

## COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS AND ON THE GLOBALLY HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS

Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Thirty-fourth session  
Geneva, 1-9 December 2008  
Item 12 of the provisional agenda

### PROGRAMME OR WORK FOR THE BIENNIUM 2009-2010

#### Intermodal Harmonisation

##### Worldwide Multimodal Harmonization – Terms of Reference

1. During the present session, the Sub-Committee considered the issues raised in 2008/65 and Inf. 20, and noted that some governments have policies of working towards a more uniform set of regulations. The Sub-Committee agreed to discuss the issues during a lunchtime working group that produced a rough draft of a list of issues (see Table in Annex 1). During a second meeting, the working group considered the issues further and proposed an incremental approach.
2. It is proposed that the Sub-Committee invite the different modal, regional and national bodies to work with the Sub-Committee to address the consolidation, clarification, and alignment of multimodal texts, and the identification of necessary differing and additional modal requirements.
3. These bodies are invited to send their feedback to the Sub-Committee regarding the Table in Annex 1 and the following issues in particular:
  - (a) Developing a common understanding on what is meant by harmonization;
  - (b) Identifying existing substantial international modal, regional, and national differences with the aim of reducing differences to the greatest extent practicable, and ensuring that where differences are necessary that they do not pose an impediment to the safe and efficient transport of dangerous goods;
  - (c) Establishing cooperative guidelines for enhancing consistency between the requirements of international modal, regional, and national bodies and reducing unnecessary impediments;
  - (d) Undertaking a technical editorial review to identify inconsistencies of use of language with the goal of ensuring that the text of each regulation is user-friendly and clear, and is easily translated into other languages.

Annex

Note: This Table was developed during a lunchtime working group amended during its second meeting and should only be considered as a draft for discussion purposes.

<b>No</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Potential solution</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	Editorial differences	Editorial WG/board	
2	Differences of substance [by regulators and industry]	Document reasons for controversial decisions	
3	Inter-modal differences	Identify the differences, develop agreed procedures between modes to cooperate	UK to circulate list of differences
4	Unclear text	Editorial WG/board	
5	National laws inconsistent with UNMR		
6	Changes to UNMR not always justified in a way that can be adopted by nations	Proposals to be accompanied by cost benefit analysis	
7	Unrealistic time pressures	Editorial WG/board	
8	Difficult to identify inter-modal differences	WG to review	UK to circulate list of differences
9	Modes sometimes identify problems that UNSC will not accept/resolve	Develop agreed procedures between modes to cooperate	
10	Participants at UNSC may not have authority to effect changes nationally/regionally		
11	Not clear what is meant by "harmonization"		
12	Ease of access to decision making (not always possible for other committees to understand decisions of UNSC)		
13	Inadequate breadth of participation – nations, industry, modes		
14	Duplication of work on classification	Develop agreed procedures between modes to cooperate	
15	Different opinions from national representatives at different forums	Develop agreed procedures between modes to cooperate	
16	Some delegations don't have multimodal view (not always possible to do this for some delegations)	Enhance the documentation of reasons for decisions for modes	
17	Inadequate procedure to resolve differences other than voting	Rules of procedure minimal amount of support before proposal can be introduced (like IATA Dangerous Goods Board and RID/ADR)	

