



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/2003/9  
21 February 2003

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

**Working Party on the Transport  
of Dangerous Goods**

(Seventy-fourth session,  
Geneva, 19-23 May 2003)

**PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES A AND B OF ADR**

**Chapter 8**

**Requirements concerning the training of drivers**

**Transmitted by the Government of Germany**

SUMMARY

<b>Executive summary:</b>	An appropriate regulation should be established for the duration and intervals of refresher training courses. For this purpose two alternatives are proposed.
<b>Action to be taken:</b>	Amend text as set out in section "Proposal" (nos. (1) to (6)).
<b>Related documents:</b>	INF.3 of the 72nd session; doc. TRANS/WP.15/2002/20

## **Introduction**

In the last two WP.15 sessions, the duration and intervals of the refresher training courses prescribed for drivers were discussed, but no decision was taken. The discussion during the last WP.15 session has shown that the national opinions of the Contracting Parties to ADR and the regulations in these States widely differ. In order to ensure that the same high training and safety standards are applied by all Contracting Parties to ADR, Germany would like to put forward the following proposal.

## **Proposal**

In the view of Germany, there are two possible regulations for the duration and intervals of refresher courses that will ensure appropriate training standards:

- either a duration of the training of at least one day every three years
- or a duration of the training of at least two days every five years including practical exercises.

The WP.15 is invited to elaborate an appropriate regulation.

Depending on the decision taken, the following amendments to ADR are required:

- (1) Sub-section 8.2.2.5.3 is amended as follows:

“The duration of the refresher training including practical exercises shall be of at least [one day] / [two days].“

- (2) Sub-section 8.2.2.5.4 is amended as follows:

“... on each training day.”

- (3) The word “course” in sub-section 8.2.2.7.3.1 is deleted.

- (4) In sub-section 8.2.2.7.3.3 the word “course” is deleted and the words “In the examination” are added at the beginning of the sentence.

- (5) As regards the first alternative, the words “every five years” shall be replaced by the words “every three years” in sub-section 8.2.1.5.

- (6) In addition, a new transitional provision 1.6.x.x is required for the first alternative:

“Training certificates issued before 1 January 2005 in accordance with the provisions applicable up to 31 December 2004 shall remain valid until their date of expiry.“

## **Justification**

The refresher training shall ensure that drivers remain aware of the special requirements for the carriage of dangerous goods and that they have the necessary knowledge and skills. This can either be ensured by means of an intensive one-day training which is based on the knowledge and skills of the drivers acquired in previous training courses, or by means of several days of training, the subjects of which provide a basic training.

The current regulation is based on the second alternative, which may result in a training of up to four days. In view of the experience Germany has gained over many years, such long training times do not seem to be necessary. In the past, Germany carried out one-day training courses every three years with good experience. This training interval also took into account the usual interval of two years for amending the regulations.

However, Germany considers a training interval of five years also as an option. In this case, the refresher training should take two days so that there is enough time for communicating all legal amendments made during the preceding five years and reminding drivers again that their actions are crucially relevant to safety.

The overall expenditure for both alternatives is approximately the same for industry.

## **Safety implications**

By harmonizing the application of provisions in the States which are Parties to ADR, the safety level is adapted and “training tourism“ is prevented.

## **Feasibility**

The burden for the economy can be reduced in those States where the training currently takes one day per course. Besides, there is no evidence for the impracticability of the proposal.

## **Enforceability**

No problems are to be expected.

-----