

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

2 July 2020

Bern, 10-11 September and Geneva, 14-18 September 2020

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

Reports of informal working groups

Comments on the Report of the informal working group on the use of the terms *risk* and *hazard* – 2020/44

Transmitted by the Government of Romania on behalf of the Group

Introduction

1. We present you a review of the situation of the group report, as follows:
 - The report of the Informal Working Group meeting held in The Hague in February was initially submitted as informal document INF.19 on the agenda of the March 2020 session of the RID/ADR/ADN Joint meeting;
 - The report was submitted also on the agenda of the 57th session of the UN Subcommittee of expert for the transport of dangerous goods (UNSCETDG) where is registered as document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/58;
 - For the September 2020 session of the RID/ADR/ADN Joint meeting, the report was registered as document ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2020/44.
2. Through the platform provided by the secretariat for the 57th session of the UNSCETDG (29 June - 8 July 2020) we received some comments that deserve to be mentioned here, to be analysed by the RID/ADR/ADN Joint meeting, as follows:

- **Belgium_TDG+GHS**

We thank the chairman of the working group for the result that is being presented. We support the work done and will continue to contribute to the review in the working group.

- **Spain_TDG**

Spain is very thankful to the authors of the proposal for continuing to work in the correct use of the terms “*risk*” and “*hazard/danger*” in the Recommendations and Model Regulations.

After analysing in detail all the proposed changes, in English and in French, Spain can support most of them, and wants to add the following comments on specific paragraphs:

- 1.4.3- Only in the French Version, the Spanish experts support option 2 to replace “haut risqué” par “conséquences graves” because this text is more in line with the English language version, which expresses correctly the security problem and the possibility of having high consequences in any case of potential misuse. We think it is important to modify this term in French, as it is a basic topic than can cause many misunderstandings ;
- 1.5.1.1- In this case we should follow the OIEA texts, and see if in the next revision of the OIEA the term risk in this point of the OIEA regulations could be reviewed ;

- 3.3, SP 391- The change is already updated in the French version (ed 21).

○ **Canada_TDG**

Thank you Romania for bringing forward this proposal.

Canada supports this proposal in principle, however, proposes some alternate wording, as follows:

English document

- 2.1.3.3.1, Note – replace “risk” by “likelihood”
- 2.6.3.2.3.4 – either keep “risk of infection” or replace by “infectiousness hazard”
- 6.7.2.5.1 – replace “as to be protected against the risk of being wrenched off” by “and protected as to ensure that it cannot be wrenched off” and the third sentence accordingly
- 6.7.3.5.1 – see comments for 6.7.2.5.1
- 6.7.4.5.1 – see comments for 6.7.2.5.1
- 7.1.2.1 – replace “may result in undue hazards” by “lead to greater consequences”
- 7.1.5.2 – replace “create an explosion hazard” by “increase the likelihood of an explosion”

French document

- 1.4.3 – dans ce contexte, le mot « risque » nous semble pleinement approprié. Cependant, si le Sous-comité tient à remplacer ce mot, nous préférons remplacer « marchandises dangereuses à haut risque » par « marchandises dangereuses présentant un danger pour la sécurité publique »
- 1.4.3.1 à 1.4.3.1.2, Tableau – voir commentaires pour 1.4.3
- 1.4.3.1.3 - dans ce contexte, le mot « risque » nous semble pleinement approprié. Cependant, si le sous-comité tient à remplacer ce mot, nous préférons remplacer « à haut risque » par « présentant un danger pour la sécurité publique »
- 1.4.3.2 à 1.4.3.2.2.1 - voir commentaires pour 1.4.3
- 2.1.3.2.3, Note 3 - remplacer « risque d’être valable seulement » par « pourrait n’être valable que »
- 2.6.2.1.3 – dans le nouveau texte, remplacer « si 10% (masse) au moins de sa masse totale sont susceptibles d’être » par « si au moins 10% de sa masse totale pourraient être » ET « au plus de 10 microns » par « de 10 microns ou moins »
- 3.3, DS 291 - remplacer « exclure le risque d’éclatement ou de fissuration » par « empêcher l’éclatement ou la fissuration »
- P200, z, par.5 - remplacer « tout risque de » par « toutes »
- TP 32, a) - remplacer « tout risque de confinement » par « toute possibilité de confinement »
- 6.2.1.1.8.3 - remplacer « il existe un risque de contact avec l’oxygène de l’air ou avec un fluide enrichi en oxygène » par « un contact avec l’oxygène de l’air ou avec un fluide enrichi en oxygène est possible »
- 7.1.5.2 - remplacer « tels qu’il en résulte un risque d’explosion » par « tels qu’il en résulte une possibilité d’explosion »

○ **Canada_TDG**

Canada has identified 2 additional proposed changes to be considered by the Expert from Romania:

- PP52 and PP76 – the word “risk” seems to be the most appropriate in this context, since packages should not increase the probability, nor the consequence of the initiation ;
- 4.1.5.2, c) – we prefer option 1, which is wording proposed by Canada in the 55th session.

○ **Netherlands_TDG**

We thank Romania for this document. We have participated in the informal working group and we support the proposal.

3. We also upload a comment on the platform, as follows:

○ **Romania_TDG**

We thank [...] for the comments and the new options/alternate wordings. The September 2020 session of the Joint meeting will be a good moment to analyse also the various options expressed here.

We intend to stress the attention of experts on 2 (two) issues highlighted in the document, as follows:

- First, for the IAEA regulations - The relation of UNMR and GHS with IAEA Regulations (2018 edition) - the proposal for the end of the last phrase of the paragraph 1.5.1.1 - We hope experts [of IAEA] to analyse it in the context of the terminology used for all (hazard) classes - the other related references are in INF. 19 (march 2020 session of Joint meeting), the paragraph 7 c) and document 2020/44 (September 2020 session of the Joint meeting) – to replace *radiation risk* by *radiation hazard*> ;
- Second, for the Explosives Working Group issues – there are 2 sub-paragraphs in INF.19 (7 e) – on items 36 and 37 of the table – for PP52 and PP76) and 7 g) on item 46 of the table – for paragraph 4.1.5.2 c)). The Hague Group developed 2 options on each case.

4. Please note that informal document INF.19 presents the proposals in a more expressive and colourful way, which can be helpful but without the above comments!

5. New comments are welcome on paragraphs that have more options (proposal in French) or where "See also paragraph 7 (c or d or h) of INF.19 mentioned above" or "Voir le paragraphe 7 (a ... i) de l'INF.19 mentionné ci-dessus" appears.

6. Our intention is to prepare, by the end of September, an informal document with the optimal proposals for the December session of UNSCETDG, which is why we consider the contribution of the Joint Meeting very important!