

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General  
17 July 2013

Original: English

---

**Economic Commission for Europe****Inland Transport Committee****Working Party on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs****Sixty-ninth session**

Geneva, 8-11 2013

Items 5 (b) and 8 of the provisional agenda

**Proposal of amendments to the ATP: New proposals****Energy labelling, refrigerants and blowing agents****Proposals by the secretariat****Note by the secretariat****I. Miscellaneous amendment proposals**

1. At the end of section 7 of annex 1, appendix 2, it is mentioned "... in conformity with one or other of the models 1 to 10 hereunder". With the addition to ATP of section 8 on tests for multi-temperature equipment, the test models can no longer be considered to be "hereunder". To resolve this issue, it would be possible to reverse the order of sections 7 and 8 or to replace "hereunder" in section 7 by "at the end of the present appendix".
2. Footnote 4 in the model certificate of compliance in annex 1, appendix 3, which refers to multi-temperature equipment states that "The test procedure is not yet determined within the ATP Agreement." A test procedure has been defined for new multi-temperature equipment. Consequently, WP.11 may wish to replace the first sentence of footnote 4 by "The test procedure for new multi-temperature equipment appears in section 8 of annex 1, appendix 2. A test procedure for in-service multi-temperature equipment has not yet been determined."
3. In footnote 8 to the model certificate in annex 1, appendix 3 A, replace "fuel" by "refrigerant". This was not corrected at the same time that the same mistake was corrected in the model certificate itself.
4. In annex 1, appendix 3 B (model certification plate) and annex 1, appendix 4 (distinguishing mark), WP.11 may wish to replace "02-2011" by "02-2019" or some other future date.

5. In Annex 2, appendix 2, para. 14 (General specifications for the measuring system), footnote 1 reads "This procedure will be defined". WP.11 may wish to decide who could be asked to define the procedure.

## **II. Assessment of the environmental impact of proposals to amend ATP**

6. At its sixty-eighth session in 2012, "WP.11 took note of the suggestion by France that in future all proposals to amend ATP should include an assessment of the environmental impact of the proposal in addition to the cost, feasibility and enforceability justifications which were already required. The secretariat was requested to prepare a proposal to this effect for the next session." (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/226, para.50)

7. The terms of reference and rules of procedure of the WP.11 (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/222/Add.1) contain an annex on Rules concerning documents to be submitted to WP.11. Paragraph 4 of the annex reads as follows:

"4. All documents containing proposed amendments to legal instruments shall comply with the standard presentation shown in the appendix to these rules, include a brief summary and, where necessary, a justification taking into account the following criteria:

Cost: What are the cost implications?

Feasibility: Which economic sector or public service is concerned by the proposed amendments?

What are the consequences in terms of the advantages and disadvantages?

Is a transitional period required?

Enforceability: Once implemented, can the amendments be observed or monitored?

This rule shall not apply to editing amendments or amendments proposed by an informal ad hoc group."

### **Proposal**

8. It is proposed to add the following new criterion in the justification after "Feasibility":

"Environmental impact: Will the proposed amendment have any environmental implications, for example in terms of increased fuel consumption or reduced insulating capacity?"

9. If agreed by WP.11, this new text would also appear in the appendix to the terms of reference and rules of procedure on the Standard format for documents.

---