



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/82
17 October 2000

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport
of Dangerous Goods

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

REPORT OF THE SESSION*

held in Bern from 11 to 15 September 2000

* Distributed by the Central Office for International Carriage by Rail (OCTI) under the symbol OCTI/RID/GT-III/2000-B.

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
Attendance	1	3
Adoption of the agenda	2 - 3	3
Miscellaneous proposals	4 - 86	4
Part 1	4 - 33	4
Part 2	34 - 35	8
Parts 4 and 6 and references to standards	36 - 45	8
Part 5	46 - 57	9
Part 3	58 - 84	11
Class 7	85 - 86	15
Future work	87 - 90	15
Adoption of the report and its annexes	91	16

Annexes

Annex 1: Texts adopted by the Joint Meeting	17
Annex 2: Annex 1 of document INF.11 without Chapter 3.2, Table A	24

REPORT

ATTENDANCE

1. The Joint Meeting of the RID Safety Committee and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods of the Economic Commission for Europe held a session in Bern from 11 to 15 September 2000, with Mr. A. Johansen (Norway) as Chairman and Mr. H. Rein (Germany) as Vice-Chairman. Representatives of the following countries took part in the work of the session: Austria; Belgium; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Italy; Liechtenstein; Luxembourg; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Russian Federation; Slovakia; Slovenia; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; United Kingdom. The following non-governmental international organizations were represented: European Liquefied Petroleum Gas Association (AEGPL); International Rail Transport Committee (CIT); European Committee for Standardization (CEN); European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA); International Federation of Freight Forwarders Associations (FIATA); European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC); International Road Transport Union (IRU); European Secretariat of Manufacturers of Light Metal Packagings (SEFEL); International Union of Railways (UIC); International Union of Private Wagons (UIP); International Technical Committee for the Prevention and Extinction of Fire (CTIF).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/81 and -/Corr.1 and circular letter A 81-02/502.2000 of the secretariat (Central Office) of the Intergovernmental Organization for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF)

Informal documents: INF.1 and INF.2

2. The Joint Meeting adopted the agenda as amended by documents INF.1 and INF.2, noting that documents -/1998/48, -/1999/23, -/1999/24 and -/2000/14 had been withdrawn from the agenda. Document -/2000/7 had been added. The representative of Sweden said that she would also withdraw document -/1997/67 since she would be preparing a new proposal at a later date.

3. In connection with the reference documents for ADR, the Joint Meeting noted that new documents had been prepared:

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/80/Add.4/Corr.1;

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/80/Add.8/Corr.1;

INF.14/Rev.1, which replaced TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/159/Add.7/Corr.1 and applied to several chapters dealing with provisions of Class 7.

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS

Part 1

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/2 (Austria)

4. Paragraph 1 of the proposal had been settled in the course of earlier work.
5. In paragraph 2, the Joint Meeting noted that the concept of the packing group did not normally exist for Class 6.2, particularly for UN Nos. 2814 and 2900 for which special packagings were required in accordance with Chapter 6.3 and packing instruction P620. Only UN No. 3291 had been empirically assigned to Packing Group II because the packagings required by instruction P621 must meet the performance level of packagings for substances of Packing Group II. In order to resolve the problem brought up by Austria, it was decided to differentiate between the transport categories for these substances in the table in 1.1.3.1 (c)/RID, 1.1.6.3/ADR by a reference to hazard groups 3 and 4 for transport category 0 and to hazard group 2 for transport category 2 (see annex 1 to the report).
6. With reference to paragraph 3 (multipliers for the substances referred to in note a/ to the table in 1.1.3.1 (c)/RID, 1.1.3.6.3/ADR) it was recalled that the Joint Meeting had already adopted a multiplier 20 (see TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/80-OCTI/RID/GT-III/2000-A, para. 12), that this multiplier had been adopted for RID, but that the Joint Meeting's decision had not been followed by the WP.15 Working Party for ADR where the multiplier 50, which was more stringent, had been considered to be preferable. Opinions on the issue were once again divided, but the Joint Meeting confirmed its earlier decision and hoped that the WP.15 Working Party would go back on its own decision in order to be in line with RID.

Documents: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/6 (Switzerland)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/7 (ECE secretariat)

7. The proposal by Switzerland had been discussed at the previous session but it had been considered that it fell outside the framework of the restructuring. Several delegations again considered that the interpretation by Switzerland of the present provisions of some marginals, particularly for the application of marginal 10 599 of ADR, was not in keeping with that of other countries and that proposals of that nature should be submitted as proposed amendments with proper justification.
8. The proposal concerning 1.1.3.1 (Exemptions relating to the nature of the transport operation) was not adopted, since several delegations considered that this proposal would lead to problems of interpretation which did not exist as things stood.
9. With reference to the question of 1.1.3.1 (c)/1.1.3.6.3, several delegations were of the opinion that the substances exempted in accordance with 1.1.3.2 to 1.1.3.5 should not be taken into account for the calculations of 1.1.3.1 (c)/1.1.3.6. The representative of Austria had prepared a replacement text for 1.1.3.1 (c)/1.1.3.6.5 which was adopted (see annex 1 to the report).

10. The proposals concerning 1.1.3.2 and 1.1.3.3 were not adopted for the reasons set out in paragraph 7 above. If the Government of Switzerland considered that certain provisions of ADR should not be subject to exemptions in connection with these paragraphs, it should submit new proposals and justify them.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/16 (EIGA)

11. This proposal to extend the provisions of 1.1.4.2 to the storage and reforwarding of receptacles of Class 2 which did not conform to RID/ADR or to European standards, was not accepted by the Joint Meeting. It was considered that it was not the province of RID/ADR to resolve questions concerning storage law and that other solutions existed such as the recognition of other standards (e.g. American) by the first RID/ADR State concerned by the consignment as was already the practice for tank-containers, or the conclusion of a multilateral agreement.

12. It was also recommended that the most immediate solution to be sought would be to harmonize requirements with the United Nations Recommendations.

13. The Joint Meeting further did not agree to establish a limit on temporary storage since this would cause conflict with the definition of the transport operation.

14. The European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA) was asked to reflect with its experts on the proposals put forward and to submit a new proposal.

15. Since harmonization for these receptacles within the United Nations Committee of Experts was on the agenda, EIGA requested the support of the European countries within the United Nations Committee of Experts.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/46 (EIGA/CEFIC)

16. This proposal to extend the 1000 l limit to 3000 l for pressure drums was rejected by 10 votes to 10, after EIGA had withdrawn its proposal concerning wall-thickness, since it concerned tanks only.

17. It was noted that confusion could be created between pressure receptacles with a capacity greater than 1000 l and tanks of more than 1000 l, including United Nations portable tanks, since the requirements applicable to them were not the same, particularly with reference to equipment, periodicity of testing and wall-thickness.

18. The representative of EIGA recommended that a distinction should be made between receptacles intended for use and not for transport and tanks which were intended for transport in particular.

19. The question was also asked how such receptacles, which were designed to be rolled and had no frame, could be transported safely, and it was noted that tank-containers could not be rolled. Receptacles of this nature could not furthermore be approved as tanks.

20. The representative of CEFIC proposed, at the request of the representative of Germany, and in view of the fact that the vote had been divided, that a working group should be organized in Brussels. Germany, Sweden, Belgium, Poland and France announced that they would participate. The representative of Italy expressed the hope that this working group would establish a European position which could be brought to the attention of the United Nations Committee of Experts.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/22 (EIGA)

21. The Joint Meeting adopted this proposal in principle by 16 votes to 2; it considered that it went further than the provisions of 1.6.3.8 and 1.6.4.5. In order to prevent any misinterpretation, the text would, however, be reworded (see annex 1 to the report).

Transitional measure of 1.6.1.1

22. In the context of a discussion within the UIC's RID standing group, the legal department of OCTI established a position on the interpretation of this provision. It emerged from this position that the provisions of Chapters 1.3, 1.4 and 1.8 were not covered by this transitional measure since they were provisions of a general and administrative nature which were not linked to a specific transport operation.

23. It was noted that this was an optional provision subject to the consignor's choice and that the situation was unclear since the whole transport chain was concerned. The railways for their part would have to accept transport operations both according to the present version of RID and the new version.

24. A member of the ECE secretariat clarified that all the provisions of Annexes A and B of ADR should in principle be considered as conditions of carriage, and if these conditions were not met, carriage could not be authorized in accordance with article 2 of ADR. This principle therefore also concerned Chapters 1.3 and 1.8. The question which arose was how paragraph 1.6.1.1 should be interpreted. Should it be considered that as from 1 July 2001 a transport operation could be subject to all the requirements in force prior to 1 July, or to all the requirements (including Chapters 1.4 and 1.8) applicable as from 1 July? Or should the possibility of a combined application be envisaged, in other words, the possibility of replacing only some requirements of the new RID/ADR by the corresponding earlier requirements of the present RID/ADR? In this case the question did indeed arise as to whether paragraph 1.1.6.1 applied to Chapters 1.4 and 1.8 which had no equivalent in the current version of RID/ADR.

25. The representative of Germany proposed that the Joint Meeting should announce that its opinion was that this transitional measure should apply to all the requirements of RID/ADR. Member States should bring this situation to the attention of the national supervisory authorities so that it could be taken into account in inspections and any sanctions procedures.

26. The Chairman considered that it would be appropriate to keep the present text and that those who were not of this opinion should propose a new text.

27. In view of the possible ambiguities regarding the interpretation of 1.1.6.1, the ECE secretariat proposed that clearer wording should be used to express more clearly the Joint Meeting's intention that the transitional period of 18 months should be valid for all provisions of the restructured RID/ADR, except for those relating specifically to Class 7. In this case, the Joint Meeting should first of all take a decision on the possibilities of interpretation mentioned in paragraph 24.

28. Opinions on the subject were divided. The majority of delegations considered that a combined application of the requirements of the old and the new RID/ADR should be possible during the transitional period. Some others considered on the contrary that in order to avoid misunderstandings between different participants during a transport operation, the version of RID/ADR selected by the consignor should be followed systematically. The Joint Meeting preferred to leave the text of 1.6.1.1 as it stood.

29. The representative of Germany suggested that the representatives of industry should meet to finalize guidelines for the standard application of these transitional measures. These guidelines could be submitted to the Joint Meeting at its next session and would serve as a model for the interpretation of paragraph 1.1.6.1 by the competent authorities. This proposal was adopted.

30. In view of the discussion, the ECE secretariat proposed that it should at least be indicated clearly that the 18-month transitional period was valid for section 1.8.3 on safety advisers, at least in countries which would not be able to take the required administrative measures before 1 January 2003. This proposal was accepted, but the text proposed should appear in Chapter 1.8 rather than in section 1.6.1. The RID Committee of Experts and the WP.15 Working Party should determine where exactly it was to go.

31. The representative of France said that provision must also be made for a transitional period of 18 months for tank constructors who would not be able to revise their manufacturing processes for 1 July 2001. The opinion of the Joint Meeting was that this only concerned ADR (particularly for aluminium and fibre-reinforced plastics tanks), since the current provisions of RID concerning the construction of tanks would not be modified.

Informal document: INF.12 (UIC)

32. The proposal to amend paragraph 1.4.2.2.1 (d) was not adopted since it constituted a proposal for a substantive change. In that context it was noted that provisions for tank-vehicles and tank-wagons were different. The representative of UIC said that he would not submit a new proposal. UIC would rather seek to solve the problem using organizational measures during sampling checks.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/19 (European Commission)

33. This proposal to exempt gas receptacles for breathing apparatus in accordance with 1.1.3.2, following the withdrawal of the first option, was not adopted by the Joint Meeting which considered that it was not indispensable.

Part 2

Exemption of six substances from the provisions of Class 8

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/1 (and informal document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/1/Rev.1) (CEFIC)

34. The proposal to list specifically six substances which CEFIC would like not to be considered as part of Class 8 was rejected. If these substances met the corrosiveness criteria they must be classified in Class 8. If need be, CEFIC should rather prepare and propose criteria for the exemption from Class 8 of certain solids if it considered it necessary.

Informal documents: INF.18 (ECE secretariat) and INF.18/Add.1 and -/Add.2 (Netherlands)

35. The corrections proposed by the ECE secretariat to Part 2 (INF.18) were adopted with some additions (INF.18/Add.1) and a number of amendments with reference to substances related to self-reactive substances (INF.18/Add.2).

Parts 4 and 6 and references to standards

Leakproofness test

Informal document: INF.16 (SEFEL)

36. The proposal that it should be specified in 4.1.1.1.2 that the leakproofness test was unnecessary for inner packagings of combination or large packagings, for inner receptacles (glass, porcelain or stoneware) and composite packagings marked RID/ADR, and for light gauge metal packagings marked RID/ADR was adopted (see annex 1 to the report).

Packing instructions for nitric acid, hydrofluoric acid and fluoroacetic acid

Informal documents: INF.4 (Belgium) and INF.7 (United Kingdom)

37. The proposals of Belgium for nitric acid, as amended by the United Kingdom, and those of the United Kingdom for the other acids were adopted (see annex 1 to the report).

38. The Meeting was reminded that similar proposals should be made to the United Nations Committee of Experts.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1998/45 (France)

39. In the context of informal document INF.8 (CEN), the Joint Meeting adopted this proposal for an addition to 6.2.1.7.1 and reworded the text (see annex 1 to the report).

Informal document: INF.8 (CEN)

40. Following the above decision, CEN would amend standard EN 1081:1996, to which 6.2.2.2 referred.

Standard EN 962:1996

41. Since this standard had recently been amended, the Joint Meeting agreed to make a reference to it in 4.1.6 (see annex 1 to the report).

Standard EN 849:1996

42. This standard had been amended a first time in 1998; CEN requested that a reference should be made in 4.1.6.7 to the annex to this standard which, however, had not yet been ratified and published. The Joint Meeting, considering that on the one hand it was not yet certain that this alternative test would provide equivalence and that on the other that it had not yet been ratified, postponed its decision until a future meeting.

Standard EN 12962:2000

43. The Joint Meeting agreed to refer to this standard in 6.2.2, in view of the fact that this was an omission on the part of CEN which had submitted it to the Joint Meeting in 1997.

Standard EN ISO 11114-2:2000

44. This standard had been placed in square brackets at the March 2000 Joint Meeting and ratified in April 2000. In the text of the restructured ADR (TRANS/WP.15/159/Add.6) it still appeared in square brackets, for lack of information from CEN regarding its publication, while it no longer appeared in the RID notification text [-/Not.37/6(a)] since CEN had informed the Committee of Experts in June that it had not yet been published. The Joint Meeting agreed to refer to it in 6.2.2.

45. Taking account of the fact that the notification for RID had already taken place on 31 July 2000, and that it was therefore no longer possible for RID, unlike ADR, to include this reference in the 1 July 2001 edition - even in the form of an erratum or corrigendum - entry into force could only be envisaged at a later date as the result of a decision by the RID Committee of Experts at a special session (for example, at the next Joint Meeting). The conclusion of a multilateral agreement could also be envisaged.

Part 5

Informal document: INF.9 (Austria)

46. In his document, the representative of Austria proposed that 6.2.2 should include a reference to standard ISO 9809-2:2000. The representative of CEN said that he would examine

the comparable CEN standard for conformity with RID/ADR. The Joint Meeting decided to postpone its decision until the next meeting in order to allow delegates to study it, since it had never been submitted.

Informal document: INF.12 (UIC) (Chapter 5.4)

47. The UIC standing group on RID, which had just met, had raised a number of problems in the restructured text of Chapter 5.4. The Strasbourg working group had addressed these questions and had proposed some amendments to be included in a corrigendum/erratum with the Joint Meeting's agreement.

5.4.1.1.1 (a)

48. Contrary to practice in the Model Regulations, the United Nations number should not be preceded by the letters "UN" following a decision by the Joint Meeting which had thus left the text as it stood. However, in 5.4.1.2.5.1 (a) for Class 7, this requirement had been taken over from the Model Regulations, perhaps inadvertently. The Joint Meeting decided to postpone its decision on this inconsistency.

5.4.1.1.1 (b)

49. The Joint Meeting amended this paragraph (see annex 1 to the report).

5.4.1.2.1 (a)

50. The Joint Meeting agreed to correct this omission for RID (marginal 115(1)) and the representative of Austria would submit a proposal to WP.15 to bring ADR into line with the structure of RID, since this provision particular to Class 1 appeared in ADR in 5.4.1.1.1 (g) (general provisions) instead of in 5.4.1.2.1 (a).

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/20 (CTIF)

51. The representative of CTIF introduced his document on emergency action codes (intervention) intended at some stage to provide the sole replacement for the "Kemler" Code (danger code), in the context of the global system of harmonization for danger coding. These codes were intended to provide firemen with information on the first measures to take.

52. The representative of UIC recalled that within the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts, UIC and other organizations were intending to submit an overview table of the various existing codes so as to compare the advantages of each in the context of the global system of harmonization.

53. Opinions were divided in the Joint Meeting between those who welcomed and supported this initiative and those who maintained a preference for the Kemler Code. It was generally agreed that harmonization was required in order to achieve a multimodal code and that the question should be dealt with by the United Nations. The representative of CEFIC said that he was in favour of the CTIF proposal in principle.

54. The representative of CTIF agreed that emergency action could differ according to the transport mode and that the codes would therefore have different meanings according to the transport mode.

55. The Chairman considered that this question was not a matter of urgent priority and could be discussed at forthcoming meetings in the context of harmonization. The Joint Meeting could take a decision on the subsidiary question of responsibilities.

Informal document: INF.13 (UIC)

56. The Joint Meeting supported, by 12 votes to 1, the principle contained in this proposal to put plates on swap-bodies in combined rail-road traffic, like large containers, and as in the case of rail traffic, for the purpose of identification in container terminals. The representative of UIC was asked to submit this proposal to WP.15 at its next meeting; at its last meeting, WP.15 had generally refused to put plates on swap-bodies.

57. The representative of France considered that the proposal to be submitted to WP.15 should make it clear that it was possible to check, on the road, that a vehicle was part of a combined transport operation, on the basis of the transport document.

Part 3

Informal document: INF.3 (Belgium)

58. The proposal by Belgium, in accordance with an earlier decision of the Joint Meeting which had not been followed by the RID Committee of Experts, to add references to the paragraphs, sections, chapters and parts concerned in the headings of columns in Table A of Chapter 3.2 was adopted.

Informal document: INF.23 (Portugal)

59. Following the decision taken on informal document INF.3 (see para. 58), the Joint Meeting adopted the references to be added to the heading of Table A of Chapter 3.2 on the basis of a proposal by the representative of Portugal (see annex 1 to the report).

Informal document: INF.5 (Belgium)

60. The proposal by Belgium that the wording of special provision 584 should be amended was adopted with some modifications (see annex 1 to the report).

Informal document: INF.6 (Belgium)

61. Some delegations opposed the proposal to specify, by entering “(P)” after the tank code in column 12, which substances were authorized for carriage in fibre-reinforced plastics tanks, since the criteria to authorize the use of these tanks had already been specified in 4.4.1 and the identification of the substances on the basis of these criteria would represent a considerable

amount of work. In practice, only a small number of substances of those meeting the criteria were actually carried in such tanks, and the work of identification would therefore be only of limited interest.

62. Other delegations on the contrary considered that the proposal by Belgium was in keeping with the principle of user-friendliness in the restructuring and supported it.

63. The Joint Meeting finally adopted the proposal by Belgium in principle, on the understanding that these amendments could at earliest only be made in the second version of the restructured RID/ADR and on the basis of full proposals identifying all the substances concerned. This decision could be reconsidered when a final proposal was submitted to the Joint Meeting.

Informal documents: INF.10 (Report of the thirty-seventh session of the RID Committee of Experts which met in Nuremberg from 26 to 30 June 2000)

INF.11 (Report of the working group of the RID Committee of Experts which met in Strasbourg from 4 to 6 September 2000 to consider Table A of Chapter 3.2)

64. The Joint Meeting adopted the recommendations of the working group for Table A, except for the following cases, or with the following comments.

65. It was pointed out that the entries for certain UN numbers should be divided to take account in the same entry of the different possibilities of viscosity or vapour pressure which were determining factors in the assignment of a tank code.

66. Some delegations considered that in order to be able to monitor the use of an appropriate tank, these parameters should be entered in the transport document. Others pointed out that no provision had been made for this in the current versions of RID and ADR, and that a requirement of this nature in transport documents should be the subject of a duly substantiated proposal.

Informal documents: INF.21 (Austria) and INF.24/Rev.1 and Rev.2

67. The problem raised in paragraphs 65 and 66 which was also the subject of document INF.21, was discussed a second time on the basis of document INF.24. The text proposed in Rev.1 and Rev.2 of this document, which also took IBCs into account, was finally adopted by 14 votes in favour and 2 against. It was the subject of a new special provision 640 (see annex 1 to the report). On the understanding that this was a question of restructuring, since the item numbers and letters in the current descriptions of the substances, which took these parameters into account, had been deleted, the Joint Meeting decided to bring this special provision into force on 1 July 2001 (for RID in the form of an erratum).

68. The Joint Meeting noted that special provisions 581, 582 and 583 would be included in Chapter 3.3 of RID at the proposal of the Strasbourg working group. It accepted the proposal by the Strasbourg working group to keep the present text of RID/ADR with reference to the

particulars in the consignment note (marginal 226/2226 (1)). The requirements for particulars on cylinders and on the marking of tanks, which appeared elsewhere in the restructured RID/ADR, were deleted from these provisions (see annex 1 to the report).

69. In answer to a question from the ECE secretariat, the Joint Meeting confirmed that the carriage of fertilizer ammoniating solution with free ammonia (UN No. 1043, Class 2) by rail or road should be prohibited.

70. The Joint Meeting accepted the proposal by the above-mentioned working group to provide two lines in Table A for substances which could concern both solids and liquids and solids carried in the molten state, in view of the different conditions of carriage to which they were subjected (packagings and tanks in particular). A distinction of this nature was currently lacking for certain substances in the United Nations Model Regulations, unlike the IMDG Code. The representative of the Netherlands would submit a relevant proposal to the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts.

71. With reference to UN Nos. 3284 and 3285 of Packing Group I, the working group had noted that carriage in portable tanks was permitted in the Model Regulations, contrary to RID/ADR and the IMDG Code, since to date no provision had been made for Packing Group I. Since the carriage in tanks of powdery or granular substances was now permitted for Packing Group I, the Joint Meeting decided to conform to the Model Regulations.

72. The working group had considered that for UN No. 0234 (Class 1) the subsidiary risk label 6.1 should be added in the Model Regulations, since provision was made for this label for the same substance in Class 4.1 (UN No. 1348). The Joint Meeting would ask the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts to correct the inconsistency.

73. The Joint Meeting agreed to make provision for LQ22 for limited quantities of UN No. 1774 (instead of LQ0), so as to be in keeping with the Model Regulations.

74. It decided, however, not to conform to the Model Regulations and the IMDG Code for UN No. 1872 and therefore to keep subsidiary risk label 6.1.

75. In the context of Class 6.2, the representative of Austria considered that RID should also make provision for carriage in "tanks" in the case of UN No. 3291, hazard group 2. The Joint Meeting thought that this question should be submitted to the RID Committee of Experts, which had in any case declared its opposition in the past. The representative of Austria also noted that carriage in tanks for infectious substances of hazard group 3 should also be permitted (the sending back of contaminated blood, for example). He was asked to submit a written proposal.

76. In order to avoid any confusion between the TP special provisions of column 13 and column 11, which were significantly different, the Joint Meeting decided to amend "TP" to "TT" for column 13.

77. As regards the deletion of special provision 223, as decided by the RID Committee of Experts, in view of the proposal by the ad hoc working group which met during the last Joint Meeting (see TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/80-OCTI/RID/GT-III/2000-A, para. 119), the question arose

as to whether it was useful to diverge from the United Nations Model Regulations in this way, particularly as the mention of this provision in column (6) of Table A would make it easier for users unfamiliar with the classification procedures to ascertain whether a substance, solution or mixture mentioned by name in Table A might possibly be exempted on the basis of tests.

78. The representative of UIC said that the system of the United Nations Model Regulations for assigning special provision 223 was not clear and that there was a risk of contradiction with the system of Part 2 of RID/ADR which varied from one class to another.

79. The ECE secretariat had prepared a list (INF.22) of substances mentioned by name in Table A to which provision 223 was assigned in the United Nations Model Regulations, and which, it seemed, in accordance with Chapter 2.2, could not be exempted even if it could be shown by testing that they did not meet the classification criteria, because paragraphs 2.2.3.1.7, 2.2.61.1.13 and 2.2.8.1.7 applied only to solutions and mixtures.

80. In connection with this list, it was pointed out that the above-mentioned paragraphs were applicable:

(a) to acids (UN Nos. 1787, 1788, 1789) because they were solutions;

(b) to items with names that also covered waste substances (e.g. crude oil, UN Nos. 1201, 1267, 1286, 1288, 1863);

(c) to all the substances of the classes concerned and not only those carrying United Nations special provision 223, if these substances were mixtures of isomers, or if the commercial product comprised a mixture of the pure substance with another substance which modified its characteristics.

As a result, the provisions of RID/ADR were less restrictive than those of the United Nations Model Regulations and some delegations feared that the addition of special provision 223 in the case of certain substances in column (6) only would conceal the fact that in accordance with Part 2 of RID/ADR it could be applicable to numerous other entries in which substances were referred to by name.

81. The Joint Meeting confirmed the decision to delete provision 223.

Document: TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1997/63 (Austria)

82. The representative of Austria introduced his proposal and noted in particular the questionable circumstances (5 votes in favour and 3 against) in which the United Nations Committee of Experts had completely exempted sulphur, except in the molten state (special provision 242). Following a serious accident, he asked that provision 242 should be deleted and that the exemption should be restricted to sea or air traffic.

83. This proposal gave rise to a lengthy discussion, particularly on whether sulphur, or certain forms of sulphur, should be considered dangerous or non-dangerous and whether it would

be necessary first to refer the matter to the United Nations Committee of Experts. The representative of Germany regretted the lack of accurate technical data for assessing the question.

84. During a first vote, the Joint Meeting refused to delete special provision 242 by 8 votes in favour and 8 votes against. During a second vote, it agreed by 13 votes to 4 to delete the exemption contained in this provision which depended on the quantity carried. Since the new content was no longer in accordance with the Model Regulations, special provision 242 was deleted and replaced by a special provision RID/ADR 640 (see annex 1 to the report). The representative of Austria was asked to submit a relevant proposal to the United Nations Committee of Experts.

Class 7

Informal document: INF.14/Rev.1

85. The Joint Meeting adopted the corrections to the texts for Class 7 prepared by the ECE secretariat on the basis of the decisions of the ad hoc working group on Class 7 at the last Joint Meeting (see TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/80-OCTI/RID/GT-III/2000-A, para.145), corrections made to the 1996 version of IAEA's ST-1 Regulations (revised version No. TS-R-1), and minor amendments adopted by the IAEA "Revision Panel TC-405.9" at its session of 4 to 8 September 2000.

86. The Joint Meeting did not, however, incorporate paragraph 4.1.9.6 proposed by the ad hoc working group, whereby radioactive pyrophoric substances should be carried in Type A, Type B or Type C packages. In fact, this requirement was not in accordance with the IAEA Regulations while it also contradicted the previous paragraph 4.1.9.5. According to 4.1.9.5, it should be possible to carry radioactive pyrophoric substances in excepted packages, industrial packages or Type A, Type B or Type C packages according to their level of radioactivity. Whatever the type of package, they must also conform to the applicable provisions of Chapters 4.1 or 4.2 and Part 6, in other words, and for example in the case of packagings, to requirements for Packing Group I and packing instructions P400 for liquids and P404 for solids.

FUTURE WORK

87. The Joint Meeting agreed to hold two (in principle) one-week sessions in 2001, the first from 28 May to 1 June (in Bern or Geneva) and the second between 10 and 21 September to finalize the 1 January 2003 edition and take account of the twelfth revised edition of the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (Model Regulations). This last-mentioned subject could already be considered at the May session.

88. The agenda would be as follows:

- harmonization with the United Nations Model Regulations (twelfth revised edition of the United Nations Recommendations)
- urgent issues (including document TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/17)

- documents pending from the current meeting
- corrigenda/errata to the 1 July 2001 edition of RID/ADR
- results of the working groups on spherical objects (para. 20), transitional measures (para.29), the definition of accident/incident (Frankfurt/Hamburg) (February 2000) and questions concerning tanks (January 2001 on the invitation of Germany, with the participation of Germany, Austria, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, United Kingdom and UIC)
- (tanks on the Wednesday).

89. The following documents remained pending:

TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1998/43 (France)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1998/46 (France)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/14 (Austria)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/16 (FIATA)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1999/17 (ECE)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/5 (Switzerland)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/7 (ECE)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/13 (Germany)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/15 (EIGA)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/17 (Germany)
TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/18 (AEGPL)
ANS/WP.15/AC.1/2000/19 (Austria)

90. A representative of OCTI asked the WP.15 Working Party to delay bringing into force (on 1 January 2003) the decisions taken by the present Joint Meeting which could not be taken into consideration in RID, in order to ensure the harmonization between RID/ADR, because of the more restrictive RID procedure in terms of time for bringing decisions into force. The Joint Meeting supported this request.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND ITS ANNEXES

91. The Joint Meeting adopted the report and its annexes.

Annex 1Texts adopted by the RID/ADR Joint MeetingPart 1 Document TRANS/WP.15/159/Add.1-OCTI/RID/Not./37/1

Throughout the restructured RID/ADR replace “with the technical or chemical name” with “with the technical, chemical or biological name”.

Amend as follows:

1.1.3.1 (c) Table: Category 0, Class 6.2: replace “without packing group” by “(hazard groups 3 and 4)”¹
 1.1.3.6.3 Category 2, Class 6.2: replace “Packing Group II” by “(hazard group 2)”¹
 Category 0: insert “Class 3: 3343”¹
 Category 2: insert “Class 9: 3245”¹
 Category 3: insert “Class 8: 2794, 2795, 2800 and 3028”¹

1.1.3.6.4 Add a new second dash to read:
 (ADR only)

“ - the quantity of substances and articles of transport category 1 referred to in the footnote * to the table in 1.1.3.6.3 multiplied by 20.”¹

1.1.3.1 (c) RID last subparagraph but one)
 1.1.3.6.5 ADR) Read as follows:

“For the purposes of these requirements, dangerous goods exempted in accordance with 1.1.3.2 to 1.1.3.5 shall not be taken into account.”¹

1.8.3 Add the following footnote:

“The provisions of section 1.8.3 are only applicable if the competent authorities of the country or countries to which the various participants in a transport chain are answerable have taken the necessary administrative measures to permit their implementation. These measures must have been taken in order for section 1.8.3 to be applicable at latest by 1 January 2003.”

1.6.3.8)

1.6.4.5)

Add: “However, for the proper shipping names required in 6.8.3.5.2 or 6.8.3.5.3 it is not necessary to take account of subsequent adaptations of the proper shipping names of these gases, provided that the proper shipping name in force appears on the shell or on the plate at latest after the date following the next periodic test.”²

Part 2

INF.18 and Add. 1 and 2: adopted.¹

Chapter 4.1

4.1.1.12

Last sentence, read:

“This test is not necessary for:

1. inner packagings, combination packagings or large packagings;
2. inner receptacles, composite packagings (glass, porcelain or stoneware) marked ‘RID/ADR’ in accordance with 6.1.3.1 (a) (ii);
3. light gauge metal packagings marked ‘RID/ADR’ in accordance with 6.1.3.1 (a) (ii).”¹

4.1.4.1

P001: RR1, beginning read: “For UN No. 1790 with not more than 85% ...”¹

P801a first line, add “2800” (ADR only)¹

P802: Delete “RR1”¹

4.1.6.7

Amend the reference to standard “EN 962:1996” to read: “EN 962:1996/A2:2000”¹

Chapter 4.3

4.3.4.1.1

In the “Code” column of the table add “2.65” under “Calculation pressure”¹

4.3.4.1.3 (g)

Amend “S2,65CN” to “S2,65AN”¹

Chapter 5.4

5.4.1.1.1

(b) After “when applicable” add “(see 3.1.2.6)”.

5.4.1.2.1

(a) Beginning, add:

“In addition to the particulars in accordance with 5.4.1.1.1, the indication of the net mass in kg of explosive substance must be included in the consignment note” (RID only)¹

Chapter 6.2

- 6.2.1.7.1 Add after “These marks ... immovably affixed attachments”:
 “For acetylene cylinders, with the agreement of the competent authority, the date of the most recent periodic inspection and the stamp of the expert may be engraved on a ring affixed to the cylinder when the tap is installed, and rendered immovable without dismantling the tap.”
- 6.2.2 Add to the table “EN 12862:2000” and the applicable sections “6.2.1.1 and 6.2.1.5”;¹
 Add to the table “EN ISO 11114-2:2000” (RID)¹
 Remove the square brackets round “EN ISO 11114-2:2000 (ADR)”.¹

Chapter 6.8

- 6.8.2.5.2 Amend “TP” to “TT”¹
- 6.8.4 (d) Add a new line under the Note in the table with the calculation pressure “2.65” and the test pressure “2.65”¹
 Replace the abbreviation “TP” by “TT” (7 times)¹

Chapter 3.3

- 223 Deleted (ADR only)¹
- 581 Last paragraph, read:
 “Where applicable, in order to meet the requirements of the transport document/consignment note (5.4.1.1.), the term ‘mixture P1’ or ‘mixture P2’ may be used instead of the technical name”.¹
- 582 Last paragraph, read:
 “Where applicable, in order to meet the requirements of the transport document/consignment note (5.4.1.1), the term ‘mixture F1’, ‘mixture F2’ or ‘mixture F3’ may be used instead of the technical name.”¹
- 583 Last two paragraphs, read:
 “Where necessary, in order to meet the requirements of the transport document/consignment note (5.4.1.1), one of the following terms may be used instead of the technical name:

- 'mixture A' or 'butane'
- 'mixture A01' or 'butane'
- 'mixture A02' or 'butane'
- 'mixture A0' or 'butane'
- 'mixture A1'
- 'mixture B1'
- 'mixture B2'
- 'mixture B'
- 'mixture C' or 'propane'.

For carriage in tanks, the commercial names 'butane' and 'propane' may only be used additionally."¹

Chapter 3.3

584

"This gas is not subject to the requirements of RID/ADR when

- it is in the gaseous state,
- it contains not more than 0.5% air,
- it is contained in metal capsules (sodors, sparklets) free from defects which may weaken their resistance,
- the leakproofness of the closure is guaranteed,
- a capsule contains not more than 25 g of this gas,
- a capsule contains not more than 75 kg of this gas per cm³ of capacity¹

639

(new)

"See 2.2.2.3, classification code 2F, UN No. 1965, Note 2"
[UN No. 1075]¹

"640

(new)

The physical and technical characteristics mentioned in column (2) of Table A of Chapter 3.2, which were intended to establish different conditions of carriage for the same packing group, should also be mentioned additionally in the consignment note/transport document."¹
[Nos. 1133, 1139, 1169, 1197, 1210, 1224, 1263, 1266, 1267, 1268, 1286, 1287, 1306, 1308, 1790, 1863, 1866, 1987, 1989, 1993, 1999, 2059, 3269, 3295 and 3336].

Document -/1997/63: adopted with the following text:

Delete special provision 242 and include a new special provision 641:

“641 Sulphur is not subject to the requirements of RID/ADR when it has been formed to a specific shape (e.g. pellets, granules, pastilles or flakes).” [1350].

Chapter 3.2, Table A

Document INF.11: adopted with the following additions:¹

2699 Column (8): Replace “P802” by “P001”

2031 Column (8): Replace “P802” by “P001” for the two entries

Column (2), 1st entry: “with more than 70% ...”
2nd entry: “with not more than 70% ...”

Column (9a), 2nd entry: Replace “Ppbb” by “RR1”
1st entry: Add “RR1”

1790 Column (8), 1st entry: Replace “P802” by “P001”

Column (9a), 1st entry: Add “RR1”
3rd entry: Replace “Ppaa” by “RR1”

1075 Insert in the different columns the particulars of UN No. 1965

1774 Column 7, amend “LQ0” to “LQ22”

1796 Packing Group II: column 19, add “CE6” (RID only)

2015 2nd entry, column 2, read:
“HYDROGEN PEROXIDE, AQUEOUS SOLUTION, STABILIZED,
with more than 70% hydrogen peroxide”

2794)

2795)

3028)

Column 8, replace “P801b” by “P801”

2800

Column 8, replace “P801b” by “P801a”

2814)

2900)

2nd entry: column 4, delete “II”¹

3194

Column 3b, replace “SW” by “S3”
Column 5, delete “+4.3”

3284) Packing Group I: column 12, add "S10AH, L10CH"
3285) column 13, add "TU14, TU15, TE1"
column 20, add "66"

3316 Column 4, add "III"

Add a new line with the following particulars:

"3316 CHEMICAL KIT or FIRST AID KIT/9/M11/II/9/251/LQ0/P901/-/-
/-/-/-/-/ 2/W1/-/-/-/90"

Column 13, throughout replace "TP" by "TT"

Add the special provision "TU14" in column 13 for the following substances:

- substances of Class 3 for which tank code "L15CH" is indicated in column 12;
- substances of Classes 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 for which tank code "L4DH", "L10DH" or "L21DH" is indicated in column 12;
- substances of Class 6.1 for which tank code "L10CH", "L15CH" or "L15DH(+)" is indicated in column 12;
- substances of Class 8 for which tank code "L21DH(+)" is indicated in column 12.

Add special provision "TE15" to column 13 for substances of Class 6.1, Packing Groups II and III.

No. 1708: add "TU15" in column 13
No. 3277: delete "TU14" in column 13
No. 3278: amend "S10CH" to "S10AH" in column 12

INF.23: adopted with the following amendments:³

Column 9a: “4.1.4” should be added

Column 13: add “+ 6.8.4”

Column 14: add “9” (ADR only)

Column 15: add “1.1.3.1(c)/1.1.3.6”

Column 16: add “7.2.4”

Column 17: add “7.3.3”

Column 18: add “7.5.11”

Column 19: add “7.6/8.5”

Column 20: add “5.3.2.3”

Class 7

INF.14/Rev.1: adopted with the following amendments:

6.4.23.9 (c): “C(F)” becomes “CF”

The addition to 4.1.9.1.6 is unnecessary.

¹ From 1 July 2001.

² For ADR, from 1 July 2001

³ Application from 1 July 2001

Annex 2

Amendments according to INF.11, annex 1, which were not included in Annex 1 above, with the exception of amendments to Table A of Chapter 3.2 which will be incorporated directly into Table A

Section 3.2.1, explanation of column 5, second subparagraph (RID only):

Replace “tank-containers, portable tanks, MEGCs, tank-wagons, wagons with movable tanks and battery-wagons” by “wagons, tank-wagons, battery-wagons, wagons with movable tanks and wagons on which tank-containers, MEGCs or portable tanks are transported”.

Chapter 4.1

4.1.4.2 Under IBC08, delete the sentence “This instruction applies to Nos. ...”.

Chapter 4.3

4.3.4.1.2 Under L4BH, add after “hazard group 2” (Class 6.2) “13/II” (ADR only);

Under S4AH, add before Class 9 “6.2/13/II” (ADR only).

4.3.4.1.3 (e) For UN No. 3110, amend the tank code to “S4AN”
ADR: same amendment as for UN No. 3120.

4.3.5 Add a new special provision to read:

“TU 36 The degree of filling according to 4.3.2.2 at the reference temperature of 15° C shall not exceed 93% of capacity.”
(7.7.1/214 770)

Chapter 5.3

5.3.2.1.1 (RID only) Add after “tank-containers”¹
“- MEGCs;
- portable tanks;”

5.3.2.1.3 and

5.3.2.1.4 Add “MEGC” after “tank-container” (RID only)

5.4.1.1.1 (k) Replace “in accordance with column (20) of Table A of Chapter 3.2” by “in accordance with 5.3.2.1” (RID only).

Chapter 6.8

6.8.4 (b) Add the following new special provision:

“TE20 Notwithstanding the other tank codes authorized in the hierarchy of tanks of the rationalized approach of 4.3.4.1.2, tanks shall be equipped with a safety valve.” [9.3.1/21x 930]

6.8.4 (d) Add the following new special provision:

“TT7 By derogation from the requirements of 6.8.2.4.2, the periodic internal inspection may be replaced by a programme approved by the competent authority.” [7.5.2/21x 750]

6.8.4 (e) Add the following new special provision:

“TM7 The trefoil symbol described in 5.2.1.7.6 shall be marked by stamping or by any other equivalent method on the plate described in 6.8.2.5.1, or on the shell itself if the shell is so reinforced that its strength is not impaired.” [7.6/21x 760]

Part 2

2.2.2.2.2 Add “- UN No. 1043 FERTILIZER AMMONIATING SOLUTION with free ammonia.”

¹ Application from 1 July 2001.