

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the
Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous GoodsGeneva, 15-19 September 2008
Item 5 (b) of the provisional agendaSafety Adviser Examination (sub-section 1.8.3.13)Transmitted by AEGPL**SUMMARY**

Executive summary:	The Safety Adviser Examination is based on sub-section 1.8.3.13 of RID / ADR, with 5 complementary levels of class expertise, one of which is dedicated to Class 2. As the current Class 2 Safety Adviser Examination has proven to be adequate for LPG, AEGPL requests that it be maintained. Moreover, in light of their specific characteristics, Class 2 products should be treated as a separate category.
Action to be taken:	Do not change indent 2 of sub-section 1.8.3.13 related to Class 2.
Related documents:	ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2008/17 (United Kingdom)

Background

1. Currently, sub-section 1.8.3.13 of RID / ADR allows for Safety Advisers to sit 1 or several of the following exams:
 - Class 1 (explosives).
 - Class 2 (gas).
 - Class 7 (nuclear).
 - Classes 3, 4.1, 4.2 4.3 5.1 5.2, 6.1, 6.2 8 and 9.
 - N° UN 1202, 1203, 1223.

2. The purpose of ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2008/17, presented by the United Kingdom is to remove or restrict the option of examining dangerous goods Safety Advisers on specific classes or substances, with 3 alternative proposals:
 - Option 1: Delete indent five of 1.8.3.13.
 - Option 2: Delete indents two and five of 1.8.3.13.
 - Option 3: Delete the whole of 1.8.3.13.

Analysis

3. Along the supply chain, 36 % of LPG is transported by barge or mono-product rail-tanker, 33 % is transported by mono-product road-tanker and 31% is transported in cylinders, generally in baskets by dedicated vehicles. Nearly all transport of LPG is therefore undertaken in a specific manner.
4. Based on its properties, LPG is included in Class 2. Class 2 Safety Advisers have a comprehensive vision of all gases in this class and of LPG in particular, making him well-equipped to provide analysis and recommendations.
5. For the LPG sector, representing 9000 trucks in Europe, the disappearance of the 2nd indent (and the integration of Class 2 into one of the remaining classes - option 2- or in all classes - option 3 -) could dilute level of expertise and focus allotted to gas.
6. Moreover, for those Advisors having a competence limited to one specific class which would be merged into a larger category, there would be considerable uncertainty as to their right and capacity to extend their competences.

Proposal

7. For these reasons, the AEGPL favours the maintenance of a Class 2 Safety Advisor exam and – by extension – the non-modification of the 2nd indent in sub-section 1.8.3.13 of RID / ADR.
 8. In the event that ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2008/17 were to be adopted, the AEGPL requests that transitional measures permitting existing Safety Advisors to integrate themselves into the new system be examined in parallel.
-