

## INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

**Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**(72<sup>nd</sup> Session, Geneva, 13-17 May 2002)**PROPOSAL OF AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 3.2**Remove entries of Portable Tank Special Provision TP13 from column 11 of Table ATransmitted by the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)

<b>SUMMARY</b>	
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	The proposal aims to delete the requirement for a self-contained breathing apparatus in road and rail transport.
<b>Action to be taken:</b>	Remove entries of TP13 from column 11 in Table A of ADR and RID
<b>Related documents:</b>	None

**Introduction**

Portable tank special provision TP13 (“Self-contained breathing apparatus shall be provided when this substance is carried”) was introduced in sub section 4.2.4.3 of the restructured RID/ADR in the frame of the harmonisation process with the UN Model Regulations.

**Proposal**

Remove all entries of TP13 into column 11 of Table A of ADR and RID

**Justification**

The requirement for a self contained breathing apparatus may well be appropriate for marine transport but should not be recommended for drivers of transport units carrying dangerous goods by road or by rail. Rather than loosing time and endangering his life whilst putting on the breathing apparatus, a driver should make use of an escape mask and should leave the danger area as soon as possible in case of emergencies involving such dangerous goods. As far as road and rail transport is concerned, a self contained breathing apparatus is reserved for trained fire fighters who can make an approach from outside the scene of the accident.

For road transport, it is up to the consignor to list the need for such an escape mask in the instructions in writing as set out in section 5.4.3. This practice is already in place nowadays and does not create problems. A parallel can be drawn with Special Provision S7 for toxic gases in chapter 8.5, which is also incorporated by the consignor in the instructions in writing for these products.

For rail transport, RID does not prescribe equivalent instructions in writing. Rail operating companies provide adequate safety instructions to their personnel, outside the frame of RID.

**Safety implications**

The removal of TP13 will not jeopardise the effective personal protection of the driver.

**Feasibility**

The proposed amendment will maintain the current satisfactory practice.

**Enforceability**

As this amendment will make the additional requirement redundant, no enforceability problems will arise