differently by the representatives of the various modes. As this problem could not be resolved at this meeting, FIATA was asked to look at the question (and, if necessary, submit a proposal to the UN) of whether this information was absolutely necessary in land and maritime transport for reasons of technical safety. For air transport, this information was required in accordance with IECC because of restrictions for passenger and cargo aircraft.

RID should in any case be aligned with ADR.

21. Number of pages

Indicating the number of pages was practised in air and maritime transport, but for road and rail transport was hardly considered feasible. The working group agreed in this case to dispense with a proposal for harmonization.

22. Flash-point

The necessity of indicating the flash-point had in principle been settled by the restructuring of the regulations. However, there were individual substances that were subject to stowage provisions in maritime transport (e.g. substances toxic upon inhalation and certain viscous substances). But for these substances, a special provision concerning stowage could be included. IMO was asked to proceed accordingly.

23. Empty, uncleaned packagings

Different information (full: danger label, empty: Class) is confusing and incomprehensible. The aim should be to require the same information for all packagings, irrespective of whether they are full or empty, thus harmonizing with the UN. The working group supported UIC's and Austria's Joint Meeting proposals towards this end because of the harmonization they sought.

24. Waste

From the point of view of transport, this information was unnecessary. It was left up to FIATA to submit a suitable proposal to the UN.

25. Water pollutants

Owing to the current discussion within IMO, this subject was not dealt with here.

26. Elevated temperature substances, salvage packagings

No problems.

27. Limited quantities

Different problem areas the transport modes had were addressed. In view of the working group on limited quantities in Paris and the potentially far-reaching consequences – depending on the results achieved there – this item was not dealt with further.

28. Packing instruction number

Following the restructuring of the regulations, there was no longer any reason to maintain this information for the air mode. The difference between packing instructions for passenger and cargo aircraft could be taken into account by amending the numbering system in the same way as the other modes.

29. Substances carried under temperature control

No problems.

30. Cargo or passenger aircraft

No problems.

31. Journey prior to or following maritime or air transport (transport chain)

The note in the transport document/consignment note indicates an authorized derogation from RID/ADR. However, the significance of this note had lessened, as there were fewer derogations as a result of harmonization.

When translating the IMDG Code, it was noted that there were still numerous derogations in the packing provisions. This note should therefore be maintained until the derogations have been eradicated. Remaining residual derogations could be listed in RID/ADR later and the note dispensed with.

Until then, there would be no further discussion on this point.

32. Overpack

In the 13th edition of the UN Model Regulations, only the marking of the overpack is prescribed. Only air transport still required this to be included in the transport document. The ICAO Dangerous Goods Panel was therefore asked to reconsider this provision.

33. Information required in the event of an emergency

The various situations in the transport modes were known, but were not felt to be very troublesome. Efforts towards harmonization should be made at UN level.

34. Use of tanks approved for maritime transport

There were different opinions on the need for this information and whether it should be retained in future. A *tour de table* indicated that a majority of the representatives of States (5 +, 0 -, 3 ~) would support the deletion of 5.4.1.1.8.

35. Combined transport

The working group considered that in view of the high level of training, 5.4.1.1.9 could be deleted without any detrimental effects on safety.

36. Addition of "solid/liquid, mixture/solution, molten, stabilized"

No problems.

37. In accordance with the paper from FIATA, the matters specific to the individual classes – starting with Class 1 – were removed.38. Net mass of explosive substance

In air transport, the net mass of explosive substance has to be given. The ICAO Dangerous Goods Panel was asked to clarify whether harmonization with the UN could be undertaken.

There were different provisions for ADR and RID, which probably went back to an earlier proposal from Norway. FIATA was asked to look into this and to report on the background at the next meeting.

39. Additional provision of the trade name

No problems.

40. Approval for n.o.s. entries or samples, application of packing instruction P101

The intense discussion made clear the many problems in dealing with this, and the many points of view. The industry wished this to be easy to handle, also with a view to "electronic" transport documents. From the authorities' point of view, safety, of which any conditions of carriage contained in the transport approval formed a part, had to be ensured. In addition, the different legal branches (carriage and handling) could, if necessary, result in the need to carry a copy of the approval on board the transport unit.

The outcome of the discussion was that before a final decision is taken, it must be investigated whether a copy of the approval is really necessary for performing the transport operation and how the provisions of 2.2.1.1.3 are applied in practice.

41. Protective receptacles

The working group discussed different approaches that took account of the various options for resolving the question of protective receptacles (tight fitting, portable receptacles). FIATA agreed to discuss this subject with the relevant experts, Mr. Johansen (N) amongst others, and to submit a proposal to the next meeting of the working group.

42. Fireworks

Consideration had to be given at UN level to carrying out a more purposeful classification. If the quality of classification were improved, removal of this provision could be considered. Until then, there would be no political will to do this.

43. Owing to lack of time, the meeting had to be closed after this item. The date of the next meeting was set at 22 and 23.09.2003 in Frankfurt. Germany would provide information concerning the organisation of the next meeting.

44. This report would be submitted to the next Joint Meeting. Comments and advice on the status of the work so far would be welcome.

45. FIATA assumed the task of dealing with the unresolved points and would submit appropriate proposals to the next meeting of the working group.