

**Economic and Social Council**

Distr.: General
2 June 2015
English
Original: French

Economic Commission for Europe**Inland Transport Committee****Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**

Joint Meeting of Experts on the Regulations annexed to the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Inland Waterways (ADN) (ADN Safety Committee)

Twenty-seventh session

Geneva, 24–28 August 2015

Item 3 (d) of the provisional agenda

Implementation of the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Inland Waterways (ADN): Training of experts

Report on the 14th meeting of the informal working group on the training of experts**Transmitted by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine (CCNR)¹**

1. The informal working group on the training of experts held its 14th meeting on 16 and 17 March 2015 in Strasbourg, under the chairmanship of Mr. Bölker (Germany). Representatives of the following countries took part in the work of the meeting: Austria, Belgium, Germany, Netherlands and Switzerland. The following non-governmental associations and training organizations were represented: Binnenschiffer-Ausbildungs-Zentrum (BAZ-Germany), European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), International Committee for the Prevention of Work Accidents in Inland Navigation (CIPA) and Maritimes Kompetenzzentrum (Ma-Co-Germany).

¹ Distributed in German by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine under the symbol CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2015/31.



I. Adoption of the agenda

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2015/2 (Agenda)

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2015/1 (Report of the 13th meeting)

2. The agenda and report were adopted without amendment.

II. Calendar of work

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2015/9 (Calendar of work)

3. Mr. Kempmann presented the programme of work updated by the CCNR secretariat. The group considered the programme of work and approved the draft, with some changes.
4. Mr. Weiner proposed reviewing the methods of work of the informal working group on the training of experts and sending a revised version to the secretariat.
5. The group invited the CCNR secretariat to revise the programme of work and submit the revised version to the ADN Safety Committee.

III. Continuous alignment of the ADN 2015 catalogue of questions (item 1 of the calendar of work)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2015/7 – Com. Secr. (ADN 2015 catalogue of questions, General)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2015/5 – Com. Secr. (ADN 2015 catalogue of questions, Chemicals)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2015/6 – Com. Secr. (ADN 2015 catalogue of questions, Gases)

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2011/4 to 17 – Com. Secr. (Confidential documents, questions of substance, ADN 2011)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/26/INF.7 – Com. Secr. (Synopsis, 2015 catalogue of questions, General)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/26/INF.9 – Com. Secr. (Synopsis, 2015 catalogue of questions, Chemicals)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/26/INF.10 – Com. Secr. (Synopsis, 2015 catalogue of questions, Gases)

6. Mr. Kempmann said that the 2015 catalogue of questions had been approved during the twenty-sixth session of the Safety Committee and had been published on the CCNR and ECE Internet sites.

A. Comparison of the French and German versions (item 1.1 of the calendar of work)

7. The agenda item concerned the content of the catalogue of questions as it stood in 2011. The versions had been revised twice and the translations had been brought into line. The task could thus be withdrawn from the programme of work.

B. Comparison of the English and German versions of questions relating to stability

8. The item was not discussed at the meeting.

C. ADN 2017 ((new) item 1.3 of the calendar of work)

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2015/3

9. Mr. de Maat reported some problems encountered in the use of calculations using Avogadro's number (question 231 03.1-01).
10. As the group was unable to help solve that problem, Mr. de Maat would have an expert consider the problems related to calculations using Avogadro's number and would submit a proposal to amend the part of the catalogue of questions on gases at the next meeting.
11. Mr. de Maat submitted a proposal from the delegation of the Netherlands with new questions relating to means of evacuation.
12. Mr. Weiner submitted additional proposals relating to means of evacuation.
13. Mr. Gildemeister recommended that those questions should be included in the basic training, as question type 112, with examination objective 06.0.
14. The group proceeded to adapt the questions. The questions would be finalized at the next session of the working group, as part of the work on the 2017 catalogue of questions.

IV. ADN expert examination (item 2 of the calendar of work)**A. Recognition of training in accordance with 8.2**

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2014/1 – Com. DE

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2015/5 – Com. DE

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/48, paras. 26–27

15. Mr. Weiner submitted a proposal that training institutions should be certified on the basis of the ISO 29990 standard.
16. Mr. Birkhuber and Mr. de Maat expressed doubts about reference to ISO 29990 certification. The standard did not ensure the quality of the training content; it only addressed how the training institution was managed. In that respect, requirements should not be exceedingly strict. It was not a question of introducing new minimum requirements, but rather of drawing up recommendations to ensure the comparability of the training.
17. Mr. Bölker noted that comparability was the basis for recognition of training and that some difficulties were still encountered in mutual recognition.
18. Mr. Weiner replied that he considered it necessary for minimum requirements for the certification of instructors to be adopted in the framework of ADN.
19. Mr. Ehrlich emphasized that ADN Chapter 8.2 already addressed the basic requirements for the recognition of ADN training. Comparability of the training programmes should be ensured through the use of the same questions on the examinations. There was some margin for interpretation only in the substantive questions relating to gases

and chemicals, but that was not the case for questions relating to basic training, where the teaching staff was composed of safety engineers, engineers and graduate engineers, some of whom did not have specific training in inland navigation, but who had professional experience in that field. Instructors must be able to familiarize themselves with new fields and to take into account innovative new techniques.

20. Mr. Bölker concluded by stating that the group did not consider it necessary to include a reference to a standard in ADN. The examination results were good and did not justify such a reference. Furthermore, there was no reason to include recommendations in ADN for the certification of instructors.

21. However, the group expressed its interest in the recognition systems in the other ADN Contracting Parties.

B. Format of the expert certificate under 8.2

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2015/6 – Com. DE

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2015/8 – Com. BE

22. Mr. Weiner submitted a proposal for a new format of the ADN specialized knowledge certificate.

23. The working group welcomed Mr. Weiner's proposal. The participants were in favour of the use of a modern expert certificate, following the model of the ADR certificate and the current rules relating to boatmasters' licences. An appropriate transitional period should be provided for the introduction of the new expert certificate. It was proposed to introduce such an amendment in ADN 2017, with an obligation to bring the new certificate into use by 2021 at the latest.

C. Procedures for and duration of examinations under 8.2 of ADN

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2015/21

24. The group welcomed the proposal by OTIF regarding the use of examinations in electronic form.

25. Mr. Birkhuber noted that if the answers were rotated as described on page 4 of the OTIF document, comparability would no longer be ensured with the written examination.

26. The group agreed on the principle of allowing the future use of calculators during the examination. The calculators should be made available by the competent authority or the examining body.

27. The group held an exchange of views concerning the duration of the examination. Mr. Ehrlich, Mr. Gildemeister, Mr. Birkhuber, Mr. Croo, Mr. de Maat and Mr. Saha confirmed that the allotted time was sufficient.

28. Mr. Bölker noted that, according to the informal working group, no amendment to the regulations was necessary.

D. Harmonization of Chapter 8.2 "Requirements concerning training" with 8.2 of ADR

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2014/4 – Com. DE

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2013/3 – Com. DE

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2013/17, paras. 13–15

29. Mr. Weiner submitted a proposal aimed at harmonizing ADN Chapter 8.2 with ADR.

30. The group considered the proposal of the German delegation (CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2013/3) and concluded that it would be advisable to revise the document in question. It would also be advisable to proceed with a prior exchange of views on whether harmonizing ADN Chapter 8.2 with ADR was absolutely necessary.

E. Proof of training as a requirement for award of the expert certificate

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2014/5 – Com. DE

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/46, paras. 24–25

31. So far, the informal working group had not noted any urgency in that regard. There was little likelihood that the examination would be taken in a State other than the one where the training was given. The participants recommended that, if necessary, the corresponding training could be recognized in the Contracting Parties concerned.

F. Renewal of gas/chemicals expert certificates

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2014/6 – Com. DE

CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WG/CQ/2015/7 – Com. DE

32. Mr. Weiner proposed that, on the basis of the communication from the German delegation, the group should proceed with an exchange of views on the possibility of renewing the certification of specialized knowledge for the transport of gases and chemical substances with a further training course or proof of employment on a corresponding vessel.

33. In most cases, the renewal took place in Germany on the basis of proof of employment on a vessel.

34. Mr. Croo noted that for further training courses in gases or chemicals, there were no examinations. In Belgium, about 90 per cent of certificates were issued on the basis of proof of employment on a vessel. He considered that there was no need to change the regulations.

35. Mr. de Maat said that in the Netherlands, approximately 75 per cent of the proof for renewal consisted of evidence of employment on a vessel and that he considered it unnecessary to make any changes.

V. General issues concerning the catalogue of questions (item 3 of the calendar of work)

36. No other general issues were raised.

VI. Calendar

37. The group decided to hold its next meeting in Strasbourg on 14 and 15 March 2016, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.