



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/2006/18
4 August 2006

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Eighty-first session
Geneva, 25-27 October 2006
Item 4 of the provisional agenda

PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO ANNEXES A AND B OF ADR

Section 8.1.5: Miscellaneous Equipment

Transmitted by the Government of the United Kingdom

SUMMARY

Executive Summary: The 80th session agreed an amendment to 8.3.7 which will require one wheel chock to be used as braking for a vehicle which does not have an auxiliary braking system. This proposal aims to bring 8.1.5 into harmony with 8.3.7 by only requiring one wheel chock, rather than two, to be carried as miscellaneous equipment in a transport unit.

Action to be taken: Amend the requirement in 8.1.5 (a) to carry wheel chocks to apply to only those vehicles which do not have parking brakes.

Related documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.15/2006/1 (Norway).

Introduction

1. Section 8.1.5 of ADR currently provides for one wheel chock to be carried per vehicle. As a vehicle includes both the tractor unit and a trailer, this means in practice at least 2 wheel chocks need to be carried. However, during discussion of proposal 2006/1 presented at the last WP.15 meeting, it was pointed out that most trailers possess an auxiliary braking device. If this is the case, it seems logical and sensible to only require the carrying of wheel chocks where the transport unit is not equipped with other braking devices. The United Kingdom makes this

GE.06-

proposal to simplify the regulation in 8.1.5 (regarding the carriage of miscellaneous equipment) to bring it into better harmony with the new text in 8.3.7.

Proposal

2. Amend the text of the first indent in 8.1.5 (a) as shown below in bold:

(a) The following general purpose safety equipment:

- For each vehicle, **not equipped with parking brakes**, at least one chock of a size suited to the weight of the vehicle and to the diameter of the wheels.

Justification

3. The vast majority of tractor units carrying dangerous goods are equipped with parking brakes. Trailer units too mostly have an auxiliary braking device which allows the trailer to be parked safely even when not attached to the tractor unit. For these vehicles there is no added value in carrying a wheel chock. Where the vehicles do not have parking brakes there is a clear safety value in one wheel chock being carried. The proposal also allows for more than one wheel chock to be carried if circumstances require it.

Background

4. In their paper 2006/1 presented to the May 2006 meeting, the Government of Norway proposed changes to 8.3.7 in ADR to ensure that trailers, when parked separately from the drawing vehicles would be parked safely, either with the use of an auxiliary parking brake or via use of one wheel chock. The proposal was adopted without a vote, but during discussion it became clear that the vast majority of trailers had auxiliary brakes and that only a relatively few number of trailers relied solely on wheel chock to be parked safely. The United Kingdom has therefore put forward a proposal to amend 8.1.5 which better reflects existing practice and technological changes, as well as reducing the cost to industry of complying with ADR.

Safety implications

5. The proposal maintains the existing safety levels by ensuring that either an auxiliary parking brake or a wheel chock is employed.

Feasibility

6. There are no feasibility issues as the proposal harmonizes 8.1.5 and 8.3.7.
